From:	Kristin Bjornsen
To:	#LandUsePlanner
Subject:	letter for the planning commission
Date:	Wednesday, November 02, 2016 9:26:56 PM

Dear Planning Commission,

I wanted to send along my Oct. 28 letter to the editor in the Daily Camera.
http://www.dailycamera.com/letters/ci_30516504/kristin-bjornsen-planning-commission-shines-light-flawed-process

Thanks for your time!

Kristin

Kristin Bjornsen: Planning Commission shines light on flawed process

POSTED: 10/28/2016 07:30:30 PM MDT

At Helm's Deep, in the darkness before dawn, when all hope seemed lost, hobbits looked to the east and saw Gandalf the White, resplendent in morning light, galloping to the rescue of Middle Earth. On Wednesday, Oct. 19, citizens looked to the county courthouse and saw the Planning Commission, equally resplendent in clarity of thought and nobility of purpose, swoop to the rescue of Boulder's democratic process.

I do not invoke Tolkien ironically. That's the only image that captures how I felt when — on their own initiative, for their own reasons — the Planning Commission voted 5-1 to hold a new hearing on the Twin Lakes.

The decision had to do with a deeply flawed public hearing. While carefully considering the issue's complexities, the Planning Commission had the greatness of heart, courage of spine, and brilliance of mind to set it right.

Some of the reasons the members gave for the landmark decision include:

• "Unusual," "exigent," "extraordinary" circumstances that none of them had experienced before after many years on the Planning Commission.

• Transparency issues during the hearing process and unevenly applied rules.

• The seriousness of four-body review.

• Lack of study on an open-space use.

• Perceived pressure from the assistant county attorney to reach a decision rather than tabling the issue for more study.

• New information that came to light.

• A need to get the process right, since "once land is gone, it's gone."

I've no idea what future votes hold, but when I was walking up the courthouse steps that Wednesday and heard the news of reconsideration, it felt like a sudden breeze blowing through my heart, reigniting embers of faith in our democratic process. I felt as Samwise Gamgee might have: "That there's some good in this world, Mr. Frodo...and it's worth fighting for."

From: Wufoo
To: Boulder County Board of Commissioners
Subject: County Commissioners Contact Us/Feedback Form. [#209]
Date: Saturday, November 05, 2016 9:10:29 AM

Name *	Danny Bailey
Email *	dbailey06@hotmail.com
My Question or Feedback most closely relates to the following subject: (fill in the blank) *	Vote
Comments, Question or Feedback *	I would like to let you know I am voting against you because of your vote on the Twin Lakes rezoning Thank You
Please check box below *	• I acknowledge receipt of the Open Records Notification

From: Wufoo
To: Boulder County Board of Commissioners
Subject: County Commissioners Contact Us/Feedback Form. [#210]
Date: Sunday, November 06, 2016 9:17:15 PM

Name *	Marilyn Stinson
Email *	mstinson@creativec.us
My Question or Feedback most closely relates to the following subject: (fill in the blank) *	Gunbarrel issues of Roads plus Twin Lakes Development

Comments, Question or Feedback *

Elise Jones & Deb Gardner, because the Republican choices weren't aligned to my Democratic/progressive politics, I voted for you both with reluctance. I live in Gunbarrel Estates and I lost respect for your decisions /handling of our roads and Twin Lakes. We have paid taxes for maintaining our streets and after living here over 30 years, we learn we have to pay more for our roads. The County claims maintenance services include pothole patching. Two damaging potholes east of Mt. Sherman and Gunbarrel Rds. intersection have created zigzagging driving for over 2 months. The Twin Lakes low-income housing development added to our frustration. Developers won the battle over residents' concern for the environment & total quality of life. It makes more sense to develop housing in North Boulder where jobs and closer transportation to those jobs would exist. The person who sold that land specified that said property was to be un develope d is my understanding.

Please check box below *	• I acknowledge receipt of the Open Records Notification

From: City of Boulder Planning
To: Sugnet, Jay; Wobus, Nicole; Giang, Steven
Subject: FW: Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation Changes
Date: Monday, November 07, 2016 10:36:41 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Dale Durland [mailto:dale.durland@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2016 4:55 PM
To: City of Boulder Planning <planning@bouldercolorado.gov>
Cc: Council <Council@bouldercolorado.gov>
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation Changes

The unprecedented process being used to change the designation of the Twin Lakes properties sets a dangerous precedent.
This process has been underhanded to say the least, if not outright unethical and illegal. The County is manipulating the Comprehensive Plan to promote what it refused to the prior owner. This is not about affordable housing! It is about foisting an urban development on a rural residential neighborhood.

In regard to affordable housing, the current policy, allowing developers to pay “in lieu of" fees rather than include affordable units in each property needs to change.
Affordable housing should be available in every new development in Boulder. Recently, Gunbarrel has absorbed 500 new apartments without one affordable unit among them!
Most of my neighbors have lived in this area for years. We are not wealthy elitists.
I have worked as a nurse in this community for my entire adult life and saved for many years to finally afford my own home.
Those who characterize us as NIMBYists don’t know the middle class families here whose homes represent most of their savings.

The current Low Density Residential designation, or better yet the Open Space designation, are the appropriate use of these parcels.

Dale Durland
4719 Quail Creek Lane
Boulder
80301

From: Kristin Bjornsen
To: boulderplanningboard
Subject: Planning Commission"s decision regarding the Twin Lakes
Date: Tuesday, November 08, 2016 1:24:07 PM

Dear Planning Board,

Regarding the Planning Commission's recent vote to hold a new hearing on the Twin Lakes, I wanted to let you know that this decision had nothing to do with having (or not having) nine members. In fact, the PC members, during the deliberation on the reconsideration, specifically said it wasn't about that. Instead, it was about the many flaws in the public hearing process and new information that came to light.

I've pasted below my letter in the Camera that lists some of the reasons given during the deliberation. I also have the full transcript if anyone is interested.

Thanks for your time!

Kristin Bjornsen

Kristin Bjornsen: Planning Commission shines light on flawed process

POSTED: 10/28/2016 07:30:30 PM MDT

At Helm's Deep, in the darkness before dawn, when all hope seemed lost, hobbits looked to the east and saw Gandalf the White, resplendent in morning light, galloping to the rescue of Middle Earth. On Wednesday, Oct. 19, citizens looked to the county courthouse and saw the Planning Commission, equally resplendent in clarity of thought and nobility of purpose, swoop to the rescue of Boulder's democratic process.

I do not invoke Tolkien ironically. That's the only image that captures how I felt when — on their own initiative, for their own reasons — the Planning Commission voted 5-1 to hold a new hearing on the Twin Lakes.

The decision had to do with a deeply flawed public hearing. While carefully considering the issue's complexities, the Planning Commission had the greatness of heart, courage of spine, and brilliance of mind to set it right.

Some of the reasons the members gave for the landmark decision include:

• "Unusual," "exigent," "extraordinary" circumstances that none of them had experienced before after many years on the Planning Commission.

• Transparency issues during the hearing process and unevenly applied rules.

• The seriousness of four-body review.

• Lack of study on an open-space use.

• Perceived pressure from the assistant county attorney to reach a decision rather than tabling the issue for more study.

• New information that came to light.

• A need to get the process right, since "once land is gone, it's gone."

I've no idea what future votes hold, but when I was walking up the courthouse steps that Wednesday and heard the news of reconsideration, it felt like a sudden breeze blowing through my heart, reigniting embers of faith in our democratic process. I felt as Samwise Gamgee might have: "That there's some good in this world, Mr. Frodo...and it's worth fighting for."

http://www.dailycamera.com/letters/ci_30516504/kristin-bjornsen-planning-commission-shines-light-flawed-process

From: Nikki Munson
To: boulderplanningboard@bouldercolorado.gov; #LandUsePlanner; council@bouldercolorado.gov
Subject: GPID Issue in Gunbarrel
Date: Thursday, November 10, 2016 10:52:50 PM
Attachments: GPID LTE.docx

Attached please find my letter to the Boulder Daily Camera regarding funds owed to the Gunbarrel GPID and how it relates to 6655 Twin Lakes Road. I am actively pursuing this matter with Boulder County, and believe it is important for you to be aware of this issue as you deliberate the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan regarding this property. Commitments for millions of dollars were made to the citizens of the GPID before we voted to tax ourselves for 12 years to fund open space purchases within the GPID. These promises must be honored, and you have a part to play in redeeming these promises.

Sincerely,

Nikki Munson

Nikki Munson
4554 Starboard Drive
Boulder, CO
303.581.9079

In 1993, the Boulder County Commissioners created the Gunbarrel Public Improvement District, to purchase land within the district for open space. GPID residents voted on and passed a 1993 ballot to tax themselves through property taxes, for 11 years, to underwrite $3,600,000 in bonds to fund: $1,900,000 to purchase open space and $1,700,000 for road improvements.

In the ballot there was a commitment that if the County Sales and Use Tax for Open Space passed, The County will provide a matching contribution toward open space purchase within the Gunbarrel Public Improvement District up to a maximum amount of $1,900,000. This County Open Space tax passed in November of 1993.

As of 2007, GPID had purchased 6 parcels totaling $2,300,340. The County contribution toward these three parcels was $1,305,634. In 2009 the remaining money in the GPID account was transferred into the County general fund.

The County has a remaining obligation to the GPID of $594,366 of their matching contribution of $1,900,000.

The County used GPID funds, commingled into the general fund in 2009, to purchase a 10-acre parcel at 6655 Twin Lakes Road, within the GPID's boundary, for $470,000. This land is thus purchased for the GPID, to further the GPID goal of retaining open space within the GPID boundary. Developing 6655 Twin Lakes Rd for housing is improper, must be reversed and the land properly designated as open space.

Per the GPID Resolution, the county commissioners are also the board of directors for the GPID, therefore their primary responsibility is to the GPID's goal of acquiring undeveloped land for open space.

From:	Allison May
To:	boulderplanningboard@bouldercolorado.gov; council@bouldercolorado.gov; #LandUsePlanner
Subject:	Mallards" misfortune at the Twin Lakes
Date:	Friday, November 11, 2016 9:25:06 AM

Dear representatives,

I just learned that a mallard's nest with eggs in it, on the north Twin Lakes field, was trampled by the Housing Authority's vehicles over the summer.

The Housing Authority was supposed to wait until AFTER the wildlife assessment to mow and after a biologist walk-through before driving through with drilling trucks. Even the fire chief had said mowing just the perimeter would be fine.

Gunbarrel residents had begged and pleaded with them to wait, but the Housing Authority called the Sheriff's Office.

With wildlife struggling so hard to survive, this is sad news, and the sight of the mother duck flying frantically over the place where the nest used to be, heartbreaking.

In happier news, on the south Twin Lakes field, the meadowlark's nest, with 5 babies in it, did survive, thanks to the diligence of Gunbarrel residents, the friendliness of the tractor operators, and the environmental stewardship of the school district to agree to mow only the perimeter. Thank you, BVSD!

Sincerely,

Allison

From: Allison May
To: council@bouldercolorado.gov; #LandUsePlanner; boulderplanningboard@bouldercolorado.gov
Subject: Mike Smith"s Daily Camera letter
Date: Friday, November 11, 2016 9:36:45 AM

Hello again,

I also meant to paste below a Daily Camera letter about the Housing Authority's ill-conceived mowing during a wildlife study. Boulder has such a legacy of environmental protection--I hope we can continue bravely forward with that now!

Sincerely,

Allison

Michael L. Smith: Mowing deliberate attempt to skew Twin Lakes study

POSTED: 08/02/2016 06:35:49 PM MDT | UPDATED: 3 MONTHS AGO

Juliet Gopinath's excellent guest opinion, "Twin Lakes studies are a sham" (Daily Camera, July 31) pointed out many of the severe flaws in Boulder County Housing Authority's hydrology and wildlife studies on the undeveloped land along Twin Lakes Road. But, perhaps because of the Camera's space limitations, she did not mention that halfway through BCHA's already compromised wildlife study, they mowed their entire 10-acre parcel. Or perhaps "scalped" is a more accurate term, because that mowing reduced the wildlife habitat on the parcel from a rich, 2-foot cover of living prairie grasses to a barren wasteland of 2-inch dried stubble.

Coming during the breeding season, it certainly destroyed every nest of several ground-nesting species on the parcel (western meadowlarks, etc.), and very likely killed most or all of several Boulder County "species of special concern," including including tiger salamanders and meadow voles. At the very least, the mowing was an act of severe incompetence by BCHA staff. But given their known determination to charge ahead with annexation, upzoning and construction of dense, multi-story apartments at Twin Lakes, it's hard not to view their mowing as a deliberate attempt to ensure that no "inconvenient" wildlife could remain to be documented on the parcel as BCHA's fatally flawed study concludes. Surely, it unleashed a holocaust on the wildlife trying to live on that land.

The Boulder City Council should demand that BCHA scrap its current wildlife study on the Twin Lakes Road parcels and conduct a new, credible study that includes a full inventory of the species that use the parcels. That inventory should last a minimum of one year in order to document the migratory species. And council absolutely should NOT allow mowing to destroy the habitat in mid-study.

Michael L. Smith

Boulder

From: John O"Dea
To: #LandUsePlanner
Subject: Today"s hearing...
Date: Wednesday, November 16, 2016 3:33:33 PM
Attachments: Speaking Order.pdf

Dear Planning Commission Members,

Thank you for agreeing to hear additional testimony related to Twin Lakes in January. At today's meeting, Land Use Director Dale Case stated unequivocally that the speaking order at the August 30 meeting was not manipulated by County staff. Mr. Case's statement is directly contradicted by the public record. The disconnect between Mr. Case's assertion that there was "no manipulation of the speaking order" and the public record is galling and reinforces the notion that a small cabal of Boulder County employees are unfairly trying to manipulate a public process to enable their pet project at Twin Lakes.

I encourage you to review the summary of this issue (attached) and the primary documents that we obtained under CORA. Further, I hope the Commission will direct Mr. Case to correct his misrepresentation so that the integrity of the public record can be maintained.

Thank you again for your leadership on this important issue. The favor of a reply is requested.

Sincerely,
John O'Dea
4704 Hampshire Street
Boulder
--

John O'Dea
(207) 446-8805

Twin Lakes
Action Group

October 6, 2016

Re: **Request to establish equitable Final Review Hearing procedures**

Dear City Council, Planning Board and BVCP Staff,

Thanks for all your efforts planning the upcoming City Final Review meeting for land-use change requests to the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan. As part of that process, the Twin Lakes Action Group (TLAG) respectfully asks that procedures be put in place to safeguard the fairness and integrity of the public hearing process. We also will send this letter to the County Commissioners so they can make their procedures more robust in the future as well.

Our request stems from troubling incidents at the Aug. 30 County Final Review hearing. One such incident involves irregularities with the speaker signup for the Public Comment period. Specifically, the County inserted several pro-Medium Density speakers into early time slots—*after* online signup had closed, when everyone else had to sign up in person that night for midnight speaking times.

We know of at least five "favored" people with which this occurred. Two examples involve the County inserting former County Commissioner and Better Boulder Chair Will Toor and Boulder Housing Partners Executive Director Betsey Martens into the 7 p.m. time block. Here is the timeline of events:

- At 10 p.m. on Sunday, Aug. 28, the online speaker signup for the Aug. 30 County Final Review Hearing closed.
- At 11:31 a.m., on Aug. 30, the image shown below was the speaking order for 7:30–7:34 p.m. that was posted on the County website (see here for full list from 5:16–11:56 p.m.):

7:00 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	James Bruce	
7:02 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Jason McRoy	
7:04 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Elizabeth Blakley	
7:06 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Gina Rosa	
7:08 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Kathy Johnston	
7:10 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Susan Ortiz	
7:12 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Odie Youngblood	
7:14 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Connie Grosshans	
7:16 PM	Pooled 4 minutes	Twin Lakes	Jim Williams	Chris Campbell
7:20 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Evalee Demery	
7:22 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Andrea Ostroy	
7:24 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Angela Lanci-Macris	
7:26 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Bridget Gordon	
7:28 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Michael Block	
7:30 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Diana Moore	
7:32 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Lee King Gasche	
7:34 PM	Pooled 4 minutes	Twin Lakes	Sarah Buss	Patrick Kelly

- At 2:08 p.m., on Aug. 30, we noticed that the speaker lineup had changed. Here was the final speaking order for 7:00–7:28 p.m. (see here for full list from 5:16 p.m. to 12:02 a.m.)

7:00 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Gina Rosa			2
7:02 PM	Pooled	Twin Lakes	Betsey Martens	Maggie Crosswy		4
7:06 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	James Bruce			2
7:08 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Alexandra Niehaus			2
7:10 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Jason McRoy			2
7:12 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Elizabeth Blakley			2
7:14 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Gina Rosa			2
7:16 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Kathy Johnston			2

ESTIMATED speaking times noted above are APPROXIMATE timeframes for speakers who signed up in advance to comment in person. This list represents the order of speakers, not actual speaking times.

BVCP Public Hearing - Aug. 30, 2016
APROXIMATE PUBLIC SPEAKER TIME SCHEDULE
(Note: Time slots are to be viewed as an approximate reference ONLY and should not be construed as set, assigned times)

Speakers and contributors must be present when called to speak.						
Time	Type	Topic	Primary Speaker	Pool Contrib 1	Pool Contrib 2	Min.
7:18 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Susan Ortiz			2
7:20 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Odie Youngblood			2
7:22 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Connie Grosshans			2
7:24 PM	Pooled 4 minutes	Twin Lakes	Will Toor	Chris Campbell		4
7:28 PM	Individual	Twin Lakes	Evalee Demery			2

- In this second speaker lineup, Ms. Martens, with pooler Maggie Crosswy (Housing and Human Services Communications), was inserted at the 7:02 p.m. slot. Will Toor (former County Commissioner), with already signed-up pooler Chris Campbell (Assistant to the Director of Housing and Human Services), was inserted at the 7:24 p.m. slot.
- That Monday and Tuesday, many TLAG members asked if they could sign up after signup had closed or change their speaking time. They were told "no." These people had to sign up in person that night for time slots starting at midnight.

We wondered how these favored speakers had gotten added to the lineup at a "prime speaking time" when online signed up had already ended. On Sept. 8, we submitted a Colorado Open Records Act (CORA) request to Boulder Housing Partners, asking for correspondence between Boulder Housing Partners and the Boulder County Land Use Department on Aug. 29 and Aug. 30, 2016.

In response, we received this document containing emails between Ms. Martens and HHS Communications Specialist Jim Williams and HHS Director Frank Alexander, where the former says she "wasn't aware that the online sign-up closed last week (although I'm sure your emails told me that) so it's unlikely these comments will be heard, or even read." And the latter two replying that she is now signed up to speak for four minutes. This is just one example.

We also submitted a CORA request to Housing & Human Services, asking for correspondence on Aug. 29 and Aug. 30 regarding speaker signup. We received this 105-page document in reply.

Reading through its pages, we were astonished to see unfold a concerted campaign by the County to marshal people from various organizations, committees, and groups to speak at the meeting. In that campaign:

- At least 5 people were added to the closed speaker list or allowed to change their time from midnight to between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m.
- For another person, who had mistakenly signed up to speak on a different topic, Land Use staff suggested that person stand up at the meeting and say it had been the County's error and to take a different person's extra time slot. (It's unclear why the latter person was allowed to have two time slots.)
- The Commissioners' Deputy Michelle Krezek even emailed the speaker lineup to BCHA on Monday, Aug. 29, for them to review without also sending it to TLAG. The Deputy also urged someone who couldn't speak to instead write a letter about housing needs to the Planning Commission.

The only changes made for TLAG members were ones in which the County had made an error (e.g., a computer glitch in the signup system, or someone who was told a wrong date for signup ending) and sometimes not even then. Several people were told "no" even to just adding a pooler.

We are very concerned that the County gave preferential treatment to pro-development speakers and bent the signup rules for them. This is inequitable and discriminatory.

These procedural problems (along with other issues from the review hearing that we're still looking into) have undermined citizen trust in the public process. We are bringing this matter to your attention so that protocols can be put in place to assure fairness and transparency at the City Final Review meeting and at future County meetings. The favor of a written reply is requested.

Our democracy is founded upon the idea that all people are created equal—whether they are a government official or regular citizen; pro-development or pro–rural preservation. Our public hearing procedures must reflect that.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

David L Rechberger
Dave Rechberger, Chairman
Twin Lakes Action Group

From:	Susan Davis Lambert
To:	boulderplanningboard
Subject:	BVSD Dedication Guest Opinion
Date:	Monday, November 28, 2016 4:52:18 PM
Attachments:	1) city_planners_memo.pdf 8) Memorandum for record.pdf 9) BVSD Deed receipt Notice to City PC.pdf

---

Dear Planning Board members,

I wanted to call your attention to a guest opinion I wrote that ran in yesterdays' Sunday Daily Camera:

http://www.dailycamera.com/guest-opinions/ci_30604905/susan-lambert-taking-twin-lakes-dedicated-land

It concerns the south Twin Lakes parcel, which is owned by BVSD, and the fact that it is a land dedication. This land was "exacted" in 1967 from the developers of Gunbarrel Green subdivision as land that would serve as a school, park or recreational site for that neighborhood in perpetuity. This land dedication was required by law, and the recipient was BVSD, who signed an agreement and other legal documents to uphold these intended uses as they took possession of the 10-acre parcel.

In recent years, BVSD has decided to sell off many of these dedicated lands, often unbeknownst to their attributing subdivisions, and always circumventing Boulder County Land Use Code.

The main point is that while the Twin Lakes BVSD land dedication remains in the County, it is use-restricted to only a school, park or recreational space. It is not eligible for any kind of housing – even for teachers. These land dedications were meant to be an oasis of green amongst housing developments – not land on which to build more housing.

And that is why I would like to recommend bifurcation of the north and south parcels within the BVCP land use designation process. The BVSD parcel is not eligible for housing since it's a use-restricted dedication, according to Assistant County Attorney Kathy Parker, which presents a conundrum for the four voting bodies. The south parcel has no business going through the comp plan update since it is a valid dedication and must adhere to the relevant restrictions, and therefore should be split from the BCHA request and appropriately eliminated from the BVCP process altogether. The north and south parcels are two different animals coupled to cloak the complexities of each parcel, and splitting them up would allow them to be treated as the unique situations that they are.

I have attached several exhibits, one of which is from the Boulder City Planners back in 1963; please see #4.

I hope you will read my guest opinion, and I would welcome any comments or be happy to discuss any part of this at any time.

Thank you for your time.

Best regards,

Susan Lambert
TLAG Board Member
303-530-7151 (H&O)
303-518-6648 (cell)

MEMORANDUM
April 5, 1963

TO: The Boulder County Planning Commission

FROM: The Boulder City Planning Office

SUBJECT: Recommendation concerning a subdivision located approximately one mile east of the Boulder Reservoir to be known as Country Club Park

On April 4, 1963, the City Planning Board reviewed the above mentioned subdivision and voted unanimously to recommend favorable action to the County Planning Commission with the following suggestions:

1. A plan should be formulated which would provide suitable access to the Longmont diagonal at the intersection of State Highway 119 and the Longmont diagonal.

2. The area designated as industrial in the northwest corner of the subdivision should be restricted (by deed covenant) to certain types of industries that do not produce excessive smoke, fumes or other obnoxious conditions. The prevailing winds in this area would no doubt carry objectionable smoke and odors directly to the residential area to the east.

3. It should be specified whether or not the golf course will provide other types of recreation in addition to golf and, if not, other parks or recreational facilities should be considered.

4. A school site should be provided to serve the large number of families with school age children who will live in this area. Additional park land could possibly be provided in conjunction with the school site.

5. A public water supply, sewer system and storm drainage system should be provided which would necessarily need to be approved by the City Engineer, the County Engineer and County Health Department.

6. It would be desirable for the County to obtain access rights along all county roads where lots back up to lots that are adjacent to these roads. It appears this could be done along all such county roads, except for the frontage of the commercial area.

7. At least two or three more connecting roads to the west should be provided in order that the entire subdivision be made more accessible.

Theadore H. Mikesell, Planning Director
City of Boulder, Colorado

ma

FILM 602

Recorded MAY 10 1967 at 10:07 A O'clock M
Reception No. 84613 Henry C. Putnam, Recorder

2-1

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

THIS MEMORANDUM OF RECORD, made and entered into this 5th day of May, 1967, by and between BOULDER VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. Re 2, a body corporate, and TWIN LAKES INVESTMENT COMPANY, a limited partnership;

WHEREAS, Twin Lakes Investment Company has heretofore conveyed by warranty deed certain real property located in the County of Boulder to the Boulder Valley School District No. Re 2, a description of which appears hereafter; and,

WHEREAS, the parties desire to place on record certain obligations and responsibilities which exist between the parties by virtue of an agreement between the parties made and executed the 27th day of March, 1967;

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties agree to record their obligations as follows:

1. The property conveyed to the school district is described as follows:

Beginning at the N 1/4 corner of Section 14, Township 1 North, Range 70 West of the 6th P.M.; thence South 0° 14' 20" East, 480.00 feet along the north-south centerline of said Section 14; thence South 89° 10' West, 415.44 feet; thence North 30° 00' West, 448.58 feet; thence North 0° 50' West, 358.25 feet; thence North 89° 10' East, 642.26 feet to the north-south centerline of Section 11, Township 1 North, Range 70 West of the 6th P.M.; thence South 0° 09' East, 270.00 feet along the north-south centerline of said Section 11 to the point of beginning.

2. Twin Lakes Investment Company has granted to the Boulder Valley School District No. Re 2 the right to obtain an easement or easements across the real property owned by Twin Lakes Investment Company for purpose of supplying water and sewer service to the above-described school site. Such easements shall be along a course or courses designated by the school district.

3. Twin Lakes Investment Company has agreed that it shall dedicate to the County of Boulder, or City of Boulder, as the case may be, a right of way for the construction of a road in accordance with the then prevailing standards and that such road shall directly enter and connect with the above-mentioned ten (10) acre parcel conveyed to the Boulder Valley School District No. Re 2.

4. The conveyance of the above-described ten (10) acres has been made directly from Twin Lakes Investment Company to the Boulder Valley School District No. Re 2 rather than from East View, Inc., a Colorado corporato the Boulder Valley School District No. Re 2, the parties agreeing that this direct conveyance is in contemplation of the agreement dated March 27, 1967, and referred to above and incorporated herein by reference.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this agreement the day and year first above written.

BOULDER VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. Re 2

By John Morris
School Planner

TWIN LAKES INVESTMENT COMPANY, a Limited Partnership

By Leeland D. Hopkins

BOULDER VALLEY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. Re2, BOULDER COUNTY
P. O. BOX 11, BOULDER, COLORADO 80301
PHONE 442-6931
Planning Department
May 24, 1967

RECEIVED
MAY 25 '67
DEVELOPMENT

Boulder County Planning Commission
Boulder County Court House
Boulder, Colorado

Attention Mr. Lynn Vandergrift, Acting Director

Gentlemen:

This is to inform you that the Boulder Valley School District Re 2 has received a Warranty Deed from Twin Lakes Investment Company for a ten acre tract to satisfy the understanding approved in 1963 by the County Planning Commission between the school district and East View Inc. with respect to the five per cent requirement of the Gunbarrel Green Subdivision and Development.

A copy of the recorded deed and exhibits will be sent to you for your files at a later date.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

John Morris

John Morris
School Planner

JTM:dc

cc: Gerald Caplan

From:	Kristin Bjornsen
To:	council@bouldercolorado.gov; boulderplanningboard@bouldercolorado.gov; #LandUsePlanner
Subject:	Resiliency and the Twin Lakes
Date:	Tuesday, November 29, 2016 1:26:15 PM

Dear Boulder governing bodies,

I saw on the City Council agenda for tonight that there will be a review of Boulder's resiliency strategy. One comment that I would like to add to the mix is that:

- Resiliency is placing high-density development close to services and transit—not situating 240 units on flood-prone fields far from services and accessed by a single road.
- Resiliency is protecting ecosystem connections so that animals can move freely when environmental stressors, such as climate change, occur—not destroying the very last wildlife corridor linking the Twin Lakes with Walden Ponds and paving over buffer habitat.

If we are serious about preparing for stressors, that means planning intelligently for a dynamic system. So I hope the County and City will consider the alternate locations and strategies that Gunbarrel and Boulder citizens have suggested for the proposed development. This would benefit the people who would be served and the environment we all depend upon.

Best wishes,

Kristin