

747 Community Project 2010 Survey



747 Community Project

PO Box 74

Allenspark, CO 80510

Email: 747CommunityProject@GMAIL.com

Website: www.747CommunityProject.org

Dear Allenspark Community Neighbor,

We would appreciate your support of the 747 Community Project by taking time to read and respond to this, our second survey. Last year's survey and community meetings helped us understand what issues were important to the community. Based on that input, we have developed options, recommendations and a few questions that deal with how we should address those issues and what kind of change is and is not supported within the community.

In presenting the proposals to you, this survey contains several sections, each addressing proposals related to one of the several issues identified last year. Each section begins with a brief description of the issue followed by the survey questions. Your answers to the questions will focus the 747 Community Project on those proposals that have high levels of support within the community for further action.

What will follow from this survey will be ongoing work to develop details around those proposals that have broad support. This summer, we will seek the involvement of the summer time community in discussing and developing the detailed proposals as we work toward presenting our proposals to Boulder County this fall.

Sincerely,
The 747 Community Project Team

Please return your completed survey by June 30, 2010

(Originally due on the 17th but now extended to the end of the month).

You may optionally take the survey on line at www.747CommunityProject.org and save the postage.

Terms used

The following terms are used in the survey.

Allenspark Area: This term refers to the Boulder County portion of the Allenspark Fire Protection District and is inclusive of the townships of Allenspark, Raymond and Riverside.

The County: This term refers to the county government and agencies including the County Commissioners, Land Use Department, Planning Commission and Health Department

Residential Floor Area: Includes all attached and detached floor area on a parcel including principal and accessory structures used or customarily used for residential purposes, such as garages, studios, pool houses, home offices and workshops. It does not include buildings used for agriculture.

Links to additional information:

Allenspark TPI Website: 747CommunityProject.org

Boulder County website for Township Planning initiatives

http://www.bouldercounty.org/lu/townsite_planning/

Allenspark area specific webpage:

http://www.bouldercounty.org/lu/townsite_planning/AllensparkRaymondRiverside.htm

Instructions:

For those questions that have a checkbox () , check all that apply

For those questions that have a radio button () , check only one that applies

Section 1: Demographics

Identification is for validation purposes only and surveys returned without this information cannot be counted. The association of the demographic information with the survey responses is not retained for the purposes of anonymity.

Question 1.1: Respondent Validation

Please enter Name and ALLENSPARK AREA PROPERTY STREET ADDRESS (not PO Box) for validation purposes
For example: 14259 Longs Peak Summit

Name _____
Property Street Address _____

Question 1.2: Contact Information (Optional)

Name _____
Address Line 1 _____
Address Line 2 _____
City _____
State _____
Zip Code _____
Phone _____
Email Address _____

Question 1.3: Location

What area is your property in?

Allenspark Townsite

Raymond Townsite

Riverside Townsite

Peak to Peak Corridor Area

Other in Allenspark Fire District

Question 1.4: Residential Status

Check all boxes that apply to you

Landowner

Year Round/Full Time Resident

Seasonal Resident

Weekend Resident

Renter

Question 1.5: Length of time as resident

Length of time as resident or property owner in the Allenspark Area

1 - 5 years

6 - 10 years

11 - 25 Years

More than 25 years

Question 1.6: Age

How old are you?

Under 18

18 - 24

25 - 39

40 - 59

60+

Question 1.7: Respond to First Survey?

Did you respond to the first 747 Community Project Survey last year?

- Yes
- No

Section 2: House-Size Regulations

Background:

In 2008, Boulder County enacted a regulation that establishes total residential floor space thresholds for new construction and additions in unincorporated portions of the county. Current thresholds include all attached and detached floor area on a parcel, including principal and accessory structures used, or customarily used for residential purposes, such as basements, enclosed porches, garages, studios, pool houses, home offices, and workshops. These thresholds vary by location. Within the 747 Community Project area these thresholds are: Allenspark, Raymond and Riverside townsites: 1500 square feet.

Outside of the designated townsites: The larger of 2500 square feet or 125% of the median residential floor space for the neighborhood (defined as other properties within the same platted subdivision, or within 1500 feet of the subject property).

The thresholds are used in Site Plan Review to determine size compatibility with the local neighborhood. Projects under the threshold are "presumed" to be compatible. Larger residential floor area can still be approved depending on the County's evaluation of additional criteria, but the applicant must demonstrate that the larger area is appropriate. The project must also meet all other Site Plan Review and Land Use Code requirements.

For more information, including links to the Boulder County Land Use Code, please refer to <http://www.747communityproject.org/size>.

Question 2.1: House Size

The 747 Community Project is presenting a range of options to the current house size regulations / thresholds in order to gauge which option may be most preferred by the community

Option A: Retain the existing regulations

(The premise of Alternative D is that:

Determining neighborhood compatibility based mainly on house size is appropriate

Option B: Criteria Only, Site-Specific.

Upper limits on size will be determined by lot size and the ability to meet established health and safety criteria as well as criteria developed and/or adopted by the community. The criteria could be tailored to meet the specific conditions and preferences of each geographic area.

1) Development criteria (e.g., lot size, set backs scaled to lot/building size, building height, septic requirements, etc.)

2) Conservation/environmental criteria (scenic views, wildlife habitat, wetlands, etc.).

(The premise of Option B is that if, by meeting the criteria, the residential structure(s) does not present a health/safety hazard, or significant negative visual or environmental impact then the size of the structure shall not be otherwise restricted.)

Option C: Criteria based, site-specific with upper size limits.

Option C is the same as Option B, except that an ABSOLUTE upper limit on residential floor area, that can not be exceeded, for each of the geographic areas should be established.

(The premise of Option C is that if, by meeting the criteria, the residential structure(s) does not present a health/safety hazard, or significant negative visual or environmental impact then the size of the structure shall not be otherwise restricted; however, some upper limit on development should be established by the community.)

Option D: Criteria With Higher Thresholds

The same as Option B but with the use of neighborhood size-compatibility thresholds higher than specified by current regulation. This option is similar to the existing county regulations, except that the size thresholds would be increased to values considered acceptable by the geographic areas affected (see following questions). To exceed the threshold would require meeting visibility criteria and size compatibility with adjacent properties as defined by the community.

(The premise of Option D is that maintaining some degree of neighborhood house-size compatibility is desirable, but that the current thresholds are too restrictive relative to the Allenspark community's vision and goals. The current thresholds are based largely on 1920-1950 vintage structure intended only as summer getaways and not well suited to supporting a stable, year round community.)

Option E: Keep Existing Regulations but Lower the Thresholds

(The premise of option E is the same as option A except that house size compatibility thresholds should be more restrictive than current regulations)

Rank the following alternatives in order of your preference, with 1 being the most preferred.

- | | Preference |
|---|------------|
| a. Retain the existing regulations | _____ |
| b. Criteria Only Site-Specific | _____ |
| c. Criteria and Absolute Upper Limit | _____ |
| d. Criteria With Higher Thresholds | _____ |
| e. Keep Existing Regulation with Lower Thresholds | _____ |

Question 2.2: Option C Absolute House Size Limit

Under Option C (site-specific criteria with absolute house size limit), what would you consider to be a suitable house-size absolute limit on total square footage for the following locations?

(Enter in Square Feet)

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| a. Allenspark Townsite | _____ |
| b. Raymond/Riverside Townsite | _____ |
| c. Peak to Peak Corridor Area | _____ |
| d. Other | _____ |

Question 2.3: Option D Criteria With Higher Threshold

Under Option D (Criteria With Higher Threshold), what would you consider to be a suitable compatibility threshold for the following locations?

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| a. Allenspark Townsite | _____ |
| b. Raymond/Riverside Townsite | _____ |
| c. Peak to Peak Corridor Area | _____ |
| d. Other | _____ |

Question 2.4: Option E Lower House Size Threshold

Under Option E (keep existing regulations with lower thresholds), what would you consider to be a suitable lower threshold for the following locations?
(Enter in Square Feet)

- a. Allenspark Townsite _____
- b. Raymond/Riverside Townsite _____
- c. Peak to Peak Corridor Area _____
- d. Other _____

Question 2.5: Size Thresholds

If house size thresholds are retained, check the statement with which you most agree:

- a. Thresholds should be set high enough to include residential living space, basements, attached and/or detached garages and accessory structures. Property owner can distribute space usage according to individual needs.
- b. Size thresholds should apply only to primary living space. Garages (attached or detached) and accessory structures should have separate size thresholds.
- c. There should not be any size thresholds on garages and accessory structures

Question 2.6: Garage, Basement and Accessory Structure Thresholds

If you answered (b) in question 2.5, how do you think those accessory structure thresholds should be determined?

- a. Each as a percentage of the square footage of the primary living space.
- b. Each as an absolute square footage threshold.
- c. Total garage and accessory structures as a percentage of primary living space.

Question 2.7: Garage, Basement and Accessory Structure Thresholds

If house size thresholds are retained, mark the following items that should be included in the thresholds.

- a. Basements
- b. Garages
- c. Accessory Structures
- d. Sheds
- e. Greenhouses
- f. Covered Decks

Section 3: Business

747 Community Project Plan: Business Recommendations and Questions

Current business zoning in the Allenspark area is inconsistent in that some businesses in our area have business zoning, and others do not. For example, Sunshine Mountain Lodge is zoned for business Meeker Park Lodge is not, yet both run the same type of business. This situation is a result of changes in county zoning regulations over the years. The rules changed, the businesses did not. The result is that many businesses are now operating under non-conforming status.

In an effort to bring existing businesses into conformity, the 747 Community Project Business Work Group has developed some proposals for your input, outlined in the questions below, so that all established businesses in the area have equal business zoning.

Note that business zoning allows only certain types of businesses, and even when a property has business zoning, the County's additional rules to restrain higher-intensity businesses (average daily trips, occupancy load, etc.) would stay in effect.

Please go to <http://www.747communityproject.org/business> to read more about the current zoning regulation and language that governs non conforming status, as well as prior 747 community surveys and meetings on this topic.

Question 3.1: Business Route 7 Zoning Recommendations

Boulder County down zoned portions of Business route 7 in the early 1980s, some parcels lost their business zoning and others retained theirs.

Tapestry of Life Coffee House, Rocky Mountain Property, Inc, Allenspark Lodge, Fawn Brook Inn, etc, have business zoning, but others, such as Meadow Mountain Café and Pine Grove Cabins, do not.

Do you agree with the following recommendation?:

With the consent of the property owner, the county shall establish business zoning along Business Route 7.

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

Question 3.2: Existing Businesses in Other Locations than Business Route 7

For many other existing businesses that have historically operated as a business, many for decades, they were considered an appropriate use when the business was established, but zoning regulations changed over the years and those businesses are now operating under non conforming status.

Existing Businesses are also located in several other parts of our area. Sunshine Mountain Lodge and the Raymond Store have business zoning, but other businesses do not, including Charlie Eagle Plumes, Bishop Art Gallery, Meeker Park Lodge, Lane Guest Ranch, Wild Basin Lodge, and Peaceful Valley Ranch. These and other established businesses have operated for many decades and were considered at the time an appropriate use. These businesses now operate under a non-conforming status and must pass a special use review if they wish to make changes and improvements on the property.

Do you agree with the following recommendation?:

With the consent of the business property owner, the county shall establish appropriate zoning for properties that have historically operated as businesses but are operating under nonconforming status. This will eliminate the need for the business owner to undergo the Special Use review process to be recognized as conforming.

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

Question 3.3: Inappropriate Businesses

Are there categories/types of businesses you feel are not appropriate for this area? If yes, please list.

Section 4: Scenic Corridor

The Peak to Peak Scenic Corridor in the Allenspark area includes Highway 7 from the Larimer County boundary south to the Highway 72 junction, and then continues south on Highway 72 past Peaceful Valley. The Boulder County Land Use Code states in Section 4-806 A.11.a.: In reviewing development proposals in the Peak-to-Peak Scenic Corridor Area, special attention will be paid to the visibility of the development from the Peak-to-Peak Highway, with the intent to ensure development is minimally visible from the Highway.

Question 4.1: Visibility Criteria Adoption

Should the 747 Community Project develop local criteria for visibility impact and mitigation for use in Site Plan Review, Special Use Permit and other applicable county reviews? These criteria would be based upon and expand the work of the Scenic Working Group described above. (Answering "No" generally implies support for continuation of the current county methodology.)

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Not Sure

Question 4.2: Criteria

Do you agree with the following criteria used to determine the impact to and mitigation of visibility in the Peak to Peak Corridor Area?

	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. Architectural style	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Building Materials	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Distance from the Peak to Peak Highway	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Structure Color	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. Profile (orientation, roofline, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. Degree of Visibility (discernable detail, prominence, angle of view, duration of view)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. Screening (Trees)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 4.3: Use of Traditional Architectural Styles and Building Materials

If traditional architectural styles and building materials are being used for any given construction project, the visibility regulations should be waived or reduced as compared to the visual impact standards applied to non-traditional architectural styles and building materials.

Strongly Agree

Moderately Agree

Neither Agree Nor Disagree

Moderately Disagree

Strongly Disagree

Question 4.4: Visibility in Townsites

Should visibility be a criterion for consideration in county regulatory reviews (Site Plan Review, Special Use Permit, etc.) for projects in townsites (Allenspark, Raymond and Riverside) and other areas with a relative high density of existing development?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

Section 5: Building Materials

The Greater Allenspark Area has had, from its earliest settlement, structures built with diverse materials. Local availability in the early days led to the use of log, log slab, rough cut timber and field stone. In the 1940's clapboard and plank siding appeared followed by frame construction and plywood siding in the seventies. Wooden decks became more common. A The majority of the housing stock, being 50 years old or older, has had a prominent role in the mix of what constitutes our "visual character".

Current Boulder County regulation largely limits exterior finish materials to masonry and cement products which favor increased safety. The following is a synopsis of current regulation furnished by Boulder County Land Use. The type of exterior wall material allowed is based on the site specific wildfire hazard rating. During the building process each site is classified as an extreme, high, or moderate wildfire hazard site and heavy, medium and light fuel found in Section R327.3 of the 2006 International Residential Code Amendments (http://www.bouldercounty.org/lu/building_code/pdf/2006_amendments.pdf).

Once a site is given a hazard rating, the construction on the site is subject to the Building Code Requirements specific to its wildfire hazard classification. On extreme hazard sites wood siding is not permitted (although timber or log construction is allowed when log diameters are at least 6-inches) and exterior walls must meet specific non-combustible requirements. On high hazard sites the exterior materials requirements are less restrictive but still wood siding is not permitted (although timber or log construction is allowed when log diameters are at least 6-inches). On moderate hazard sites exterior walls may be constructed of any material approved by the International Building Code. (See Section R327.5 Restrictions for Extreme Hazard Wildfire Sites, Section R327.6 Restrictions for High Hazard Wildfire Sites, and Section R327.7 Restrictions for Moderate Wildfire Sites for exact code language.)

The prior section concerning visual impact supports a reduction in reviews required when traditional architecture and materials are used. This proposal complements that by allowing a greater possibility of maintaining that character.

Question 5.1: Building Material Recommendations

Please indicate your level of agreement with the choices below:

	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. Allow any and all exterior materials including, but not limited to, wood, masonry, log, log slab, stucco and Hardieboard regardless of hazard classification but retain existing mitigation standards.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Allow any and all materials but require increased levels of fire mitigation when more combustible materials would be used.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Allow only minimally (moderately) fire resistant materials (i.e.: combustible siding over one hour rated substrate) with minimum mitigation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Retain current Boulder County regulation requiring fire-resistant materials to be used in most cases along with current fire mitigation levels.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 6: Solar Energy

Solar is a complex subject and information presented here should be considered a starting point. Additional information is available from - Energysavers.gov, NREL.com (National Renewable Energy Laboratory located in Golden, CO.) Estes.net.com/lightpower, Xcelenergy.com/solar

Question 6.1: Installing Solar

Should the community work to establish county level "acceptability criteria" for proposed renewable energy source installations, for example visual, or location criteria?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

Section 7: Forest Health

From information gathered as part of the 747 Community Project over the past year, forest health was repeatedly identified as a major concern by area residents. In the community-wide survey conducted by the 747 Community Project last year, approximately 70% of the respondents indicated that the Allenspark area should seek additional assistance in battling the pine beetle and clearing dead trees for fire mitigation. Boulder County currently provides a forestry sort yard and air-curtain burner for the disposal of slash and beetle-infested wood on Highway 7 near the Boulder/Larimer County line. However, the forestry sort yard is only available for a limited time each year because the county staff and equipment are moved to the Nederland area for part of the year.

Local residents and volunteers have also prepared an outstanding CWPP (Community Wildfire Protection Plan) for the Allenspark area that has been approved by the Allenspark Fire Department, Boulder County, Colorado State Forest Service, US Forest Service and Rocky Mountain National Park. Because our area now has an approved CWPP, property owners who implement forest health projects under the plan may apply for grants or qualify for tax incentives to help defray costs. A local group has also been very active in educating and assisting property owners to take action to slow the current pine beetle epidemic in our area. The plans are in place, but implementation and success depends on citizen action. However, there may be additional ideas or actions that could be explored to assist property owners in managing the long-term health of the forest on their property.

Question 7.1: Forestry Sort Yard and Air-Curtain Burner

Would you be more likely to utilize or more fully utilize the Meeker Park forestry sort yard if it were open for the full forest maintenance season of May through October?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

Question 7.2: Community Support for Forestry Sort Yard

Would you be willing to make a contribution (for example, \$50.00 or more) to a community fund that would be used to apply for grants, matching funds, or partner with the County in the operation and equipping of the Meeker Park Community Forestry Sort Yard?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

Question 7.3: Financial Incentives

Boulder County should consider implementing a program(s) offering financial incentives (e.g., pro-rated property tax rebates, low interest loans, etc.) to property owners who take preapproved and verified actions to improve forest health, mitigate wildfire hazards and stem pine beetle activity on private lands in the 747 Community Project area.

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

Question 7.4: Volunteer

Would you be willing to volunteer your time in the following capacities:

- Sort Yard Host
- Neighborhood Project Leader for CWPP implementation

Question 7.5: Comments and Suggestions

Please provide any suggestions or ideas you may have with respect to how the community and/or the County may contribute to forest health and wildfire mitigation activities in the 747 Community Project area.

Section 8: Septic Issues

Current State policy requires that every septic system be approved by the year 2023. As a recognized area of higher health risk exposure, some properties in the 747 Community Project area may be required to have approved septic systems within 5 years. The state policy requires documentation and approval of all existing systems.

Septic Introduction-

In the prior survey and summer work sessions, the Community identified the maintenance of water quality and the health of our wells, rivers and streams as high priorities.

Aging, unapproved and inadequate septic systems eventually deteriorate over time posing environmental health risk to the residents and the environment.

Outhouses are not compliant with code and Incinerating toilets are also not compliant as they don't meet NSF standards. Vaults can be a solution but come with very tight restrictions. The state mandates that all septic systems be adequate and the County enforces the requirement that all septic systems be approved.

Given that the septic standards in place support the health of our community, and these policies align with the community goals, we see our best value is spent focusing on the creation of water quality data collection plan. This would be a voluntary effort to provide an on going understanding of our water quality.

<http://www.747communityproject.org/issues/septic-wastewater>

Question 8.1: Protect Clean Water

Would you support the establishment of a voluntary and community based water quality monitoring program (including wells and streams) throughout the Allenspark Fire District?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

Question 8.2: Sample Submission and Funding

Please answer if you answered question 8.1 "yes" or "not sure"

Currently outside of the Allenspark Water and Sanitation District, the balance of the area (Raymond Riverside and Peak to Peak) does not have an ongoing water quality monitoring plan that samples and tracks ground water data.

- | | Yes | No | Not Sure |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| a. Would you be willing to semi annually submit samples from your well for testing to enable the 747 Community Project Area to establish an ongoing water quality data base? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| b. Would you be willing to fund \$10 to \$20 per sample for such testing?
(This would enable us to seek matching grant funds) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| c. Would you support the 747 Community Project team exploration of grant options to assist with the funding of an on going water quality data collection plan? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Question 8.3: Unapproved Septic System Assistance

Would you be more likely to take early action replacing an unapproved septic system if the following were available?

- | | Yes | No | Not Sure |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| a. County Property Tax Incentive | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| b. Low Interest Loans | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| c. Engineering Support | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| d. Testing Resources | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| e. Other _____ | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Section 9: Advisory Body

The 2009 survey asked whether the community supported the creation of an on-going advisory body to provide advice and guidance to locals in navigating through County processes such as SPR. As well received as that idea was, the 747 Community Project team found a basic issue of legal responsibility and exposure for anyone participating in the giving of advice and we decided not to pursue this further.

The survey also showed that the community supported the 747 Community Project effort. The 747 Community Project will terminate its activities at the end of our process later this year, so we have chosen to look at whether or not an on going advisory body should be formed to perform some or all of the functions of the 747 Community Project team.

Question 9.1: Formal Advisory Body

Which of the following advisory body options do you favor?

- | | Yes | No | Maybe |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| a. I do not support the creation of an ongoing local advisory body | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| b. To oversee the implementation of the 747 Community Project plan to completion with the County | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| c. Provide periodic reviews (5 years) to update the 747 Community Project plan | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| d. To serve as a two way interface between the community and the County, (providing information to the community about County policies and providing policy input to the County from the community) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| e. To provide input and feedback on specific project proposals regarding consistency with the 747 Community Project plan | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Question 9.2: Serve on Advisory Body?

Would you be willing to serve on such an advisory body?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

Question 9.3: Comments on Advisory Body

Section 10: Transportation

Boulder County has initiated a Transportation Study for the mountain areas.

The following questions about Transportation are to enable the County to continue with the planning process. The results of these questions will be turned over to the county and our liaison will continue to interface with the County on Transportation issues. The 747 Community Project Team is not currently working on transportation policies and initiatives.

Question 10.1: Most Frequent Destination From the Allenspark Area

Where do you travel on a regular basis?

- a. Boulder
- b. Longmont/Lyons
- c. Estes Park
- d. Ward/Nederland
- e. Denver, Denver Suburbs, DIA
- f. Other _____

Question 10.2: Most Frequent Destination From the Allenspark Area

How often do you travel on a regular basis?
(Days per week)

- a. Boulder _____
- b. Longmont/Lyons _____
- c. Estes Park _____
- d. Ward/Nederland _____
- e. Denver, Denver Suburbs, DIA _____

Question 10.3: Destination Reason

Why do you travel outside of Allenspark

- a. Work
- b. Shopping/laundry/services
- c. School
- d. Dr. appt or other medical
- e. Social / Recreational
- f. Other _____

Question 10.4: Most Frequent Destination From the Allenspark Area

How often do you travel on a regular basis?
(Days per week)

- a. Work _____
- b. Shopping/Laundry/Services _____
- c. School _____
- d. Dr. Appt. or Other Medical _____
- e. Social / Recreational _____
- f. Other _____

Question 10.5: Trip Frequency

If bus service is provided to / from Allenspark:

- a. What is the #1 reason you would use it? _____
- b. What is the #1 reason you would NOT use it? _____

Section 11: Shooting Range

Question 11.1:

The Forest Service has temporarily closed the old Allenspark dumpsite for recreational shooting owing to safety concerns--many nearby property owners have complained about the disturbance of noise and dozens of wayward bullets that have invaded private properties. The Forest Service has now formulated a proposal to develop the site as a permanent, official shooting range.

Do you favor continued, permanent closure of the site?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure