City Council

Agenda

Tuesday, February 20, 2024
Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:00 PM

Members of the public are welcome to attend and give comments remotely; however, the in-person meeting may continue even if technology issues prevent remote participation.

- *You can call in to +1 719 359 4580 or 877 853 5247 (toll free)*
  Webinar ID #876 9127 0986.
- *You can log in via your computer. Please visit the City's website here to link to the meeting: www.louisvilleco.gov/council*

The Council will accommodate public comments during the meeting. Anyone may also email comments to the Council prior to the meeting at Council@LouisvilleCO.gov.

1. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA AND ITEMS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

Public comments are limited to 3 minutes per speaker. When several people wish to speak on the same position on a given item, Council requests they select a spokesperson to state that position.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

The following items on the City Council Agenda are considered routine by the City Manager and shall be approved, adopted, accepted, etc., by motion of the City Council and voice vote unless the Mayor or a City Council person specifically requests an item be considered under "Regular Business." In such an event the item shall be removed from the "Consent Agenda" and Council action taken separately on said item in the order appearing on the Agenda. Those items so approved under the heading "Consent Agenda" will appear in the Council Minutes in their proper order.

A. Approval of Bills
B. Approval of Minutes: June 6, 2023; February 13, 2024

Citizen Information

If you wish to speak at the City Council meeting in person, please fill out a sign-up card and present it to the City Clerk at the meeting; if you are attending remotely, please use the "raise hand" icon to show you wish to speak in public comments.

Persons planning to attend the meeting who need sign language interpretation, translation services, assisted listening systems, Braille, taped material, or special transportation, should contact the City Clerk's Office (303.335.4536 or 303.335.4574) or ClerksOffice@LouisvilleCO.gov. A forty-eight-hour notice is requested.

Si requiere una copia en español de esta publicación o necesita un intérprete durante la reunión del Consejo, por favor llame a la Ciudad al 303.335.4536 o 303.335.4574 o email ClerksOffice@LouisvilleCO.gov.

C. Resolution No. 7, Series 2024 – A Resolution Approving an Installation Service Agreement with Rockfan Entertainment, LLC for Upgrades to the Audio-Visual Equipment in Council Chambers
D. Approval of Resolution No. 8, Series 2024 – A Resolution Approving a New Name for the Landmarked Property at 1045 Front Street
E. Approval of Professional Services Agreement for 2024 Resident Survey

6. COUNCIL INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS ON PERTINENT ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA (Council general comments are scheduled at the end of the Agenda.)

7. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

8. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. RESOLUTION NO. 80, SERIES 2023 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE REDTAIL RIDGE FILING NO. 1 PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT – *continued from 2/6/24*

- Mayor Reopens Public Hearing
- Council Questions for Applicant
- Public Comments (Please limit to three minutes each)
- Council Questions & Comments
- Mayor Closes Public Hearing
- Action

B. ORDINANCE NO. 1869, SERIES 2024 – AN ORDINANCE APPROVING THE VACATION OF THREE EASEMENTS LOCATED ON LOT 1 DEDICATED BY THE EMPIRE ROAD SUBDIVISION (1303 EMPIRE ROAD) – 1st READING – SET PUBLIC HEARING 3/5/24

- Introduction
- Action

9. CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

10. COUNCIL COMMENTS, COMMITTEE REPORTS, AND IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

11. ADJOURN

ITEMS TENTATIVELY SCHEDULED FOR REGULAR MEETING 3/5/24.

This list is not inclusive; items are subject to change; additional items may be added.

- Meals on Wheels Proclamation
- Life in Louisville Photo Contest Awards
- Ironton Easement Vacation (2nd reading), Annexation Agreement, Final Plat & PUD
- Solid Waste Contract
- Budget Amendment to Establish New Parks and Open Space Funds
- Commercial Energy Codes Update – 1st Reading
- EV Charging Code – 1st Reading

CASH ACCOUNT: 001000 101001 WARRANT: 020124 02/01/2024

VENDOR	VENDOR NAME	PURPOSE	AMOUNT
99999	KIANA FREEMAN	MILEAGE REIMB 1/17/24 - 1	92.06
99999	NATALEA COHEN	MILEAGE REIMB 1/5/24 - 1/	131.86
99999	ABBY MCNEAL	SPORTS FIELD CONF 1/20/24	1,008.04
99999	SHEILA SMITH	REFUND LOUISVILLE REC CEN	50.00
99999	JAMIE ZIMMERMAN	UTILITY BILLING REFUND 75	48.81
99999	PATRICIA MCCONNELL	UTILITY BILLING REFUND 39	65.08
99999	MELISSA GALLAGHER	REFUND UTILITY BILLING	70.68
99999	ALLISON FITZGERALD	REFUND REC CENTER	404.00
99999	TOM NIELSEN	REFUND REC CENTER	476.00
99999	XI WANG	REFUND REC CENTER	408.00
99999	HAIDAO LIN	REFUND LOUISVILLE REC CEN	302.00
99999	NEIL NORDBY	REFUND LOUISVILLE REC CEN	288.75
99999	ALEX FLORES	REFUND LOUISVILLE REC CEN	65.50
10884	WORD OF MOUTH CATERING INC	LUNCHES SERVED 1/25/24 -	2,057.50
13790	ZAYO GROUP LLC	ACCT #936665	870.83
	15 INVOICES	WARRANT TOTAL	6,339.11

CASH ACCOUNT: 001000 101001 WARRANT: 123123 12/31/2023

VENDOR	VENDOR NAME	PURPOSE	AMOUNT
15172	DANIELS LONG CHEVROLET	CUST #63168 VIN#1GB4TSEY	80,725.00
12841	ECONOMIC & PLANNING SYSTEMS IN	SERVICES THROUGH 10/31/23	11,315.00
12841	ECONOMIC & PLANNING SYSTEMS IN	SERVICES THROUGH 11/30/23	1,015.00
12841	ECONOMIC & PLANNING SYSTEMS IN	SERVICES THROUGH 12/31/23	2,920.00
15497	SENERGY PETROLEUM LLC	CUST ID #84628	523.72
	5 INVOICES	WARRANT TOTAL	96,498.72

CASH ACCOUNT: 001000 101001 WARRANT: 020824 02/08/2024

VENDOR	VENDOR NAME	PURPOSE	AMOUNT
10606	COMMUTING SOLUTIONS	2024 NW MCC STATE/FED LOB	9,926.00
5255	FAMILY SUPPORT REGISTRY	Payroll Run 1 - Warrant 0	173.53
13926	NICOLETTI-FLATER ASSOCIATES PL	FITNESS FOR DUTY	2,100.00
99999	FRANK SANCHEZ	REIMBURSE BOOT ALLOWANCE	75.00
99999	SANDY ANDRETICH	MILEAGE REIMBURSEMENT	53.87
10884	WORD OF MOUTH CATERING INC	LUNCHES SERVED 2/1/24 - 2	2,032.00
3875	XCEL ENERGY	ACCT #53-1879593-8	140.34
3875	XCEL ENERGY	ACCT #53-1879596-1	33,488.65
8 INVOICES		WARRANT TOTAL	47,989.39

CASH ACCOUNT: 001000 101001 WARRANT: 123123I 12/31/2023

VENDOR	VENDOR NAME	PURPOSE	AMOUNT
15481	AMTERRE PINE LLC	FACADE IMP PROGRAM REIMBU	12,369.28
1280	COLORADO STATE TREASURER	EMPLOYER ID #1326536 0	9,772.00
645	HUMANE SOCIETY OF BOULDER VALL	2023 ANIMAL IMPOUNDMENT S	12,100.00
3370	PETTY CASH - JILL SIEWERT	PETTY CASH REIMBURSEMENT	124.71
	4 INVOICES	WARRANT TOTAL	34,365.99

CASH ACCOUNT: 001000 101001 WARRANT: 022024 02/20/2024

VENDOR	VENDOR NAME	PURPOSE	AMOUNT
6866	4 RIVERS EQUIPMENT, LLC	ACCT #16511	198.70
14121	ACUSHNET COMPANY	ACCT #US00002149\US000602	244.02
12890	ADAMSON POLICE PRODUCTS	ORDER #CO114435	1,460.00
12890	ADAMSON POLICE PRODUCTS	J.PADILLA ORDER #CO1149	12.95
12890	ADAMSON POLICE PRODUCTS	C.NORTHROP ORDER #CO115	2,415.80
12890	ADAMSON POLICE PRODUCTS	CUST #CO260	1,012.00
12890	ADAMSON POLICE PRODUCTS	C.JACOBS ORDER #CO11474	762.00
14669	AG INVESTIGATIONS LLC	PRE-EMPLOYMENT BACKGROUND	1,000.00
4160	ALARM DETECTION SYSTEMS, INC.	ACCT #870159	232.00
4160	ALARM DETECTION SYSTEMS, INC.	ACCT #870159	893.00
15322	AQUATIC RESOURCES	SALES ORDER #SC2200	4,589.00
13457	AUTO TRUCK GROUP LLC	spinner & motor gear	988.00
480	AV-TECH ELECTRONICS INC	CUST #10-LOU1002	508.15
480	AV-TECH ELECTRONICS INC	CUST #10-LOU1002	1,868.00
10801	BADGER METER INC	CUST #51080	108.00
10801	BADGER METER INC	CUST #51080	1,357.51
500	BAKER AND TAYLOR	ACCT #415337 L121376 4 B0	47.20
15566	BIOBAG AMERICAS, INC	SALES ORDER #so18922	822.00
14251	BK TIRE INC	TIRES VEHICLE #5328	171.08
14251	BK TIRE INC	TIRE DISPOSAL VEHICLE #35	20.00
14251	BK TIRE INC	POLICE VEHICLE TIRES	1,708.51
14251	BK TIRE INC	TIRES FOR VEHICLE #5367 &	1,039.44
14251	BK TIRE INC	TIRE DISPOSAL	40.00
14251	BK TIRE INC	VEHICLE #5341 TIRES	692.28
14251	BK TIRE INC	VEHICLE #3406 TIRES	141.50
14251	BK TIRE INC	VEHICLE #5341 TIRES	692.68
11605	BOBCAT OF THE ROCKIES LLC	ACCT #021884	1,647.94
11605	BOBCAT OF THE ROCKIES LLC	ACCT #021884	98.74
11605	BOBCAT OF THE ROCKIES LLC	ACCT #021884	542.40
640	BOULDER COUNTY	BOULDER C OUNTY USE TAX J	67,004.20
7706	BRANNAN SAND & GRAVEL CO LLC	CUST #1488	1,064.88
14403	CALLAWAY GOLF	ACCT #18883	192.60
14403	CALLAWAY GOLF	ACCT #18883	1,069.74
14403	CALLAWAY GOLF	ACCT #18883	762.84
14403	CALLAWAY GOLF	ACCT #18883	1,525.68

CASH ACCOUNT: 001000 101001 WARRANT: 022024 02/20/2024

VENDOR	VENDOR NAME	PURPOSE	AMOUNT
14403	CALLAWAY GOLF	ACCT #18883	264.38
248	CDW GOVERNMENT	CUST #5143572	307.96
248	CDW GOVERNMENT	CUST #5143572	9,110.61
248	CDW GOVERNMENT	CUST #5143572	2,154.48
248	CDW GOVERNMENT	CUST #5143572	479.36
248	CDW GOVERNMENT	CUST #5143572	16,281.86
14036	CENTER COPY BOULDER INC	BAG TAX MAILING	262.84
14036	CENTER COPY BOULDER INC	BAG TAX MAILING	262.84
14036	CENTER COPY BOULDER INC	ABANDON VEHICLE FORMS	514.50
15352	CFM COMPANY	CUST ID #03260	490.00
2220	CHEMTRADE CHEMICALS US LLC	CUST #401485	6,702.64
4025	CINTAS FIRST AID AND SAFETY	CUST #12522401	320.75
14636	COLO COMMUNITIES FOR CLIMATE A	2024 ANNUAL MEMBER DUES	5,225.00
1120	COLORADO ANALYTICAL LABORATORI	WWTP-BIOSOLIDS-PFAS-QUART	605.00
1120	COLORADO ANALYTICAL LABORATORI	CITY OF LOUISVILLE CO0107	99.00
1120	COLORADO ANALYTICAL LABORATORI	CITY OF LOUISVILLE CO0107	61.20
1120	COLORADO ANALYTICAL LABORATORI	CITY OF LOUISVILLE CO0107	126.00
1120	COLORADO ANALYTICAL LABORATORI	CITY OF LOUISVILLE CO0107	171.00
1120	COLORADO ANALYTICAL LABORATORI	WATER PLANT QUARTERLY IPP	246.60
1120	COLORADO ANALYTICAL LABORATORI	CITY OF LOUISVILLE CO0107	126.00
1120	COLORADO ANALYTICAL LABORATORI	CITY OF LOUISVILLE CO0107	171.00
15611	CONTROLOGY STUDIO LLC	CONTROLOGY PILATES	1,092.00
13162	CORE & MAIN LP	ACCT #103796	1,880.00
13162	CORE & MAIN LP	ACCT #103796	776.25
845	CPRA	PROF ORGANIZATION DUES	1,675.00
15190	DANIEL LASHER	ASL TRANSLATION FOR CITY	1,084.45
15036	DAVID J. THROWER	JANUARY 2024 MUNICIPAL JU	2,800.00
11476	DBC IRRIGATION SUPPLY	CUST #1268	1,097.72
15512	DEBTBOOK	TIER 1 LEASE & SBITA MANA	7,000.00
15382	DELLACAVA/TEBO DEVELOPMENT CO.	1805 HWY 42, SUITE 101	6,560.00
15777	DJ MAESTRO, INC.	DJ SERVICES 2/24/24	700.00
1520	DRCOG	CUST ID #0013 MEM	5,150.00

CASH ACCOUNT: 001000 101001 WARRANT: 022024 02/20/2024

VENDOR	VENDOR NAME	PURPOSE	AMOUNT
14691	EEG ENTERPRISES INC	2/1/24 - 3/1/24 LEXI MON	299.00
6258	ENVIROTECH SERVICES INC	CUST #10327	3,432.98
6258	ENVIROTECH SERVICES INC	CUST #10327	3,206.77
6258	ENVIROTECH SERVICES INC	CUST #10327	3,811.41
6258	ENVIROTECH SERVICES INC	CUST #10327	3,906.73
15144	EXCEL DRIVER SERVICES LLC	CLASS #24118	7,000.00
13916	FERGUSON WATERWORKS	CUST #29809	447.50
13683	FIRST CHOICE COFFEE SERVICES	CUST #C271512 FEB 2024	70.00
6847	GENERAL AIR SERVICE & SUPPLY	ACCT #42580500	99.58
246	GREEN MILL SPORTSMAN CLUB	RANGE USE 1/19/24 & 1/25/	300.00
2415	HARCROS CHEMICALS INC	CUST #01605450-GOL10	931.00
15209	HOLLAR TREE CO LLC	Tree pruning on S Boulder	6,250.00
15209	HOLLAR TREE CO LLC	2/2/24 SBR & DAHLIA ST AS	1,325.00
645	HUMANE SOCIETY OF BOULDER VALL	2024 ANIMAL IMPOUNDMENT S	12,700.00
15329	IMEG CORP	SERVICES THROUGH 1/28/24	120.00
15261	WESTERN PAPER DISTRIBUTORS	CUST ID #244097	55.69
15261	WESTERN PAPER DISTRIBUTORS	CUST ID #244097	98.47
15261	WESTERN PAPER DISTRIBUTORS	CUST ID #244097	243.74
15261	WESTERN PAPER DISTRIBUTORS	CUST ID #244097	614.00
15261	WESTERN PAPER DISTRIBUTORS	CUST ID #244097	828.04
15261	WESTERN PAPER DISTRIBUTORS	CUST ID #244097	2,980.31
15261	WESTERN PAPER DISTRIBUTORS	CUST ID #244097	437.29
15261	WESTERN PAPER DISTRIBUTORS	CUST ID #244097	168.46
15261	WESTERN PAPER DISTRIBUTORS	CUST ID #244097	39.81
15261	WESTERN PAPER DISTRIBUTORS	CUST ID #244097	7.08
14089	INDIGO WATER GROUP LLC	TRAINING COURSES THROUGH	1,000.00
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	61.50
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	320.88
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	575.22
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	568.32
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	337.95
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	189.44
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	220.54
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	351.86
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	334.37
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	334.82
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	289.51

CASH ACCOUNT: 001000 101001 WARRANT: 022024 02/20/2024

VENDOR	VENDOR NAME	PURPOSE	AMOUNT
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	147.10
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	265.88
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	433.52
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	354.12
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	267.64
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	412.95
14239	JC GOLF ACCESSORIES	ACCT #COALCRK	712.98
13490	JOHNSON CONTROLS FIRE PROTECTI	SERVICE REQUEST #56232282	1,174.02
15499	KATHRYN A MIHELIC	JAN 2024 PICKLEBALL CONTR	1,029.00
2360	KELLY PC	LEGAL SERVICES THROUGH 1/	28,255.00
2815	KENZ & LESLIE DISTRIBUTING CO	CUST #000015914	644.70
8002	KINSCO LLC	C.NORTHROP	26.47
8002	KINSCO LLC	L.ROLLINS	20.00
8002	KINSCO LLC	D.CRANK ORDER #0016116	270.00
13782	LEXISNEXIS RISK DATA MANAGEMEN	BILLING ID #1236104 JAN	479.00
15754	LIGHTHOUSE TRANSPORTATION GROU	JAN 2024 Traffic Signal M	11,081.40
13692	LIGHTNING MOBILE SERVICES LLC	JAN, MAR, MAY, JUL, SEPT,	335.00
3070	LL JOHNSON DISTRIBUTING CO	ACCT #158907	1,453.78
8059	LOUISVILLE DOLPHINS SWIM TEAM	JAN 2024 SWIM CLINICS	6,825.00
5432	LOUISVILLE FIRE PROTECTION DIS	JAN 2024 FIRE PROT DISTRI	1,340.00
9498	LOUISVILLE TIRE AND AUTO CARE	VEHICLE #5341 ALIGNMENT	99.00
14068	MAC EQUIPMENT INC	CONTACT ID #394	458.31
14068	MAC EQUIPMENT INC	CONTACT ID #394	166.03
14068	MAC EQUIPMENT INC	CONTACT ID #394	4,782.94
14068	MAC EQUIPMENT INC	CONTACT ID #394	800.00
14731	MARY MULCAHEY	REFUND BLOOMIN SENIORS SU	247.73
14071	MARY RITTER	JAN 2024 RUNNING H2O	680.40
6939	MCCANDLESS TRUCK CENTER LLC	ACCT #100743	878.24
314	MEURER RESEARCH	CUST #BP4000293	251.28
14214	MICROAGE	CUST ID #106967	615.00

CASH ACCOUNT: 001000 101001 WARRANT: 022024 02/20/2024

VENDOR	VENDOR NAME	PURPOSE	AMOUNT
15526	MINES AND ASSOCIATES INC.	CUST ID #LOUISVILLE	1,081.60
14768	MOJOS CLEANING SERVICES INC	FEB 2024 JANITORIAL SERVI	33,533.41
14768	MOJOS CLEANING SERVICES INC	JAN 2024 REC & SENIOR CEN	585.60
14768	MOJOS CLEANING SERVICES INC	JAN 2024 PARKS	3,300.00
6168	MOTION & FLOW CONTROL PRODUCTS	ORDER #5821781	588.24
11061	MOUNTAIN PEAK CONTROLS INC	TROUBLESHOOT STEEL RANCH	540.00
12853	NEOGOV	GOVERNMENTJOBS.COM 3/23/	2,107.57
99999	DOUG HALEY	REFUND LOUISVILLE REC CEN	24.00
99999	CAITLIN HOSMER	REFUND LOUISVILLE REC CEN	75.00
99999	AFFORDABLE COLORADO HVAC	REFUND LIC #LSVL-004866-2	110.00
13649	OVERDRIVE INC	CUST ID #1100-0005	83.00
13649	OVERDRIVE INC	CUST ID #1100-0005	27.98
13649	OVERDRIVE INC	CUST ID #1100-0005	453.45
14524	PC SOLUTIONS & INTEGRATION INC	2024 Switch Replacement	107,852.51
15254	NORTHSIDE TTC	JANUARY 2024 TABLE TENNIS	2,160.00
14144	PING INC	CUST #40692	971.70
14144	PING INC	CUST #40692	-33.17
14728	PORTER LEE CORPORATION	ANNUAL SOFTWARE SUPPORT B	1,235.00
14160	PRECISE MRM LLC	CUST #679650	320.00
14394	PROS PLUS LLC	YOUTH BASKETBALL	808.00
14394	PROS PLUS LLC	YOUTH BASKETBALL	606.00
13549	PUSH PEDAL PULL INC	CUST #0002335	1,246.33
11351	QUADIENT INC	3/1/24 - 5/31/24 ACCT #	134.96
14844	REPUBLIC SERVICES INC #535	ACCT #3-0535-0109715	4,505.13
14844	REPUBLIC SERVICES INC #535	ACCT #3-0535-9535390	129,619.05
15528	RYDERS PUBLIC SAFETY LLC	O.BERG ALTERATIONS	45.00
14560	SAMEDAY OFFICE SUPPLY	ACCT #A12877	335.00
11395	SHRED-IT USA LLC	CUST #1000157150	171.53
15594	SIMPLER SYSTEMS, INC	JAN 2024 Consulting Servi	1,000.00
15206	SMITH POWER PRODUCTS, INC	JOB #546515	1,392.25

CASH ACCOUNT: 001000 101001 WARRANT: 022024 02/20/2024

VENDOR	VENDOR NAME	PURPOSE	AMOUNT
15772	STEVEN E. ALTERMATT	HISTORIC STRUCTURE ASSESS	4,000.00
14139	SUN MOUNTAIN SPORTS INC	ACCT #8002701	4,430.00
7917	THE AQUEOUS SOLUTION INC	TAYLOR KIT TESTING REAGEN	774.52
6609	THE TRAVELERSE INDEMNITY COMPA	POLICY #31N22649-ZLP AC	54.80
4765	UNCC	JAN 2024	1,782.78
11087	UNITED SITE SERVICES OF COLORA	CUST #ACT-00002162	228.00
11087	UNITED SITE SERVICES OF COLORA	CUST #ACT-00002162	393.00
6009	UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO	SUSTAINABILITY RESEARCH S	2,500.00
6009	UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO	1/30/24-5/31/24 DICKINSON	2,500.00
15620	VECTORS, INC.	2 SCHONSTEDT MAGNETIC LOC	2,371.27
14373	WEIFIELD GROUP CONTRACTING INC	SENSOR WIRING	1,070.00
13790	ZAYO GROUP LLC	ACCT #018253 FEB 2024	1,500.00
	176 INVOICES	WARRANT TOTAL	605,678.55

CASH ACCOUNT: 001000 101001 WARRANT: 123123H 12/31/2023

VENDOR	VENDOR NAME	PURPOSE	AMOUNT
14095	ABC AUTO BODY	RO#25299 Plate #OAM226	2,500.00
15449	AECOM TECHNICAL SERVICES, INC.	PROJ #60691889	2,037.50
4160	ALARM DETECTION SYSTEMS, INC.	ACCT #870159	427.50
4160	ALARM DETECTION SYSTEMS, INC.	ACCT #870159	379.02
4160	ALARM DETECTION SYSTEMS, INC.	ACCT #870159	990.00
4160	ALARM DETECTION SYSTEMS, INC.	ACCT #870159	347.51
13120	ARVADA PUMP COMPANY	JOB #23-098 LOUISVILLE	1,215.00
15732	CARAHSOFT TECHNOLOGY CORPORATI	CUST #LOU009	30.00
1120	COLORADO ANALYTICAL LABORATORI	BELT FILTER PILOT	1,611.00
14308	COLORADO CIVIL INFRASTRUCTURE	2023 Sanitary Sewer Main	23,821.25
12428	CUMMINS SALES AND SERVICE	CUST #479194	3,879.97
11142	DESIGN CONCEPTS	Professional Services-Mar	19,195.95
15683	DESIGN WORKSHOP, INC.	DEC 2023 PROJ #007131.00	17,834.19
15683	DESIGN WORKSHOP, INC.	PROJ #007131.00 JANUARY	34,090.38
15615	ECONORTHWEST	PROJ #25608.00 OCTOBER	7,880.04
13009	EIDE BAILLY LLP	CLIENT #80119	10,350.00
11124	EJ USA INC	CUST #20003577	4,719.24
14936	GOLDEN AUTOMATION LLC	12/5/23 SOUTH MIX TANK WI	1,400.00
9428	IDEAL FENCING CORPORATION LLC	JOB #202401 COUNTY ROAD G	4,920.00
13778	INVISION GIS LLC	GIS & AM Implementation S	10,247.50
11289	JVA INC	SERVICES THROUGH 12/31/23	30,026.10
8002	KINSCO LLC	S.HAMILTON	454.95
15340	LESLIE ANN HOFFMANN	STRENGTH TRAINING FOR RUN	1,166.20
8059	LOUISVILLE DOLPHINS SWIM TEAM	CORRECTION SEPT/OCT/NOV 2	2,275.00
11061	MOUNTAIN PEAK CONTROLS INC	TROUBLESHOOT CTC LIFT STA	540.00
15613	NATIONAL COATINGS, INC	WWTP Clarifier Coating	11,551.50
15613	NATIONAL COATINGS, INC	WWTP Clarifier Coating	2,175.00
14899	OTAK INC	SBR at Grade Construction	10,905.50

CASH ACCOUNT: 001000 101001 WARRANT: 123123H 12/31/2023

VENDOR	VENDOR NAME	PURPOSE	AMOUNT
15254	NORTHSIDE TTC	NOV & DEC 2023 TABLE TENN	3,736.80
15776	QUISITIVE LLC	GROUP POLICY SUPPORT	7,693.20
14733	RADIATION PROS LLC	PROJ #FP-1134	14,617.69
14733	RADIATION PROS LLC	PROJ #FP-1190	6,249.27
14041	RAMEY ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	JOB #ESD-7101	2,722.67
15721	SCHLAGETER PROPERTIES, LLC	FACADE IMPROV PROG 916 MA	109,918.41
15220	STAR PLAYGROUNDS	COTTONWOOD PARK CUSTOM LI	3,977.00
15451	SYLVESTER'S MAINTENANCE & MECH	JOB #84133542 CS BAY DO	890.00
15242	WALL COAT COMPANY INC	Paint interior of SWTP -P	28,710.00
12997	WHITESTONE CONSTRUCTION SERVIC	SERVICES 3/23 - 12/23	53,441.94
3875	XCEL ENERGY	ACCT #53-8315925-3	17,531.03
	39 INVOICES	WARRANT TOTAL	456,458.31

CITY OF LOUISVILLE
PURCHASE CARD SUMMARY
STATEMENT PERIOD 12/21/23 - 1/19/24

SUPPLIER	SUPPLIER LOCATION	CARDHOLDER	DEPARTMENT	TRANS DATE	AMOUNT
21ST CENTURY EQUIPMENT	LONGMONT	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	12/21/2023	$77.64
21ST CENTURY EQUIPMENT	LONGMONT	LANCE PFEIFER	GOLF COURSE	12/20/2023	$323.54
7SHIFTS	WILMINGTON	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	01/12/2024	$76.99
ABCMOUSE.COM*	800-633-3331	LANA FAUVER	REC CENTER	01/12/2024	$45.00
ADOBE *ACROPRO SUBS	4085366000	KURT KOWAR	PUBLIC WORKS	01/08/2024	$29.99
ADOBE *STOCK	4085366000	DEREK COSSON	CITY MANAGER	01/01/2024	$79.99
ALLDATA	800-859-3282	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	01/02/2024	$125.00
ALPHA GOLF	8187259720	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	12/27/2023	$25.00
ALPHA GOLF	8187259720	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	12/27/2023	$96.00
AMAZON RET* 101321-522	SEATTLE	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/17/2024	$11.99
AMAZON.COM*6W1681V43	SEATTLE	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	12/21/2023	$75.72
AMAZON.COM*L75TP8ID3	SEATTLE	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	12/22/2023	$18.79
AMAZON.COM*P38TQ5IF3	SEATTLE	CATHERINE JEPSON	PARKS	12/28/2023	$117.90
AMAZON.COM*QU14Q7TZ3	SEATTLE	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	12/31/2023	$6.73
AMAZON.COM*R76SD5GG3	SEATTLE	KELLY THARP	OPERATIONS	12/26/2023	$44.52
AMAZON.COM*RT92H15V0	SEATTLE	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/09/2024	$9.09
AMAZON.COM*T04641FK3	SEATTLE	LINDSEY WITTY	REC CENTER	12/26/2023	$127.45
AMAZON.COM*TK69J0550	SEATTLE	KATIE BEASLEY	REC CENTER	01/03/2024	$29.56
AMAZON.COM*UM9ND3BR3	SEATTLE	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	12/27/2023	$13.98
AMAZON.COM*V99Q87A43	SEATTLE	GREG VENETTE	WATER	12/21/2023	$169.97
AMAZON.COM*V99ZD3K43	SEATTLE	GREG VENETTE	WATER	12/27/2023	$59.99
AMAZON.COM*XD8AX8XH3	SEATTLE	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	12/28/2023	$128.52
AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOC	860-347-6933	PEGGY NORRIS	LIBRARY	01/17/2024	$156.18
AMERICAN RED CROSS	800-733-2767	DANNY WEIONSTOCK	REC CENTER	01/04/2024	$301.00
AMERICAN RED CROSS	800-733-2767	DANNY WEIONSTOCK	REC CENTER	12/20/2023	$224.00
AMZN MKTP US	SEATTLE	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/04/2024	-$100.69
AMZN MKTP US	SEATTLE	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/04/2024	-$100.69
AMZN MKTP US*5E2SE03C3	SEATTLE	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	12/28/2023	$100.59
AMZN MKTP US*D39QQ9423	SEATTLE	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	12/20/2023	$26.48
AMZN MKTP US*LC2C46IB3	SEATTLE	LINDSEY WITTY	REC CENTER	12/27/2023	$127.78
AMZN MKTP US*RT53297A2	SEATTLE	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	01/15/2024	$159.28
AMZN MKTP US*RT8SG6US0	SEATTLE	LINDSEY WITTY	REC CENTER	01/11/2024	$7.99
AMZN MKTP US*TK4364671	SEATTLE	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	01/09/2024	$364.16
AMZN MKTP US*TK7S47DB0	SEATTLE	DANIEL BIDLEMEN	REC CENTER	01/04/2024	$17.99
AMZN MKTP US	AMZN.COM/BILL	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	01/13/2024	-$19.87
AMZN MKTP US	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	01/12/2024	-$79.80
AMZN MKTP US	AMZN.COM/BILL	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	01/08/2024	-$154.00
AMZN MKTP US*1V9UZ9SR3	AMZN.COM/BILL	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	12/29/2023	$83.97
AMZN MKTP US*241RK0IG3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	12/20/2023	$12.36
AMZN MKTP US*2I8KS08D3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	12/27/2023	$357.99
AMZN MKTP US*2Y9WA14A3	AMZN.COM/BILL	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	12/28/2023	$49.24
AMZN MKTP US*440ZW9UW3	AMZN.COM/BILL	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/04/2024	$27.90
AMZN MKTP US*468IV4MO3	AMZN.COM/BILL	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	12/21/2023	$58.53
AMZN MKTP US*5N8OH9363	AMZN.COM/BILL	ERIK SWIATEK	PARKS	12/28/2023	$19.59
AMZN MKTP US*6Q6QC17R3	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	12/29/2023	$270.68
AMZN MKTP US*6Z2834KV3	AMZN.COM/BILL	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	12/23/2023	$16.44
AMZN MKTP US*7I8DB6QS3	AMZN.COM/BILL	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	12/28/2023	$630.56
AMZN MKTP US*AA5US9MJ3	AMZN.COM/BILL	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	12/23/2023	$87.73
AMZN MKTP US*B178U4FR3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	12/20/2023	$98.99
AMZN MKTP US*BP9HF6Q23	AMZN.COM/BILL	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	12/20/2023	$98.17
AMZN MKTP US*CZ05C1CF3	AMZN.COM/BILL	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	12/21/2023	$195.60
AMZN MKTP US*HQ7JJ3HF3	AMZN.COM/BILL	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	12/20/2023	$60.35
AMZN MKTP US*HT6I94E83	AMZN.COM/BILL	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	12/21/2023	$10.99
AMZN MKTP US*KA2DE2KD3	AMZN.COM/BILL	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	12/20/2023	$19.77
AMZN MKTP US*MK3IC2WI3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	12/21/2023	$236.98

AMZN MKTP US*NX6530MI3	AMZN.COM/BILL	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	01/03/2024	$11.00
AMZN MKTP US*R18FW9I93	AMZN.COM/BILL	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	12/27/2023	$79.84
AMZN MKTP US*R80DP54L1	AMZN.COM/BILL	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	01/19/2024	$301.98
AMZN MKTP US*R817S4OV1	AMZN.COM/BILL	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	01/18/2024	$48.60
AMZN MKTP US*R828Y4920	AMZN.COM/BILL	ABBY MCNEAL	PARKS	01/18/2024	$96.95
AMZN MKTP US*R84EA6T80	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	01/14/2024	$23.29
AMZN MKTP US*R84S437J0	AMZN.COM/BILL	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/18/2024	$72.63
AMZN MKTP US*R85F87CF1	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	01/18/2024	$49.98
AMZN MKTP US*R85U62EI2	AMZN.COM/BILL	GREG VENETTE	WATER	01/19/2024	$23.08
AMZN MKTP US*R86PT5DG0	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	01/17/2024	$8.49
AMZN MKTP US*R892S50Y0	AMZN.COM/BILL	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	01/15/2024	$114.92
AMZN MKTP US*RT0DV0Y72	AMZN.COM/BILL	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	01/17/2024	$260.62
AMZN MKTP US*RT0U92E20	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	01/08/2024	$286.49
AMZN MKTP US*RT1UJ6NK0	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	01/07/2024	$9.99
AMZN MKTP US*RT21C79P1	AMZN.COM/BILL	PAULINA BENNETT	IT	01/17/2024	$768.70
AMZN MKTP US*RT2ET3H42	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEFF OWENS	WATER	01/14/2024	$9.88
AMZN MKTP US*RT3GL21P0	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEN KENNEY	POLICE	01/08/2024	$9.98
AMZN MKTP US*RT3PQ94G1	AMZN.COM/BILL	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	01/11/2024	$35.89
AMZN MKTP US*RT47L1CH0	AMZN.COM/BILL	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	01/06/2024	$19.87
AMZN MKTP US*RT4LD61K1	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEFF OWENS	WATER	01/14/2024	$49.94
AMZN MKTP US*RT4RV9GL0	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	01/09/2024	$7.99
AMZN MKTP US*RT51A2ZL1	AMZN.COM/BILL	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	01/12/2024	$47.98
AMZN MKTP US*RT5EP8GN0	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	01/09/2024	$8.99
AMZN MKTP US*RT6OT32J0	AMZN.COM/BILL	MARLA OLSON	PARKS	01/11/2024	$69.00
AMZN MKTP US*RT72C6TU0	AMZN.COM/BILL	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/08/2024	$23.97
AMZN MKTP US*RT7IW1IM0	AMZN.COM/BILL	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	01/12/2024	$350.00
AMZN MKTP US*RT8276JT2	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	01/11/2024	$79.80
AMZN MKTP US*RT8HX9910	AMZN.COM/BILL	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	01/11/2024	$49.49
AMZN MKTP US*RT9854D50	AMZN.COM/BILL	LINDSEY WITTY	REC CENTER	01/11/2024	$13.92
AMZN MKTP US*RT9V93UY2	AMZN.COM/BILL	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/16/2024	$23.97
AMZN MKTP US*RX9Q33N33	AMZN.COM/BILL	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	12/21/2023	$39.48
AMZN MKTP US*SK6AC9UW3	AMZN.COM/BILL	KRISTEN BODINE	LIBRARY	12/28/2023	$49.48
AMZN MKTP US*SQ5SF7LY3	AMZN.COM/BILL	GREG VENETTE	WATER	12/23/2023	$45.75
AMZN MKTP US*TK02251G1	AMZN.COM/BILL	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	01/07/2024	$18.99
AMZN MKTP US*TK05S9GE1	AMZN.COM/BILL	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	01/07/2024	$118.23
AMZN MKTP US*TK0BH61U1	AMZN.COM/BILL	JULIE SEYDEL	REC CENTER	01/07/2024	$221.62
AMZN MKTP US*TK1QV29X0	AMZN.COM/BILL	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	01/05/2024	$17.39
AMZN MKTP US*TK35X3FN1	AMZN.COM/BILL	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/05/2024	$50.76
AMZN MKTP US*TK3M894I1	AMZN.COM/BILL	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/05/2024	$54.45
AMZN MKTP US*TK3XQ4JF2	AMZN.COM/BILL	KATIE BEASLEY	REC CENTER	01/05/2024	$59.99
AMZN MKTP US*TK4MJ1X52	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEFF OWENS	WATER	01/06/2024	$53.98
AMZN MKTP US*TK5S035A1	AMZN.COM/BILL	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	01/08/2024	$225.90
AMZN MKTP US*TK6MX73N0	AMZN.COM/BILL	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	01/02/2024	$74.25
AMZN MKTP US*TK72Z99L0	AMZN.COM/BILL	ABBY MCNEAL	PARKS	01/05/2024	$23.40
AMZN MKTP US*TK7AU8621	AMZN.COM/BILL	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	01/09/2024	$6.99
AMZN MKTP US*TK85B7NR2	AMZN.COM/BILL	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	01/04/2024	$35.88
AMZN MKTP US*TK8A309Y0	AMZN.COM/BILL	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	01/05/2024	$31.50
AMZN MKTP US*TK8HM74X1	AMZN.COM/BILL	ABBY MCNEAL	PARKS	01/05/2024	$226.99
AMZN MKTP US*TK8VH2IQ0	AMZN.COM/BILL	JESSE DEGRAW	REC CENTER	01/06/2024	$155.88
AMZN MKTP US*TK8XS1382	AMZN.COM/BILL	ALINA KIRCHNER	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/04/2024	$111.88
AMZN MKTP US*TK9BO4X21	AMZN.COM/BILL	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	01/07/2024	$122.92
AMZN MKTP US*TK9E12WG2	AMZN.COM/BILL	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/10/2024	$238.98
AMZN MKTP US*TO5YB8UL3	AMZN.COM/BILL	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	12/21/2023	$39.80
AMZN MKTP US*UK8GU4WO3	AMZN.COM/BILL	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	12/28/2023	$109.90
AMZN MKTP US*WU3878KK3	AMZN.COM/BILL	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	12/27/2023	$39.61
AMZN MKTP US*Y69WD0QW3	AMZN.COM/BILL	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	01/02/2024	$13.99
ANC*ANCESTRY.COM	LEHI	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	01/15/2024	$49.99
ARROWSTAGELINES.COM	OMAHA	KATIE BEASLEY	REC CENTER	12/29/2023	$1,202.00
ARROWSTAGELINES.COM	OMAHA	KATIE BEASLEY	REC CENTER	12/29/2023	$1,379.00
AWWA.ORG	303-347-6197	THOMAS CZAJKA	OPERATIONS	01/05/2024	$255.00

AMAZON.COM	AMZN.COM/BILL	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/09/2024	-$32.72
AMAZON.COM*0A4J86Y53	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	01/04/2024	$71.42
AMAZON.COM*EE9T77O53	AMZN.COM/BILL	DEVIN MADIGAN	WASTEWATER	12/28/2023	$745.99
AMAZON.COM*MH7KE8PO3	AMZN.COM/BILL	DEVIN MADIGAN	WASTEWATER	12/23/2023	$80.51
AMAZON.COM*RT20A4QD0	AMZN.COM/BILL	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	01/10/2024	$43.69
AMAZON.COM*RT2A52GZ1	AMZN.COM/BILL	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	01/14/2024	$16.90
AMAZON.COM*RT2N38AU1	AMZN.COM/BILL	JULIE SEYDEL	REC CENTER	01/13/2024	$243.23
AMAZON.COM*RT48S7YH2	AMZN.COM/BILL	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/17/2024	$6.99
AMAZON.COM*RT7LK9NW2	AMZN.COM/BILL	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	01/11/2024	$71.80
AMAZON.COM*RT8BV4MJ0	AMZN.COM/BILL	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	01/09/2024	$55.52
AMAZON.COM*RT8VC4NO0	AMZN.COM/BILL	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	01/07/2024	$12.82
AMAZON.COM*RT9N72DN0	AMZN.COM/BILL	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	01/10/2024	$10.87
AMAZON.COM*SW8FP1IQ3	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	12/31/2023	$49.99
AMAZON.COM*TK0PU3OJ2	AMZN.COM/BILL	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/03/2024	$125.99
AMAZON.COM*TK1UT7TS2	AMZN.COM/BILL	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	01/05/2024	$57.19
AMAZON.COM*TK1Y88FY2	AMZN.COM/BILL	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/03/2024	$32.72
AMAZON.COM*TK4290812	AMZN.COM/BILL	DEVIN MADIGAN	WASTEWATER	01/08/2024	$54.06
AMAZON.COM*TK82D9R52	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	01/09/2024	$79.88
AMAZON.COM*TK8GE8NV2	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	01/04/2024	$134.82
AMAZON.COM*TK92F42T0	AMZN.COM/BILL	DEVIN MADIGAN	WASTEWATER	01/05/2024	$96.59
AMAZON.COM*UK1DN9HX3	AMZN.COM/BILL	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	12/27/2023	$16.79
AMAZON.COM*XK1NH7NQ3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	12/20/2023	$37.38
AMAZON.COM*XL88V6LC3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEFF OWENS	WATER	12/26/2023	$69.00
B&H PHOTO 800-606-6969	NEW YORK	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	12/20/2023	$1,974.07
B2B PRIME*TK78Y8BT2	AMZN.COM/BILL	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	01/07/2024	$1,299.00
BANNERS ON THE CHEAP	18003217265	SCOTT MOORE	POLICE	12/20/2023	$45.11
BARNES&NOBLE PAPERSOUR	WESTBURY	LANA FAUVER	REC CENTER	01/16/2024	-$10.11
BARNES&NOBLE PAPERSOUR	WESTBURY	LANA FAUVER	REC CENTER	01/14/2024	$17.34
BARNES&NOBLE PAPERSOUR	WESTBURY	LANA FAUVER	REC CENTER	01/13/2024	$188.07
BESTBUYCOM806897659801	888BESTBUY	BRENDON MEILI	PARKS	12/28/2023	$599.99
BESTBUYCOM806901376381	888BESTBUY	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	01/06/2024	$92.99
BITWARDEN	SANTA BARBARA	ANDY SQUIRES	IT	12/21/2023	$8.06
BIZWEST-DIGITAL	FORT COLLINS	ROBERT ZUCCARO	PLANNING	01/12/2024	$11.00
BLACKJACK PIZZA - CO 0	LOUISVILLE	THOMAS CZAJKA	OPERATIONS	01/18/2024	$83.93
BLACKJACK PIZZA - CO 0	LOUISVILLE	RENEE LEWELLYN	OPERATIONS	01/18/2024	$31.98
BOSS PRINTING	BROOMFIELD	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	01/05/2024	$159.25
BOSS PRINTING	BROOMFIELD	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	12/30/2023	$66.43
BRIDGEPAY NETWORK SOLU	407-9008967	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	01/17/2024	$27.70
BROOKS GREASE SERVICE	918-836-1772	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	01/12/2024	$475.00
CALENDLY	AVONDALE ESTA	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	01/17/2024	$33.48
CALENDLY	AVONDALE ESTA	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	01/17/2024	$531.36
CALENDLY	AVONDALE ESTA	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	01/09/2024	$15.00
CARRIER WEST	DENVER	MATTHEW ROWE	FACILITIES	12/27/2023	$880.50
CCCMA	LOUISVILLE	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	01/16/2024	$190.00
CDW GOVT #NZ98315	800-808-4239	DANIEL WOOLDRIDGE		01/15/2024	$440.00
CENTER COPY PRINTING	303-4406000	GENEVIEVE KLINE	CITY CLERK	01/09/2024	$183.40
CENTER COPY PRINTING	303-4406000	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	01/09/2024	$110.00
CENTER COPY PRINTING	303-4406000	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	01/09/2024	$55.00
CENTER COPY PRINTING	303-4406000	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	01/03/2024	$981.93
CENTER COPY PRINTING	303-4406000	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	01/02/2024	$41.31
CHILDHEALTHCONNECTION	FORT COLLINS	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	01/16/2024	$80.00
CHOICE SCREENING INC.	720-974-7878	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/09/2024	$329.00
CLIC	3034221150	ERIN OWEN	LIBRARY	12/19/2023	$25.00
CLUBCONNECT	9136615569	LINDSEY WITTY	REC CENTER	01/01/2024	$149.00
CO MOTOR VEHICLE SERVI	DENVER	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	01/17/2024	$67.38
CO SECRETARY STATE FEE	DENVER	JOHN BROOKS	POLICE	01/07/2024	$10.00
CO SECRETARY STATE FEE	DENVER	BEN REDARD	POLICE	01/05/2024	$10.00
CO SECRETARY STATE FEE	DENVER	ROSS MURPHY	POLICE	01/04/2024	$10.00
CO SECRETARY STATE FEE	DENVER	RICKY BLACKNEY	POLICE	01/04/2024	$10.00
CO SECRETARY STATE FEE	DENVER	RYAN MORRIS	POLICE	01/03/2024	$10.00

CO SECRETARY STATE FEE	DENVER	JEN KENNEY	POLICE	12/30/2023	$10.00
COAL CREEK ACE HARDWAR	LOUISVILLE	MIKE MILLER	POLICE	01/08/2024	$210.88
COAL CREEK ACE HARDWAR	LOUISVILLE	KEN MATHEWS	OPERATIONS	01/02/2024	$33.99
COLORADO ANALYTICAL	BRIGHTON	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	12/20/2023	$58.00
COLORADO ASSOCIATION O	720-6747275	JEFF FISHER	POLICE	01/03/2024	$250.00
COLORADO ASSOCIATION O	720-6747275	MIKE MILLER	POLICE	01/03/2024	$500.00
COLORADOFED	3034757713	SUSAN KENNEY	POLICE	01/09/2024	$45.00
COMCAST CABLE COMM	800-COMCAST	SHARON NEMECHEK	LIBRARY	01/13/2024	$111.95
COMCAST CABLE COMM	800-COMCAST	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/13/2024	$36.95
COMCAST CABLE COMM	800-COMCAST	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/07/2024	$437.12
COMCAST CABLE COMM	800-COMCAST	MARLA OLSON	PARKS	12/28/2023	$459.07
COMCAST DENVER	800-266-2278	PAMELA PETERSON-HOHS	GOLF COURSE	01/18/2024	$115.00
COMCAST DENVER	800-266-2278	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	01/11/2024	$129.89
CONCENTRA INC	MECHANICSBURG	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/17/2024	$390.00
CONCENTRA INC	MECHANICSBURG	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/16/2024	$195.00
CONCENTRA INC	MECHANICSBURG	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/02/2024	$113.00
CONCENTRA INC	MECHANICSBURG	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	12/20/2023	$348.00
CONPS	7208859558	NATHANIEL GOECKNER	PARKS	01/11/2024	$25.00
CONTAINERSTORE.COM	800-733-3532	KRISTEN BODINE	LIBRARY	12/21/2023	$38.12
CRAIGSLIST.ORG	415-399-5200	PENNY FORD	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/12/2024	$25.00
CRAIGSLIST.ORG	415-399-5200	PENNY FORD	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/12/2024	$25.00
CS* EUVCC4DXPO	LOUISVILLE	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	12/30/2023	-$95.00
CS* EUVCC4DXPO	LOUISVILLE	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	12/30/2023	-$80.00
CSU DRONE CENTER	970-4918985	JULIAN CLARK	POLICE	01/02/2024	$650.00
CSU PARKING	FORT COLLINS	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/12/2024	$13.00
CSU PARKING	FORT COLLINS	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/11/2024	$19.00
CSU PARKING	FORT COLLINS	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/10/2024	$3.00
CU BLDR PKNG SVCS MTR	BOULDER	SAMMA FOX	CITY MANAGER	01/09/2024	$3.00
CANVA* 04018-66088837	KENT	MIKE MILLER	POLICE	01/03/2024	$119.99
DAILY CAMERA	BOULDER	KATIE BEASLEY	REC CENTER	01/17/2024	$499.20
DBC IRRIGATION SUPPLY	BROOMFIELD	MATT LOOMIS	PARKS	01/09/2024	$207.64
DBC IRRIGATION SUPPLY	BROOMFIELD	STEVEN HUIZENGA	PARKS	12/20/2023	$161.14
DISCOUNTSCH 8006272829	800-482-5846	LANA FAUVER	REC CENTER	01/10/2024	$524.72
DOLLAR TREE	LAFAYETTE	PAMELA LEMON	REC CENTER	01/18/2024	$18.75
DOLLAR TREE	NORTHGLENN	LANA FAUVER	REC CENTER	01/17/2024	$90.00
DOLLARTREE	LOUISVILLE	PAMELA LEMON	REC CENTER	01/16/2024	$15.00
DOLLARTREE	LOUISVILLE	JULIE SEYDEL	REC CENTER	12/31/2023	$98.75
DOLLARTREE	LOUISVILLE	LINDSEY WITTY	REC CENTER	12/29/2023	$7.50
DONORBOX DONATION PLAT	ALEXANDRIA	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	01/03/2024	$2.28
E 470 EXPRESS TOLLS	AURORA	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	12/21/2023	$17.45
EARL S SAW SHOP	BOULDER	NICHOLAS POTOPCHUK	PARKS	01/02/2024	$225.34
EB FATAL ERRORS EMPLO	8014137200	RONDA HENGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/03/2024	$220.50
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE	ARVADA	RANDY DEWITZ	BUILDING SAFETY	01/18/2024	$481.65
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE	ARVADA	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	01/04/2024	$428.90
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE	ARVADA	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	12/28/2023	$288.99
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE	ARVADA	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	12/21/2023	$385.32
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE	ARVADA	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	12/21/2023	$481.65
ELDORADO ARTESIAN SPRI	LOUISVILLE	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/09/2024	$16.00
EPACT NETWORK LTD	TORONTO	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	01/17/2024	$995.00
ESRI	REDLANDS	PAULINA BENNETT	IT	01/18/2024	$1,590.00
EVENT* LASERFICHE EMPO	TYSONS CORNER	MEREDYTH MUTH	CITY MANAGER	01/09/2024	$1,750.00
EVENT* LASERFICHE EMPO	TYSONS CORNER	MEREDYTH MUTH	CITY MANAGER	01/09/2024	$1,750.00
EVENTBRITE.COM ORG FEE	SAN FRANCISCO	DEREK COSSON	CITY MANAGER	12/23/2023	$29.00
EZGO FINANCE PAYMTS	800-448-7476	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	01/16/2024	$211.21
FBI LEEDA INC	877-7727712	JEFF FISHER	POLICE	01/03/2024	$50.00
FEDEX OFFIC74200007427	LOUISVILLE	GINGER CROSS	GOLF COURSE	01/17/2024	$58.64
FEDEX OFFIC74200007427	LOUISVILLE	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/16/2024	$63.32
FEDEX OFFIC74200007427	LOUISVILLE	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	12/22/2023	$46.33
FH* DOWNTOWN AQUARIUM	DENVER	KATIE BEASLEY	REC CENTER	01/09/2024	$480.00
FIELDTEX PRODUCTS, INC	ROCHESTER	BRENDON MEILI	PARKS	12/28/2023	$27.45

FIRST CHOICE-BOYER S C	303-9649400	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	12/29/2023	$63.23
FIRST CHOICE-BOYER S C	303-9649400	GREG VENETTE	WATER	12/29/2023	$103.13
FSP*CACEO	CASTLE ROCK	JEN KENNEY	POLICE	01/09/2024	$45.00
FSP*CACEO	CASTLE ROCK	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	01/03/2024	$45.00
FSP*CO PRIMA	DENVER	DAWN BURGESS	CITY MANAGER	01/03/2024	$60.00
FSP*ROCKY MOUNTAIN GC	WESTMINSTER	NORMAN MERLO	GOLF COURSE	01/12/2024	$170.00
FSP*ROCKY MOUNTAIN GC	WESTMINSTER	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	01/01/2024	$170.00
FIRE MARSHALS ASSOCIAT	GOLDEN	CHAD ROOT	BUILDING SAFETY	01/11/2024	$10.00
GAYLORD BROS INC	N. SYRACUSE	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	12/30/2023	$45.84
GOLF COURSE SUPERINTEN	LAWRENCE	NORMAN MERLO	GOLF COURSE	01/05/2024	$240.00
GOLF COURSE SUPERINTEN	LAWRENCE	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	01/01/2024	$465.00
GOVOS BOULDER RECORDS	DALLAS	GENEVIEVE KLINE	CITY CLERK	01/09/2024	$20.00
GRAINGER	LAKE FOREST	LANCE PFEIFER	GOLF COURSE	01/02/2024	$46.92
GRAINGER	LAKE FOREST	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	01/02/2024	$254.83
GREEN CO2 SYSTEMS	970-482-0203	DANIEL BIDLEMEN	REC CENTER	01/08/2024	$367.00
GREEN CO2 SYSTEMS	970-482-0203	DANIEL BIDLEMEN	REC CENTER	01/05/2024	$941.12
HDD SUN ENTERPRISES IN	THORNTON	MATT ISABELL	PARKS	01/10/2024	$36.74
HDD SUN ENTERPRISES IN	THORNTON	ERIK SWIATEK	PARKS	01/03/2024	$94.48
HERTZ	HERTZ PPAY	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	01/04/2024	$253.47
HOMEDEPOT.COM	800-430-3376	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	01/17/2024	$99.95
HOMEDEPOT.COM	800-430-3376	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	01/16/2024	$79.14
IACP	ALEXANDRIA	JEFF FISHER	POLICE	12/20/2023	$240.00
IAPMO	909-4724100	STEVEN HUIZENGA	PARKS	01/05/2024	$1,000.00
IN *1ST RESPONDER HEAL	800-262-3246	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/09/2024	$613.00
IN *ARROWHEAD AWARDS,	303-4479407	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	01/11/2024	$42.50
IN *ARROWHEAD AWARDS,	303-4479407	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	01/09/2024	$15.00
IN *ARROWHEAD AWARDS,	303-4479407	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	01/05/2024	$82.50
IN *BADGE FRAME, INC.	909-5913033	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	12/21/2023	$80.00
IN *ELITE HOOD CLEANIN	720-3388788	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	01/18/2024	$925.00
IN *INTERMOUNTAIN SALE	303-7621070	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	01/03/2024	$113.34
IN *KAISER LOCK & KEY	LOUISVILLE	VICKIE ILKO	OPERATIONS	01/08/2024	$407.52
IN *LANGUAGEUSA, INC.	713-7833800	DEREK COSSON	CITY MANAGER	01/04/2024	$35.00
IN *REED RESTAURANT RE	303-9549537	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	01/16/2024	$262.50
INSIGHT PUBLIC SECTOR	CHANDLER	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	01/10/2024	$24.05
INSTANT IMPRINTS LOUIS	LOUISVILLE	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	12/27/2023	$395.59
INSTANT IMPRINTS LOUIS	LOUISVILLE	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	12/20/2023	$87.90
INT'L CODE COUNCIL INC	888-422-7233	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	01/18/2024	$417.00
INT'L CODE COUNCIL INC	888-422-7233	CHAD ROOT	BUILDING SAFETY	01/10/2024	$443.50
INTERMOUNTAIN SAFETY	GOLDEN	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	12/22/2023	$422.86
JAX - 05	LAFAYETTE	CHAD ROOT	BUILDING SAFETY	01/08/2024	$304.95
JAX - 06	LAFAYETTE	THOMAS CZAJKA	OPERATIONS	01/11/2024	$165.77
JAX - 06	LAFAYETTE	LUKE LAYTON	PARKS	01/09/2024	$5.99
JAX - 06	LAFAYETTE	JACK MANIAN	OPERATIONS	01/08/2024	$144.50
JAX - 06	LAFAYETTE	RANDY DEWITZ	BUILDING SAFETY	01/08/2024	$84.99
JAX - 06	LAFAYETTE	LUKE LAYTON	PARKS	01/03/2024	$44.99
JAX - 06	LAFAYETTE	AUSTIN BROWN	CITY MANAGER	12/29/2023	$322.46
JAX - 06	LAFAYETTE	CATHERINE JEPSON	PARKS	12/29/2023	$243.36
JAX - 06	LAFAYETTE	CATHERINE JEPSON	PARKS	12/20/2023	$8.98
JERSEY MIKES 22024	LOUISVILLE	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	12/27/2023	$59.90
JIMMY JOHNS - 2668 - M	LOUISVILLE	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/02/2024	$144.98
JOSEPH ELLIOTT USA LLC	SAN DIEGO	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	01/16/2024	$117.50
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	DAWN BURGESS	CITY MANAGER	01/17/2024	$38.27
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	01/16/2024	$15.97
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	01/12/2024	$98.32
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	01/05/2024	$253.86
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	01/05/2024	$69.95
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	PEGGY NORRIS	LIBRARY	12/22/2023	$51.71
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	12/20/2023	$84.04
KINDLE SVCS*RT8TL4OC1	888-802-3080	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	01/11/2024	$5.44
LANDS END BUS OUTFITTE	DODGEVILLE	JEN KENNEY	POLICE	01/19/2024	$606.29

LANGUAGE LINE	MONTEREY	MEREDYTH MUTH	CITY MANAGER	01/05/2024	$14.57
LES MILLS US TRADING	CHICAGO	LINDSEY WITTY	REC CENTER	01/11/2024	$389.00
LOUISVILLE CHAMBER OF	LOUISVILLE	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	01/03/2024	$375.00
LUCILE'S CREOLE CAFE	LONGMONT	JEFF FISHER	POLICE	01/04/2024	$110.24
LAMARS DONUTS #45	LOUISVILLE	JEN KENNEY	POLICE	01/09/2024	$53.97
MAC EQUIPMENT INC (LON	LONGMONT	NICHOLAS POTOPCHUK	PARKS	12/29/2023	$605.99
MAC EQUIPMENT INC (LON	LONGMONT	NICHOLAS POTOPCHUK	PARKS	12/28/2023	$895.97
MAC EQUIPMENT INC (LON	LONGMONT	JACOB MARINKOVICH	PARKS	12/28/2023	$680.00
MAILCHIMP *MISC	MAILCHIMP.COM	DEREK COSSON	CITY MANAGER	01/18/2024	$514.25
MAPFLING	MENLO PARK	GREG VENETTE	WATER	01/04/2024	$11.88
MCGUCKIN HARDWARE	BOULDER	NATHANIEL GOECKNER	PARKS	12/28/2023	$24.99
MICHAELS STORES 2059	SUPERIOR	EMILY VIGMOSTAD	REC CENTER	01/16/2024	$28.99
MOUNTAIN STATE EMPLOYE	3038395177	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/16/2024	$600.00
NAPA AUTO 0025122	BOULDER	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	01/10/2024	$3,426.65
NAPA AUTO 0025122	BOULDER	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	01/03/2024	$81.03
NAPA AUTO 0025122	BOULDER	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	01/03/2024	$2,449.51
NATGEO LKIDS 800647546	WASHINGTON	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	01/09/2024	$35.39
NATIONAL WESTERN STOCK	DENVER	KATIE BEASLEY	REC CENTER	01/02/2024	$793.00
NRPA OPERATING	ASHBURN	ABBY MCNEAL	PARKS	01/08/2024	$70.00
OFFICE DEPOT #1080	DENVER	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	01/08/2024	$89.96
OFFICE DEPOT #1080	DENVER	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	12/27/2023	$140.98
OFFICE DEPOT #567	WESTMINSTER	LANA FAUVER	REC CENTER	01/07/2024	$95.32
OTC BRANDS INC	OMAHA	KATIE TOFTE	REC CENTER	12/19/2023	$324.78
PARKER STORE LOUISVILL	LOUISVILLE	SHANE MAHAN	OPERATIONS	12/21/2023	-$75.49
PARKER STORE LOUISVILL	LOUISVILLE	SHANE MAHAN	OPERATIONS	12/20/2023	$75.49
PARTY CITY 890	LONGMONT	KRISTEN BODINE	LIBRARY	12/28/2023	$9.00
PAY*KIDCREATE STUDIO	GOLDEN	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	01/02/2024	$924.00
PAYFLOW/PAYPAL	LAVISTA	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	01/02/2024	$19.95
PAYFLOW/PAYPAL	LAVISTA	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	01/02/2024	$59.95
PAYPAL *ESPIOC ORG	4029357733	SCOTT MOORE	POLICE	01/15/2024	$100.00
PAYPAL *INDIGOWATER	4029357733	VICKIE ILKO	OPERATIONS	01/05/2024	$304.00
PF CHANGS #7700 CP	BROOMFIELD	JEFF FISHER	POLICE	01/04/2024	$100.00
PFMC BOULDER	BOULDER	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/02/2024	$95.00
PHOENIX GOLDEN WEST	PHOENIX	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	12/29/2023	$441.84
PHOENIX GOLDEN WEST	PHOENIX	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	12/29/2023	$441.84
PORTER LEE CORPORATION	SCHAUMBURG	ERICA BERZINS	POLICE	01/18/2024	$379.87
PRAIRIE MOUNTAIN MEDIA	BOULDER	GINGER CROSS	GOLF COURSE	01/04/2024	$135.00
PRAIRIE MOUNTAIN MEDIA	BOULDER	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	12/29/2023	$968.44
PSI SERVICES INC	18188476180	DEVIN MADIGAN	WASTEWATER	01/09/2024	$100.00
PSI SERVICES INC	18188476180	DEVIN MADIGAN	WASTEWATER	01/05/2024	$100.00
PSI SERVICES LLC	8188476180	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/10/2024	$175.00
PSI SERVICES LLC	8188476180	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/10/2024	-$175.00
PSI SERVICES LLC	8188476180	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/10/2024	$175.00
PY *DOWNTOWN COLORADO,	DENVER	AUSTIN BROWN	CITY MANAGER	12/28/2023	$217.50
PY *STORQUEST-LOUISVIL	LOUISVILLE	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	12/30/2023	$429.00
PET SCOOP	DENVER	ABBY MCNEAL	PARKS	01/01/2024	$424.00
RME*THE GOLFWORKS	800-848-8358	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	01/03/2024	$127.57
RMWEA	3037480321	GREG VENETTE	WATER	01/08/2024	$35.00
RMWEA	3037480321	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	01/03/2024	$525.00
SAFEWAY #2812	LOUISVILLE	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/08/2024	$21.80
SAFEWAY #2812	LOUISVILLE	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/08/2024	-$1.37
SAFEWAY #2812	LOUISVILLE	MIKE MILLER	POLICE	01/02/2024	$129.72
SAFEWAY #2812	LOUISVILLE	JULIE SEYDEL	REC CENTER	12/31/2023	$113.91
SAFEWAY #2812	LOUISVILLE	KATIE BEASLEY	REC CENTER	12/20/2023	$21.98
SAMEDAY OFFICE SUPPLY	MORGAN@SAMEDA	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/17/2024	$2.73
SAMEDAY OFFICE SUPPLY	MORGAN@SAMEDA	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	01/04/2024	$13.23
SAMEDAY OFFICE SUPPLY	MORGAN@SAMEDA	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	01/03/2024	$94.15
SAMEDAY OFFICE SUPPLY	MORGAN@SAMEDA	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	12/29/2023	$946.32
SAMEDAY OFFICE SUPPLY	MORGAN@SAMEDA	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	12/29/2023	$18.30
SAMEDAY OFFICE SUPPLY	MORGAN@SAMEDA	KAYLA CORCELLI	PARKS	12/28/2023	$41.32

SAMEDAY OFFICE SUPPLY	MORGAN@SAMEDA	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	12/21/2023	$32.29
SAMEDAY OFFICE SUPPLY	MORGAN@SAMEDA	KELLY THARP	OPERATIONS	12/20/2023	$23.65
SAMEDAY OFFICE SUPPLY	MORGAN@SAMEDA	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	12/19/2023	$449.41
SAMEDAY OFFICE SUPPLY	MORGAN@SAMEDA	BELAN CARRILLO	PUBLIC WORKS	12/19/2023	$55.58
SANDBAG STORE LLC	LAS VEGAS	JESSE DEGRAW	REC CENTER	01/08/2024	$232.00
SANTIAGOS MEXICAN REST	LAFAYETTE	ALINA KIRCHNER	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/11/2024	$75.22
SANTIAGOS MEXICAN REST	SUPERIOR	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	12/20/2023	$101.60
SHOPEYS PIZZA	LOUISVILLE	MARLA OLSON	PARKS	01/18/2024	$185.40
SIP.US	ALPHARETTA	DEVIN MADIGAN	WASTEWATER	01/09/2024	$30.96
SMARTSHEET INC.	BELLEVUE	PAULINA BENNETT	IT	01/09/2024	$194.11
SNAP-ON TOOLS CO629128	262-656-8721	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	12/20/2023	$87.00
SNAPOLOGY OF G-L	DENVER	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	01/15/2024	$525.00
SNARFS LOUISVILLE LLC	LOUISVILLE	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	01/17/2024	$408.28
SP CAMLOCKDIRECTCOM	MOORESVILLE	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	12/29/2023	$182.88
SP CAMLOCKDIRECTCOM	MOORESVILLE	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	12/22/2023	$343.05
SP SAFEWERKS	VAIL	NATHANIEL GOECKNER	PARKS	12/26/2023	$518.81
SPI*CENTURYLINK/LUMEN	MONROE	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	12/26/2023	$2,656.38
SPI*DIRECT SERVICE	800-531-5000	PAMELA PETERSON-HOHS	GOLF COURSE	01/17/2024	$311.58
SPI*DIRECT SERVICE	800-531-5000	PAMELA PETERSON-HOHS	GOLF COURSE	12/27/2023	$243.92
SQ *AQUATIC MEDIA	GOSQ.COM	LINDSEY WITTY	REC CENTER	01/10/2024	$299.00
SQ *B.O.B.S. DINER	LOUISVILLE	VICKIE ILKO	OPERATIONS	01/15/2024	$104.73
SQ *B.O.B.S. DINER	LOUISVILLE	VICKIE ILKO	OPERATIONS	01/08/2024	$29.97
SQ *CHARM WINDOW	BOULDER	GREG VENETTE	WATER	01/09/2024	$48.00
SQ *MOXIE BREAD CO.	LOUISVILLE	KIANA FREEMAN	CITY MANAGER	12/20/2023	$60.28
SQ *NEW BELGIUM BREWIN	GOSQ.COM	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	01/02/2024	$250.00
SQ *PICA'S LOUISVILLE	LOUISVILLE	PAULA KNAPEK	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/08/2024	$47.72
SQ *PICA'S LOUISVILLE	LOUISVILLE	ROBERT ZUCCARO	PLANNING	12/28/2023	$70.20
SQ *SWEET SISTERS BAKE	BOULDER	MIKE MILLER	POLICE	01/04/2024	$209.05
SQ *SWEET SISTERS BAKE	BOULDER	MIKE MILLER	POLICE	01/04/2024	-$14.65
STAPLS7615407469002001	877-8267755	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	12/23/2023	-$92.77
STAPLS7622583212000001	877-8267755	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	12/29/2023	$69.38
STAPLS7622805472000001	877-8267755	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	01/07/2024	$244.95
STAPLS7622806968000001	877-8267755	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	01/07/2024	$889.80
STERICYCLE INC/SHRED-I	BANNOCKBURN	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/16/2024	$30.00
STERICYCLE INC/SHRED-I	BANNOCKBURN	MEREDYTH MUTH	CITY MANAGER	01/05/2024	$30.00
STERICYCLE INC/SHRED-I	BANNOCKBURN	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	01/02/2024	$34.17
STUDENT MARKETING AGEN	ENGLEWOOD	JEFF FISHER	POLICE	12/26/2023	$77.10
SUPERIOR CHAMBER OF CO	SUPERIOR	PEGGY NORRIS	LIBRARY	12/22/2023	$325.00
STAPLES INC	STAPLES.COM	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/10/2024	$20.99
STAPLES INC	STAPLES.COM	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/09/2024	-$128.21
STAPLES INC	STAPLES.COM	MARLA OLSON	PARKS	12/23/2023	$111.98
TARGET 00017699	SUPERIOR	REBECCA STORES	REC CENTER	01/11/2024	$28.43
TARGET 00017699	SUPERIOR	CATHERINE JEPSON	PARKS	01/03/2024	$14.49
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	ANDY ELLIS	PARKS	01/17/2024	$14.93
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	ANDY ELLIS	PARKS	01/17/2024	$31.86
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	01/17/2024	$39.86
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	BRYCE LINN	PARKS	01/17/2024	$3.42
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	BRYCE LINN	PARKS	01/17/2024	$33.78
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	BRYCE LINN	PARKS	01/17/2024	-$21.94
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	01/17/2024	$8.32
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	SUSAN KENNEY	POLICE	01/17/2024	$10.96
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	01/16/2024	$14.96
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	MATTHEW ROWE	FACILITIES	01/16/2024	$248.20
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	MATTHEW ROWE	FACILITIES	01/16/2024	$194.29
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	01/16/2024	$9.97
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	BRYCE LINN	PARKS	01/12/2024	$33.91
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	BRYCE LINN	PARKS	01/12/2024	-$31.47
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	ERIK SWIATEK	PARKS	01/12/2024	$51.44
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	RANDY DEWITZ	BUILDING SAFETY	01/12/2024	$43.97
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	RANDY DEWITZ	BUILDING SAFETY	01/12/2024	-$43.97

THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JEFF ROBISON	FACILITIES	01/11/2024	$39.97
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	ANDY ELLIS	PARKS	01/11/2024	$5.47
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	01/11/2024	$7.46
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	VICKIE ILKO	OPERATIONS	01/11/2024	$105.38
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	RANDY DEWITZ	BUILDING SAFETY	01/10/2024	$647.22
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	01/10/2024	$49.96
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	MATTHEW ROWE	FACILITIES	01/10/2024	$5.11
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	VICKIE ILKO	OPERATIONS	01/09/2024	$91.71
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	ANDY ELLIS	PARKS	01/09/2024	$10.74
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	MIKE MILLER	POLICE	01/09/2024	$42.40
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	BRYCE LINN	PARKS	01/09/2024	$70.69
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	MIKE MILLER	POLICE	01/08/2024	$88.80
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	ANDY ELLIS	PARKS	01/08/2024	$23.48
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JEFF ROBISON	FACILITIES	01/08/2024	$59.99
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	01/08/2024	$199.00
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JEFF ROBISON	FACILITIES	01/04/2024	$472.00
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JEFF ROBISON	FACILITIES	01/04/2024	$23.23
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	SHANE MAHAN	OPERATIONS	01/04/2024	$34.98
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	MATTHEW ROWE	FACILITIES	01/04/2024	$30.45
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	CATHERINE JEPSON	PARKS	01/04/2024	$10.97
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JEFF OWENS	WATER	01/04/2024	$63.21
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	01/04/2024	$10.44
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	01/03/2024	$27.95
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL WOOLDRIDGE		01/03/2024	$434.00
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	01/02/2024	$117.70
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	AARON GRANT	PARKS	01/02/2024	$1.98
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JACOB MARINKOVICH	PARKS	12/29/2023	$480.75
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	SHANE MAHAN	OPERATIONS	12/29/2023	$29.97
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JEFF ROBISON	FACILITIES	12/28/2023	$5.21
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	12/28/2023	$33.92
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	AARON GRANT	PARKS	12/28/2023	$341.32
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	12/27/2023	$16.86
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	ANDY ELLIS	PARKS	12/27/2023	$32.78
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	KRISTEN BODINE	LIBRARY	12/27/2023	$334.00
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	AARON GRANT	PARKS	12/27/2023	$10.46
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JACK MANIAN	OPERATIONS	12/27/2023	$358.66
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	ANDY ELLIS	PARKS	12/22/2023	$17.88
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	SHANE MAHAN	OPERATIONS	12/22/2023	$116.02
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	12/21/2023	$25.89
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	STEVEN HUIZENGA	PARKS	12/21/2023	$52.39
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JACK MANIAN	OPERATIONS	12/21/2023	$166.66
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	AARON GRANT	PARKS	12/21/2023	$74.19
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JEFF OWENS	WATER	12/21/2023	$153.90
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL BIDLEMEN	REC CENTER	12/20/2023	$218.79
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL BIDLEMEN	REC CENTER	12/20/2023	$80.78
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	AARON GRANT	PARKS	12/20/2023	$76.49
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	12/19/2023	$11.97
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	STEVEN HUIZENGA	PARKS	12/19/2023	$167.28
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	THOMAS CZAJKA	OPERATIONS	12/19/2023	$88.02
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	LANCE PFEIFER	GOLF COURSE	12/19/2023	$96.58
THE WEBSTAURANT STORE	LANCASTER	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	01/13/2024	$101.09
TOP GOLF THORNTON 69-2	THORNTON	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	12/22/2023	$330.25
TOSHIBA BUSINESS SOLUT	801-5563471	MARLA OLSON	PARKS	01/17/2024	$347.30
TOWN OF SUPERIOR	303-499-3675	ERIK SWIATEK	PARKS	01/05/2024	$18.97
TRACTOR SUPPLY #2105	LAFAYETTE	JEFF ROBISON	FACILITIES	01/05/2024	$99.99
TRACTOR SUPPLY #2105	LAFAYETTE	CATHERINE JEPSON	PARKS	12/29/2023	$59.99
TRACTOR SUPPLY #2105	LAFAYETTE	CATHERINE JEPSON	PARKS	12/28/2023	$54.99
TST* LULUS BBQ	LOUISVILLE	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/09/2024	$1,003.38
TST* THE HUCKLEBERRY	LOUISVILLE	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	01/04/2024	$87.83
TST* THE HUCKLEBERRY	LOUISVILLE	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	01/03/2024	$37.18

TST* VERDE - LOUISVILL	LOUISVILLE	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	01/03/2024	$230.25
TST* VERDE - LOUISVILL	LOUISVILLE	JEFF DURBIN	CITY MANAGER	12/21/2023	$28.50
TST* WATERLOO	LOUISVILLE	PAULINA BENNETT	IT	01/12/2024	$66.00
TST* WATERLOO	LOUISVILLE	ANDY SQUIRES	IT	01/03/2024	$145.80
TVY*SILVERSNEAKERS	480-444-5154	LINDSEY WITTY	REC CENTER	01/05/2024	$216.00
TRANSPARENT INFORMATIO	3032178747	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/07/2024	$1,044.80
UNITED AIRLINES	UNITED.COM	JENNIFER REILLY	IT	01/17/2024	$505.98
USABLUEBOOK	ATLANTA	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	01/10/2024	$126.40
USABLUEBOOK	ATLANTA	DEVIN MADIGAN	WASTEWATER	12/24/2023	$440.45
USERWAY.ORG	WILMINGTON	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	12/30/2023	$3,341.23
VERIZON*ONEPOS 707698	800-922-0204	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	12/21/2023	$1,299.98
VZWRLSS*MY VZ VB P	800-922-0204	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	01/06/2024	$2,793.87
VZWRLSS*MY VZ VB P	800-922-0204	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	12/22/2023	$2,984.68
VZWRLSS*MY VZ VB P	800-922-0204	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	12/22/2023	$872.09
VZWRLSS*PRPAY AUTOPAY	888-294-6804	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	01/08/2024	$20.00
VRBO FEE	512-759-0902	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	12/30/2023	$94.00
WAL-MART #2223	WESTMINSTER	LANA FAUVER	REC CENTER	01/11/2024	$19.96
WAL-MART #4288	BROOMFIELD	LANA FAUVER	REC CENTER	01/14/2024	$77.77
WAL-MART #5341	BROOMFIELD	LINDSEY WITTY	REC CENTER	12/29/2023	$55.89
WALGREENS #7006	SUPERIOR	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	01/04/2024	$3.49
WESTERN PAPER DISTRIBU	DENVER	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	01/14/2024	$54.73
WHENTOWORK INC	TUSTIN	PAUL BORTH	REC CENTER	01/16/2024	$770.00
WILBUR ELLIS DENVER	DENVER	ABBY MCNEAL	PARKS	12/20/2023	$307.50
WM SUPERCENTER #5341	BROOMFIELD	KATIE TOFTE	REC CENTER	01/10/2024	-$44.92
WWW.AMAZON* 101321-BRE	SEATTLE	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	12/29/2023	$9.98
WWW.AMAZON* 113-170605	SEATTLE	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	12/26/2023	$18.99
WWW.AMAZON* 113-404541	SEATTLE	JESSE DEGRAW	REC CENTER	12/20/2023	$199.70
WWW.AMAZON.COM* ERIK	SEATTLE	ERIK SWIATEK	PARKS	01/03/2024	$61.74
WWW.GRIZZLYWASHCO.COM	GREELEY	SANDRA ANDRETICH	OPERATIONS	12/23/2023	$450.00
WWW.ROCKY-IAEI.ORG	LAKEWOOD	CLAIRE KREYCIK	PLANNING	01/12/2024	$375.00
ZOOM.US 888-799-9666	SAN JOSE	ROBERT ZUCCARO	PLANNING	01/16/2024	$55.99
ZOOM.US 888-799-9666	SAN JOSE	PAULA KNAPEK	HUMAN RESOURCES	01/09/2024	$163.34
ZOOM.US 888-799-9666	SAN JOSE	LINDSEY WITTY	REC CENTER	01/02/2024	$15.99
ZOOM.US 888-799-9666	SAN JOSE	ALINA KIRCHNER	HUMAN RESOURCES	12/28/2023	$15.99
					$105,918.37

V. Ilko	-$859.31
R.Morris	-$10.00
	$105,049.06

City of Louisville
COLORADO • SINCE 1878

City Council

Meeting Minutes

June 6, 2023
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:00 PM

Call to Order – Mayor Maloney called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. **Roll Call** was taken and the following members were present:

City Council:	***Mayor Dennis Maloney***
	Mayor Pro Tem Deborah Fahey
	Councilmember Caleb Dickinson
	Councilmember Barbara Hamlington
	Councilmember Dietrich Hoefner
	Councilmember Chris Leh
Absent:	***Councilmember Maxine Most***
Staff Present:	***Jeff Durbin, City Manager***
	Rob Zuccaro, Community Development Director
	Amelia Brackett Hogstad, Planner II
	April Kroner, Economic Vitality Manager
	Ryder Bailey, Finance Director
	Paulina Bennett, Information Technology Director
	Rafael Gutierrez, Police Chief
	Monai Myles, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Manager
	Meredyth Muth, City Clerk
Others Present:	***Kathleen Kelly, City Attorney***

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mayor Maloney called for changes to the agenda and hearing none asked for a motion. **Motion:** Councilmember Dickinson moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Councilmember Hoefner. **Vote:** All in favor.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA AND ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

Eric Lund, Chamber of Commerce, thanked the City for supporting the Taste of Louisville this year. It had many great events over three days and record turnout of participants.

APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Maloney asked that Item C be moved to the regular agenda and moved to approve the consent agenda as amended, seconded by Councilmember Leh.
Vote: All in favor**.**

- **A.** ***Approval of Bills***
- **B.** ***Approval of Minutes: May 16, 2023***
- **C.** ***Approval of a Proclamation Observing Juneteenth National Independence Day – moved to regular agenda***
- **D.** ***Approval of additional funding, awarding bid and contract with Green Landscape Solutions for the 2023 Tier I Median Landscape Renovations.***
- **E.** ***Approval of a contract with Design Workshop for consultation services to develop a Comprehensive Plan update***
- **F.** ***Colorado Communities for Climate Action (CC4CA) Policy Statement proposed updates***
- **G.** ***Resolution No. 32, Series 2023 – Approving an Amendment to the Annual Budget for the Louisville Revitalization Commission for the Fiscal Year 2023.***
- **H.** ***Approval of Contracts Between the City of Louisville and National Coatings and Fusion Inspections and Consultants for Wastewater Treatment Plant Clarifier Coating and Inspection Services***
- **I.** ***Approval of Contract Between the City of Louisville and ICON Engineering, Inc. for Storm Water Quality Master Plan Pilot Project Design***
- **J.** ***Award Bid for 2023 Water Main Replacement***
- **K.** ***Approval of Amendment #1 to Contracts for the 2023 Street Resurfacing Project***

COUNCIL INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS ON PERTINENT ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Councilmember Leh thanked the Chamber for the new Main Street dinner event and said it was a great success.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

City Manager Jeff Durbin stated the City Clerk's office is hosting a Candidate Informational Forum on June 12th for residents interested in running for City Council. He noted that the Street Faire starts next week.

Introduced the new Police Chief Rafael Gutierrez and Information Technology Director Paulina Bennett.

REGULAR BUSINESS

LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, TRANSGENDER AND QUEER PLUS PRIDE MONTH PROCLAMATION

Councilmember Hamlington noted the growing anti LBGTQ legislation across the United States and across the world. She stated the city continues to welcome and supported the LBGTQ community. She noted the June 19 event the City is sponsoring which will have panelists that will discuss what it means to be LBGTQ in this current moment in time.

Councilmember Hamlington read the proclamation.

MOTION: Councilmember Hamlington moved to approve the proclamation; seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Fahey.

Public Comment - None

VOTE: Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

PROCLAMATION OBSERVING JUNETEENTH NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE DAY – *moved from consent agenda*

Councilmember Leh noted that Juneteenth was recognized as a federal holiday in 2021 and a State of Colorado holiday in 2022. This holiday commemorates the day that the final enslaved Americans were made aware of the Emancipation Proclamation and also commemorates the end of slavery in the United States.

Councilmember Leh read the proclamation.

MOTION: Councilmember Leh moved to adopt the proclamation; seconded by Councilmember Dickinson.

Public Comments – None

EDI Manager Myles stated that there will be a community film screening on June 15 at the library with information on Juneteenth prior to the movie and discussion afterward.

VOTE: Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

929 PARKVIEW STREET

RESOLUTION NO. 33, SERIES 2023 – A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF A LANDMARK DESIGNATION FOR A HISTORICAL RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT 929 PARKVIEW STREET.

RESOLUTION NO. 34, SERIES 2023 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING A PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION GRANT FOR THE MADONNA HOMESTEAD AT 929 PARKVIEW.

RESOLUTION NO. 35, SERIES 2023 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING A PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION LOAN FOR THE MADONNA HOMESTEAD AT 929 PARKVIEW.

Mayor Maloney introduced the items and asked for disclosures; seeing none he opened the public hearing.

Planner Brackett Hogstad stated the home was built in the minimalist ranch style in 1952 and has a long history with the Madonna family. There is a grant request for matching funds of $51,974. The Historic Preservation Commission approved the restoration work and noted that there are extraordinary circumstances that require foundation work to bring the home up to code and make it habitable. A loan request for $51,974 is also being brought forward to cover the matching portion of the grant. The applicant has qualified for the Impact Development Fund. Staff is recommending approval of the landmark, the grant funding, and the loan funding.

Gordon Madonna, applicant, thanked the Council and staff for helping him preserve the property.

Public Comments – None

Mayor Pro Tem Fahey mentioned how wonderful it is to see another home in Louisville landmarked.

Mayor Maloney closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Dickinson stated this is a really important program. While the upfront costs are high, there are amazing benefits for doing these projects. He thanked the applicant for putting in the time, effort, and money and for taking care of this property.

Councilmember Leh noted it was nice to see the Madonna family in Chambers and he appreciate the contribution they have made to the City. He is pleased Council will be doing the designation of their home.

Councilmember Hamlington noted she also landmarked her home and knows it is no small task to preserve a property and thanked the family for helping maintain the charm of the city.

Mayor Maloney stated that in his time on Council he can see the impact of this program and he knows that using incentives is the right approach. This application reflects the intention of the program.

MOTION: Mayor Pro Tem Fahey moved to approve Resolution No. 33, seconded by Councilmember Leh.

VOTE: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote

MOTION: Mayor Pro Tem Fahey moved to approve Resolution No. 34, seconded by Councilmember Leh.

VOTE: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

MOTION: Mayor Pro Tem Fahey moved to approve Resolution No. 35, seconded by Councilmember Leh.

VOTE: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

1209 MAIN STREET

RESOLUTION NO. 36, SERIES 2023 – A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF A LANDMARK DESIGNATION FOR A HISTORICAL RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1209 MAIN STREET.

RESOLUTION NO. 37, SERIES 2023 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE NICOLAS DIGIACOMO ADDITION – REPLAT B, A MINOR SUBDIVISION TO REPLAT LOTS 3-4-5-6, BLOCK 1 OF THE NICOLAS DIGIACOMO ADDITION TO CREATE TWO LOTS.

Mayor Maloney introduced the item and asked for disclosures; seeing none he opened the public hearing.

Planner Brackett Hogstad stated the structure on the property was built in 1909 in the Craftsman style. This home was associated with the Colacci family and the size and form have been maintained. This came before the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) in 2022 as a full scrape of the property. The owner wanted to put up a four-plex. The HPC put a 180-day stay in place to protect the historical home. The applicant and staff then worked together to come up with a solution to save the historic property. The result was the landmark request and the associated subdivision request. Staff is recommending approval of the landmarking.

The proposed subdivision would divide the lot in two with a few modifications to take the lot sizes and configurations back to what is present in the neighborhood. Staff is also recommending approval of the subdivision agreement.

Councilmember Dickinson asked if the northern lot would be eligible for a duplex. Planner Brackett Hogstad noted that the southern lot would be the larger lot and the northern lot would only be able to have one residence based on the size of the lot. Director Zuccaro added that the southern lot would be large enough to have a small alley loaded in-law type unit which is typical in this section of town. If the owner wanted to put a second residence on the southern lot it would have to go through HPC for design review.

Vincent Colson, applicant, stated that at this time his intent is to go have two units total on the two lots. He is planning on putting a garage behind the historical home and a single family home on the northern lot. He believes this is good for old town.

Public Comments – none

Councilmember Hamlington thanked the applicant for navigating this process and saving the home which was a change from their original plan.

Councilmember Leh voiced his appreciation for the applicant's participation in this process and the historical significance of the home.

Councilmember Dickinson stated that in his time on the HPC he never saw a stay result in a landmarking. This stay resulted in more thought and contemplation. It's a win-win for the City and the owner.

MOTION: Councilmember Dickinson moved to approve Resolution No. 36, seconded by Councilmember Leh.

VOTE: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

MOTION: Councilmember Dickinson moved to approve Resolution No. 37, seconded by Councilmember Leh

VOTE: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

RESOLUTION NO. 38, SERIES 2023 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE ENCLAVE FINAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT REGARDING FENCE REGULATIONS.

Mayor Maloney introduced the item and asked for disclosures. Mayor Pro Tem Fahey noted she lives in the Enclave but does not back to any fences in the neighborhood.

City Attorney Kelly agreed that Mayor Pro Tem Fahey did not need to recuse herself from this item.

Mayor Maloney opened the public hearing.

Director Zuccaro stated this is a PUD amendment to the Enclave Fence Regulations. As a result of the Marshall Fire, residents would like some flexibility is using non-combustible materials. The PUD regulates perimeter fencing and fencing adjacent to Enclave. He reviewed the proposed specifics for each fence type in the PUD.

Amy Austin, representing the neighborhood, noted this is a request from the entire neighborhood and there has been no contention.

Public Comments

Tina Fontillas, resident of the Enclave, mentioned that everyone worked together to get to this point.

Carol Neslund, resident of the Enclave, noted it was a very positive experience in a tough time.

Mayor Maloney closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Mayor Pro Tem Fahey moved to approve Resolution No. 38, seconded by Councilmember Hoefner

VOTE: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

RESOLUTION NO. 39, SERIES 2023 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CHERRYWOOD II FINAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT REGARDING FENCE REGULATIONS.

Mayor Maloney introduced the item and asked for disclosures; seeing none he opened the public hearing.

Director Zuccaro stated that there were fifteen homes in this subdivision destroyed in the Marshall Fire. This request is for changes to the perimeter fence regulations for Lots 48-64 only and all other fence regulations shown on the Cherrywood II PUD will remain in effect. For lots 48-61 the request is to allow any fence permitted by the Louisville Municipal Code. The west side of lot 62 would be allowed to have any fence permitted by the Municipal Code while the northern side of the lot would be a 48” high Black Open Style Metal Fence. Lots 63 and 64 would be included in the 48” high Black Open Style Metal Fence for the northern property lines.

Maria McClure, Cherrywood HOA, stated that they neighborhood came to this agreement as a group as way to be assured of getting noncombustible fences.

Public Comments

Roger Wilkerson, Louisville, noted he would like to have some sort of fire resistant fence. He added that the HOA does have an architectural fence committee and there is a desire to have some sort of continuity.

Don, Louisville, stated it is his understanding that some of the other materials will melt if they get hot enough and may catch fire.

MOTION: Councilmember Dickinson moved to approve Resolution No. 39, seconded by Councilmember Leh

Mayor Maloney closed the public hearing.

VOTE: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote

EXECUTIVE SESSION

REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS AND DISPOSITIONS (Home Rule Charter Section 5-2(c) and C.R.S. 24-6-402(4)(a))

Mayor Maloney introduced the executive session.

City Attorney Kelly noted the items to be discussed and the authority under which the Council can go into executive session. She stated the City Manager is requesting the executive session for the purpose of discussing real property acquisitions and dispositions concerning properties in Louisville only as to appraisals and other value estimates and strategies.

City Clerk Muth read Section 2.90.050 of the Louisville Municipal Code, which outlines the topics permitted for discussion in an executive session.

City Attorney Kelly stated the authority to conduct this executive session is in the Louisville Home Rule Charter Section 5-2(c) which authorizes an executive session for the purpose of discussing real property acquisitions and dispositions concerning properties in Louisville at but only as to appraisals and other value estimates and strategy. Authorization is also allowed by the Colorado Open meetings law in C.R.S. 24-6-402(4)(a).

MOTION: Mayor Maloney moved to go into executive session for the purpose of discussing real property acquisitions and dispositions concerning properties in Louisville but only as to appraisals and other value estimates and strategy and that the executive

session include City Manager Jeff Durbin, Community Development Director Rob Zuccaro, Economic Vitality Manager April Kroner, Danica Powell with Trestle Strategy Group; John Koval with Coburn Partners; and City Attorney Kathleen Kelly. Councilmember Hoefner seconded the motion.

VOTE: Motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

Council adjourned to executive session at 7:14 pm. The Council meeting reconvened at 8:20 pm.

REPORT – DISCUSSION/DIRECTION/ACTION – REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS/DISPOSITIONS

City Attorney Kelly reported that the Council had discussions related real property acquisitions and dispositions and no further action is needed this evening.

CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

None.

COUNCIL COMMENTS, COMMITTEE REPORTS, AND IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Councilmember Hoefner noted a request from the Downtown Business Association to study the closure of Main Street seasonally or year around to cars. He asked that it be considered to be added to an agenda. After a brief discussion it was determined it will discussed during the work plan discussion.

Mayor Maloney stated staff is requesting the cancellation of the June 13 Study Session. Members approved the cancellation.

ADJOURN

Members adjourned at 8:33 pm.

_____
Dennis Maloney, Mayor

_____
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

City of Louisville
COLORADO • SINCE 1878

City Council

Meeting Minutes

February 13, 2024
Library Meeting Room
951 Spruce Street
6:00 PM

Call to Order – Mayor Leh called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. **Roll Call** was taken and the following members were present:

City Council: ***Mayor Chris Leh***
Mayor Pro Tem Caleb Dickinson
Councilmember Tim Bierman
Councilmember Deborah Fahey
Councilmember Barbara Hamlington
Councilmember Dietrich Hoefner
Councilmember Judi Kern

Staff Present: ***Jeff Durbin, City Manager***
Samma Fox, Deputy City Manager
Adam Blackmore, Parks, Recreation, & Open Space Director
Ember Brignull, Open Space Superintendent
Abby McNeal, Parks Superintendent
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

Others Present:

Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board Members:
Cynthia Corne
Ellen Toon
John Webb
Shannon Mihaly

Open Space Advisory Board Members:
Susan McEachern
David Blankinship
Charles Danforth
Michiko Christiansen
Andy Dorsey
Jessamine Fitzpatrick
Mark Poletti
Brad Pugh

PARKS & PUBLIC LANDSCAPING ADVISORY BOARD UPDATE AND 2024 WORK PLAN

Cynthia Corne, board chair, reviewed the work of the board over the past year. She noted successes with advising on the 2C ballot language, providing input on median and playground projects, and getting the City designated as a Bee City. She reviewed the board's proposed work plan for 2024.

She asked for feedback from Council on the economic impact of parks on the community, if the work plan aligns with the City Council work plan, and if the current communications strategy for Parks is working well.

Public Comments

Sherry Sommer, Louisville, stated she would like to see more communication between the boards and Council and more ways for input from residents to be incorporated in decision making.

Members all agreed parks are an important asset to the community for economic and quality of life reasons. They need to be property maintained as an asset and be accessible to all members of the community.

Councilmembers and board members discussed the need for including sustainability in decision making around parks.

Board members noted concerns that the split of the Parks and Open Space Funds could reduce the budget for parks. Everyone agreed this will need to be considered in the 2025 budget.

Councilmembers agreed the Board work plan aligns with the City Council's plan. Members also agreed that the communications strategy for parks has been working well.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY BOARD UPDATE AND 2024 WORK PLAN

Chair Susan McEachern reviewed the role of OSAB and the highlights from 2023. She reviewed the board 2024 priorities including open space management, wildfire mitigation, and creating an acquisition policy.

David Blankinship stated the current acquisition process is too slow and we need a policy in place so we can move quickly if a property becomes available.

He reviewed projects the Board would like to see funded with any new funds generated by the approved open space and parks tax including habitat protection and restoration;

wildfire mitigation; and a sustainable grazing program. He also reviewed suggestions for capital projects for 2025.

Blankinship stated the Board would like feedback on if the Board should continue in a quasi-judicial role for land use applications and how best to communicate with Council.

Councilmember Kern stated she would like to see more in the work plan about open space management and wildfire mitigation.

Board members stated they feel acquisition has been short-changed in recent years and they want to be sure there is a good long-term plan for the new 2C acquisition money becoming available.

Councilmember Hamlington would like to see the board work plan better differentiate between what is a board role and that of staff. Many of the items listed appear to be staff duties.

Public Comments

Cathern Smith, Louisville, stated the division of the parks and open space funds needs citizen input to be sure to represent what residents want. She stated citizens do want more acquisition.

Sherry Sommer, Louisville, stated we should look at the big picture of how to do both acquisition and fire mitigation. Find a way to do both. She wants to see the knowledge provided by the board members incorporated in decisions.

Cynthia Corne, Louisville, stated the City needs to hire experts and write an open space management plan. The City should hire a consultant to help better determine the organization of the parks and open space divisions.

Mayor Leh noted that serving in a quasi-judicial capacity is challenging as you can’t speak freely on land use cases. He feels this role is important for OSAB and PPLAB.

Councilmembers agreed they want the OSAB and PPLAB to continue in their current quasi-judicial roles. They feel getting that quasi-judicial input on land use items from the boards is critical in their decision making. Staff will arrange for more quasi-judicial training for the boards.

Everyone agreed to continue work on a better acquisition policy. Someone on staff should be tasked with making contacts with the owners of parcels that are a high priority so the City can request first right of refusal.

Members encouraged the Board to continue to communicate with the Council through the established staff liaison channels.

Mayor Pro Tem Dickinson stated he wants to make sure we are maintaining our existing open space to the highest standards before acquiring additional land.

Councilmember Fahey asked the Board members to consider fire mitigation in all their decision making.

Members agreed to continue discussions on a better acquisition policy and open space management plans.

ADJOURN

Members adjourned at 9:01 pm.

_____
Christopher M. Leh, Mayor

_____
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

SUBJECT: **APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION NO. 7, SERIES 2024 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN INSTALLATION SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH ROCKFAN ENTERTAINMENT, LLC FOR UPGRADES TO THE AUDIO-VISUAL EQUIPMENT IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS RESOLUTION**

DATE: **FEBRUARY 20, 2024**

PRESENTED BY: **MEREDYTH MUTH, CITY CLERK**

SUMMARY:
The 2024 Budget includes funding for a Capital Improvement Project to upgrade the audio-visual equipment in Council Chambers. Much of the equipment is at end of life and is no longer serviceable.

Staff released a request for proposals for this project in May 2023. We received nine bids as follows:

Company	**Bid Amoung**
Lux AVL	$61,833-$71,917
High Country Low Voltage	$118,268
Rockfan Entertainment	**$127,503**
CTI	$126,326-$148,326
AVI SPL	$155,000
Xcite AudioVisuals	$171,351
Ford Audio Video Systems	$175,281
Bluum Technology	$193,422-$229,822
CCS Presentation Systems	$196,906

Staff interviewed two companies and reviewed references. Staff recommends awarding the contract to Rockfan Entertainment. Rockfan has a good history working with governmental agencies and excellent knowledge for systems such as ours.

FISCAL IMPACT
This project is anticipated to come in within the budgeted amount of $175,000. This cost will be partially offset with accumulated PEG fees in that Fund.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval of the Resolution awarding the contract to Rockfan.

ATTACHMENT(S):

1. Resolution
2. Contract
3. Rockfan Proposal

STRATEGIC PLAN IMPACT:

☒	**Financial Stewardship & Asset Management**	☒	**Reliable Core Services**
☐	**Vibrant Economic Climate**	☐	**Quality Programs & Amenities**
☐	**Engaged Community**	☐	**Healthy Workforce**
☐	**Supportive Technology**	☐	**Collaborative Regional Partner**

RESOLUTION NO. 7
SERIES 2024

A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN INSTALLATION SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH ROCKFAN ENTERTAINMENT, LLC FOR UPGRADES TO THE AUDIO-VISUAL EQUIPMENT IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS

WHEREAS, the audio-visual system in the Louisville City Council Chambers is in need of upgrades; and

WHEREAS, there has been proposed an agreement by which Rockfan Entertainment, LLC ("Rockfan") would perform the needed upgrades, including equipment and materials procurement, installation, and integration services, in exchange for payment from the City (the "Agreement"); and

WHEREAS, the Agreement contemplates that several components of the City's existing audio-visual system may be salvaged and re-used in the work performed by Rockfan, such as the displays, equipment racks, and some microphones, and that other equipment may require replacement with new and upgraded equipment; and

WHEREAS, by this resolution the City Council desires to approve, and authorize the Mayor to execute, the Intergovernmental Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO:

Section 1. The City Council hereby approves the Installation Service Agreement (the "Agreement"), between the City of Louisville and Rockfan Entertainment, LLC, for upgrades to the audio-visual system in the City Council Chambers, in essentially the same form as the copy of such Agreement that accompanies this resolution.

Section 2. The Mayor is hereby authorized to execute the Agreement on behalf of the City, and the Mayor is hereby further authorized to negotiate and approve such revisions to the Agreement as the Mayor determines are necessary or desirable for the protection of the City, so long as the essential terms and conditions of the Agreement are not altered.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 20th day of February, 2024.

_____
Christopher M Leh, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

Installation Contract

Council Chambers AV Upgrades | Quote ID: 1179

Rockfan Entertainment, LLC
Installation Service Agreement

This installation agreement ("contract" or "Agreement") is made and entered into by and between **Rockfan Entertainment, LLC,** 2649 E. Mulberry St., Suite 8, Fort Collins, Colorado ("Rockfan") and **City of Louisville,** located at 749 Main Street Louisville, CO 80027 ("Client").

1. **Statement of Purpose of Agreement.** Rockfan desires to provide and the Client desires to receive the requested audio-visual (AV) equipment and materials procurement, installation, and integration services as described in the Proposal Scope of Work ("Scope of Work"), attached to this Agreement as Exhibit A, which exhibit is incorporated herein by this reference. Such services are limited to what is listed in the Scope of Work, but may include designing systems and controls, procuring products and materials, providing labor for installation, and implementing programming and training. To carry out these purposes, the parties agree to the terms of this Agreement.

2. **Client's Payment Obligations.**

a. Subject to subparagraph (c), the Client agrees to pay **$ 127,503.27** which is the Grand Total with Tax (not applicable) listed in the quote. Payment shall be made as follows:

i. $ 31,875.82 Due at signing (25% of Grand Total);

ii. $63,751.63 due upon delivery of all equipment (50% of Grand Total)

iii. $ 31,875.82 Due upon Completion of Scope of Work (25% of Grand Total), as indicated by the Client's written acceptance of the work.

b. If the payment terms of this Paragraph 2 differ from that stated in the Scope of Work, the terms of this Paragraph control.

c. As stated in Rockfan's Proposal attached hereto as Exhibit A, several existing AV components may be salvaged and re-used in the work performed by Rockfan, such as the displays, equipment racks, and some microphones. Rockfan shall use commercially reasonable efforts to identify, salvage, re-use and integrate existing AV components into the work contemplated hereunder, and in the event such existing items are salvaged and integrated into the work such that new equipment serving the same purpose is not needed to serve the Client's intended function, then the Grand Total due to Rockfan from Client shall be reduced accordingly by reference to the cost of such (unneeded) equipment in Exhibit A.

3. **Rockfan's Obligations.**

a. After payment of the amount due at signing, Rockfan will provide the services described in the Detailed Description of the Scope of Work.

b. Rockfan is not required to perform services that are not reasonably identified in the Scope of Work, and that are not otherwise mutually agreed to by the parties in accordance with subparagraph 9.a below.

c. Rockfan and its employees, contractors, or other representatives will comply with all Client direction, standards, and policies to the extent that Client advises of them in writing to Rockfan.

d. Rockfan shall perform the work identified in the Scope of Work in accordance with the highest professional workmanship and service standards in the field to the satisfaction of the Client, Any work not meeting the foregoing quality standard shall be corrected or replaced by Rockfan at no cost to Client.

e. Until the final acceptance of the work by the Client in writing (which includes electronic messaging), Rockfan shall have the charge and care thereof, and shall take every necessary precaution against injury or damage to any part thereof from any cause. Rockfan, at its own expense, shall rebuild, repair, restore, and correct all injuries or damages to any portion of the work occasioned by any causes before its completion and written acceptance by Client.

f. Rockfan agrees to guarantee all installation workmanship under this Agreement for a period of two (2) years from the date of final acceptance by the Client. If any unsatisfactory condition or damage develops within the time of this guaranty due to workmanship that results in defective or inferior outcomes, or is not in accordance with the Agreement,

as reasonably determined by the Client, then Rockfan shall, when notified by Client, immediately place such guaranteed work in a condition satisfactory to Client. Client shall have all available remedies to enforce such guaranty, except that Client shall not have any work performed independently to fulfill such guaranty and require Rockfan to pay Client such sums as were expended by the Client for such work, unless Client has first given notice to Rockfan of the deficiency and given Rockfan a reasonable opportunity to cure the same. Following such workmanship warranty period, Client may request, and Rockfan shall perform service and maintenance requests at Rockfan's then-current rates offered to municipal clients for service and maintenance of work installed by Rockfan. Rockfan's obligations under this subsection shall survive termination or expiration of this Agreement.

g. Rockfan agrees to pass through to Client any manufacturer warranties applicable to equipment or materials integrated into the work. In the unlikely case that equipment or materials are defective or inferior, Rockfan will work with Client to expedite replacement or repairs in accordance with manufacturer warranty periods; in the case that warranty periods have expired, Rockfan will work in good faith with Client to find a mutually agreed-upon solution or remedy at the minimum cost to the Client.

h. Rockfan agrees to procure and maintain, at its own cost, Comprehensive General Liability insurance with minimum combined single limits of ONE MILLION DOLLARS ($1,000,000) each occurrence and TWO MILLION DOLLARS ($2,000,000) aggregate. The policy shall be applicable to all premises and operations. The policy shall include coverage for bodily injury, broad form property damage (including completed operations), personal injury (including coverage for contractual and employee acts), blanket contractual, independent contractors, products, and completed operations. The policy shall contain a severability of interests provision, and shall be endorsed to include Client, and its officers and employees, as additional insureds. The additional insured endorsement shall not contain any exclusion for bodily injury or property damage arising from completed operations. The policy shall be primary insurance, and any insurance carried by the Client, its officers, or its employees, shall be excess and not contributory insurance to that provided by Rockfan. Rockfan shall be solely responsible for any deductible losses under such policy. Certificates of insurance shall be completed by Rockfan's insurance agent as evidence that a policy providing the required coverages, conditions, and minimum limits is in full force and effect, and shall be subject to review and approval by the Client.

i. To the fullest extent permitted by law, Rockfan agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the Client, and its officers and its employees, from and against all liability, claims, and demands, on account of any injury, loss, or damage, which arise out of or are connected with the work, if such injury, loss, or damage, or any portion thereof, is caused by, or claimed to be caused by, the act, omission, or other fault of Rockfan or any subcontractor of Rockfan, or any officer, employee, or agent of Rockfan or any subcontractor, or any other person for whom Rockfan is responsible. Rockfan shall investigate, handle, respond to, and provide defense for and defend against any such liability, claims, and demands, and to bear all other costs and expenses related thereto, including court costs and attorneys' fees. Rockfan's indemnification obligation shall not be construed to extend to any injury, loss, or damage which is caused by the act, omission, or other fault of Client.

4. **Effectiveness and Date.** This Agreement is effective when all parties have signed it. The date of this Agreement is the date it is signed by the last party to sign.

5. **Time to Completion.** Time is of the essence in all material respects with regard to the work contemplated under this contract. Rockfan shall perform the installation work on such date(s) and time(s) agreed to by the parties in a subsequent writing, which writing shall set forth a completion deadline, which may be extended by Client if Rockfan demonstrates to Client's satisfaction that an extension is needed due to equipment availability, labor needs, any requested or agreed Change Orders and similar factors that may affect the timeline for delivery of services.

6. **Additional Client Responsibilities; Release.** The Client agrees to protect and keep unauthorized individuals away from the area of installation during performance of the Scope of Work, and to release Rockfan from any claims arising out of Client's failure to properly and safely secure such area. Client shall also release Rockfan from any claims arising out of improper or unsafe use the equipment installed or otherwise provided by Rockfan under this Agreement, and alteration of equipment or installation work, following Completion. The obligations and releases set forth in this Paragraph 6 shall survive the termination of this Agreement.

7. **Media Release.** Client grants Rockfan the right, without compensation, to photograph, record video, and/or record installation projects before and during performance of services and after Completion, provided that Rockfan shall not photograph or record Client's employees or officers or members of the public without first obtaining the subject person's consent. Client further grants Rockfan the right to use those images and recordings in publicly disseminated information and materials in any medium, including but not limited to print, internet, social media, radio, television or other digital formats, provided the use does not (i) disparage or appear to disparage Client, its mayor, council members, officers, employees, or agents and others acting Client's behalf (collectively, the "Related Parties"), (ii) violate any of the proprietary rights of the Client or the Related parties, (iii) violate any applicable federal, state, or local law, rule, or regulation, (iv) associate the Client or related parties with any libelous, defamatory, obscene or unlawful material, or any material that might in any manner embarrass the Client or the Related Parties, or otherwise violate or infringe any right of any third party, or (v) imply sponsorship, endorsement or any association between Rockfan and Client or the Related Parties, unless Rockfan receives the City Manager's separate written permission to do so.

8. **Force Majeure.**

a. If Rockfan's ability to perform any obligation under this Agreement is prevented, restricted or delayed because of unforeseen circumstances beyond such Rockfan's reasonable control, including but not limited to acts of God; acts of a public enemy; war; rebellion; insurrection; riot; terrorist acts; epidemic; pandemic; any law, order, proclamation, regulation, ordinance, demand or requirement of any governmental authority or any political subdivision or any department or regulatory agency thereof, including quarantine restrictions, stay-at-home orders or any requirements or restrictions of a similar nature; orders of any court or arbitral body; changes in law; acts of any person or persons engaged in subversive activity or sabotage; fires, floods, explosions, storms, earthquakes, lightning; or other catastrophes; strikes, lockout, picketing, work slow-downs or other labor disputes; boycott; embargoes; blockade; unavoidable delays or inability to obtain equipment, labor, fuel, steam, water, electricity or materials or anything else necessary to operate a party's offices or equipment or otherwise provide services (a "Force Majeure"), then Rockfan will be excused from performance of the obligation to the extent and for the duration of such prevention, restriction or delay. Rockfan will give the other party prompt and detailed notice of the Force Majeure, including the probable duration thereof, and will promptly notify the Client when the Force Majeure has ended. During the Force Majeure, Rockfan will use its best efforts to avoid, reduce or eliminate the Force Majeure's effect on the performance of its obligations under this Agreement.

b. If a Force Majeure continues to affect Rockfan's performance under this Agreement for more than 90 days, either Client or Rockfan may terminate this Agreement upon written notice to the other party. If this Agreement is terminated under this provision and prior to Completion, then Client is obligated to compensate Rockfan for all equipment purchased, even if not yet installed, all labor performed, and all other costs listed in the Scope of Work that Rockfan has incurred prior to termination of the Agreement. If Client has paid Rockfan more than it is obligated to compensation Rockfan under the terms of this provision, then Rockfan will refund the difference.

9. **General Terms.**

a. **Amendments.** This Agreement may not be amended except in a writing that is agreed to and signed by both parties. This includes but is not limited to changes to the Scope of Work requested by the Client or recommended by Rockfan.

b. **Jurisdiction and Venue; Choice of Law.** This Agreement is governed by Colorado law without giving effect to those principles of conflict of laws that might otherwise require the application of the laws of another jurisdiction. Any litigation must be brought in District Court, Boulder County, State of Colorado, and each party submits to the exclusive jurisdiction of such court and waives the right to change venue. Each party further consents to the exercise of personal jurisdiction by such court with respect to any such proceeding.

c. **Nonassignability.** This Agreement is not assignable by any party without the written consent of the other party.

d. **Severability.** Any invalid or unenforceable provision will be deemed severed from this Agreement to the extent of its invalidity or unenforceability, and the remainder of this Agreement will remain in full force and effect.

e. **No Waiver.** No waiver of any breach of any one or more of the terms of this Agreement by either party will be deemed to imply or constitute a waiver of a breach of the same term in the future, or a waiver of a breach of any other term of this Agreement. No provision of this Agreement may be waived except by a written waiver signed by the waiving party.

f. **Third-Party Beneficiaries.** The parties agree that this Agreement is for the parties' mutual and exclusive benefit, that it does not confer any rights upon any person not a party to this Agreement, and that no individual or entity shall be construed or considered to be a third-party beneficiary of this Agreement, including any payor or other individual or entity.

g. **Complete Agreement.** This Agreement constitutes the entire understanding between the parties with respect to the subject matter of this Agreement, and supersedes completely all negotiations, discussions, and prior agreements, oral or written, between the parties with respect to the subject matter of this Agreement. This Agreement may not be amended except in a writing that is agreed to and acknowledged by both parties.

h. **Further Assurances.** The parties agree that they will execute, acknowledge, and deliver any further instruments or documents or take such actions as may be necessary to give force and effect to this agreement and to carry out the intent of the provisions of this agreement.

i. **Interpretation.** Any ambiguity in this Agreement shall not be resolved against either party under any rules of construction.

j. **Dispute Resolution.** If a Dispute (defined as a claim or controversy arising from this Agreement including, without limitation, contract, tort and other claims) arises between the parties, the parties agree to first attempt to resolve the dispute through friendly discussions. If friendly discussions fail to resolve the Dispute, then any party may require, by written demand, that the Dispute be submitted to nonbinding mediation.

k. **Costs.** If either party retains counsel for the purpose of enforcing or preventing the breach or any threatened

breach of any provision of this Agreement or for any other remedy relating to it, then the prevailing party will be entitled to be reimbursed by the non-prevailing party for all costs and expenses so incurred (including reasonable attorney's fees, costs of bonds, and fees and expenses for expert witnesses) unless the arbitrator or other trier of fact determines otherwise in the interest of fairness.

l. **Supremacy.** In the event this Agreement conflicts with any other document between the parties for the transactions subject to this Agreement, the terms of this Agreement will control.

m. **Survivability.** The obligations in this Agreement, which by their nature would continue beyond the termination, cancellation, or expiration of this agreement will survive the Termination of this Agreement, even if the terms of this Agreement do not otherwise specify that they survive.

n. **Notice.** Any notice, demand, or other communication (collectively, a "notice") made pursuant to this Agreement must be in writing and either delivered by email, personally, sent by overnight delivery courier, or sent by certified or registered mail, postage prepaid, return receipt requested to the person designated below. Delivery is effective on the date emailed or personally delivered to the parties requiring notice, or the date confirmed delivered by the overnight delivery courier or by the mail service. Notices must be addressed to the parties' representatives and at the addresses or email(s) listed below their signature in this Agreement. Each party shall advise the other party immediately of any change in address or other contact information to which notice should be given.

o. **Scanning and Photocopies.** The parties agree that the original of this Agreement, including the signature page, may be scanned and stored in a computer database or similar device, and that any printout or other output readable by sight that accurately reproduces the original of this document may be used for any purpose just as if it were the original, including proof of the content of the original writing.

p. **Counterparts.** This agreement may be executed in counterparts which, when taken together, will be deemed an original and constitute one and the same document. Facsimile transmission of executed signature pages will be sufficient to bind the executing party.

q. **Termination.** This Agreement may be terminated by either party for material breach or default of this Agreement by the other party not caused by any action or omission of the other party by giving the other party written notice at least thirty (30) days in advance of the termination date. In addition to the foregoing, this Agreement may be terminated by Client for its convenience and without cause of any nature by giving written notice at least fifteen (15) days in advance of the termination date. In the event of such termination, Rockfan will be paid for the reasonable value of the services rendered to the date of termination, not to exceed a pro-rated daily rate, for the services rendered to the date of termination, and upon such payment, all obligations of Client to Rockfan under this Agreement will cease. Termination pursuant to this subsection shall not prevent either party from exercising any other legal remedies which may be available to it.

r. **Accessibility.** Rockfan represents and warrants that any equipment, hardware, software, or other Information and Communication Technology (ICT), as such term is defined in the Accessibility Standards for Individuals with a Disability as established by the Office of Information Technology pursuant to Section §24-85-103 (2.5), C.R.S. (the "Accessibility Standards"), furnished or licensed to Client under this Agreement fully complies with §§24-85-101, et seq., C.R.S., and the Accessibility Standards. If Rockfan violates this subsection, Client may (1) require Rockfan to replace the noncomplying equipment, hardware, software, or other Information and Communication Technology (ICT), with items fully conforming to §§24-85-101, et seq., C.R.S., and the Accessibility Standards, or (2) immediately terminate the Agreement for breach.

s. **Independent Contractor.** It is the expressed intent of the parties that Rockfan is an independent contractor and not the agent, employee or servant of the Client, and that: ROCKFAN SHALL SATISFY ALL TAX AND OTHER GOVERNMENTALLY IMPOSED RESPONSIBILITIES INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, PAYMENT OF STATE, FEDERAL, AND SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES, UNEMPLOYMENT TAXES, WORKER'S COMPENSATION AND SELF-EMPLOYMENT TAXES. NO STATE, FEDERAL OR LOCAL TAXES OF ANY KIND SHALL BE WITHHELD OR PAID BY THE CLIENT. ROCKFAN IS NOT ENTITLED TO WORKERS' COMPENSATION BENEFITS EXCEPT AS MAY BE PROVIDED BY ROCKFAN NOR TO UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS UNLESS UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION COVERAGE IS PROVIDED BY ROCKFAN OR SOME ENTITY OTHER THAN THE CLIENT.

Installation Contract

Council Chambers AV Upgrades | Quote ID: 1179

Signature Page

Each party is signing this Agreement on the date stated opposite that party's signature.

Date: February 13, 2024 **Rockfan Entertainment, LLC**

By: _____

Name: Lee Putnam, President

2649 E. Mulberry St., STE 8
Fort Collins, CO 80524
lee@rockfan.email
info@rockfan.email

Date: _____, 20__ **Client Name: City of Louisville**

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Address: _____

_____

Email: _____

Rockfan Entertainment, LLC
2649 E. Mulberry St #8
Fort Collins, CO 80524
(970) 682-4015
info@rockfan.email
http://Rockfan.Rocks

Received 7/3/2023 @ 2:52pm MDT
via email
Louisville City Clerk's Office

Greetings,

On behalf of my team, thank you for the consideration of your time in reviewing the attached proposal for Council Chambers AV Upgrades.

Since 2012, Rockfan has earned the reputation of a boutique AV firm that cares about its clients and delivers on expectations. Headquartered in Fort Collins, Colorado, our staff is comprised of acoustic technicians, information technology professionals, audio engineers, event production experts, product specialists and trained field technicians.

Our work spans a wide range of these areas – from educational facilities, to corporate and municipal spaces, to performing arts venues, houses of worship and live stages big and small – wherein we strive to exceed expectations through honesty and reliability.

A sampling of our current and previous AV Installation and system programming customers include the Denver Broncos, Kroenke Sports and Entertainment, Denver Zoo, Colorado State University, University of Colorado and municipalities like the City of Fort Collins, Longmont and many more.

Be confident to connect with us, as our leadership team and friendly staff are dedicated to ensuring a successful project that is on time and on budget. All installation work will be completed by salaried Rockfan staff – none of the work will be subcontracted.

Audiovisual installation services can be confusing and stressful but that should not be the case. Our team brings confidence to the project and we look forward to sharing in your success along the way. We have the resources, experience and expertise to carry out your project's vision so we look forward to hearing your thoughts when time allows.

With Gratitude,

Lee Putnam
President
Rockfan

Rockfan Entertainment, LLC
2649 E. Mulberry St #8
Fort Collins, CO 80524
(970) 682-4015
info@rockfan.email
http://Rockfan.Rocks

Rockfan Peace of Mind Guarantee

With audio and video installation projects, the acronyms don't stop with AV! There's SPL, dB, EASE, DSP, aptX, ASIO and the list goes on…not to mention watts, ohms, absorption, dissipation, hertz and the various manufacturer specs and ever-evolving tech!

Know that partnering with Rockfan means providing yourself with peace of mind: not only will we work closely with you to see your project scope to successful completion, but you can also rely on us in the long run to provide guidance, advice and technical support.

We realize that projects can sometimes experience hiccups, whether it be a faulty connection cable, a dead battery or perhaps the need to have equipment tested and potentially repaired by the manufacturer. Rockfan will be there for you to fix those problems and find solutions to unforeseen circumstances.

We take pride in our work and always strive to foster long-term relationships built on service, integrity and sharing knowledge.

That's why, in addition to the standard manufacturers' warranties on products, we also offer the Rockfan Service Warranty Guarantee. So, what exactly is it?

Rockfan provides a 100% customer satisfaction guarantee for all technical labor, programming and design necessary to complete the project scope. You won't experience add-on charges after the fact and you can be confident that your project will be completed to your desired specifications.

We don't want you to feel like you're being nickel-and-dimed when you should instead be excited about how your new AV system will better serve your customers and employees and enhance your business.

We look forward to working with you now and into the future!

Rockfan Entertainment, LLC
2649 E. Mulberry St #8
Fort Collins, CO 80524
(970) 682-4015
info@rockfan.email
http://Rockfan.Rocks

10-Step AV Installation Process

Step #1. Jointly Review Quote & Scope of Work

Step #2. Client Approves Quote & Scope of Work

Step #3. Jointly Sign Contract & Agree to Installation Terms

Step #4. Client Remits “Due at Signing” Invoice Amount

Step #5. Rockfan Orders Equipment

Step #6. Jointly Schedule Installation Dates Based on Equipment Availability

Step #7. Rockfan Completes Installation Scope of Work

Step #8. Client “Signs off” on Job Completion Scope of Work Verification

Step #9. Client Remits “Final Payment” Invoice Amount

Step #10. Post-Installation Warranty Terms Begin

Rockfan Entertainment, LLC
2649 E. Mulberry St #8
Fort Collins, CO 80524
(970) 682-4015
info@rockfan.email
http://Rockfan.Rocks

Post-Installation Service Warranty

After the installation, Rockfan is still here for you! For 365 days after the completion of your project's scope of work, we offer the following ***special service warranty rates*** to meet your ongoing needs. Perhaps you hire new employees who need training or maybe you desire ongoing operations and maintenance assistance such as system tuning or cleaning. No matter the need, we'll answer the call. Based on the need and technical nature of the assistance, we'll work to schedule service and support in fast fashion.

Service Category	Standard Rate	Special Rate
Service Call Fee	$125	No Charge
Hourly Rate: Field Technician Labor	$90/hr	$70/hr
Hourly Rate: Training	$90/hr	$70/hr
Hourly Rate: System Programming	$195/hr	$125/hr
Travel & Trip Charge Mileage Fee	$1.50/mile	$0.75/mile

Experience, Technical Competence & References

Q-SYS Programming and Integration: Rockfan has designed, programmed and deployed high-profile Q-SYS-based AV systems in settings big and small. Rockfan's President (Lee Putnam) was QSC's Q-SYS certified trainer for Colorado for eight years. In turn, we have vast experience with listening to clients' needs and customizing Q-SYS programming and control to align with their project vision.

All design, installation work, programming and training will be provided by salaried Rockfan staff; none of the work will be subtracted.

Rockfan is frequently subcontracted as a go-to Q-SYS programmer for AV consulting firms and other AV integrators, such as K2, AVI-SPL, Clearwing and more. Rockfan's field technicians all have experience with how the AV equipment will integrate with Q-SYS controls and programming capabilities detailed in the scope of work.

Rockfan also provides full-service live audio and lighting production services and has produced concerts, theatrical productions, music festivals and dance showcases at venues ranging from Red Rocks to city parks. With 100+ concert productions each year, our team has a keen awareness of how stages function, how performance venues should look and sound and how each room is unique. With respect to venue expectations, gear and production expectations, our team will be speaking the same language as the City of Louisville's technical staff.

The following case studies provide a snapshot of Rockfan's confidence and familiarity with municipal governments, mult-level high-profile organizations, Q-SYS and AV System integration.

Case Study Example #1: City of Fort Collins Q-SYS Projects

- **Summary:** Rockfan has designed and completed multiple Q-SYS projects and has several ongoing AV installs for the City of Fort Collins. The majority of the projects are built on a Q-SYS backbone, including AV upgrades at City Hall and Council Chambers, Fort Collins Municipal Court, Fort Collins Emergency Operations Center and Fort Collins Police Services Command Center. One particular room, referred to as the "Colorado Room" has become the gold standard for the City's HyFlex multipurpose meeting spaces. Our work in that space included integration of video, audio and projectors via full Q-SYS control with PTZ cameras, voice integration and touchscreen control.
- **Project Date**: 2021 – Ongoing working relationship.
- **Project Amount Range**: $125,000 - $175,000

Case Study Example #2: Denver Broncos Locker Room Q-SYS Integration

- **Summary:** Rockfan provided an audio and video upgrade to the Broncos' Visitor Locker Room at the stadium, including ceiling speakers, projector, screen and processing that was Q-SYS controlled. The project also required integration with the stadium's existing Q-SYS backbone and Rockfan worked with K2 to ensure that the new equipment was compatible and functioning properly.
- **Project Date:** 2023 – Ongoing working relationship
- **Project Amount Range**: $100,000 - $150,000

Case Study Example #3: Denver Zoo Q-SYS Programming

- **Summary**: In this K2-designed project, Rockfan was contracted to implement complex Q-SYS programming at the Denver Zoo's Veterinary Medicine Hospital in order to enhance the guest experience. The programming provided the ability for zoo guests in the lobby area to interact with veterinarians during medical procedures. A zoo staff member could control cameras inside the surgery room via an iPad to display live procedures on 86" lobby TVs. The staff member could also relay real-time questions to the vet who could then talk back to the guests via ceiling speakers installed in the lobby.
- **Project Date:** 2020 & 2021 update
- **Project Amount Range**: $7,500 - $15,000

Case Study Example #4: University Schools Auditorium & Football Field Q-SYS Integration

- **Project Scope:** Rockan has designed and implemented multiple Q-SYS based AV upgrades for University Schools K-12 public charter school in Greeley, CO. The auditorium project featured a full-scale theatrical AV upgrade and was built on Q-SYS, including line arrays, lighting rig and video projection. The Q-SYS programming features an "easy mode" with control of basic functions via a touchscreen and an "advanced performance mode" that enables the lighting system to be managed by an independent lighting console. At the school's football stadium, Rockfan installed a new sound system and connected the stadium to the Q-SYS core within the auditorium which allows for the auditorium to serve as an overflow space for stadium events, such as pep rallies or adverse weather conditions.
- **Project Date:** 2020 – Ongoing working relationship
- **Project Amount Range**: $100,000 - $150,000

Case Study Example #5: Nissi's Entertainment and Event Center AV Installation

- **Project Summary**: Rockfan engineered and installed a full-scale audio and lighting system for this new music venue in Lafayette, CO. The system was designed upon a Q-SYS backbone that controls the house lights, enables a lighting console to take over control and handles the processing for the audio system and room tuning.
- **Project Date**: 2022
- **Project Amount Range**: $50,000 - $100,000

Project Case Study References

Reference for Case Study Example #1: City of Fort Collins Q-SYS Projects

- Contact: Carson Hamlin, Sr. Systems Engineer, City of Fort Collins
- Phone: 970-221-6510; Email: CHAMLIN@fcgov.com
- Project Date: 2021 – ongoing projects

Reference for Case Study Example #2: Denver Broncos Locker Room Q-SYS Integration

- Contact: Pat Jordan, Director of Broadcast and Technical Operations
- Phone: 720-258-3014; Email: Pat.Jordan@broncos.nfl.net
- Project Date: 2022 – 2023

Reference for Case Study Example #3: Denver Zoo Q-SYS Programming

- Contact: Dean Paulson, Sr. Director of IT, Denver Zoological Foundation
- Phone: 720-337-1426; Email: dpaulson@denverzoo.org
- Project Date: 2020 & 2021

Reference for Case Study Example #4: University Schools Auditorium & Football Field Q-SYS Integration

- Contact: David Wertz, Director of Technologies at University Schools
- Phone: 970-673-7675; Email: dwertz@universityschools.com
- Project Date: 2021 – ongoing projects

Reference for Case Study Example #5: Nissi's Entertainment & Event Center AV Installation

- Contact: Marc Gitlin, Venue Owner, Nissi's
- Phone: 720-318-8631; Email: marc@nissis.com
- Project Date: 2021

Rockfan AVL Production & Integration: Key Project Staff

Key Project Staff: For purposes of this project, the following members of Rockfan's leadership team look forward to the opportunity of working with the City of Louisville.

- Lee Putnam, President: Company founder, chief systems engineer and primary point-of-contact.
    - Cell: 605-431-5714. Email: Lee@Rockfan.email
- Cody Green, Installation Manager: Crew chief, project manager and technical services coordinator.
    - Cell: 720-324-3819. Email: Cody@Rockfan.email
- James Yearling, General Manager: Procurement and communications.
    - Cell: 419-203-6824. Email: James@Rockfan.email
- Megan Beardsley, Office & Administrative Manager: Billing and administrative support.
    - Cell: 303-748-0547. Email: Megan@Rockfan.email

APPENDIX A

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Vendor must disclose any possible conflict of interest with the City of Louisville including, but not limited to, any relationship with any City of Louisville elected official or employee. Your response must disclose if a known relationship exists between any principal of your firm and any City of Louisville elected official or employee. If, to your knowledge, no relationship exists, this should also be stated in your response. Failure to disclose such a relationship may result in cancellation of a contract as a result of your response. This form must be completed and returned in order for your proposal to be eligible for consideration.

NO KNOWN RELATIONSHIPS EXIST **: No known relationships exist**

RELATIONSHIP EXISTS (Please explain relationship)

_____

_

_____

_

I CERTIFY THAT:

1. I, as an officer of this organization, or per the attached letter of authorization, am duly authorized to certify the information provided herein are accurate and true as of the date; and

2. My organization shall comply with all State and Federal Equal Opportunity and Non-Discrimination requirements and conditions of employment.

Lee Putnam _____ **President** _____

Printed or Typed Name Title

_____

Signature

Job Name: Council Chambers AV Upgrades
Quote Name: Council Chambers AV Upgrades
Quote Date: 6/1/2023 - Valid for 30 Days
Quote #: 1179
Version: 1

Prepared for: City of Louisville
Meredyth Muth
City Clerk
Phone: (303) 335-4536
Email: clerksoffice@louisvilleco.gov

Prepared By:

Rockfan Entertainment LLC.
2649 E. Mulberry St. STE 8
Fort Collins, CO 80524

http://Rockfan.Rocks

Lee Putnam
Office: (970) 682-4015
Cell: (970) 682-3258

Email: lee@rockfan.email

Scope of Work

Rockfan is pleased to present this preliminary quote with respect to the City of Louisville's RFP for City Council Chambers Audio-Video Equipment Upgrade.

Please note that Rockfan cordially request a follow-up meeting to talk through options and reasoning per the quote contents. For example, Rockfan believes that several existing AV components can be salvaged and re-used in the upgrade, such as the displays, the equipment rack(s) and some microphones. Rockfan would be happy to quote all new products, but in the name of cost-savings and practicality, we have not quoted all products at this time.

The work and components within the quote will deliver upon the RFP's purpose and will allow users to easily operate the room without assistance from a broadcast technician. Rockfan will replace all video switching and control and will replace the existing system with that of the QSC Q-SYS ecosystem.

Rockfan will also look forward to formalizing warranty and service work guidelines that make sense for the City of Louisville staff and use of the room.

Council Chambers AV Upgrades

Council Chambers AV Upgrades - v.1

ROCKFAN AVL PRODUCTION • INTEGRATION

1. Broadcast

Product	QTY	Price	Total
Blackmagic ATEM Television Studio 4K8 Powerful Ultra HD live production switcher similar to the non ISO HD model, however includes 8 x 12G-SDI inputs, 10 12G-SDI aux outputs for external recorders, 4 port 10G Ethernet switch and more!	1	$4,499.00	$4,499.00
Pro Presenter Live Presentation Software	1	$399.00	$399.00
Black Magic BMD-CONVCMIC/SH12G/WPSU Blackmagic Design Micro Converter - SDI to HDMI 12G with PSU	6	$159.00	$954.00
QSC TSC-70-G3 Q-SYS 7” PoE Touch Screen Controller for In-Wall Mounting. Color - Black only	1	$1,905.00	$1,905.00
QSC TSC-710t-G3 Table top mounting accessory for TSC-70-G3 and TSC-101-G3.	1	$455.00	$455.00
QSC NV-21-HU 4K60 4:4:4 Network Video Endpoint for Q-SYSEcosystem, software configurable as Encoder or Decoder. 1 HDMI 2.0 Input, 1 USB-C Input, 1 HDMI 2.0 output. Optional Software License to enable AV Bridging (SLQBR-P).	3	$1,999.00	$5,997.00

1. Broadcast Total: $14,209.00

2. Dais

Product	QTY	Price	Total
QSC NV-21-HU 4K60 4:4:4 Network Video Endpoint for Q-SYSEcosystem, software configurable as Encoder or Decoder. 1 HDMI 2.0 Input, 1 USB-C Input, 1 HDMI 2.0 output. Optional Software License to enable AV Bridging (SLQBR-P).	1	$1,999.00	$1,999.00
QSC TSC-70-G3 Q-SYS 7” PoE Touch Screen Controller for In-Wall Mounting. Color - Black only	1	$1,905.00	$1,905.00
QSC TSC-710t-G3 Table top mounting accessory for TSC-70-G3 and TSC-101-G3.	1	$455.00	$455.00
		2. Dais Total:	**$4,359.00**

3. Lectern

Product	QTY	Price	Total
NETGEAR GSM4210PD-100NAS M4250-9G1F-POE+ FULLY MANAGED DESKTOP SWITCH	1	$699.00	$699.00
QSC NV-21-HU 4K60 4:4:4 Network Video Endpoint for Q-SYSEcosystem, software configurable as Encoder or Decoder. 1 HDMI 2.0 Input, 1 USB-C Input, 1 HDMI 2.0 output. Optional Software License to enable AV Bridging (SLQBR-P).	1	$1,999.00	$1,999.00
QSC TSC-70-G3 Q-SYS 7” PoE Touch Screen Controller for In-Wall Mounting. Color - Black only	1	$1,905.00	$1,905.00
QSC TSC-710t-G3 Table top mounting accessory for TSC-70-G3 and TSC-101-G3.	1	$455.00	$455.00
		3. Lectern Total:	**$5,058.00**

4. Wireless Mics

Product	QTY	Price	Total
Shure MXCW640 Wireless Conference Unit with 4.3 inch color touchscreen for voting, interpretation channel selection, and conference information, integrated NFC ID card reader, chairman, delegate, listener, and ambient modes, integrated loudspeaker, 10-pin microphone connector, 2 3.5mm headphone jacks with volume controls. Includes SB930 rechargeable Li-Ion battery.	4	$1,620.00	$6,480.00
Shure MXC416DF/C Cardioid Dual-Flex Gooseneck Microphone (16 in/40 cm) with flexible top and bottom sections, bi-color LED, 10-pin connector, and foam windscreen, for MXC, MXCW conference units; black	4	$224.00	$896.00
Shure MXCWAPT-A Access Point Transceiver for US only; manages audio routing, frequency coordination, and system control for up to 125 wireless conference units; includes 10 DanteTM inputs/outputs and analog XLR inputs/outputs; requires Power-over-Ethernet. Includes paintable cover and wall/ceiling mounting plate.	1	$4,053.00	$4,053.00
Shure MXCWNCS-US NETWORKED CHARGING STATION, 10BAY SB930, US IEC POWER CORD	1	$1,216.00	$1,216.00
		4. Wireless Mics Total:	**$12,645.00**

5. Processing

Product	QTY	Price	Total
QSC CORE 110f-v2 Unified Core with 24 local audio I/O channels, 128x128 total network I/O channels with 8x8 Software-based Dante license included, USB AV bridging, dual LAN ports, POTS and VoIP telephony, no GPIO, 16 next-generation AEC processors, 1RU.	1	$4,170.00	$4,170.00
QSC SLQUD-110-P Q-SYS Core 110 UCI Deployment Software License, Perpetual.	1	$234.00	$234.00
QSC SLQSE-110-P Q-SYS Core 110 Scripting Engine Software License, Perpetual.	1	$465.00	$465.00
Netgear GSM4230P-100NAS 24 Port PoE Switch	1	$1,399.00	$1,399.00
Listen Technologies LS-31-072-D Listen iDSP Essentials Level 2 Stationary RF System (72 MHz) (Dante)	1	$1,729.00	$1,729.00
QSC QIO-ML2x2 Q-SYS peripheral providing 2 mic/line inputs and 2 line outputs. Up to 4 devices daisy-chainable. 1U-1/4W, powered over Ethernet or +24 VDC. Surface mountable, rack kit sold separately.	4	$685.00	$2,740.00
QSC QIO-PSU Power Supply Accessory to support up to 4 QIO units with external power.	1	$185.00	$185.00
QSC QIO-RMK Rack mount tray and blanking panels to mount up to four QIO units in a 1U 19" standard rack format.	1	$185.00	$185.00

5. Processing Total: $11,107.00

6. Teleconferencing

Product	QTY	Price	Total
QSC NC-12x80 12x Optical Zoom 80° Horizontal Field of View, PTZ Network Camera, PoE, with HDMI and SDI output. Includes PTZ-WMB1 wall mount bracket	2	$3,999.00	$7,998.00
QSC SLQBR-P Q-SYS AV Bridging feature license. One license is required per TSC Series Gen 3 touch screen controller with AV Bridging enabled. Perpetual. For NV-21-HU, TSC-70-G3 & TSC-101-G3	3	$599.00	$1,797.00
Extron MediaPort 200 HDMI and Audio to USB Scaling Bridge	1	$3,499.00	$3,499.00
		6. Teleconferencing Total:	**$13,294.00**

7. Video

Product	QTY	Price	Total
Barco G62-W9 (White) 9,000 Lumen Laser Projector - WUXGA - WHITE	2	$10,999.00	$21,998.00
Barco R9832756 The Barco R9832756 G Series Lens (Throw Ratio 1.52-2.92)	2	$2,499.00	$4,998.00
LG 55US670H9UA 55" 4K UHD SMART Hospitality TV PRO IDIOM B-LAN	1	$896.00	$896.00
Cheif MTM1U Universal display mount	1	$196.00	$196.00
QSC NV-21-HU 4K60 4:4:4 Network Video Endpoint for Q-SYSEcosystem, software configurable as Encoder or Decoder. 1 HDMI 2.0 Input, 1 USB-C Input, 1 HDMI 2.0 output. Optional Software License to enable AV Bridging (SLQBR-P).	6	$1,999.00	$11,994.00

7. Video Total: **$40,082.00**

8. Labor & Overhead

Product	QTY	Price	Total
Demolition Fee Hourly Technical labor for demolition of existing equipment; TBD recycling fee to be reiumbursed by City of Louisville	4	$90.00	$360.00
Project Overhead Administrative Fees and overhead for potential increase in freight and/or manufacturer product pricing	1	$2,000.00	$2,000.00
Rockfan Engineering Labor Labor for designs and engineering	24	$180.00	$4,320.00
Rockfan Install Tech Trained technician install labor.	168	$90.00	$15,120.00
Rockfan Shipping Shipping and Delivery Expense - ESTIMATE	1	$899.00	$899.00
Rockfan Trip Charge Job site travel, fuel and delivery fees.	5	$150.00	$750.00
Rockfan Bulk Cable Cable needed to complete install. - ESTIMATE	1	$2,500.00	$2,500.00
Rockfan Misc Hardware Misc. Hardware needed for install. - ESTIMATE	1	$800.00	$800.00
Rockfan Colorado Retail Delivery Fee Department of Revenue Surcharge	1	$0.27	$0.27

8. Labor & Overhead Total: $26,749.27

	Products Total:	$ 127,503.27
+	Tax Estimate (7.40%):	$ 0.00
=	**Due at signing:**	**$ 102,002.62**
+	**Due at substantial completion:**	**$ 25,500.65**
=	**Grand Total with Tax:**	**$ 127,503.27**

Note: Additional shipping charges and taxes may apply. By signing this quote you also agree to our installation terms and conditions

City of Louisville

Meredyth Muth

Signature

Date

Rockfan Entertainment, LLC
Installation Service Agreement

This installation agreement ("contract") is made and entered into by and between Rockfan Entertainment, LLC, 2649 E. Mulberry St., Suite 8, Fort Collins, Colorado ("Rockfan") and **City of Louisville,** located at 749 Main Street Louisville, CO 80027 ("Client").

1. **Statement of Purpose of Agreement.** Rockfan desires to provide and the Client desires to receive the requested audio-visual (AV) installation and integration services as described in the Proposal Scope of Work "Scope of Work"), attached to this Agreement. Such services are limited to what is listed in the Scope of Work, but may include designing systems and controls, procuring products and materials, providing labor for installation, and implementing programming and training. To carry out these purposes, the parties agree to the terms of this Agreement.

2. **Client's Payment Obligations.**

   a. The Client agrees to pay **$ 127503.27** which is the Grand Total with Tax (if applicable) listed in the quote. Payment shall be made as follows:

   i. **$ 102002.62** Due at signing (80% of Grand Total with Tax)

   ii. **$ 25500.65** Due on Completion of Scope of Work.

   b. If the payment terms of this Paragraph 2 differ from that stated in the Scope of Work, the terms of this Paragraph control.

3. **Rockfan's Service Obligations.**

   a. After payment of the amount due at signing, Rockfan will provide the services described in the Detailed Description of the Scope of Work.

   b. Rockfan is not required to perform services that are not reasonably identified in the Scope of Work, and that are not otherwise mutually agreed to by the parties in accordance with subparagraph 9.a below.

   c. Rockfan and its employees, contractors, or other representatives will comply with all Client standards and policies to the extent that Client advises of them in writing to Rockfan.

4. **Effectiveness and Date.** This Agreement is effective when all parties have signed it. The date of this Agreement is the date it is signed by the last party to sign.

5. **Estimated time to Completion.** Client understands that the estimated time to project completion is based upon equipment availability, labor needs, any requested or agreed Change Orders and similar factors that may affect the timeline for delivery of services. If a targeted completion is desired, Client understands that this is an estimate only and not a guarantee.

6. **Indemnification.** The Client agrees to defend and indemnify Rockfan and its affiliates, including its shareholders, officers, directors, employees, and agents, for any and all damages, losses, liabilities, claims and causes of action of any kind, including property damage, bodily injury or death, or any other consequential damage, arising out of or related to the conduct of the Client or its affiliates, including its shareholders, officers, directors, employees, volunteers, subcontractors, suppliers, or any other person or entity visiting Client's property or acting on the Client's behalf. Such conduct includes but is not limited to failure to protect and keep unauthorized individuals away from the area of installation during performance of the Scope of Work; failure to properly and safely use the equipment installed or otherwise provided; and alteration of equipment or installation work following Completion. Such conduct is not limited to acts or omissions that constitute a breach of this Agreement. In the event the Client is obligated to defend under this Paragraph 6, Rockfan retains the right to select counsel and control the defense. The obligations of this Paragraph 6 survive the termination of this Agreement.

7. **Media Release.** Client grants Rockfan the right, without compensation, to photograph, record video, and/or record installation projects before and during performance of services and after Completion. Client further grants Rockfan the right to use those images and recordings in publicly disseminated information and materials in any medium, including but not limited to print, internet, social media, radio, television or other digital formats. Client releases Rockfan from any and all liability related to such use.

8. **Force Majeure.**

    a. If Rockfan's ability to perform any obligation under this Agreement is prevented, restricted or delayed because of unforeseen circumstances beyond such Rockfan's reasonable control, including but not limited to acts of God; acts of a public enemy; war; rebellion; insurrection; riot; terrorist acts; epidemic; pandemic; any law, order, proclamation, regulation, ordinance, demand or requirement of any governmental authority or any political subdivision or any department or regulatory agency thereof, including quarantine restrictions, stay-at-home orders or any requirements or restrictions of a similar nature; orders of any court or arbitral body; changes in law; acts of any person or persons engaged in subversive activity or sabotage; fires, floods, explosions, storms, earthquakes, lightning; or other catastrophes; strikes, lockout, picketing, work slow-downs or other labor disputes; boycott; embargoes; blockade; unavoidable delays or inability to obtain equipment, labor, fuel, steam, water, electricity or materials or anything else necessary to operate a party's offices or equipment or otherwise provide services (a "Force Majeure"), then Rockfan will be excused from performance of the obligation to the extent and for the duration of such prevention, restriction or delay. Rockfan will give the other party prompt and detailed notice of the Force Majeure, including the probable duration thereof, and will promptly notify the Client when the Force Majeure has ended. During the Force Majeure, Rockfan will use its best efforts to avoid, reduce or eliminate the Force Majeure's effect on the performance of its obligations under this Agreement.

    b. If a Force Majeure continues to affect Rockfan's performance under this Agreement for more than 90 days, either Client or Rockfan may terminate this Agreement upon written notice to the other party. If this Agreement is terminated under this provision and prior to Completion, then Client is obligated to compensate Rockfan for all equipment purchased, even if not yet installed, all labor performed, and all other costs listed in the Scope of Work that Rockfan has incurred prior to termination of the Agreement. If Client has paid Rockfan more than it is obligated to compensation Rockfan under the terms of this provision, then Rockfan will refund the difference.

9. **General Terms.**

    a. **Amendments.** This Agreement may not be amended except in a writing that is agreed to and acknowledged by both parties. This includes but is not limited to changes to the Scope of Work requested by the Client or recommended by Rockfan.

    b. **Jurisdiction and Venue; Choice of Law.** This Agreement is governed by Colorado law without giving effect to those principles of conflict of laws that might otherwise require the application of the laws of another jurisdiction. Any arbitration, enforcement of an arbitration award, or litigation must be brought in District Court, Larimer County, State of Colorado or the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado, if appropriate, and each party submits to the exclusive jurisdiction of those courts and waives the right to change venue. Each party further consents to the exercise of personal jurisdiction by any such court with respect to any such proceeding.

    c. **Nonassignability.** This Agreement is not assignable by any party without the written consent of the other party.

    d. **Severability.** Any invalid or unenforceable provision will be deemed severed from this Agreement to the extent of its invalidity or unenforceability, and the remainder of this Agreement will remain in full force and effect.

    e. **No Waiver.** No waiver of any breach of any one or more of the terms of this Agreement by either party will be deemed to imply or constitute a waiver of a breach of the same term in the future, or a waiver of a breach of any other term of this Agreement. No provision of this Agreement may be waived except by a written waiver signed by the waiving party.

f. **Third-Party Beneficiaries.** The parties agree that this Agreement is for the parties' mutual and exclusive benefit, that it does not confer any rights upon any person not a party to this Agreement, and that no individual or entity shall be construed or considered to be a third-party beneficiary of this Agreement, including any payor or other individual or entity.

g. **Complete Agreement.** This Agreement constitutes the entire understanding between the parties with respect to the subject matter of this Agreement, and supersedes completely all negotiations, discussions, and prior agreements, oral or written, between the parties with respect to the subject matter of this Agreement. This Agreement may not be amended except in a writing that is agreed to and acknowledged by both parties.

h. **Further Assurances.** The parties agree that they will execute, acknowledge, and deliver any further instruments or documents or take such actions as may be necessary to give force and effect to this agreement and to carry out the intent of the provisions of this agreement.

i. **Interpretation.** Any ambiguity in this Agreement shall not be resolved against either party under any rules of construction.

j. **Dispute Resolution.** If a Dispute (defined as a claim or controversy arising from this Agreement including, without limitation, contract, tort and other claims) arises between the parties, the parties agree to first attempt to resolve the dispute through friendly discussions. If friendly discussions fail to resolve the Dispute, then any party may require, by written demand, that the Dispute be submitted to nonbinding mediation.

k. **Costs.** If either party retains counsel for the purpose of enforcing or preventing the breach or any threatened breach of any provision of this Agreement or for any other remedy relating to it, then the prevailing party will be entitled to be reimbursed by the non-prevailing party for all costs and expenses so incurred (including reasonable attorney's fees, costs of bonds, and fees and expenses for expert witnesses) unless the arbitrator or other trier of fact determines otherwise in the interest of fairness.

l. **Supremacy.** In the event this Agreement conflicts with any other document between the parties for the transactions subject to this Agreement, the terms of this Agreement will control.

m. **Survivability.** The obligations in this Agreement, which by their nature would continue beyond the termination, cancellation, or expiration of this agreement will survive the Termination of this Agreement, even if the terms of this Agreement do not otherwise specify that they survive.

n. **Notice.** Any notice, demand, or other communication (collectively, a "notice") made pursuant to this Agreement must be in writing and either delivered by email, personally, sent by overnight delivery courier, or sent by certified or registered mail, postage prepaid, return receipt requested to the person designated below. Delivery is effective on the date emailed or personally delivered to the parties requiring notice, or the date confirmed delivered by the overnight delivery courier or by the mail service. Notices must be addressed to the parties' representatives and at the addresses or email(s) listed below their signature in this Agreement. Each party shall advise the other party immediately of any change in address or other contact information to which notice should be given.

o. **Scanning and Photocopies.** The parties agree that the original of this Agreement, including the signature page, may be scanned and stored in a computer database or similar device, and that any printout or other output readable by sight that accurately reproduces the original of this document may be used for any purpose just as if it were the original, including proof of the content of the original writing.

p. **Counterparts.** This agreement may be executed in counterparts which, when taken together, will be deemed an original and constitute one and the same document. Facsimile transmission of executed signature pages will be sufficient to bind the executing party.

Signature Page

Each party is signing this Agreement on the date stated opposite that party's signature.

Date: _____, 20__

Rockfan Entertainment, LLC
By:_____
Name:_____

2649 E. Mulberry St., STE 8
Fort Collins, CO 80524
lee@rockfan.email
info@rockfan.email

Date: _____, 20__

Client Name: City of Louisville

By:_____

Name:_____

Title:_____

Address:_____

_____

Email:_____

From:	James Yearling
To:	Clerks Office
Cc:	Installs; Lee Putnam
Subject:	Rockfan Proposal: City Council Chambers AV Equipment Upgrade
Date:	Monday, July 3, 2023 2:52:36 PM
Attachments:	Rockfan_Council Chambers AV Upgrade Quote_1179_v1.pdf

You don't often get email from james@rockfan.email. Learn why this is important

Hello, Meredyth & Team:

I hope Monday is treating you well! When time allows, please see the attached proposal regarding the RFP for City Council Chambers AV Equipment Upgrade.

Please note that Rockfan cordially requests a follow-up meeting to talk through options and reasoning per the quote contents. For example, Rockfan believes that several existing AV components can be salvaged and reused in the upgrade, such as the displays, the equipment rack(s) and some microphones. Rockfan would be happy to quote all new products, but in the name of cost-savings and practicality, we have not quoted all products at this time.

The work and components within the quote will deliver upon the RFP's purpose and will allow users to easily operate the room without assistance from a broadcast technician. Rockfan will replace all video switching and control and will replace the existing system with that of the QSC Q- SYS ecosystem.

Rockfan will also look forward to formalizing warranty and service work guidelines that make sense for the City of Louisville staff and use of the room.

Thank you for the consideration and please let us know if we can further assist at this time.

Best Regards,
James Yearling
General Manager
Rockfan AVL Production/Integration
o: 970-682-4015 | c: 419-203-6824
e: James@rockfan.email
a: 2649 E Mulberry St. #8, Fort Collins, CO 80524
w: http://rockfan.rocks

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

SUBJECT: **RESOLUTION NO. 8, SERIES 2024 – A RESOLUTION RENAMING THE LANDMARKED PROPERTY AT 1045 FRONT STREET FROM THE DESANTIS HOUSE TO THE LASALLE-DESANTIS HOUSE**

DATE: **FEBRUARY 20, 2024**

PRESENTED BY: **AMELIA BRACKETT HOGSTAD, SENIOR PLANNER COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

SUMMARY

City Council landmarked the property at 1045 Front Street with Resolution 72, Series 2023. That resolution named the primary structure the DeSantis House. There is already a landmarked property with the same name, so the landmark at 1045 Front Street needs to be renamed.

When the Historic Preservation Commission recommended approval of the landmark to City Council, it did so with the name the LaSalle-DeSantis House.

This resolution would correct the error and avoid confusion with having two landmarks with the same name.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the resolution to rename the landmarked property at 1045 Front Street.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Resolution No. 8, Series 2024 (landmark with LaSalle-DeSantis House name)

RESOLUTION NO. 8
SERIES 2024

A RESOLUTION APPROVING A NEW NAME FOR THE LANDMARKED PROPERTY AT 1045 FRONT STREET

WHEREAS, the City Council approved Resolution 72, Series 2023, landmarking the property at 1045 Front Street, legally described as Lot 1, Block 17, Caledonia Place, and naming the landmark the DeSantis House;

WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission approved HPC Resolution 14, Series 2023, recommended approval of a landmark at 1045 Front Street and recommending the name the LaSalle-DeSantis House; and

WHEREAS, the City Council previously named a different landmark as the DeSantis House;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO:

1. The name of the landmark at 1045 Front Street is changed to the LaSalle-DeSantis House.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 20th day of February, 2024.

By: _____
Christopher M. Leh, Mayor

Attest: _____
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

SUBJECT: **APPROVAL OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT FOR 2024 RESIDENT SURVEY**

DATE: **FEBRUARY 20, 2024**

PRESENTED BY: **SAMMA FOX, DEPUTY CITY MANAGER**

SUMMARY:
The City has been conducting resident surveys with POLCO (formerly National Research Center (NRC)) every four years since 2004. For the 2020 cycle, the City solicited proposals for consultant services to conduct the resident survey and selected POLCO. For the 2024 cycle staff recommends continuing with POLCO for continuity and valuable trend data used in providing comprehensive feedback on the City's delivery of services and programs. The survey also informs the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), which measure the City's progress in achieving its goals and objectives.

BACKGROUND:
The City's most recent Resident Survey was conducted in 2020 by POLCO. Survey questions focused on quality of life in Louisville, sense of community and appearance, safety, transportation, affordable housing, recreational opportunities, and other policy issues. The 2024 survey is intended to provide updated data regarding community satisfaction with the City and mirrors the prior survey to better show trends. There will be two components to the survey, a scientific sampling and an open response sample. This will allow council and staff to consider a representative sample of the Louisville community while also providing a space for all who are interested to participate.

Staff has worked closely with the Community Development Department to time the survey as best as possible around Comprehensive Plan Engagement and anticipates opening the survey in April and bringing a presentation for council in advance of the anticipated July Budget Retreat.

FISCAL IMPACT
The proposed survey will cost $34,000 and is budgeted for 2024.

PROGRAM/SUB-PROGRAM IMPACT:
The objectives for the Governance and Administration Sub-Program focus on a thorough understanding of the community's diverse interests and support for informed policy-making. The Resident Survey aims to solicit input from the community and determine how well the City's programs are meeting goals and addressing the needs of residents, furthering the objectives of the Governance and Administration Sub-Program.

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval of the professional services agreement with POLCO for the 2024 Resident Survey and allow staff to make non-material changes if approved by the City Attorney.

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. Professional Services Agreement with POLCO

STRATEGIC PLAN IMPACT:

☐	**Financial Stewardship & Asset Management**	☐	**Reliable Core Services**
☐	**Vibrant Economic Climate**	☐	**Quality Programs & Amenities**
☒	**Engaged Community**	☐	**Healthy Workforce**
☐	**Supportive Technology**	☐	**Collaborative Regional Partner**

AN AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE AND POLICY CONFLUENCE, INC. (POLCO) FOR CONSULTING SERVICES

1.0 PARTIES

This AGREEMENT FOR CONSULTING SERVICES (this "Agreement") is made and entered into this ____ day of February 2024 (the "Effective Date"), by and between the **City of Louisville**, a Colorado home rule municipal corporation, hereinafter referred to as the "City", and Policy Confluence, Inc. (Polco), a Delaware corporation hereinafter referred to as the "Consultant".

2.0 RECITALS AND PURPOSE

2.1 The City desires to engage the Consultant for the purpose of providing resident surveys, including software service subscription services as further set forth in the Consultant's Scope of Services (which services are hereinafter referred to as the "Services").

2.2 The Consultant represents that it has the special expertise, qualifications and background necessary to complete the Services.

3.0 SCOPE OF SERVICES

The Consultant agrees to provide the City with the specific Services and to perform the specific tasks, duties and responsibilities set forth in Scope of Services attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by reference.

4.0 COMPENSATION

4.1 The City shall pay the Consultant for services under this agreement a total not to exceed the amounts set forth in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference. The City shall not pay mileage and other reimbursable expenses (such as meals, parking, travel expenses, necessary memberships, etc.), unless such expenses are (1) clearly set forth in the Scope of Services, and (2) necessary for performance of the Services ("Pre-Approved Expenses"). The foregoing amounts of compensation shall be inclusive of all costs of whatsoever nature associated with the Consultant's efforts, including but not limited to salaries, benefits, overhead, administration, profits, expenses, and outside consultant fees. The Scope of Services and payment therefor shall only be changed by a properly authorized amendment to this Agreement. No City employee has the authority to bind the City with regard to any payment for any services which exceeds the amount payable under the terms of this Agreement.

4.2 The Consultant shall submit monthly an invoice to the City for Services rendered and a detailed expense report for Pre-Approved Expenses incurred during the previous month. The invoice shall document the Services provided during the preceding month, identifying by work category and subcategory the work and tasks performed and such other information as may be required by the City. The Consultant shall provide such additional backup documentation as may be required by the City. The City shall pay the invoice within thirty (30) days of receipt unless the Services or the documentation therefor are unsatisfactory. Payments made after thirty (30) days may be assessed an interest charge of one percent (1%) per month unless the delay in payment resulted from unsatisfactory work or documentation therefor.

5.0 PROJECT REPRESENTATION

5.1 The City designates Samma Fox, Deputy City Manager as the responsible City staff to provide direction to the Consultant during the conduct of the Services. The Consultant shall comply with the directions given by Samma Fox and such person's designees.

5.2 The Consultant designates _____ as its project manager and as the principal in charge who shall be providing the Services under this Agreement. Should any of the representatives be replaced, particularly _____, and such replacement require the City or the Consultant to undertake additional reevaluations, coordination, orientations, etc., the Consultant shall be fully responsible for all such additional costs and services.

6.0 TERM

6.1 The term of this Agreement shall be from the Effective Date to December 31, 2027, unless sooner terminated pursuant to Section 13, below. The Consultant's Services under this Agreement shall commence on January 1, 2024 or as of the date of this signed agreement and Consultant shall proceed with diligence and promptness so that the Services are completed in a timely fashion consistent with the City's requirements.

6.2 Nothing in this Agreement is intended or shall be deemed or construed as creating any multiple-fiscal year direct or indirect debt or financial obligation on the part of the City within the meaning of Colorado Constitution Article X, Section 20 or any other constitutional or statutory provision. All financial obligations of the City under this Agreement are subject to annual budgeting and appropriation by the Louisville City Council, in its sole discretion. Notwithstanding anything in this Agreement to the contrary, in the event of non-appropriation, this Agreement shall terminate effective December 31 of the then-current fiscal year.

7.0 INSURANCE

7.1 The Consultant agrees to procure and maintain, at its own cost, the policies of insurance set forth in Subsections 7.1.1 through 7.1.4. The Consultant shall not be relieved of any liability, claims, demands, or other obligations assumed pursuant to this Agreement by reason of its failure to procure or maintain insurance, or by reason of its failure to procure or maintain insurance in sufficient amounts, durations, or types. The coverages required below shall be procured and maintained with forms and insurers acceptable to the City. All coverages shall be continuously maintained from the date of commencement of services hereunder. The required coverages are:

7.1.1 Workers' Compensation insurance as required by the Labor Code of the State of Colorado and Employers Liability Insurance. Evidence of qualified self-insured status may be substituted.

7.1.2 General Liability insurance with minimum combined single limits of ONE MILLION DOLLARS ($1,000,000) each occurrence and TWO MILLION DOLLARS ($2,000,000) aggregate. The policy shall include the City of Louisville, its officers and its employees, as additional insureds, with primary coverage as respects the City of Louisville, its officers and its employees, and shall contain a severability of interests provision.

7.1.3 Comprehensive Automobile Liability insurance with minimum combined single limits for bodily injury and property damage of not less than FOUR HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($400,000) per person in any one occurrence and ONE MILLION DOLLARS ($1,000,000) for two or more persons in any one occurrence, and auto property damage insurance of at least FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($50,000) per occurrence, with respect to each of Consultant’s owned, hired or non-owned vehicles assigned to or used in performance of the services. The policy shall contain a severability of interests provision. If the Consultant has no owned automobiles, the requirements of this paragraph shall be met by each employee of the Consultant providing services to the City of Louisville under this Agreement.

7.1.4 Professional Liability coverage with minimum combined single limits of ONE MILLION DOLLARS ($1,000,000) each occurrence and ONE MILLION DOLLARS ($1,000,000) aggregate.

7.2 The Consultant’s general liability insurance, automobile liability and physical damage insurance, and professional liability insurance shall be endorsed to include the City, and its elected and appointed officers and employees, as additional insureds, unless the City in its sole discretion waives such requirement. Every policy required above shall be primary insurance, and any insurance carried by the City, its officers, or its employees, shall be excess and not contributory insurance to that provided by the Consultant. Such policies shall contain a

severability of interests provision. The Consultant shall be solely responsible for any deductible losses under each of the policies required above.

7.3 Certificates of insurance shall be provided by the Consultant as evidence that policies providing the required coverages, conditions, and minimum limits are in full force and effect, and shall be subject to review and approval by the City. No required coverage shall be cancelled, terminated or materially changed until at least 30 days' prior written notice has been given to the City. The City reserves the right to request and receive a certified copy of any policy and any endorsement thereto.

7.4 Failure on the part of the Consultant to procure or maintain policies providing the required coverages, conditions, and minimum limits shall constitute a material breach of contract upon which the City may immediately terminate this Agreement, or at its discretion may procure or renew any such policy or any extended reporting period thereto and may pay any and all premiums in connection therewith, and all monies so paid by the City shall be repaid by Consultant to the City upon demand, or the City may offset the cost of the premiums against any monies due to Consultant from the City.

7.5 The parties understand and agree that the City is relying on, and does not waive or intend to waive by any provision of this Agreement, the monetary limitations or any other rights, immunities, and protections provided by the Colorado Governmental Immunity Act, § 24-10-101 et seq., C.R.S., as from time to time amended, or otherwise available to the City, its officers, or its employees.

8.0 INDEMNIFICATION

To the fullest extent permitted by law, the Consultant agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the City, and its elected and appointed officers and its employees, from and against all liability, claims, and demands, on account of any injury, loss, or damage, which arise out of or are connected with the services hereunder, if and to the extent such injury, loss, or damage is caused by the negligent act, omission, or other fault of the Consultant or any subcontractor of the Consultant, or any officer, employee, or agent of the Consultant or any subcontractor, or any other person for whom Consultant is responsible. The Consultant shall investigate, handle, respond to, and provide defense for and defend against any such liability, claims, and demands. The Consultant shall further bear all other costs and expenses incurred by the City or Consultant and related to any such liability, claims and demands, including but not limited to court costs, expert witness fees and attorneys' fees if the court determines that these incurred costs and expenses are related to such negligent acts, errors, and omissions or other fault of the Consultant. [The City shall be entitled to its costs and attorneys' fees incurred in any action to enforce the provisions of this Section 8.0. The Consultant's indemnification obligation shall not be construed to extend to any injury, loss, or damage which is caused by the act, omission, or other fault of the City.

9.0 QUALITY OF WORK

Consultant's professional services shall be in accordance with the prevailing standard of practice normally exercised in the performance of services of a similar nature in the Denver metropolitan area.

10.0 INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR

It is the expressed intent of the parties that the Consultant is an independent contractor and not the agent, employee or servant of the City, and that:

10.1. Consultant shall satisfy all tax and other governmentally imposed responsibilities including but not limited to, payment of state, federal, and social security taxes, unemployment taxes, worker's compensation and self-employment taxes. No state, federal or local taxes of any kind shall be withheld or paid by the City.

10.2. **Consultant is not entitled to worker's compensation benefits except as may be provided by the Consultant nor to unemployment insurance benefits unless unemployment compensation coverage is provided by the Consultant or some entity other than the City.**

10.3. Consultant does not have the authority to act for the City, or to bind the City in any respect whatsoever, or to incur any debts or liabilities in the name of or on behalf of the City.

10.4. Consultant has and retains control of and supervision over the performance of Consultant's obligations hereunder and control over any persons employed by Consultant for performing the Services hereunder.

10.5. The City will not provide training or instruction to Consultant or any of its employees regarding the performance of the Services hereunder.

10.6. Neither the Consultant nor any of its officers or employees will receive benefits of any type from the City.

10.7. Consultant represents that it is engaged in providing similar services to other clients and/or the general public and is not required to work exclusively for the City.

10.8. All Services are to be performed solely at the risk of Consultant and Consultant shall take all precautions necessary for the proper and sole performance thereof.

10.9. Consultant will not combine its business operations in any way with the City's business operations and each party shall maintain their operations as separate

and distinct.

11.0 ASSIGNMENT

Except as provided in section 22.0 hereof, Consultant shall not assign or delegate this Agreement or any portion thereof, or any monies due or to become due hereunder without the City's prior written consent.

12.0 DEFAULT

Each and every term and condition hereof shall be deemed to be a material element of this Agreement. In the event either party should fail or refuse to perform according to the terms of this Agreement, such party may be declared in default.

13.0 TERMINATION

13.1 This Agreement may be terminated by either party for material breach or default of this Agreement by the other party not caused by any action or omission of the other party by giving the other party written notice at least thirty (30) days in advance of the termination date. Termination pursuant to this subsection shall not prevent either party from exercising any other legal remedies which may be available to it.

13.2 In addition to the foregoing, this Agreement may be terminated by the City for its convenience and without cause of any nature by giving written notice at least fifteen (15) days in advance of the termination date. In the event of such termination, the Consultant will be paid for the reasonable value of the services rendered to the date of termination, not to exceed a pro-rated daily rate, for the services rendered to the date of termination, and upon such payment, all obligations of the City to the Consultant under this Agreement will cease. Termination pursuant to this subsection shall not prevent either party from exercising any other legal remedies which may be available to it.

14.0 INSPECTION AND AUDIT

The City and its duly authorized representatives shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records of the Consultant that are related to this Agreement for the purpose of making audits, examinations, excerpts, and transcriptions.

15.0 DOCUMENTS

All computer input and output, analyses, plans, documents photographic images, tests, maps, surveys, electronic files and written material of any kind generated in the performance of this Agreement or developed for the City in performance of the Services are and shall remain the sole and exclusive property of the City. All such materials shall

be promptly provided to the City upon request therefor and at the time of termination of this Agreement, without further charge or expense to the City. Consultant shall not provide copies of any such material to any other party without the prior written consent of the City.

16.0 ENFORCEMENT

16.1 In the event that suit is brought upon this Agreement to enforce its terms, the prevailing party shall be entitled to its reasonable attorneys' fees and related court costs.

16.2 This Agreement shall be deemed entered into in Boulder County, Colorado, and shall be governed by and interpreted under the laws of the State of Colorado. Any action arising out of, in connection with, or relating to this Agreement shall be filed in the District Court of Boulder County of the State of Colorado, and in no other court. Consultant hereby waives its right to challenge the personal jurisdiction of the District Court of Boulder County of the State of Colorado over it.

17.0 COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS

17.1 Consultant shall be solely responsible for compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, including the ordinances, resolutions, rules, and regulations of the City; for payment of all applicable taxes; and obtaining and keeping in force all applicable permits and approvals.

17.2 Consultant acknowledges that the City of Louisville Code of Ethics provides that independent contractors who perform official actions on behalf of the City which involve the use of discretionary authority shall not receive any gifts seeking to influence their official actions on behalf of the City, and that City officers and employees similarly shall not receive such gifts. Consultant agrees to abide by the gift restrictions of the City's Code of Ethics.

18.0 INTEGRATION AND AMENDMENT

This Agreement represents the entire Agreement between the parties and there are no oral or collateral agreements or understandings. This Agreement may be amended only by an instrument in writing signed by the parties.

19.0 NOTICES

All notices required or permitted under this Agreement shall be in writing and shall be given by hand delivery, by United States first class mail, postage prepaid, registered or certified, return receipt requested, by national overnight carrier, or by facsimile transmission, addressed to the party for whom it is intended at the following address:

If to the City:

City of Louisville
Attn: City Manager
749 Main Street
Louisville, Colorado 80027
Telephone: (303) 335-4533
Fax: (303) 335-4550

If to the Consultant:

_____
_____
_____
_____

Any such notice or other communication shall be effective when received as indicated on the delivery receipt, if by hand delivery or overnight carrier; on the United States mail return receipt, if by United States mail; or on facsimile transmission receipt. Either party may by similar notice given, change the address to which future notices or other communications shall be sent.

20.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

20.1 Consultant will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, age, sex, disability or national origin. Consultant will take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed and that employees are treated during employment without regard to their race, color, religion, age, sex, disability, or national origin. Such action shall include but not be limited to the following: employment, upgrading, demotion or transfer, recruitment or recruitment advertising, layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship. Consultant agrees to post in conspicuous places, available to employees and applicants for employment, notice to be provided by an agency of the federal government, setting forth the provisions of the Equal Opportunity Laws.

20.2 Consultant shall be in compliance with the applicable provisions of the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 as enacted and from time to time amended and any other applicable federal, state, or local laws and regulations. A signed, written certificate stating compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act may be requested at any time during the life of this Agreement or any renewal thereof.

21.0 NO THIRD PARTY BENEFICIARIES

It is expressly understood and agreed that enforcement of the terms and conditions of this Agreement, and all rights of action relating to such enforcement, shall be

strictly reserved to City and Consultant, and nothing contained in this Agreement shall give or allow any such claim or right of action by any other third party on such Agreement. It is the express intention of the parties that any person other than City or Consultant receiving services or benefits under this Agreement shall be deemed to be an incidental beneficiary only.

22.0 SUBCONTRACTORS

Consultant may utilize subcontractors identified in its qualifications submittal to assist with non-specialized works as necessary to complete projects. Consultant will submit any proposed subcontractor and the description of its services to the City for approval. The City will not work directly with subcontractors.

23.0 AUTHORITY TO BIND

Each of the persons signing below on behalf of any party hereby represents and warrants that such person is signing with full and complete authority to bind the party on whose behalf of whom such person is signing, to each and every term of this Agreement.

In witness whereof, the parties have executed this Agreement to be effective on the date first above written.

CITY OF LOUISVILLE,
a Colorado Municipal Corporation

By:_____
Christopher M. Leh, Mayor

Attest:_____
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

CONSULTANT:

_____

By:_____
Title:_____

Exhibit A – Scope of Services & Fees

Policy Confluence, Inc.
Subscription Services

Training and Support - Your subscription includes access to Polco Modules and Support as described below, which includes training materials, as well as access to technical support services for your Authorized Users. You understand that technical support services are for technical product support, and such services are not to be used as a substitute for proper training and education.

Privacy Policy - You acknowledge that you have read and understand Polco's Privacy Policy (the "**Privacy Policy**" found at https://info.polco.us/privacy).

Fees - The Fees for your Initial Term are outlined below. All Fees are for annual terms (from the commencement of this Agreement) unless otherwise noted.

Fee Type	Description of Services	Fee
Software Service Subscription	Polco Engage (All) + Custom Survey Development and Programming (5 Page Survey) *Louisville Community Survey* All Polco Engage Features are available to you during your subscription term to engage with your target audiences. The Engage + Custom Assess Module includes 1 custom survey per contract term. Your online report will include demographic and geographic comparisons (if response is sufficient by subgroup). Our customer success team will guide your benchmark survey process to ensure smooth implementation. A representative sample of residents (or other appropriate stakeholders) will be invited to complete the survey to ensure statistically significant response and results. We will use statistically appropriate methodologies to garner community-wide representativeness with approximately a 6% margin of error (4-6% is typical and meets best practices for performance measurement, about 250-450 responses) per local jurisdiction. The invitations will contain an introduction outlining the importance of the survey and instructions for completing it. To supplement this effort, the client will be asked to participate in outreach efforts with guidance on best practices from Polco. Responses will be statistically weighted to ensure the best representation of your community (or stakeholder group, if applicable). There will also be an Open Participation Survey available online.	$18,000/4-Years
Subscription	Custom Survey Analysis and Reporting	$13,000/4-Years

Subscription	Remote or Local Presentation of Results A senior Polco staff member will make one presentation of survey results to staff, Council, Boards, or other appropriate groups. For this presentation, we use Microsoft® PowerPoint or Google Slides as a visual aid and a copy of the slideshow is left with your staff for internal use.	$3,000/4-Years
		4 Year Total : $34,000

EXHIBIT B – Project Timeline

Initial Term Starting: January 1, 2024
Initial Term Ending: December 31, 2027

The following is a draft timeline for the survey. This can be modified if agreed upon by the Louisville and POLCO project managers.

Activity	Date
Contract execution and project initiation	February 29, 2024
Develop survey instrument and mailing materials (iterative process)	through March 22
Finalize survey instrument	March 22
Surveys Open	First Week of April (open ~6 wks)
Data collection, analysis, and report writing	through June 7
Report finalized	By end of June
Presentation to Council	July

ADDENDUM TO
AN AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE
AND POLICY CONFLUENCE, INC. (POLCO)
FOR CONSULTING SERVICES

This Addendum is attached to and made part of the **AN AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE AND POLICY CONFLUENCE, INC. (POLCO) FOR CONSULTING SERVICES** dated February ____,2024 ("Agreement") between Policy Confluence, Inc. (Polco), a Delaware corporation ("Vendor") and the **City of Louisville, Colorado** ("City").

WHEREAS, Vendor and City by this Addendum desire to amend the Agreement as set forth herein;

NOW THEREFORE, Vendor and City hereby agree to the following additions to the Agreement, and hereby agree **the provisions of this Addendum shall control in the event of any conflict**:

1. Service Level.

A. The products/services provided to City by Vendor shall be available 99.9% of the time, excluding unavailability due to City's inability to maintain internet access or due to any failure in internet access caused by a third-party internet provider, and excluding scheduled downtime, which downtime shall not exceed four (4) hours in duration in any one month period, of which City is notified at least 12 hours in advance and which shall occur outside of normal business hours ("Availability Requirement"). In the event the products/services do not meet the Availability Requirement (a "Service Level Failure") in any calendar month, Vendor shall provide City with a credit on the next monthly invoice equal to the pro-rated charges for one (1) full day of the affected services (i.e., 1/30 of the monthly fee, assuming a 30-day month) for each day during which there was a Service Level Failure in such calendar month (a "Service Credit").

B. Vendor shall back up data provided by City and City customers ("City Data") at an off-site location at least as frequently as follows: for the first seven (7) days after such data has been provided, every fifteen (15) minutes; for the second seven (7) days after such data has been provided, every four (4) hours; and, after fourteen (14) days since such data has been provided, daily. Vendor shall ensure City Data can be restored from such backups in the event of server failure of other failure resulting in data loss. Vendor shall ensure City Data is retained in such backups for the entire term of the Agreement.

2. Ownership and Confidentiality.

A. All City Data is and shall remain the sole and exclusive property of City and all right, title, interest in the same is reserved to City. All City Data shall be

capable of export to Microsoft Excel, Word, CSV or fixed-length file formats (each a "Reproducible Format").

B. All City Data is and shall remain the confidential information of City. In fulfilling its obligations under the Agreement, Vendor shall exercise the same degree of care and protection with respect to City Data that it exercises with respect to its own confidential information, but in no event shall Vendor exercise less than a reasonable standard of care. Vendor shall only use, access and disclose City Data as necessary to fulfill its obligations under the Agreement. Except as provided in subsection (C), Vendor shall not directly or indirectly disclose, sell, copy, distribute, republish, market, demonstrate or allow any third party to have access to any City Data.

C. If, in fulfilling its obligations under this Agreement, Vendor should disclose any City Data to any third party or subcontractor, Vendor shall cause such third party or subcontractor, through written agreement, to exercise the same degree of care and protection with respect to City Data as is required of Vendor under this Agreement. Vendor agrees that it is fully responsible to City for the acts and omissions of its subcontractors and of persons directly or indirectly employed by Vendor. Nothing contained herein shall create any contractual relations between City and any subcontractor of Vendor. Vendor shall remain responsible to City for all activities of its subcontractors to the same extent as if such activities had been undertaken by Vendor itself.

D. All domains and domain names used and/or created in connection with the products/services provided under the Agreement to City shall become, and all logos and information provided by City for use in such domains are and shall remain, the sole property of City.

3. Personal Identifying Information and Breach.

A. City Data will include City customer "Personal Identifying Information" (hereinafter referred to as "Personal Information"), as such term is defined in Title 24, Article 73, Part 1 of the Colorado Revised Statutes ("C.R.S."). Vendor shall not directly or indirectly disclose, sell, copy, distribute, republish, market, demonstrate or allow any third party to have access to any Personal Information. In maintaining, storing, and processing of Personal Information, Vendor shall comply with the obligations of a "Third-Party Service Provider" as such term is defined in Section 24-73-102, C.R.S. Such obligations include but are not limited to implementation and maintenance of reasonable security procedures and practices that are: (a) appropriate to the nature of the Personal Information disclosed to Vendor; and (b) reasonably designed to help protect Personal Information from unauthorized access, use, modification, disclosure, or destruction.

B. If Vendor becomes aware that a security breach of Personal Information may have occurred, Vendor shall notify the City within 3 days. Such notice shall at minimum contain (a) the date, estimated date, or estimated date range of the

security breach; and (b) a description of the Personal Information that was acquired or reasonably believed to have been acquired as part of the security breach. The City may request, and upon such request Vendor shall provide, additional information relevant to the security breach; provided that, Vendor shall not be required to disclose confidential business information or trade secrets.

C. Vendor shall, at its sole expense, indemnify, defend and hold harmless City, its elected and appointed officers and its employees (the "Indemnified Parties"), from and against all liability, claims, demands, costs, expenses, claims, damages, court awards, and other amounts (including attorneys' fees and related costs) incurred by any of the Indemnified Parties, on account of any injury, loss, or damage, arising out of any third party claim, action or proceeding brought against any of the Indemnified Parties, for any security breach or unauthorized disclosure of Personal Information.

4. Open Records Act Compliance.

A. City Data will include the names, addresses, and telephone numbers, and personal financial information of past or present users of public utilities, public facilities, or recreational or cultural services that are owned and operated by the City ("User Data"). The parties acknowledge that the Colorado Open Records Act, Section 24-72-201, et seq., C.R.S. ("CORA"), prohibits disclosure of User Data, except to the person in interest. As an independent contractor of City, Vendor shall comply with CORA, as it relates to User Data, as if Vendor were an "official custodian of any public records."

B. Vendor shall not directly or indirectly disclose, sell, copy, distribute, republish, market, demonstrate or allow any third party to have access to any User Data; provided that, Vendor may allow a customer to access such customer's own User Data; and provided, further, that, nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit disclosure of information in an aggregate or statistical form so classified as to prevent the identification, location, or habits of individual customers.

C. If Vendor becomes aware that a security breach of User Data may have occurred, Vendor shall notify City within three (3) days. Such notice shall at minimum contain (a) the date, estimated date, or estimated date range of the security breach; and (b) a description of the User Data that was acquired or reasonably believed to have been acquired as part of the security breach. City may request, and upon such request Vendor shall provide, additional information relevant to the security breach; provided that, Vendor shall not be required to disclose confidential business information or trade secrets.

D. Vendor shall, at its sole expense, indemnify, defend and hold harmless the Indemnified Parties, from and against all liability, claims, demands, costs, expenses, claims, damages, court awards, and other amounts (including attorneys' fees and related costs) incurred by any of the Indemnified Parties, on account of any injury,

loss, or damage, arising out of any third party claim, action or proceeding brought against any of the Indemnified Parties for any security breach or unauthorized disclosure of User Data.

5. Accessibility.

A. Vendor represents and warrants that of Vendor's hardware, software, products, content, and services furnished or licensed to the City under the Agreement fully complies with §§24-85-101, et seq., C.R.S., or the Accessibility Standards for Individuals with a Disability as established by the Office of Information Technology pursuant to Section §24-85-103 (2.5), C.R.S.

B. If Vendor violates this Section 5, the City may either: (1) require Vendor's full compliance with §§24-85-101, et seq., C.R.S., and the Accessibility Standards for Individuals with a Disability as established by the Office of Information Technology pursuant to Section §24-85-103 (2.5), C.R.S.; or (2) immediately terminate the Agreement for breach.

C. Vendor shall, at its sole expense, indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the Indemnified Parties, from and against any and all liability, claims, demands, costs, expenses, claims, damages, court awards, and other amounts (including attorneys' fees and related costs) incurred by any of the Indemnified Parties, pursuant to § 24-34-802 or otherwise, in relation to Vendor's failure, or the failure of any of Vendor's hardware, software, products, and services, to comply with §§24-85-101, et seq., C.R.S., or the Accessibility Standards for Individuals with a Disability as established by the Office of Information Technology pursuant to Section §24-85-103 (2.5), C.R.S.

6. Location of Servers. The parties agree all Vendor products/services shall be hosted, primarily, on servers located in _____ ("Primary Servers"). In the event of a failure in Primary Servers, such products/services shall be rolled over to servers located in _____ ("Backup Servers"). Vendor shall provide City with notice within one (1) hour of the rollover of the products/services to the Backup Servers.

7. Termination. In addition to City's right to terminate in accordance with Section 5(B), City may terminate the Agreement upon giving 30 days written notice to Vendor. Vendor may terminate this Agreement only if City fails to make a monthly payment in accordance with the Agreement, and fails to cure such failure within 5 days of receiving written notice from Vendor. Within 30 days of termination of the Agreement, Vendor shall provide to City the City Data in the Reproducible Format requested by City. If City does not request a particular Reproducible Format, Vendor shall provide City Data in CSV format. Vendor shall destroy all City Data after, but only after, it provides to the City the City Data in accordance with the requirements of this Section.

8. Survival. Each of Vendor's obligations under this Addendum to defend,

indemnify, and hold the City harmless, shall survive termination of the Agreement.

9. Independent Contractor. It is the expressed intent of the parties that Vendor is an independent contractor and not the agent, employee or servant of City, and that: **VENDOR SHALL SATISFY ALL TAX OBLIGATIONS ON PAYMENTS MADE TO IT HEREUNDER INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, PAYMENT OF STATE AND FEDERAL INCOME AND OTHER TAXES. NO FEDERAL, STATE OR LOCAL TAXES OF ANY KIND SHALL BE WITHHELD OR PAID BY CITY. VENDOR IS NOT ENTITLED TO WORKERS' COMPENSATION BENEFITS EXCEPT AS MAY BE PROVIDED BY THE INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR NOR TO UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS UNLESS UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION COVERAGE IS PROVIDED BY THE INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR OR SOME ENTITY OTHER THAN CITY.**

10. Non-Appropriation. Nothing in this Agreement is intended or shall be deemed or construed as creating any multiple-fiscal year direct or indirect debt or financial obligation on the part of City within the meaning of Colorado Constitution Article X, Section 20 or any other constitutional or statutory provision. All financial obligations of City under this Agreement are subject to annual budgeting and appropriation by the Louisville City Council, in its sole discretion. Notwithstanding anything in this Agreement to the contrary, in the event of non-appropriation, City shall immediately notify Vendor of such occurrence, and this Agreement shall terminate effective December 31 of the then-current fiscal year.

11. Insurance; Non-waiver of Governmental Immunity. Vendor shall carry insurance of the type and in amounts sufficient to cover its indemnification obligations under this Agreement. The parties understand and agree that City is relying on, and does not waive or intend to waive by any provision of this contract, the monetary limitations or any other rights, immunities, and protections provided by the Colorado Governmental Immunity Act, § 24-10-101 et seq., C.R.S., as from time to time amended, or otherwise available to City, its officers, or its employees.

THIS ADDENDUM ACCEPTED AND AGREED TO BY:

Policy Confluence, Inc. (Polco)	**City of Louisville, Colorado**
Signature:_____	Signature:_____
Name:_____	Name:Christopher M. Leh
Title:_____	Title:_Mayor_____
Date:_____	Date:_____

SUBJECT: **RESOLUTION NO. 80, SERIES 2023 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE REDTAIL RIDGE FILING NO. 1 PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT – *continued from 2/6/24***

DATE: **FEBRUARY 20, 2024**

PRESENTED BY: **ROB ZUCCARO, AICP, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR**

VICINITY MAP:



SUMMARY:
The hearing for this application was continued from the February 6, 2024 meeting following the completion of the staff and applicant presentations. The packet from the February 6, 2024 meeting and supplements to the packet can be found at the following link:
www.louisvilleco.gov/Home/Components/Calendar/Event/37868/18
Based on questions raised as part of the February 6th hearing, staff is providing the following additional information to further supplement the packet materials.

- Attached is the preliminary Drainage Report (see Attachment No. 1). The February 6, 2024 packet materials included the overall drainage plan for the project (Attachment No. 2c. to the February 6, 2024 staff memo). The attached Drainage Report provides more detail and Public Works and Mile High Flood District have reviewed the report and do not have any outstanding comments on the preliminary study. If the application proceeds to a Final Plat application, the City will review an updated Final Drainage Report as part of that application.

- Allowed land uses are not determined by the subdivision plat and instead established by zoning and the GDP. In this case, the 2010 ConcoPhillips General Development Plan (GDP) includes a Permitted Uses table, which outlines allowed land uses (Attachment No. 3 to the February 6, 2024 staff memo). Anticipated land uses include a mix of hospital, medial office, light industrial, commercial, and office uses, all of which are permitted by the 2010 ConocoPhillips GDP. The allowed land uses should inform if the proposed lot layout, utilities and transportation system so that it is designed to properly serve the development. However, the allowed land uses may change over time through zoning or GDP amendments, thus having a note on a preliminary or final plat about allowed land uses can cause confusion and is not advised by staff.

- The allowed building heights are regulated by the zoning code and GDP. Further information on maximum building heights is included on the 2010 ConcoPhillips GDP Yard and Bulk Requirements notes, which states:

  > *Building heights are expected to range from 35' in some areas or 65' or 95' in other areas. Proposed maximum building heights in excess of CDDSG requirements require City Council approval either by separate vesting agreement or through the PUD development plan review process, and are not approved by the GDP.*

  The 2010 ConocoPhillips GDP also includes a note that development is subject to the Commercial Development Design Standards and Guidelines (CDDSG), which includes a building height limit of 35' or 42' to the top of a rooftop mechanical screen, unless another height is allowed through the PUD approval and waiver process.

  Additionally, the February 6, 2024 staff memo outlines the Phillips 66 Rural Special District policy on building heights and notes the policy limits height to three stories, but additional height may be permitted if structures are clustered and located out of public view shed and buffered by surrounding topography and open space.

As with allowed land uses, allowed building heights may change over time through zoning amendments, GDP amendments, or through PUD approvals, thus having a note on a preliminary or final plat about building heights can cause confusion and is not advised by staff.

- Attached are supplemental documents related to the location of existing utilities and natural features on the site, including an ALTA/NSPS Land Title Survey and Wildlife Use Assessment that includes detailed mapping of natural features in relations to wildlife on the property (see Attachment Nos. 2 and 3).

- Attached No. 4 to this memo includes additional public comments that were mistakenly omitted from the original packet. These include one supplement of comments sent to the Planning Commission and comments from the Open Space Advisory Board and Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board meetings.

This item was continued twice from earlier meetings. Those meeting videos are available here:

- Link to February 6, 2024 City Council Meeting Video
- Link to December 5, 2023 City Council Meeting Video

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Redtail Ridge Filing No. 1 Drainage Report
2. ALTA/NSPS Land Title Survey
3. Wildlife Use Assessment
4. Additional Public Comments
5. Public Comments Received Since 2/6/24 Packet published

STRATEGIC PLAN IMPACT:

☐	**Financial Stewardship & Asset Management**	☐	**Reliable Core Services**
☒	**Vibrant Economic Climate**	☐	**Quality Programs & Amenities**
☐	**Engaged Community**	☐	**Healthy Workforce**
☐	**Supportive Technology**	☐	**Collaborative Regional Partner**

FINAL DRAINAGE REPORT

FOR

REDTAIL RIDGE SUBDIVISION FILING NO. 1

CITY OF LOUISVILLE
BOULDER COUNTY
STATE OF COLORADO

JULY 15, 2022

Prepared for:

BRUE·BAUKOL
CAPITAL PARTNERS

1555 Blake Street, Suite 210
Denver, CO 80202
Ph: 720-930-4711

Prepared by:

HKS HARRIS KOCHER SMITH

1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1000
Denver, CO 80203
Ph: 303-623-6300, Fax: 303-623-6311

Contact:
Mark A. West, PE, CFM, LEEDAP

Harris Kocher Smith Project No. 190108

Table of Contents

ENGINEER CERTIFICATION .....
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1
A. FILING 1 FINAL DRAINAGE REPORT FOR REDTAIL RIDGE 1
II. GENERAL LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION 2
A. Location 2
B. Description of Property 2
C. Historic Drainage 4
1. Major Basin Description 4
2. Sub-Basin Description 4
III. DRAINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA 5
A. Regulations 5
B. Development Criteria References and Constraints 5
C. Hydrologic Criteria 6
D. Hydraulic Criteria 7
E. Waivers from Criteria 7
IV. DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN 7
A. General Concept 7
B. Specific Details 8
C. Goodhue Ditch 13
D. Stormwater Detention and Water Quality 14
E. Off-site Flows 15
F. Rock Creek Tributary I 16
1. Tributary Watershed 16
2. Hydrology Data and CUHP/SWMM Modeling 16
3. Channel Geometry 18
4. HEC-RAS Modeling and 20
5. Revegetation 21
6. MHFD Maintenance Eligibility 21
7. Culverts 26
G. Site Phasing 26
H. Construction Best Management Practices (BMP) Plan 26
I. Project Schedule 28
J. BMP Maintenance 28
V. CONCLUSIONS 29
A. Compliance with Standards 29
B. Drainage Concept 29
VI. REFERENCES 30
APPENDIX A – Vicinity Map, FIRM Map, and NRCS Web Soil Survey .....
APPENDIX B – Reference Material and Supporting Documents .....
APPENDIX C – Hydrologic and Hydraulic Computations .....
APPENDIX D – Existing and Preliminary Master Drainage and Grading Plans .....
APPENDIX E – HECRAS Model .....

ENGINEER CERTIFICATION

"I hereby certify that this Final Master Drainage Report for the final drainage design of the Redtail Ridge project was prepared by me (or under my direct supervision) in accordance with the provisions of the City of Louisville Storm Drainage Design and Technical Criteria for the owners thereof."

_____

Mark A. West, PE, CFM, LEEDAP
Licensed Professional Engineer
State of Colorado
No. 38561
On behalf of Harris Kocher Smith

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. FILING 1 FINAL DRAINAGE REPORT FOR REDTAIL RIDGE

The purpose of this report is to outline the proposed stormwater infrastructure and drainage design for Redtail Ridge Filing No. 1 (Filing 1). All proposed development within Filing 1 follows the guidelines set forth in the Final Master Drainage Report for Redtail Ridge or provides alternative designs or methods that do not cause adverse impact to adjacent facilities or property owners.

The construction of the overall Site is broken in to two phases that generally correlate with planned Redtail Ridge platting of Filing No. 1 and Filing No. 2. A Phasing line is included in the drainage plans for the project, included in Appendix D.

Phase I is proposed to include the construction of all of Campus Drive and associated storm sewer, Sorrel Avenue, the east segment of Rockcress Drive (From the Northwest Parkway to Sorrel Avenue), Tributary I, the Goodhue Ditch crossing, and Full Spectrum Detention Ponds C-1, C-2 and B. With Phase 1, all runoff from developed infrastructure is routed to either Pond C-1 or C-2.

Phase II shall consist of the remaining construction, which includes Rockcress Drive west of Sorrell Avenue and its associated storm system, as well as Ponds A-3 and E. Since Phase II corresponds to Filing No. 2, this is subject to change as design develops.

II. GENERAL LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

A. Location

The proposed Redtail Ridge Phase 1 development by Brue Baukol Capital Partners on the former Storage Tek / ConocoPhillips Site property (hereinafter referred to as "Site" or "Project") is situated in the City of Louisville (hereinafter referred to as "City"); specifically the Northeast ½ and South ½ of Section 20, the North ½ of Section 29, and the Northwest ¼ of Section 28, Township 1 South, Range 69 West of the 6th P.M. Counties of Boulder and Broomfield, State of Colorado.

The Project is located east of S. 88th Street, South of Campus Drive, West of S. 96th Street and Northwest Parkway, and Northeast of Highway 36. A Vicinity Map is included in Appendix A for reference.

There is an existing Outfall System Plan which was used as reference for the Site. The City of Louisville/Boulder County Outfall System Plan (hereinafter referred to as "Louisville OSP") dated November 1982 indicates that there are several existing ponds at low points throughout the Site. Excerpts from this report are included in Appendix B.

The adjoining parcels include the Monarch K-8 School campuses north of Campus Drive, the Health Park complex west of S. 88th Street and northwest of the Site, and the Parkway Circle development east of S. 96th Street.

B. Description of Property

The Site is approximately 389 acres and was formerly a developed office campus that has been demolished and removed from the Site. The Site is currently covered with grass vegetation, remnants of building slabs, and several private roadways. A ridge bisects the Site approximately along the alignment of the existing Tape Drive.

To the north, existing runoff flows from the ridge north and east towards S. 96th Street at slopes approximately ranging from 2-3%. To the South, existing runoff flows from the ridge south and east towards Highway 36 at slopes approximately ranging from 2-45%.

The Site is shown to be in a Zone X Flood Area according to FIRM map 08013C0584K, Boulder County, Colorado, and Incorporated Areas, August 8, 2019. Zone X is described on this map as areas outside the 0.2% annual chance of flood. Runoff from the northwest portion of the Site generally flows into the existing Tributary I at slopes ranging from 5-10%. Tributary I is not a FEMA regulated floodplain. Tributary I is, and will remain, a natural channel terminating on-site into a roadway culvert at S. 96th Street, that will be replaced with proposed construction on S. 96th Street. See Section IV for specific details about the Tributary I. A copy of the FIRM map is included in Appendix A for reference.

The Louisville OSP also describes several irrigation swales traversing the Site, specifically Goodhue Ditch (hereinafter referred to as "Ditch") in the northeast corner of the Site and Tributary I along the Site's northern property boundary. Specific details on the Ditch culvert crossing are provided in Section IV of this report.

According to the Request for Approved Jurisdictional Determination for Phillips 66 Site Boulder and Broomfield Counties, Colorado issued on January 24, 2019 by ERO Resources Corp., none of the existing drainage features within the Project area are jurisdictional except for the Ditch and Rock Creek. Development is not planned in the vicinity of Rock Creek, and no modifications to Rock Creek are proposed.

According to the Phillips 66 Site – Delineation of the Ditch and Rock Creek issued on September 23, 2019 by ERO Resources Corp., there are wetlands abutting the Ditch. ERO mapped approximately 0.428 acres of open water along the Ditch and approximately 0.121 acres of wetlands abutting the Ditch within the Project area during a 2019 Site visit. A copy of this report can be found in Appendix B for reference.

According to soils information provided by CTL|Thompson for the project, the soil borings for the Site consist of existing fill and/or natural sandy clay with fewer amounts of sand, gravel and cobble, which overlie claystone and interbedded claystone/sandstone bedrock of the Laramie Formation. A majority of the soils on the Site are Type C soils. A copy of the geologic, bedrock, and groundwater maps is included in Appendix B for reference.

According to the Boulder Valley School District (hereinafter referred to as "BVSD") Louisville Campus PUD Drainage Report (hereinafter referred to as "School Report"), there is an existing pond at the northwest corner of the Site (hereinafter referred to as "School Pond"), that is a part of the Monarch K-8 school's drainage system. According to the School Report, the pond collects runoff from an off-site basin tributary to the school's site. This runoff is detained in the pond at the northwest corner of the Site and then released into a drainage swale that drains to a culvert under Campus Drive and outfalls into the Bus Loop Pond on the school's site. The School Report specifies that this runoff was detained off-site because the engineer was concerned that peak flows from this basin would increase the size of the on-site systems and the size of Bus Loop Pond. A copy of the Master Drainage Plan for the BVSD Monarch School Campus is included in Appendix B for reference.

C. Historic Drainage

1. Major Basin Description

The Site is located within Basins 4-I, 5-I, 6-I, 2-J, and 10-H of the Louisville OSP. The north portion of the Site is tributary to Rock Creek Tributary I, and the balance of the Site is tributary to the Rock Creek main channel. Rock Creek eventually combines with Coal Creek and is tributary to Boulder Creek. The following is how the Louisville OSP describes the Rock Creek and Coal Creek basins:

> *"The Rock Creek basin has a northeast aspect with the high point of the basin (elevation 5560) just southwest of U.S. 36. The upper section of the basin has slopes that range from 5 to 10% and then level out to an average of 1.5% in the lower reaches of the basin."*

> *"The Coal Creek basin has a West to East aspect with the high point (elevation 5670) of the basin on the Davidson Mesa. The slopes on top of the mesa are very mild, but rapidly approach 6 to 7% upon decent from the mesa. The terrain then levels out to an average grade of 2% for the remaining portion of the basin."*

The Site contains several irrigation swales and ditches that were utilized with the previous land uses but are no longer in service. The only active and defined irrigation ditch is located in the far northeast corner of the Site and is owned by the Goodhue Ditch & Reservoir Company (hereinafter referred to as "Ditch Company"). All other irrigation swales and ditches are non–binding and will be routed on a Site level basis per development plans for individual parcels.

2. Sub-Basin Description

Basin delineation, areas, and flows for the Existing Drainage Plan were derived from the Louisville OSP as the existing condition. The Site design maintains the historical drainage patterns and the allowable flow at S. 96th Street (specified by the Louisville OSP) will not be exceeded with the proposed development.

Runoff flows from the northern portion of the Site (Louisville OSP Basins 4-I and 5-I) historically drains to the existing Rock Creek Tributary I channel, which contains two existing in line ponds. The central portion of the Site (Louisville OSP Basin 6-I) historically drains from southwest to northeast into a channel on the eastern side of the Site which conveys flows from South to North along the Northwest Parkway. The southern portion of the Site (Louisville OSP Basin 2-J) historically flows from west to east across the Site to the Northwest Parkway. As shown in the Louisville OSP, approximately half of basins 4-I and 5-I drain on-site from off-site. The flows from these basins, as well as portions of basin 10-H, are accounted for in the design of Rock Creek Tributary I. See Appendix D to reference the Existing Drainage Plan.

The historic basin 2-J of the Louisville OSP located in the southeast portion of the site drains to an existing 48" HDPE culvert located at the East side of the basin that conveys flows offsite underneath Northwest Parkway where it joins an existing "Northern" storm sewer that discharges flows to the Northeast. Historical records indicate that it conveys a flow of 39.17 CFS and 80.5 CFS for the 5 and 100 year storm respectively. Additional Information and flows can be found in Appendix B of the Via Varra & West Midway Improvements construction documents prepared by Drexel Barrel & CO (December 4, 2002). An excerpt of this document can be found in the appendix of this report.

Off the northeast corner of the Site, at the Tributary I crossing, the Northwest Parkway Toll Authority installed the existing dual (2) 10' x 6' Reinforced Concrete Box Culvert (hereinafter referred to as "RCBC") at the intersection of the Northwest Parkway and S. 96th Street. The existing culvert under the Northwest Parkway will be maintained as the outfall for the Site flows. Per Table 4 of this report, peak flows to this culvert are lower than historic in the developed condition.

III. DRAINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA

A. Regulations

The Site will comply with the City's and Mile High Flood District's, formerly known as Urban Drainage Flood Control District (hereinafter referred to as "MHFD"), requirements. The Site will comply with current City and MHFD criteria, including runoff reduction, water quality capture volume, stabilizing drainageways and source control BMPs, as applicable. The Site will also comply with the Louisville OSP as it relates to the extents of the Site.

B. Development Criteria References and Constraints

The principal design guidelines that will be sourced for this Site development are the City of Louisville Storm Drainage & Technical Criteria Manual (hereinafter referred to as "Louisville Criteria") and the current version of the MHFD Urban Storm Drainage Criteria Manual (hereinafter referred to as "District Manual").

The existing conditions of the adjacent properties and those relevant drainage studies that affect the Site in that the existing conditions were analyzed, and the appropriate measures taken to maintain historic runoff as it relates to the Site. The drainage design will be affected by the proposed grading, building outline and legal boundaries of the Site. These existing basins encompass the entirety of the Site and represent the previous drainage study the Site will be modifying per the proposed developments.

Existing Site constraints include: Rock Creek Tributary I, the Goodhue Ditch, and various irrigation ditches or swales throughout the Site, existing structural building pads, and an overhead electric line and easement. Please see Appendix D for existing drainage. See Section IV of this report for a discussion on how the Site will take into consideration Rock Creek Tributary I and the Goodhue Ditch.

C. Hydrologic Criteria

On a regional basis for the channel design, a hydrologic stormwater routing analysis for the watershed was completed using a combination of the Colorado Urban Hydrograph Procedure (CUHP) v. 2.0.0 and the US Environmental Protection Agency Storm Water Management Model (EPA SWMM) v. 5.1. To create the Tributary I regional model, storm hydrographs produced by CUHP were integrated into EPA SWMM for routing and flood risk analysis

The following formula, from the District Manual, was used to determine rainfall intensities:

$$I = \frac{28.5P_1}{(10 + T_C)^{0.786}}$$

For this report, the 5-year and 100-year storm events have been analyzed. The 5-year storm is considered the minor event and the 100-year storm is considered the major event. One-hour rainfall P_1 values were taken from NOAA Atlas 14, Volume 8, and Version 2 for the Site. The P_1 values for the 5-year and 100-year storms are 1.08 inches and 2.50 inches, respectively.

CUHP and EPA SWMM were used in conjunction to analyze peak flows for the proposed roadway storm sewer analysis. While the Rational Method is often used for runoff analyses totaling under 90 acres, the CUHP method is more accurate and exceeds the minimum criteria set by the City. Utilizing catchment area, rainfall data, an assumed imperviousness for all development parcels, and infiltration parameters based on Horton's Infiltration Model, the CUHP workbook calculates hydrographs to determine the basin time to peak flow and peak runoff rate, in additional to other parameters. As a conservative approach, to accommodate future developments, most parcel areas are assumed to have between 75-85% imperviousness to account for future development. Most roadway basins were set at 75%, to account for pervious landscaping. Roadway basins containing roundabouts were assumed to be 80% to account for the increased amount of pavement. The following basins were assumed to have a lower percentage of impervious surfaces, between 2-9%, as limited development is predicted in these areas: A-1, A-2-1, D-2, F, OS-1, OS-2, and OS-3. The results from these calculations can be found in Appendix C, for reference. The CUHP results are linked to the EPA SWMM model in order to assess the proposed storm drain system.

As these criteria represent all required information for development of Project hydrology, other criteria or calculation methods outside of Louisville Criteria and the District Manual were not used in the hydrologic design for the Site.

D. Hydraulic Criteria

For the proposed Site Full Spectrum Detention Facilities, the District Manual MHFD-Detention_v4.05 workbooks were used to determine required volumes and release rates for each design storm.

Per Chapter 3.0 of the District Manual; calculation of the Water Quality Capture Volume (hereinafter referred to as "WQCV") in watershed inches is given as:

$$WQCV = a\,(0.91\,I^3 - 1.19\,I^2 + 0.78\,I) \qquad \text{Equation 3-1}$$

where:
- a = 1.0 for a 40-hour drain time for extended detention;
- I = Contributing Basin Imperviousness

$$V = (\,WQCV * A\,) / 12 \qquad \text{Equation 3-2}$$

where:
- V = required storage volume (acre-feet)
- A = watershed tributary area upstream (acres)
- WQCV = Water Quality Capture Volume (watershed-inches)

Other criteria or calculation methods outside of Louisville Criteria and the District Manual were not used in the hydraulic design for the Site.

E. Waivers from Criteria

No waivers were requested or granted. All aspects of design are intended to meet or exceed criteria.

IV. DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN

A. General Concept

The general drainage concept for the Site is to capture storm water runoff from the Site and roadway drainage basins and route the runoff through proposed storm sewer infrastructure to existing and proposed Full Spectrum Detention Facilities. Detained runoff will be released at specified rates through outlet structures to existing or proposed drainage infrastructure. Only runoff from Basin D-2 will flow off the Site per historic conditions into the drainage system associated with U.S. Highway 36. This is referenced in Appendix D.

The north portion of the Site releases per historical conditions and as shown on the Existing Drainage Plan at 96th Street. From this point, Tributary I releases to the existing dual 10'(W) x 6'(H) RCBC under the Northwest Parkway. Per the Louisville OSP, the

peak discharge at this location is 842 cfs for the 100-year storm event. Proposed Site releases, as described below, will not exceed the allowable 842 cfs through the existing dual 10' x 6' RCBC in the 100-year storm event.

SWMM element Out1 represents all the Site flows contributing to Tributary I. The OSP shows a flow of 842 cfs discharging from the Site through Tributary I, but Site detention meeting MHFD standards have decreased this to below pre-developed site conditions. The SWMM model 100-year storm event flows at element Out1 were found to be 441 cfs in the pre-developed condition and 373.68 cfs in the developed condition. This shows the Site is meeting the design criteria of MHFD to release 100-year storm events at or below the pre-developed flows from the basin.

SWMM element Out2 represents all the flows contributing to the 48" RCP shown on the Grading Plan and Basin Delineation from the Via Varra & West Midway Improvements construction documents prepared by Drexell Barrell & company which are provided in Appendix B. This report calculates that off-site basin DA-1C contributes 80.5 cfs to the Northern Storm System which is the existing 48" HDPE culvert. The SWMM model 100-year storm event flows at element Out2 were found to be 65.26 cfs in the developed condition.

The aforementioned report additionally calculates that off-site basins DA-1A and DA-1B contribute 19.5 cfs to the Southern Storm System at the existing 36" HDPE storm sewer in Via Varra Road. Most of these flows from this area will be routed to the on-site pond C-2 and the only flow contributing to the Southern Storm System will be from sub-basin C-6-3 with a developed flow of 1.59 CFS. These flows are not represented in the SWMM model. See appendix B for existing offsite basins.

SWMM nodes were created corresponding to the proposed layout of the complete storm sewer system. The full SWMM modeling inputs and results can be found in Appendix C.

B. Specific Details

The following section describes in detail the proposed major drainage basins for the overall Redtail Ridge Site. See Appendix D for a detailed layout of all major basins.

Minor basins within the roadway areas are shown in the drainage plan and included in the CUHP/SWMM calculations found in Appendix C.

Calculations for all proposed Ponds as well as their respective outlet structure design can also be found in Appendix C.

Basin A is in the northwest corner of the Site located to the north of Rockcress Drive, to the east of South 88th Street, and to the south of Campus Drive, Tributary I splits the parcel from southwest to northeast dividing Sub-Basins A-1 and A-2-1. Flows from A-1 historically flow from northwest to southeast into Tributary I and flows from Sub-Basin

A-2-2 historically flow from southwest to northeast in to Tributary I. Sub-Basin A-3 consists of a portion of Rockcress Drive which must be discharged in to Basin A.

Sub-Basin A-1 is northwest of Tributary I. Sub-Basin A-1 is proposed to be and open space area dedicated to the City of Louisville. Stormwater runoff from Sub-Basin A-1 will continue to sheet flow as it historically does into Tributary I. Water quality should be considered for any future hardscape improvements (such as parking lots) that may be proposed in this basin.

Sub-Basin A-2-1 is south of Tributary I. Sub-Basin A-2-1 is proposed as an undeveloped parcel at 2% imperviousness. Stormwater runoff from Sub-Basin A-2-1 is proposed to drain as it does historically and will release directly to Tributary I.

Sub-Basin A-2-2 is southeast of Tributary I. Sub-Basin A-2-2 is proposed as a development parcel at 85% imperviousness. Stormwater runoff from Sub-Basin A-2 is proposed to drain to future curb, gutter, inlet, and storm sewer system that will release to the proposed full spectrum detention Pond B at a location in the downgradient area of the basin. Pond B is proposed to release flows to Tributary I.

Sub-Basin A-3 is along the western extents of Rockcress Drive. Stormwater runoff from Sub-Basin A-3 is proposed to drain to future curb, gutter, inlet, and storm sewer system along Rockcress Drive that will release to the proposed full spectrum detention Pond A-3 at a down gradient location in the southwestern corner of Sub-Basin A-3. Flows from Pond A-3 are proposed to release to the Rock Creek Tributary I channel.

In the pre-developed condition, the Health Park subdivision and the S. 88th Street roadway west of Basin A contribute 84 cfs to the School Pond at the northwest corner of Basin A. The School Pond then releases up to a maximum of 56 cfs north into the school site through a 30" RCP storm sewer pipe north to the Bus Loop Pond, as shown on the BVSD Drainage plan provided in Appendix B. With the development of Campus Drive, the school pond will be removed and these flows are proposed to be captured at the 88th and Campus Drive intersection and will then routed to the proposed storm sewer in Campus Drive.

A 30" RCP will outlet from a manhole in the proposed Campus Drive storm sewer and release flows at an equivalent rate as the existing culvert into the Bus Loop Pond. The balance of flow not released to the Bus Loop Pond will overtop the 30" RCP in the manhole and continue east through the proposed Campus Drive storm sewer system to Pond C-1.

In the existing condition, flows from the offsite School Site Basin contribute 1.9 cfs in the 10-year event and 4.2 cfs in the 100-year event to Sub-Basin A-1. The School Site Detention Pond D releases 1.1 cfs in the 10-year event and 4.8 cfs in the 100-year event into Sub-Basin A-1 as well. With the construction of Campus Drive, these flows will be collected by the proposed storm sewer main in Campus Drive. These flows will be routed

to the storm sewer in Campus drive beginning at the existing flared end section at the northwest corner of the parcel and be released into Pond C-1.

Basin B is in the central portion of the Site located to the north of Rockcress Drive, to the east of Basin A-1, to the south of Campus Drive, and to the west of Sorrel Avenue. A natural ridge in the southern portion of the parcel splits the basin into Sub-Basins B-1 draining north and B-2 draining south.

Sub-Basin B-1 will be developed to drain to a curb, gutter, inlet and storm sewer system that will release to a proposed Full Spectrum Detention Facility Pond B (hereinafter referred to as "Pond B") located at the northeast corner of Basin B. Pond B is planned to release north into Tributary I. Calculations for the design of Pond B as well as outlet structure design are included in Appendix C.

Sub-Basin B-2 drains south and is contributory to proposed Full Spectrum Detention Facility Pond C-2. A storm sewer outfall stub is provided to the southeast corner of Basin B2 to collect developed stormwater runoff from Basin B-2 and route to Pond C-2.

Basin C is in the eastern portion of the Site and generally lies east of Sorrel Avenue and west of S. 96th Street. A natural ridge in the south portion of the parcel splits the basin into Sub-Basins C-1 draining north and C-2 draining south. Basin C Sub-Basins include the portions of Campus Drive, Rockcress Drive, and Sorrel Avenue which are Tributary to Ponds C-1 and C-2.

Sub-Basin C-1 is in the northeastern portion of Basin C between Sorrel Avenue and S. 96th Street. This Sub-Basin is proposed to be developed at 80% Imperviousness. Sub-Basin C-1 contains the Full Spectrum Detention Facility Pond C-1 (hereinafter referred to as "Pond C-1"). Basin C-1 will be developed to drain to a curb, gutter, inlet and storm sewer system that will release to Pond C-1, located at the northeast corner of the basin. Pond C-1 is a planned permanent water surface facility with stormwater detention provided above the permanent water surface. This pond will follow state permit procedure for permanent water surface facilities. The outlet of Pond C-1 will release east into Tributary I.

Sub-Basin C-2 is the southeastern portion of Basin C between Sorrel Avenue and Northwest Parkway. This Sub-Basin is proposed to be developed at 80% Imperviousness. Runoff from Sub-Basin C-2 will be routed south through a proposed curb, gutter, inlet, and storm sewer system to Pond C-2 where it will be combined with flows from Sub-Basin C-5. The combined flows will then be detained for both the WQCV event and the major storm event. The outfall for Pond C-2 will be routed to the existing 48" RCP storm sewer releasing east under the Northwest Parkway.

Sub-Basin C-3 is composed of the area routed to Basin C from Campus Drive and Sorrel Avenue. Stormwater runoff in Sub-Basin C-3 will be developed to drain to a curb, gutter, inlet, and storm sewer system that will release to Pond C-1.

Sub-Basin C-4 is composed of the northeastern portion of Campus Drive which grades preclude from being routed to Pond C-1. Stormwater runoff in Sub-Basin C-4 is to be collected by proposed curb, gutter, inlets, and storm sewer which will be treated by a Barracuda Hydrodynamic Stormwater Separator to provide water quality and then routed to Tributary I. A BMP agreement will be put together for this stormwater facility this will be finalized along with the civil construction documents for this facility.

Sub-Basin C-5 is composed of the area routed to Basin C from Rockcress Drive and Sorrel Avenue. Stormwater runoff in Sub-Basin C-5 will be developed to drain to a curb, gutter, inlet, and storm sewer system that will release to Pond C-2.

Sub-Basin C-6 is composed of the southeastern portion of Rockcress Drive which at portion of its grades preclude from being routed to Pond C-2. Stormwater runoff in Sub-Basin C-6-1 and C-6-2 is to be collected by proposed curb, gutter, inlets, and storm sewer and will be routed to pond C-2. Sub basin C-6-3 will sheet flow off site and will then be routed to the existing 36" HDPE storm sewer releasing east in Via Varra Road.

Basin D is in the southern portion of the Site and generally lies south of Rockcress Drive and Basin E. Extents of proposed development and an existing ridge in Parcel E split Sub-Basins D-1, D-2, and E. Sub-Basin D-1 drains from both northwest and southeast to meet approximately in the center of the sub-basin. Sub-Basin D-2 generally drains along the existing ridge in Parcel E from northeast to southwest.

Sub-Basin D-1 contains the southeast corner of the Site, an area bounded by Rockcress Drive to the north, by property boundary to the south and east, and by an existing ridge to the west. Flows from Sub-Basin D-1 shall be routed to storm sewer at the intersection of Rockcress Drive and Sorrel Avenue through curb, gutter, inlets, and storm sewer. Flows will then be routed to the Full Spectrum Detention Facility Pond C-2, where flows will be detained for both the WQCV event and the major storm event. In order for the parcel to drain to Pond C-2 fill will required to be placed on the Site. If alternate parcel development plans are desired, this area may be released south to Rock Creek with the proper Jurisdictional approvals.

Sub-Basin D-2 is proposed as open space and will drain as it does historically. The historical flows for Basin D-2 generally flow from northeast to southwest into an empty field within the City and County of Broomfield. There appears to be an outfall crossing Northwest Parkway and Storage Tek Drive approximately 800' south from the southeast corner of the Site where runoff from D-2 eventually ends and continues downstream.

Basin E is in the southwest portion of the Site and generally lies south of Basin A and west of Sub-Basin D-2. Stormwater runoff in Basin E is proposed to drain to a curb, gutter, inlet and storm sewer system that will release to a proposed Full Spectrum Detention Facility Pond E (hereinafter referred to as "Pond E") located in the downgradient portion of Basin E. Pond E is planned to release northeast into the proposed storm sewer for Rockcress Drive. Flows will then be routed through storm sewer to Pond C-2 where they will be detained for the WQCV event and then released to the existing 48" HDPE under the Northwest Parkway.

Basin F is in the northern portion of the Site and is existing open space and will drain as it does historically. Basin F is bound on the north by the property line and on the east, west, and south by Campus Drive. The historical flows for Basin F generally flow from the extents of the basin to the center where they meet Tributary I.

Basin OS-1 is located generally west of the Site and is existing open space and roadway areas. Basin OS-1 will drain as it does historically. The historical flows for Basin OS-1 generally flow east to S. 88th Street. Flows are conveyed under 88th St. to Tributary I in Basin A via an existing 36" RCP culvert and two 18" CMP.

Basin OS-2 is located generally north of the Site and is existing farm and residential land. Basin OS-2 will be left to drain as it does historically. The historical flows for Basin OS-2 generally flow southeast into Basin F and then Tributary I.

Basin OS-3 is located generally north of the Site, east of OS-2, and is existing farm and residential land. Basin OS-3 will also be left to drain as it does historically, into Basin F and then Tributary I.

Basins OS-4-1, OS-4-2, OS-7-1, OS-7-2, OS-7-3, and OS-7-4 are located northeast of the Site, within S 96th Ave. These basins represent improvements to be completed off-site to that roadway in conjunction with the Project. Full details on these basins may be found in the Off-Site Roadway Improvements Addendum to Redtail Ridge Subdivision Filing No. 1, submitted April 1, 2022.

TABLE 1: POND SUMMARY TABLE

POND	WATERSHED AREA (ACRE)	CONTRIBUTING BASINS	WATERSHED IMPERVIOUSNESS (%)	100 YR STORAGE REQUIRED (AC-FT)	100 YR STORAGE PROVIDED (AC-FT)
A-3	1.67	A-3	75.0%	0.205	0.227
B	118.46	A-2-2, B-1	85.0%	16.043	17.515
C-1	67.40	C-1, C-3	79.8%	8.682	9.811
C-2	82.03	B-2, C-2, C-5, C-6, D-1	77.8%	10.357	12.446
E	34.29	E	75.0%	4.205	4.413

TABLE 2: Basin Summary Table

BASIN	AREA (AC)	IMPERVIOUSNESS (%)	Q5 (CFS)	Q100 (CFS)
A-1	37.99	2%	2.30	41.92
A-2-1	14.62	2%	0.69	13.14
A-2-2	47.44	85%	63.12	171.71
A-3	1.67	75%	1.28	3.86
B-1	71.02	85%	99.51	269.69
B-2	25.45	85%	36.89	99.68
C-1	53.21	80%	64.57	183.61
C-2	19.63	80%	31.60	88.58
C-3	14.19	79%	7.42	22.67
C-4	2.78	75%	2.42	7.26
C-5	9.66	76%	4.06	12.91
C-6	1.82	75%	1.75	5.22
D-1	25.81	70%	27.59	85.56
D-2	19.24	2%	0.98	18.34
E	34.29	75%	40.63	120.09
F	17.05	2%	0.90	16.59
OS-1	77.43	9%	8.78	99.62
OS-2	32.32	6%	1.49	40.72
OS-3	19.51	5%	1.33	44.68
OS-4-1	1.51	86%	0.98	2.83
OS-4-2	1.66	88%	1.12	3.18
OS-7-1	0.53	100%	0.35	0.93
OS-7-2	0.51	100%	0.34	0.89
OS-7-3	0.55	100%	0.35	0.92
OS-7-4	0.56	100%	0.36	0.95

C. Goodhue Ditch

The Ditch traverses the far northeast corner of the Site and is owned by the Ditch Company. The Ditch contains a defined bed and bank with fringe wetlands along portions of the banks. The Ditch is shown on the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Louisville topographic quadrangle and on the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) as a canal/ditch and intermittent stream.

A crossing of the Ditch by Campus Drive is planned, subject to Ditch Company's approval, with the proposed development. The Ditch will continue to outfall per historic conditions at the existing location on northeast property boundary. The Ditch Company has been contacted regarding the requirements of the proposed Ditch revisions. The proposed Ditch crossing has been designed and included in a separate plan set for approval by the Ditch Company according to the Ditch Company requirements.

Decreed flows in this section of the Ditch range between 30 cfs and 40 cfs. We have requested additional information on the specific decreed flow from the Ditch Company. Based on the Ditch crossing at the intersection of Via Varra and Northwest Parkway just north of the Broomfield Business center, a 54" RCP has been sized for the Ditch crossing. Preliminary calculations indicate that a 54" RCP conveys 50 cfs, which was used for design on the Site. A maintenance road with a minimum 15' wide easement is required, and the roadway crossing will also incorporate the ability for maintenance equipment to cross.

As the Ditch crossing will disturb waters of the US, the Project team has engaged the services of ERO Resources Corporation to assist in obtaining the required permitting. A copy of ERO's Preconstruction Notification (hereinafter referred to as "PCN") can be found in Appendix B. Per correspondence with the Army Corps of Engineers, the Goodhue Ditch Crossing, (NWO-2020-00467-DEN) will be issued an exemption for this project. It will be considered construction of an irrigation ditch, which is exempt under Section 404(f), and does not require a permit, which is referenced in Regulatory Guidance Letter 07-02.

The Site contains several other minor irrigation swales and ditches that are internal to the Site and do not flow off-site. All other irrigation swales and ditches in the Project are non–binding and will be routed on a Site level basis per development plans for individual parcels. See Appendix D for the Existing Drainage Plan sheet.

D. Stormwater Detention and Water Quality

All Detention and water quality ponds on-site are designed to be Extended Detention Basins (EDBs) per the Criteria of the District Manual Volume 3. Construction Documents detail the required forebay, upper stage area, lower stage area and micro-pool area of these EDBs. Each Basin design will incorporate an outlet feature that is intended to delay the release of the WQCV over a 40-hour period. This outlet feature will also allow the major 100-year storm event to be detained and released through the top of the outlet feature. The overflow has been designed with 1.0' of freeboard to the top of the detention berm. The spillway is sized to accommodate the 100-year event total inflows to the pond and will be protected with Type L buried soil riprap outlet protection.

To further the MHFD goal of watershed level runoff control, this Final Master Drainage Report encourages the implementation of Low Impact Development practices and alternative water quality features per the District Manual Volume 3, Chapter 4.

The WQCV treatment system and release rate will be designed in accordance with Volume 3 of the District Manual and Chapter 6 of Louisville Criteria. The Full Spectrum Detention Facilities are designed as permanent, post-construction Best Management Practice (BMP) to treat the WQCV in accordance with Louisville Criteria for each of the facilities' tributary areas.

E. Off-site Flows

Basin D-2, which is to be left undeveloped, is the only on-site basin which will be left to flow freely off-site. This basin contains primarily landscaped areas and will continue to flow off-site per historical conditions.

Off-site Basins OS-1,OS-2, and OS-3 will be left to drain freely on-site as they do historically. OS-1 drains into Tributary I, while OS-2 and OS-3 generally drains east. A portion of the runoff from OS-2 splits to Tributary I at the southeast boundary between OS-2 and OS-3. Using HY-8 Culvert Hydraulic Analysis Program v7.3, it was confirmed that the 36" RCP and two 18" CMP culverts have capacity to convey the 100-year storm from basin OS-1 under S. 88th St. without overtopping the road. These calculations have been included in Appendix C.

The existing pond in the northwest corner of Parcel A, known as the "School Pond", is associated with BVSD Monarch School Campuses. This pond will be removed at the time that the Campus Drive storm sewer is installed. Contributing flows to the School Pond will be rerouted from the existing flared end section and into the proposed storm sewer in Campus Drive. Currently a 30" RCP releases a maximum flow of 56 cfs (maximum pipe capacity) from the School Pond into the BVSD Monarch School Site to the north. In the proposed condition, this pipe will connect the storm sewer main In Campus Drive to the Bus Loop Pond on the School Site. The invert of the 30" RCP to the Bus Loop Pond is set lower than the invert of the main, ensuring that the 30" continues to release 56 cfs north matching the existing condition.

Currently there are two storm sewer pipes that release historical flow into vacant land south of Campus Drive. These pipes release 4.2 cfs in the 100-year event and Pond D releases 4.8 cfs in the 100-year event. Both of these pipes will be connected to the storm sewer main in the proposed condition of Campus Drive.

The existing inlets at the intersection of Rockcress Drive and Via Varra Road are contributory to the storm sewer system in Via Varra Road. This system connects to storm sewer in West Midway Blvd and ultimately releases south of Rock Creek. The proposed development will not add additional flows to this intersection, and the existing inlets are to be reset at the new curb locations in the intersection.

Stormwater drainage in Sub-Basin C-4 at the eastern section of Campus Drive will be routed by a curb, gutter, inlet, and storm sewer system south to Tributary I. Flows at and near the intersection of Campus Drive and S. 96th Street will release into the roadside ditch fronting Fire Station 67, and travel southeast within the roadside ditch ultimately discharge into Tributary I.

Pond C-2 and Sub-Basin C-6 release flows to the Via Varra subdivision east of the Site. Pond C-2 releases to an existing 48" HDPE storm sewer discharging east under E-470. In the Final Drainage Report for Parkway Circle, 96th Street & Carbon Road, the Existing Off-site Facilities Section delineates Basin DA-1C tributary to the 48" HDPE with a peak flow of 80.5 cfs. This report also indicates that the 48" HDPE is routed within the North Storm System which runs north and then east at Carbon Drive. Basins DA-1A, DA-1B release into the existing 36" HDPE system in Via Varra Road with a peak flow of 19.5 cfs. The grading plan with the storm sewer plan and a drainage basin map from this report can be found in Appendix B.

No other minor or major flows besides those listed above are anticipated to enter or exit the Site boundary. All flows exiting the Site, with the exception of the undeveloped Sub-Basin D-2, will be routed through proposed drainage infrastructure to existing drainage infrastructure which has the capacity available to convey these flows.

Additional roadway improvements have been proposed off-site, along S. 96th Street, and are being reviewed by the City separately from this filing. An addendum to this report has been submitted for these off-site improvements, wherein more details can be found. Details may also be found in the Master Drainage Report for Redtail Ridge.

F. Rock Creek Tributary I

1. Tributary Watershed

The Tributary I Watershed is approximately 586 acres. Tributary I drains the area along U.S. Highway 36 from just West of U.S. Highway 36 to S. 96th Street, then through a narrow section from S. 96th Street to Rock Creek. The watercourse throughout consists of a well-defined channel.

The majority of the channel has a relatively wide and shallow floodplain with bank slopes which are densely vegetated with native grasses that provide significantly increased channel stability. Soils within the upper watershed vary but are considered Hydrologic soil group C.

2. Hydrology Data and CUHP/SWMM Modeling

A detailed analysis of the OSP basin delineation was conducted in order to make comparisons of proposed to historical flow conditions. This analysis indicated a discrepancy in the Area of Basin 6-I (148-acres to 184-acres). Additionally, Basin 2-J in

the OSP contained areas of the Northwest Parkway which no longer drain in the manner described in the OSP (23 acres).

The hydrologic stormwater routing analysis for the watershed was completed using a combination of the Colorado Urban Hydrograph Procedure (CUHP) v. 2.0.1 and the US Environmental Protection Agency Storm Water Management Model (EPA SWMM) v. 5.1. To create the Tributary I Basin regional model, storm hydrographs produced by CUHP were integrated into EPA SWMM for routing and flood risk analysis. The SWMM has been developed utilizing the proposed Site development planning areas routed to respective full-spectrum water quality and detention facilities. In general, Site areas drain to full spectrum detention facilities, which then release flows at rates that mimic historic flows into Tributary I.

Due to the discrepancies in the OSP, a pre-developed CUHP/SWMM model was created to create a more accurate representation of the Site-specific historical flow conditions. The creation of this model provides a more direct comparison for acceptable release rates of developed flows from the Site's proposed detention structures, and was the hydrologic flow condition selected to represent existing conditions for the design of Tributary I.

To understand the effects that the proposed development and private detention ponds have on the overall Tributary I flood control system, hydrographs were compared at several locations within the Project. A summary of SWMM Hydrographs results were compared at specific nodes for the 2, 10, and 100-year events and have been included in Appendix C. Results shown in these hydrographs indicate closely matched peaks and timing for all events.

A summary table detailing these changes and a comparison of the 100-year pre-developed flows from these basins to existing conditions from the Louisville OSP can be found in Table 3 below.

TABLE 3: Existing Basin Summary Table

BASIN	OSP AREA (AC)	PRE-DEVELOPED BASIN DELINEATION AREA (AC)	OSP EXISTING PERCENT IMPERVIOUS	PRE-DEVELOPED PERCENT IMPERVIOUS	OSP EXISTING Q100 (CFS)	PRE-DEVELOPED BASIN Q100 (CFS)
4 - I	110	110	13	2	213	128
5 - I	142	142	3	2	235	126
6 - I	148	184	57	2	382	176
2 - J	104	81	44	2	306	96

See Appendix D for the Louisville OSP Existing Drainage Plan sheet.

3. Channel Geometry

Tributary I as it exists within the Site extends from the existing culvert at S. 88th Street to the downstream culvert at S. 96th Street. The proposed design for Tributary I is broken into three reaches. Tributary I will conform to a high functioning low maintenance (HFLM) stream design approach and will seek to armor the bankfull portion of the channel as needed to protect against long term erosion concerns while keeping a wide, vegetated, and shallow floodplain for larger flooding events. The design of the typical sections of this HFLM was based on MHFD criteria for natural streams.

Three typical channel sections for Tributary I were identified within the existing and proposed Project extents and titled Reach 1, Reach 2, and Reach 3. Reach 1 will be left undisturbed in the existing channel condition. Reach 2 will seek to maintain the existing channel's planform geometry and alignment but will incorporate a new typical section with an armored bankfull channel and minimal grading. Reach 3 will be realigned to mimic a portion of Reach 2's planform geometry and will incorporate a new proposed cross section with an armored bankfull channel and a wide and shallow floodplain. Details of Tributary I typical sections are included in the construction documents for Redtail Ridge Phase 1. Calculations and design of each Typical Section was performed using Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk AutoCAD Civil 3D Ver. 2018.3.

Reach 1 is to be left in existing conditions because low velocities and shear stresses were evaluated within this reach. With the available spread for flow through this section it was determined that native grasses would be sufficient to maintain stability of the channel following development.

Reach 2 is proposed to include four typical sections between the West Campus Dr. Culvert and the East Campus Dr. Culvert. These are broken out into separate typical sections to deal with different longitudinal slopes and flow rates. All four typical sections are designed to carry the 10% 100-year flow within an armored bankfull channel and allow larger events to spread out on the adjacent floodplain up to the 100-year event. The four reaches are broken out as follows below.

- Reach 2 IN 0.2% is designed convey flows of SWMM node Reach 2 IN with a 0.2% longitudinal slope along the existing alignment of the channel.
- Reach 2 IN 1.3% is designed to convey flows of SWMM node Reach 2 IN with a 1.3% longitudinal slope along the existing alignment of the channel.
- Reach 2 Armored Bankfull is designed to convey flows of SWMM node Reach 2 IN. This section will take advantage of the existing floodplain grades and grades. It will only disturb the existing ground to establish the Bankfull channel.
- Reach 2 OUT is designed to convey flows of the SWMM node Reach 3 OUT at 1.0% longitudinal slope. The alignment of the channel will be changed here but is designed to have a similar sinuosity of the existing channel.

Reach 3 is a proposed channel between the eastern culvert under Campus Drive and the culvert under S. 96th Street. Reach 3 is similar to Reach 2 OUT but is designed to convey the SWMM flows of Reach 3 at a slope of 1.6% longitudinal slope.

Flow values in the table below are taken from the SWMM model prepared for Tributary I.

TABLE 4: SWMM Tributary I Reach Flows – Pre-Developed (CFS)

Rock Creek Tributary I Reach	2 YR	10YR	100YR	100YR OSP*
Reach 1	0.52	20.67	124.43	170
Reach 2 IN	0.84	38.19	239.44	345
Reach 2 OUT	0.84	38.19	239.44	345
Reach 3	1.93	67.96	441.42	842**

TABLE 5: SWMM Tributary I Reach Flows – Developed with Detention (CFS)

Rock Creek Tributary I Reach	10% 100YR	10YR	100YR	100YR OSP*
Reach 1	9.97	21.69	99.68	170
Reach 2 IN	15	27.67	150.01	345
Reach 2 OUT	20.25	34.63	202.46	345
Reach 3	32.34	38.07	323.35	842**

TABLE 6: SWMM Tributary I Reach Flows – Developed without Detention (CFS)

Rock Creek Tributary I Reach	10% 100YR	10YR	100YR	100YR OSP*
Reach 1	10.26	22.99	102.6	170
Reach 2 IN	15.31	29	153.06	345
Reach 2 OUT	20.56	35.83	205.59	345
Reach 3	69.31	301.25	693.06	842**

*****OSP values are approximate from Design Peak Flow Diagrams Drawing 6 of the OSP
******Flow includes portions of Northwest Parkway and Via Varra Subdivision

Flows in the table below represent the developed site flows at each release point into the channel and the corresponding channel flow at each release/outfall point.

TABLE 7: Site Release/Outfall Points

Developed Site Release Point	Channel Station	Release Point Flow (CFS)	Channel Flow (CFS)
Pond A-3	55+00	1.5	99.68
Pond B	5+00	88.5	202.46
Pond C-1	3+00	49.1	323.35

4. HEC-RAS Modeling and

One-dimensional steady flow models were prepared for existing and proposed Tributary I configurations using a series of input parameters including flowrate, channel cross-section geometry, roughness coefficients, and main channel bank stations.

Cross-sections were sampled in regular intervals (roughly every 50') and at areas that were determined to have complex or important geometry. The geometry of the existing channel was modeled using topography extracted from ground survey provided by LIDAR data that was collected for the Site. Cross-sections were created in AutoCAD, which were then exported into HEC-RAS for analysis. The Manning's n roughness was chosen based on MHFD suggested values for native grasses and to represent the existing topography of natural grasses within Tributary I.

The following Manning's n values were used for native grasses within the channel:

- 0.032 when assessing Velocity, Froude No., Shear Stress
- 0.050 when assessing Water Surface Elevation and Water Depth

The following Manning's n values were used for sections where the channel bottom would be considered sand/clay:

- 0.030 when assessing Velocity, Froude No., Shear Stress
- 0.040 when assessing Water Surface Elevation and Water Depth

The following Manning's n values were used for channel bottom would be considered cobbles or riprap lined:

- 0.035 when assessing Velocity, Froude No., Shear Stress
- 0.070 when assessing Water Surface Elevation and Water Depth

The development does not plan to introduce new or different vegetative communities that would alter these coefficients.

Table 6 provides the calculated hydraulic parameters for the three proposed reaches indicating low velocities and shear stress.

Flow for the major storm event was quantified within the CUHP/EPASWMM model. Flows as listed in Table 4 of this report were used as input values within the model as steady-state flow to represent the 100-year event within Tributary I.

Boundary conditions of the HEC-RAS model were based on normal depth and the average slope of the channel. A mixed-flow analysis was performed based on the mild slopes within the existing channel geometry that are expected to have sub-critical flow and the proposed drop structure where super critical flow and hydraulic jumps are predicted to occur.

The results of the model were used to represent the proposed and existing flooding extents of 10% of the 100-year, the 10-year, and 100-year events, flooding depths, and flow velocities to determine channel stability. A Floodplain Workmap indicating cross-section locations and proposed floodplain limits as well as a copy of the HEC-RAS model results are included in Appendix E. It is noted that the resulting flow velocities and depths indicated a stable stream section except within the bankfull channel. A natural stream design, while accounting for higher velocities and shear stresses in the bankfull section will be used to mimic the current stream conditions.

5. Revegetation

The disturbed areas of Tributary I will be seeded with a seeding plan consisting of two main seed mixes, an Upland Seed Mix and a Riparian Seed Mix.

To further encourage the development of well-established vegetation, soil amendments may be incorporated along Tributary I channel slopes. Depending on growing conditions, a temporary irrigation system may be needed.

Details on the percentage of each grass in each mix, locations, and areas where the different seed mixes are to be applied will be included in the Rock Creek Tributary I Channel and Detention Pond Seeding and Vegetation Management Plan to be submitted and approved by the City prior to construction.

6. MHFD Maintenance Eligibility

The Tributary I improvements and all drainage improvements impacting Tributary I have been designed to meet MHFD maintenance eligibility requirements, as demonstrated by the hydraulic modeling results in Table 8 below. Eligibility requirements are given below as well in Tables 9 and 10.

TABLE 8: Tributary I Typical Channel Section Hydraulic Results Summary

REACH 1	10% Q100	Q10	Q100
Discharge (cfs)	9.97	21.69	99.68
Total Depth (ft)	0.21	0.24	0.58
Area (sf)	9.76	11.31	30.08
Slope (ft/ft)	0.013	0.013	0.013
Velocity (ft/s)	1.02	1.92	3.31
Wp (wetted perimeter - ft)	50.95	51.61	58.91
Top Width (ft)	50.94	51.59	58.86
Hydraulic Radius (A / Wp)	0.19	0.22	0.51
Shear Stress (lb/sf)	0.16	0.18	0.41

REACH 2 IN, 0.2%	10% Q100	Q10	Q100
Discharge (cfs)	15.00	27.67	150.01
Total Depth (ft)	0.92	1.38	2.14
Area (sf)	9.90	23.44	91.00
Slope (ft/ft)	0.002	0.002	0.002
Velocity (ft/s)	1.52	1.18	1.65
Wp (wetted perimeter - ft)	13.82	51.78	126.70
Top Width (ft)	13.52	51.45	126.35
Hydraulic Radius (A / Wp)	0.72	0.45	0.72
Shear Stress (lb/sf)	0.09	0.06	0.09

REACH 2 IN, 1.3%	10% Q100	Q10	Q100
Discharge (cfs)	15.00	27.67	150.01
Total Depth (ft)	0.66	0.99	1.54
Area (sf)	5.04	11.52	45.89
Slope (ft/ft)	0.013	0.013	0.013
Velocity (ft/s)	2.97	2.40	3.27
Wp (wetted perimeter - ft)	10.44	35.19	90.20
Top Width (ft)	10.28	35.00	90.00
Hydraulic Radius (A / Wp)	0.48	0.33	0.51
Shear Stress (lb/sf)	0.39	0.27	0.41

REACH 2 IN, ARMORED	10% Q100	Q10	Q100
Discharge (cfs)	15.00	27.67	150.01
Total Depth (ft)	1.33	1.37	1.84
Area (sf)	10.81	12.59	44.02
Slope (ft/ft)	0.014	0.014	0.014
Velocity (ft/s)	1.39	2.20	3.41
Wp (wetted perimeter - ft)	43.12	46.64	87.96
Top Width (ft)	42.74	46.26	87.57
Hydraulic Radius (A / Wp)	0.25	0.27	0.50
Shear Stress (lb/sf)	0.22	0.24	0.44

REACH 2 OUT	10% Q100	Q10	Q100
Discharge (cfs)	20.25	34.63	202.46
Total Depth (ft)	0.80	1.22	1.88
Area (sf)	5.92	12.86	56.68
Slope (ft/ft)	0.013	0.013	0.013
Velocity (ft/s)	3.42	2.69	3.57
Wp (wetted perimeter - ft)	10.06	33.49	99.98
Top Width (ft)	9.80	33.16	99.64
Hydraulic Radius (A / Wp)	0.59	0.38	0.57
Shear Stress (lb/sf)	0.48	0.32	0.47

REACH 3	10% Q100	Q10	Q100
Discharge (cfs)	32.34	38.07	323.35
Total Depth (ft)	0.87	0.95	1.89
Area (sf)	8.25	9.31	71.30
Slope (ft/ft)	0.016	0.016	0.016
Velocity (ft/s)	3.92	4.09	4.53
Wp (wetted perimeter - ft)	13.17	13.83	102.93
Top Width (ft)	12.96	13.60	102.67
Hydraulic Radius (A / Wp)	0.63	0.67	0.69
Shear Stress (lb/sf)	0.63	0.67	0.69

TABLE 9: MHFD Table 8-3: Design Parameters for Naturalized Channels

Design Parameters for Naturalized Channels					
Design Parameter	**MHFD Recommended Value**	**Rock Creek Tributary I Design Value**			**Comment**
Maximum 100-year Depth Outside of Bankfull Channel	5 ft	4.66 ft			Meets Criteria
Roughness Values	Per Table 8-5	Flooding Extents - n = 0.05 overbanks, n = 0.04 channel; Velocity/Shear Stress/Froude - n = 0.03 overbanks, n - 0.035 main channel			Meets Criteria
Maximum 5-year Velocity, Main Channel (Within Bankfull Channel Width) (ft./s)	5 ft/s	**Reach 1** 2.98 ft/s (10-YR)	**Reach 2** 5.05 ft/s (10-YR)	**Reach 3** 4.8 ft/s (10-YR)	Channel is Lined in Reach 2 & 3 to Account for Excess Velocity
Maximum 100-year Velocity, Main Channel (Within Bankfull Channel Width) (ft./s)	7 ft/s	4.34 ft/s	7.69 ft/s	7.60 ft/s	Channel is Lined in Reach 2 & 3 to Account for Excess Velocity
Froude No., 5-year, Main Channel (Within Bankfull Channel Width)	0.7	0.99 (10-YR)	0.94 (10-YR)	0.92 (10-YR)	Channel is lined in Reach 2 & # to Account for Excess Froude #
Froude No., 100-year, Main Channel (Within Bankfull Channel Width)	0.8	1.3	1.14	1.05	Channel is Generally Stable in Existing Condition
Maximum Shear Stress, 100-year, Main Channel (Within Bankfull Channel Width)	1.2 lb/sf	0.78 lb/sf	2.15 lb/sf	1.96 lb/sf	Channel is Lined in Reach 2 & 3 to Account for Excess Shear Stress

Design Parameters for Naturalized Channels					
Minimum Bankfull Capacity of Bankfull Channel (Based on Future Development Conditions)	70% of 2-year discharge or 10% of 100-yr discharge, whichever is greater (see above)	100% 2-year discharge	100% 2-year discharge	100% 2-year discharge	Does not meet 100-yr criteria, but designed to mimic existing geometry.

TABLE 10: MHFD Table 8-4: Design Parameters for Naturalized Channels Cont

Design Parameters for Naturalized Channels					
Minimum Bankfull Channel Geometry	Per Table 8-2	Depth = 0.1', Width = 47', Terrace = 51'	Depth = 1', Width = 9', Terrace = 70'	Depth = 1', Width = 10', Terrace = 70'	Meets Criteria
Minimum Bankfull Channel Width/Depth Ratio (Equation 8-3)	9	470.0	9.3	12.5	Meets Criteria
Minimum Entrenchment Ratio (Equation 8-4)	3	3.2	16.7	15.0	Meets Criteria
Maximum Longitudinal Slope of Low Flow Channel (Assuming Unlined, Unvegetated Low Flow Channel)	0.2 percent	1.68%	2.07%	1.59%	Low Flow Channel is Lined and Vegetated
Bankfull Channel Sinuosity (Equation 8-5)	1.1 to 1.3	1.02	1.04	1.05	Designed to Match Existing Channel Sinuosity
Maximum Overbank Side Slope	4(H):1(V)	10(H):1(V)	33(H):1(V)	33(H):1(V)	Meets Criteria
Maximum Bankfull Side Slope	2.5(H):1(V)	100(H):1(V)	3(H):1(V)	4(H):1(V)	Meets Criteria
Minimum Radius of Curvature	2.5 times top width, Reach 1 = 100', Reach 2 = 22.5', Reach 3 = 25'	161' = 3.4x	65' = 7.2x	65' = 6.5x	Meets Criteria

7. Culverts

Several culverts are proposed with the Project and the culvert calculating program HY-8 was used to analyze these culverts. In HY-8 the tailwater was determined through a normal depth calculation based on downstream channel geometry inputs.

Two culverts have been designed for crossing the proposed Campus Drive at Tributary I reach stations 30+00 and 7+00.

Both crossings are composed of a dual box system which includes one lower structure solely for flow conveyance and another raised structure which doubles as a trail underpass for vehicle and pedestrian access during storms up to the 10-year event. The lower RCBC will have a span of 8' with a rise of 5' and the raised trail underpass RCBC will have a span of 10' and rise of 8'.

A culvert is proposed to cross under S. 96th Street on the downstream end of Tributary I project extents. The culvert is proposed as a dual barrel RCBC running approximately 80' long with a geometry of 8'(W) x 5'(H). This culvert does not include a trail underpass.

G. Site Phasing

The overall Site storm sewer and detention pond improvement phasing is broken out by Phase. below:

Redtail Ridge Subdivision Phase 1 – Parcels B, C, and F

- Campus Drive storm sewer in its entirety
- Rockcress Drive storm sewer built from Via Varra to Sorrel Avenue
- Sorrel Avenue storm sewer
- Pond C-1, Pond C-2, and Pond B
- Rock Creek Tributary I improvements

Redtail Ridge Subdivision Phase 2 – Parcels A, D, and E

- Pond A-3, and Pond E
- Rockcress Drive storm sewer in its entirety

H. Construction Best Management Practices (BMP) Plan

Erosion and Sediment Control Measures Discussion

All areas considered for development and any disturbed areas will be included in the Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) design. The proposed grading design for this Site will consist of both cut and fill. The predominant Construction BMP (CBMP) control

measure will be several sedimentation basins located throughout the Project area to be installed as the Project phasing occurs. These basins have been sized to account for sediment yield from the basins adjacent to that area.

Initial SWMP ~ Utilizes a combination of the following:

- Stabilized staging area (SSA)
- Construction Entrance and Vehicle Tracking Control (CE) (VTC)
- Concrete Washout Area (CWA)
- Silt fence (SF) installation on the downstream portions of the Site
- Inlet protection (IP) for the existing storm drain system located adjacent to the Site
- Check Dam (CD) for open channels
- Temporary Stream Crossing (SC)
- Temporary Sediment Basin (TSB)
- Sediment Control Log (SCL)
- Project phasing to minimize the amount of open acreage.

Interim SWMP ~ Within phasing limits utilizes a combination of the following:

- Stabilized staging area (SSA)
- Construction Entrance and Vehicle Tracking Control (CE) (VTC)
- Concrete Washout Area (CWA)
- Surface roughening (SR)
- Temporary Stream Crossing (SC)
- Inlet protection (IP) for the existing storm drain system located adjacent to the Site
- Sediment Control Log (SCL)
- Silt fence (SF) installation on the downstream portions of the Site
- Maintenance of the previously installed measures

Interim SWMP ~ Utilizes a combination of sediment control measures, after the storm system has been installed, of the following:

- On-site Inlet Protection (IP)
- Check Dams within swales (CD)
- Additional Silt Fencing (SF)
- Surface roughening (SR)
- Outlet Protection (OP) for newly installed storm drain system
- Sediment Control Log (SCL)
- Maintenance of all new and previously installed measures.

Final SWMP ~ Utilizes a combination of sediment control measures, after the storm system has been installed, of the following:

- On-site Inlet Protection (IP) to remain until all disturbed areas have been re-established with 80% vegetation.
- Outlet Protection (OP)
- Erosion Control Blanket (ECB) on slopes greater than 4:1
- Seeding, Mulching, and Crimping (SMC)
- Surface Roughening (SF)
- Temporary Irrigation (TI)
- Silt Fence (SF) to remain until all disturbed areas have been re-established with 80% vegetation.
- Maintenance of all installed measures.
- Upon acceptance by the City, all temporary measures are to be removed and any disturbance caused by these removals shall be brought into compliance to achieve restoration of the area.

I. Project Schedule

The start of the project schedule is determined on the approval of the project Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control plan and supportive construction documents. At the time of approval, it is anticipated that the Initial SWMP measures will be implemented within one week. The timeline of events is determined by the date of issuance of the Grading Permit. A pre-construction meeting will be necessary to adequately establish the final phasing areas and implementation of the SWMP measures. At the pre-construction meeting the final schedule will be determined. It is anticipated that the grading operations for the entire disturbed area will take approximately six months, weather permitting.

J. BMP Maintenance

The General Contractor will designate an on-site SWMP Manager at the time of permit issuance. The Contractor's SWMP Manager will be the responsible party for ensuring that the Site remains in compliance with the SWMP and will be the Contractor's contact person with the permitting agency for all matters pertaining to the permit. Paved areas, including streets, will be kept clean throughout build-out and will be cleaned at first notice of accidental tracking. At a minimum, the SWMP Manager will inspect all BMP's weekly and after runoff events. All necessary maintenance and repair activities will be performed within 24-hours or as directed by the permitting agency.

V. CONCLUSIONS

A. Compliance with Standards

Drainage design for the Site was performed in accordance with Louisville and MHFD Criteria. The District Manual was used for the design of the Site only when instructed to by Louisville Criteria. The control measures identified in this report are in compliance with part I.E.4.a.iv of the CDPHE Municipal Storm Sewer Systems General permit.

It is the intent of this Final Master Drainage Report to act as the master report for the entire Site. Future Development's preliminary plats, final plats, and individual Site Plans shall be required to submit their own Preliminary and Final Drainage Reports, as applicable, with subsequent development applications.

B. Drainage Concept

The proposed drainage design for the Site will effectively control and minimize any damage from storm runoff associated with the design storms. As stated, runoff will be routed through proposed curb and gutter within roadways, to proposed storm sewer inlets and pipes, and then to one of six Full Spectrum Detention Facilities. All these systems will be adequately sized for the flows associated with the Site and off-site discharges will be managed in a manner which causes no negative effects downstream.

VI. REFERENCES

1. *Boulder Valley School District Louisville Campus PUD Drainage Report*, Charles Keim & Associates, May 31, 1996
2. *City of Louisville/Bounder County Outfall System Plan*, Water Resources Consultants, INC. November 1982
3. *Executive Summary of Previous Investigations, Former ConocoPhillips Site (Storage Tek Campus),* CTL|Thompson, April 19, 2019.
4. *Flood Insurance Rate Map*, Boulder County, Colorado, Map #08013C0584J, FEMA, revised December 18, 2012.
5. Storm Drainage Design & Technical Criteria Manual, City of Louisville, August 2013
6. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Former Conoco Phillips Site*, CTL|Thompson, February 25, 2019.
7. MHFD / Urban Storm Drainage Criteria Manual, Volumes 1, 2, and 3 by Urban Drainage and Flood Control District, Current Version.



BASIN SUMMARY TABLE

BASIN	AREA (AC)	PERCENT IMPERVIOUS	Q100 (CFS)
10 - H	133	8	148
4 - I	110	13	213
5 - I	142	3	235
6 - I	148	57	382
2 - J	104	44	306
OS - 1	37	3	47

*Q100 FROM CUHP. RESULTS USING VALUES FROM 1982 LOUISVILLE OSP

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.
CALL 3 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

SCALE: 1" = 400'

DESIGNED BY: TMW
CHECKED BY: MAW
DRAWN BY: TMW

HARRIS KOCHER SMITH
1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80203
P: 303.623.6300 F: 303.623.6311
HarrisKocherSmith.com

BRUE·BAUKOL CAPITAL PARTNERS

NATWATNY RIDGE
EXISTING DRAINAGE PLAN

ISSUE DATE: 10-02-2019 | PROJECT #: 190108

DATE	REVISION COMMENTS

SHEET NO. 1
1 OF 14

NO CHANGES ARE TO BE MADE TO THIS DRAWING WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION OF HARRIS KOCHER SMITH

FILEPATH: P:\190\DWG\ENGINEERING\CIVIL\PCDP - EXISTING DRAINAGE PLAN.DWG, LAYOUT: HKS TITLE SHEET
XREFs: clientcop, e-base, e-rigid, logos, p-base[Ut], p-legal[Ut]
PLOTTED: WED 04/09/20 4:08:58p BY: MICHAEL WALTON



LEGEND:

- BASIN BOUNDARY
- GOODHUE IRRIGATION DITCH
- TRIBUTARY I 10-YEAR FLOODPLAIN
- TRIBUTARY I 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN
- PR PEDESTRIAN TRAIL
- PROPOSED STORM SEWER OUTFALLS
- DRAINAGE FLOW
- PROPOSED CONTOURS
- EXISTING CONTOURS
- PHASING LINE

BASIN DESIGNATION — OS 1 — BASIN IMPERVIOUSNESS
BASIN SIZE IN ACRES — AREA 1.23 AC — IMPERV 2%
1 BASIN DESIGN POINT

BASIN SUMMARY AND DISCHARGE TABLE:

DESIGN POINT	CONTRIBUTING BASINS	CONTRIBUTING AREA (AC)	Q5 (CFS)	Q100 (CFS)
1	A-3-1 & A-3-2	0.97	0.45	1.44
2	DP 1 & A-3-3	1.32	0.79	2.4
3	DP 2 & A-3-4	1.67	1.16	3.49
4	88th St Culvert & School West Culvert	0	29.9	83.8
5	DP 4 & C-3-1 & C-3-2	2.63	33.08	93
6	DP 5 & School Pond Bypass	2.63	33.07	93
7	DP 6 & C-3-3 & C-3-4	3.50	0.59	55.84
8	DP 7 & School East Culvert	3.50	1.68	60.59
9	DP 8 & C-3-5 & C-3-6	4.99	3.09	64.5
10	DP 9 & C-3-7 & C-3-8	6.89	4.79	53.29
11	DP 10 & C-3-15 & C-3-16	8.22	5.32	53.94
12	DP 11 & C-3-17 & C-3-18	9.31	6.05	55.91
13	DP 12 & C-3-19	10.20	6.71	57.88
14	DP 13 & C-3-20	12.17	7.86	61.4
15	DP 14 & C-3-21	14.19	9.05	64.98
16	C-4-1 & C-4-2	2.78	2	6.14
17	C-5-1 & C-5-2	1.41	0.72	2.28
18	DP17 & Pond E	35.70	1.5	40.92
19	DP 18, C-5-3, & C-5-4	37.02	2.04	42.78
20	DP 19, C-5-5, & C-5-6	38.62	2.82	45.04
21	DP 20 & C-5-7 & C-5-8	40.24	3.67	47.31
22	C-5-9 & C-5-10	1.08	0.82	2.54
23	DP 22 & B-2	26.53	39.85	109.58
24	DP21 & DP23	66.77	40.6	111.06
25	DP 24 & C-5-11 & C-5-12	69.07	41.24	111.89
26	C-6-1 & C-6-2, D-2	20.72	28.47	79.8
27	C-6-3 Offsite	0.34	0.39	1.14
28	Pond C-2 Release	109.42	1.51	65.26

*CUHP/SWMM WAS USED TO CALCULATE THESE VALUES. THE FULL CUHP/SWMM RESULTS TO CALCULATE RUNOFF FOR BASINS WILL BE INCLUDED WITH THE FINAL MASTER DRAINAGE REPORT
*DESIGN POINTS ARE SHOWN ON SHEETS ST-8:ST-11

POND SUMMARY TABLE:

POND DESCRIPTION	CONTRIBUTING BASINS	WATERSHED AREA (AC)	WATERSHED IMPERVIOUSNESS (%)	REQUIRED 100-YEAR STORAGE (AC-FT)	PROVIDED 100-YEAR STORAGE (AC-FT)	5-YEAR RELEASE RATE (CFS)	100-YEAR RELEASE RATE (CFS)
A-3 (Phase II)	A-3	1.67	75%	0.205	0.227	0.1	1.5
B	A-2-2, B-1	118.46	85%	16.043	17.515	2.7	88.5
C-1	C-1, C-3	67.40	80%	8.682	9.811	1.2	49.1
C-2	B-2, C-2, C-5, C-6-1, C-6-2, D-1	82.03	78%	10.357	12.446	1.5	59.8
E (Phase II)	E	34.29	75%	4.205	4.413	1.1	40.3

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.
CALL 3 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

300 0 300 600
SCALE: 1" = 300'

DESIGNED BY: SDM
CHECKED BY: MAW
DRAWN BY: SDM

HARRIS KOCHER SMITH
1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80203
P: 303.623.6300 F: 303.623.6311
HarrisKocherSmith.com

BRUE·BAUKOL CAPITAL PARTNERS

REDTAIL RIDGE - FILING NO. 1
OVERALL DRAINAGE PLAN

ISSUE DATE: 11-15-2019 PROJECT #: 190108

DATE	REVISION COMMENTS
04-06-2020	SECOND SUBMITTAL PER CITY COMMENTS
04-05-2021	FIRST SUBMITTAL NEW PROGRAM
10-29-2021	SECOND SUBMITTAL NEW PROGRAM
07-15-2022	THIRD SUBMITTAL NEW PROGRAM

SHEET NO.
ST - 3
ST - 3 OF ST - 41

NO CHANGES ARE TO BE MADE TO THIS DRAWING WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF HARRIS KOCHER SMITH

FILEPATH: P:\190\DWG\ENGINEERING\DRAINAGE\2021 MASTER DRAINAGE PLAN.DWG, LAYOUT: OVERALL DRAINAGE PLAN
12 XREFs: client logo, e-base, e-legal, e-util, key map, p-base-f, p-base-f2, p-base-os, p-prog, p-legal-fc, stamp - storm, storm - fc, stamp
PLOTTED: THU 07/14/22 8:53:31 P BY: ADAN LOWE



811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

CALL 3 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

100 0 100 200
SCALE: 1" = 100'

DESIGNED BY: SDM
CHECKED BY: MAW
DRAWN BY: SDM

HARRIS KOCHER SMITH
1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80203
P: 303.623.6300 F: 303.623.6311
HarrisKocherSmith.com

BRUE·BAUKOL CAPITAL PARTNERS

REDTAIL RIDGE - FILING NO. 1
DRAINAGE PLAN NW

ISSUE DATE: 11-15-2019	PROJECT #: 190108
DATE	REVISION COMMENTS
04-06-2020	SECOND SUBMITTAL PER CITY COMMENTS
04-05-2021	FIRST SUBMITTAL NEW PROGRAM
10-29-2021	SECOND SUBMITTAL NEW PROGRAM
07-15-2022	THIRD SUBMITTAL NEW PROGRAM

PRELIMINARY NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

SHEET NO.
ST - 4
ST - 4 OF ST - 41

NO CHANGES ARE TO BE MADE TO THIS DRAWING WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION OF HARRIS KOCHER SMITH

FILEPATH: P:\190\DWG\ENGINEERING\DRAWINGS\2021 MASTER DRAINAGE PLAN.DWG, LAYOUT: DRAINAGE PLAN NW
12 XREFs: client logo, x-base, e-legal, e-util, key map, p-base-f1, p-base-f2, p-base-os, p-dmp, p-legal-fil, stamp - storm, storm - fil, - stamp
PLOTTED: THU 07/14/22 8:54:58P BY: AIDAN LOWE



811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

CALL 3 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

100 0 100 200
SCALE: 1" = 100'

DESIGNED BY: SDM
CHECKED BY: MAW
DRAWN BY: SDM

HARRIS KOCHER SMITH
1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80203
P: 303.623.6300 F: 303.623.6311
HarrisKocherSmith.com

BRUE·BAUKOL CAPITAL PARTNERS

REDTAIL RIDGE - FILING NO. 1
DRAINAGE PLAN NE

ISSUE DATE: 11-15-2019 | PROJECT #: 190108

DATE	REVISION COMMENTS
04-06-2020	SECOND SUBMITTAL PER CITY COMMENTS
04-05-2021	FIRST SUBMITTAL NEW PROGRAM
10-29-2021	SECOND SUBMITTAL NEW PROGRAM
07-15-2022	THIRD SUBMITTAL NEW PROGRAM

PRELIMINARY NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

SHEET NO.
ST - 5
ST - 5 OF ST - 41

NO CHANGES ARE TO BE MADE TO THIS DRAWING WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION OF HARRIS KOCHER SMITH

FILEPATH: P:\190\DWG\ENGINEERING\DRAWINGS\2021 MASTER DRAWINGS\PLAN LWG_LAYOUT_DRAINAGE PLAN NE
12 XREFS: client logo, x-base, e-legal, e-util, key map, p-base-f1, p-base-f2, p-base-os, p-dmg, p-legal-fc, stamp - storm, storm - fc, - stamp
PLOTTED: THU 07/14/22 8:51:06P BY: AIDAN LOWE



NO CHANGES ARE TO BE MADE TO THIS DRAWING WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION OF HARRIS KOCHER SMITH

FILEPATH: P:\190108\ENGINEERING\DRAWINGS\2021 MASTER DRAWINGS\PLAN DWG_LAYOUT_DRAINAGE PLAN SW
12 XREFs: client logo, e-base, e-layout, e-util, key map, p-base-f2, p-base-f2, p-base-os, p-prop, p-layout, p-base-f1, stamp - storm, storm - b, - stamp
PLOTTED: THU 07/14/22 8:59:29P BY: ADAM LOWE

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.
CALL 3 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

100 0 100 200
SCALE: 1" = 100'

DESIGNED BY: SDM
CHECKED BY: MAW
DRAWN BY: SDM

HARRIS KOCHER SMITH
1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80203
P: 303.623.6300 F: 303.623.6311
HarrisKocherSmith.com

BRUE·BAUKOL CAPITAL PARTNERS

REDTAIL RIDGE - FILING NO. 1
DRAINAGE PLAN SW

ISSUE DATE: 11-15-2019	PROJECT #: 190108
DATE	REVISION COMMENTS
04-06-2020	SECOND SUBMITTAL PER CITY COMMENTS
04-05-2021	FIRST SUBMITTAL NEW PROGRAM
10-29-2021	SECOND SUBMITTAL NEW PROGRAM
07-15-2022	THIRD SUBMITTAL NEW PROGRAM

PRELIMINARY NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

SHEET NO.
ST - 6
ST - 6 OF ST - 41



811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

CALL 3 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

SCALE: 1" = 100'

DESIGNED BY: SDM
CHECKED BY: MAW
DRAWN BY: SDM

HARRIS KOCHER SMITH
1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80203
P: 303.623.6300 F: 303.623.6311
HarrisKocherSmith.com

BRUE·BAUKOL CAPITAL PARTNERS

REDTAIL RIDGE - FILING NO. 1
DRAINAGE PLAN SE

ISSUE DATE: 11-15-2019 | PROJECT #: 190108

DATE	REVISION COMMENTS
04-06-2020	SECOND SUBMITTAL PER CITY COMMENTS
04-05-2021	FIRST SUBMITTAL NEW PROGRAM
10-29-2021	SECOND SUBMITTAL NEW PROGRAM
07-15-2022	THIRD SUBMITTAL NEW PROGRAM

PRELIMINARY NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

SHEET NO.
ST - 7
ST - 7 OF ST - 41

NO CHANGES ARE TO BE MADE TO THIS DRAWING WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION OF HARRIS KOCHER SMITH

FILEPATH: P:\190\DWG\ENGINEERING\DRAWINGS\2021 MASTER DRAINAGE PLAN\DRAINAGE PLAN SE 11 2 XREFs: client logo, e-base, e-legal, e-util, key map, p-base-f1, p-base-f2, p-base-os, p-dmg, p-legal-fil, stamp - storm, storm - fil, - stamp PLOTTED: THU 07/14/22 8:54:42P BY: ARJAN LOWE

ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEY

SITUATED IN THE NORTHEAST 1/4 AND SOUTH 1/2 OF SECTION 20, THE NORTH 1/2 OF SECTION 29, AND THE NORTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 28, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M.
COUNTIES OF BOULDER AND BROOMFIELD, STATE OF COLORADO.

SHEET INDEX

SHEETS 1-3	PROPERTY DESCRIPTIONS/NOTES
SHEET 3	KEY MAP
SHEET 4-9	SURVEY SHEETS
SHEET 9	LEGEND

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

PARCEL 1:
THE NORTH HALF OF THE SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO.
EXCEPT THE EAST 30 FEET THEREOF.

PARCEL 2:
THE SOUTH HALF OF THE SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO.
EXCEPT THE EAST 30 FEET THEREOF.
ALSO EXCEPT THAT PORTION CONVEYED TO NORTHWEST PARKWAY PUBLIC HIGHWAY AUTHORITY BY DEED RECORDED JULY 19, 2002 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2309730 AND BY DEED RECORDED JANUARY 22, 2003 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2386686.
AND ALSO EXCEPT THAT PORTION LYING WITHIN THE PLAT OF STORAGETEK BUILDING SIX SUBDIVISION ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED OCTOBER 3, 1985 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 717095.

PARCEL 3:
THE NORTH HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO.
EXCEPT THAT PORTION CONVEYED TO THE STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED DECEMBER 5, 1950 IN BOOK 878 AT PAGE 503.
ALSO EXCEPT THAT PORTION CONVEYED TO BOULDER VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. RE-2 BY QUIT CLAIM DEED RECORDED NOVEMBER 19, 1996 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 01658713.
ALSO EXCEPT THAT PORTION CONVEYED TO LOUISVILLE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT BY QUIT CLAIM DEED RECORDED JULY 2, 1998 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 1819920.
AND ALSO EXCEPT THAT PORTION CONVEYED TO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE OF COLORADO BY DEED RECORDED OCTOBER 8, 1999 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 1989419.

PARCEL 4:
A TRACT OF LAND IN THE SOUTH 1/2 OF THE SOUTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, AND IN THE NORTH 1/2 OF THE NORTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 29, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
BEGINNING AT THE SOUTH ONE-QUARTER CORNER OF SAID SECTION 20 (SAID CORNER ALSO BEING THE NORTH ONE-QUARTER CORNER OF SAID SECTION 29);
THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 02 MINUTES 17 SECONDS EAST ALONG THE EAST LINE OF THE SOUTH 1/2 SOUTHWEST 1/4 OF SAID SECTION 20, A DISTANCE OF 1324.56 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF SAID SOUTH 1/2 SOUTHWEST 1/4;
THENCE NORTH 89 DEGREES 35 MINUTES 07 SECONDS WEST ALONG SAID NORTH LINE, A DISTANCE OF 2523.46 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EASTERLY RIGHT OF WAY OF A PARCEL OF LAND CONVEYED TO THE STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT AS DESCRIBED AND RECORDED JANUARY 5, 1951 IN BOOK 880 AT PAGE 98 OF THE BOULDER COUNTY RECORDS, SAID POINT ALSO BEARS SOUTH 89 DEGREES 35 MINUTES 07 SECONDS EAST, A DISTANCE OF 127.32 FEET FROM THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE SOUTH 1/2 SOUTHWEST 1/4 OF SAID SECTION 20;
THENCE SOUTH 25 DEGREES 28 MINUTES 17 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID STATE HIGHWAY RIGHT OF WAY, A DISTANCE OF 857.43 FEET;
THENCE CONTINUING SOUTH 49 DEGREES 43 MINUTES 17 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID RIGHT OF WAY, A DISTANCE OF 853.72 FEET TO A POINT ON THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID SECTION 20 (ALSO BEING A POINT ON THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF THE DENVER-BOULDER TURNPIKE AS DESCRIBED AND RECORDED DECEMBER 5, 1950 IN BOOK 878 AT PAGE 507, BOULDER COUNTY RECORDS, AND A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF SAID SECTION 29);
THENCE SOUTH 89 DEGREES 21 MINUTES 40 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID SOUTH LINE OF SAID SECTION 20, ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF LAST SAID RIGHT OF WAY AND ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID SECTION 29, A DISTANCE OF 74.15 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTHEASTERLY RIGHT OF WAY OF SAID DENVER-BOULDER TURNPIKE;
THENCE SOUTH 50 DEGREES 24 MINUTES 31 SECONDS EAST ALONG THE NORTHEASTERLY RIGHT OF WAY OF SAID DENVER-BOULDER TURNPIKE, A DISTANCE OF 1751.52 FEET TO THE P.C. OF A CURVE WHOSE DELTA IS 01 DEGREES 04 MINUTES 41 SECONDS, RADIUS IS 5580 FEET AND WHOSE LONG CHORD BEARS SOUTH 50 DEGREES 45 MINUTES 26 SECONDS EAST, A DISTANCE OF 105.00 FEET;
THENCE ALONG SAID CURVE TO THE LEFT, A DISTANCE OF 105.00 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EAST LINE OF THE NORTH 1/2 NORTHWEST 1/4 OF SAID SECTION 29;
THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 08 MINUTES 06 SECONDS WEST ALONG LAST SAID EAST LINE, A DISTANCE OF 1166.75 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.
EXCEPT THOSE PORTIONS CONVEYED TO CITY OF BROOMFIELD BY DEED RECORDED JANUARY 10, 2000 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2013403.
ALSO EXCEPT THOSE PORTIONS CONVEYED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, STATE OF COLORADO BY DEED RECORDED NOVEMBER 6, 2014 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3411796.

PARCEL 5:
ALL THAT PART OF THE NORTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 29, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
BEGINNING AT THE NORTH 1/4 CORNER OF SAID SECTION 29;
THENCE SOUTH 89°42'42" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 2,659.28 FEET ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID NORTHEAST 1/4 TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 29;
THENCE SOUTH 00°00'35" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 1,316.88 FEET ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID SECTION 29;
THENCE NORTH 89°42'42" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 2,460.45 FEET FEET AND PARALLEL WITH THE NORTH LINE OF SAID NORTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 29, TO THE NORTHEASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF U.S. HIGHWAY NO. 36 A POINT OF NON-TANGENT CURVATURE;
THENCE ALONG THE ARC OF SAID CURVE TO THE RIGHT AN ARC LENGTH OF 246.55 FEET, SAID CURVE HAVING A RADIUS OF 5,579.25 FEET, A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 02°31'55", AND A CHORD WHICH BEARS NORTH 52°31'27" WEST A CHORD DISTANCE OF 246.53 FEET ALONG THE NORTHEASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF U.S. HIGHWAY NO. 36 TO A POINT ON THE SOUTH CENTERLINE OF SAID SECTION 29;
THENCE NORTH 00°08'41" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 1,167.89 FEET ALONG THE NORTH – SOUTH CENTERLINE OF SAID SECTION 29 TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING;
EXCEPT THAT PART CONVEYED TO WESTERN SLOPE GAS COMPANY BY DEED RECORDED NOVEMBER 19, 1982 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 520800.
ALSO EXCEPT THAT PORTION CONVEYED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO BY DEED RECORDED FEBRUARY 3, 1983 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 531604.
ALSO EXCEPT THAT PORTION LYING WITHIN THE PLAT OF STORAGETEK BUILDING SIX SUBDIVISION RECORDED OCTOBER 3, 1985 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 717095.
ALSO EXCEPT THOSE PORTIONS CONVEYED TO CITY OF BROOMFIELD BY DEED RECORDED NOVEMBER 6, 1995 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 01560711.
ALSO EXCEPT THOSE PORTIONS CONVEYED TO THE CITY OF BROOMFIELD BY DEED RECORDED JANUARY 10, 2000 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2013403.
AND ALSO EXCEPT THAT PORTION CONVEYED TO NORTHWEST PARKWAY PUBLIC HIGHWAY AUTHORITY BY DEED RECORDED JULY 19, 2002 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2309730.

PARCEL 6:
A TRACT OF LAND LOCATED IN THE EAST HALF OF SECTION 29, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF BROOMFIELD, STATE OF COLORADO, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
COMMENCING AT THE NORTH QUARTER CORNER OF SAID SECTION 29;
THENCE SOUTH 89 DEGREES 29 MINUTES 10 SECONDS EAST, 2659.02 FEET ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 29 TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER THEREOF;
THENCE SOUTH 00 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 03 SECONDS WEST, 1316.88 FEET ALONG THE EAST LINE OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 29 TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;
THENCE NORTH 89 DEGREES 29 MINUTES 10 SECONDS WEST, 2459.02 FEET PARALLEL WITH THE NORTH LINE OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 29 TO THE NORTHEASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF U.S. HIGHWAY NO. 36.
THE FOLLOWING COURSES AND DISTANCES ARE ALONG THE NORTHEASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF U.S. HIGHWAY NO. 36;
THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY, 589.48 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CURVE CONCAVE TO THE NORTHEAST TO A POINT TANGENT, SAID ARC HAVING A RADIUS OF 5,580 FEET A DELTA ANGLE OF 06 DEGREES 03 MINUTES 10 SECONDS AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 56 DEGREES 37 MINUTES 41 SECONDS EAST, 589.20 FEET;
THENCE SOUTH 59 DEGREES 39 MINUTES 15 SECONDS EAST, 1462.60 FEET;
THENCE NORTH 30 DEGREES 20 MINUTES 45 SECONDS EAST, 100.00 FEET;
THENCE SOUTH 59 DEGREES 39 MINUTES 15 SECONDS EAST, 150.00 FEET;
THENCE SOUTH 30 DEGREES 20 MINUTES 45 SECONDS WEST, 100.00 FEET;
THENCE SOUTH 59 DEGREES 39 MINUTES 15 SECONDS EAST, 659.01 FEET TO THE EAST LINE OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 29;
THENCE LEAVING THE NORTHEASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF SAID U.S. HIGHWAY NO. 36 NORTH 00 DEGREES 18 MINUTES 55 SECONDS EAST, 129.99 FEET ALONG THE EAST LINE OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 29 TO THE EAST QUARTER CORNER OF SAID SECTION 29;
THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 03 SECONDS EAST, 1320.72 FEET ALONG THE EAST LINE OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 29 TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.
EXCEPT THAT PORTION CONVEYED TO CITY OF BROOMFIELD BY DEED RECORDED NOVEMBER 6, 1995 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 01560711.
ALSO EXCEPT THOSE PORTIONS CONVEYED TO CITY OF BROOMFIELD BY DEED RECORDED JANUARY 10, 2000 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2013403.
AND ALSO EXCEPT THAT PORTION CONVEYED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, STATE OF COLORADO BY DEED RECORDED NOVEMBER 6, 2014 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2014010827.

PARCEL 7:
LOT 1, BLOCK 1, AND OUTLOT "A", STORAGETEK BUILDING SIX SUBDIVISION, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO.
EXCEPT THAT PORTION OF SAID OUTLOT "A" CONVEYED TO NORTHWEST PARKWAY PUBLIC HIGHWAY AUTHORITY BY DEED RECORDED JULY 19, 2002 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2309730.
EXCEPT ANY PORTION OF THE ABOVE 7 PARCELS CONVEYED TO NORTHWEST PARKWAY PUBLIC HIGHWAY AUTHORITY IN DEED RECORDED JANUARY 22, 2003 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2386686.



VICINITY MAP
SCALE: 1" = 2,000'

PARCEL 8:
A TRACT OF LAND LOCATED IN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 28, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY AND COUNTY OF BROOMFIELD, STATE OF COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
COMMENCING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 28, WITH THE BASIS OF BEARING BEING THE WEST LINE OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 28, WITH THE BEARING OF SAID LINE BEING SOUTH 00 DEGREES, 01 MINUTES, 28 SECONDS WEST;
THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID WEST LINE OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER SOUTH 00 DEGREES 01 MINUTES 28 SECONDS WEST, A DISTANCE OF 1252.76 TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;
THENCE CONTINUING SOUTH 00 DEGREES 01 MINUTES 28 SECONDS WEST, A DISTANCE OF 1084.73 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF PARCEL II DESCRIBED IN THE DOCUMENT FILED SEPTEMBER 1, 1982 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 509745 WITH THE COUNTY CLERK AND RECORDER, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO;
THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID NORTH LINE OF PARCEL II, NORTH 89 DEGREES 26 MINUTES, 56 SECONDS EAST, A DISTANCE OF 152.81 FEET TO THE PROPOSED WESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY OF 96TH STREET;
THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG SAID WESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY NORTH 01 DEGREES, 13 MINUTES, 11 SECONDS EAST, A DISTANCE OF 357.27 FEET;
THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG SAID WESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY NORTH 12 DEGREES, 25 MINUTES, 23 SECONDS WEST, A DISTANCE OF 743.48 FEET TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.
EXCEPT THAT PORTION CONVEYED TO THE CITY OF BROOMFIELD, A COLORADO MUNICIPAL CORPORATION BY SPECIAL WARRANTY DEED RECORDED NOVEMBER 6, 1995 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 1560711.

PARCEL 9:
THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., EXCEPTING THOSE PORTIONS THEREOF CONVEYED TO THE COUNTY OF BOULDER IN DEEDS RECORDED DECEMBER 04, 1972 IN FILM 798 AT RECEPTION NO. 045849, DECEMBER 04, 1972 IN FILM 798 AT RECEPTION NO. 045851 AND RE-RECORDED DECEMBER 19, 1972 IN FILM 800 AT RECEPTION NO. 47728.
FURTHER EXCEPTING THOSE PORTIONS THEREOF CONVEYED TO THE NORTHWEST PARKWAY PUBLIC HIGHWAY AUTHORITY PURSUANT TO NOTICE OF LIS PENDENS RECORDED MAY 30, 2002 AT RECEPTION NO. 2292472,
AND FURTHER EXCEPTING ANY PORTION THEREOF LYING WITHIN ANY PUBLIC ROAD, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO.

PARCEL 10:
THE SOUTHWEST 1/4 OF THE SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF THE NORTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., EXCEPT THE NORTHERLY 30.00 FEET THEREOF CONVEYED BY MARVIN H. STRACK AND WILBERT J. SOHNS TO THE COUNTY OF BOULDER, A BODY CORPORATE AND POLITIC, IN DEED RECORDED DECEMBER 04, 1972, ON FILM 798 AS RECEPTION NO. 045851 AND RE-RECORDED DECEMBER 19, 1972 ON FILM 800 AS RECEPTION NO. 047728, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO
AND ALSO EXCEPT THAT PORTION DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
BEGINNING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THE WEST HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M.:
THENCE WESTERLY 331.84 FEET ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF THE WEST HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 20 TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID WEST HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 20; THENCE SOUTHERLY 262.51 FEET ALONG THE WEST LINE OF THE WEST HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 20; THENCE EASTERLY 331.88 FEET PARALLEL WITH THE NORTH LINE OF THE WEST HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 20 TO A POINT ON THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 20; THENCE NORTHERLY 262.51 FEET ALONG THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER
OF SAID SECTION 20, TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO.

PARCEL 11:
THAT PORTION OF THE SW 1/4 OF THE SE 1/4 OF THE NE 1/4 OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
BEGINNING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THE WEST HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 20;
THENCE WESTERLY 331.84 FEET ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF THE WEST HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 20 TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID WEST HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 20; THENCE SOUTHERLY 262.51 FEET ALONG THE WEST LINE OF THE WEST HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 20;
THENCE EASTERLY 331.88 FEET PARALLEL WITH THE NORTH LINE OF THE WEST HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 20 TO A POINT ON THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 20;
THENCE NORTHERLY 262.51 FEET ALONG THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 20 TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING;
EXCEPT THE NORTHERLY 30.00 FEET THEREOF CONVEYED BY MARVIN H. STRACK AND WILBERT J. SOHNS TO THE COUNTY OF BOULDER, A BODY CORPORATE AND POLITIC, IN DEED RECORDED DECEMBER 04, 1972, ON FILM 798 AS RECEPTION NO. 045851 AND RE-RECORDED DECEMBER 19, 1972 ON FILM 800 AS RECEPTION NO. 047728, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO.

PARCEL 12:
THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER (NE 1/4 SW 1/4 NE 1/4) AND THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER (NW 1/4 SE 1/4 NE 1/4) OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO,
EXCEPT THAT PORTION THEREOF CONVEYED TO THE COUNTY OF BOULDER IN DEED RECORDED DECEMBER 04, 1972 ON FILM 798 AT RECEPTION NO. 045851 AND RE-RECORDED DECEMBER 19, 1972 ON FILM 800 AT RECEPTION NO. 47728.

PARCEL 13:
THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER (NW 1/4 SW 1/4 NE 1/4) OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO,
EXCEPT THAT PORTION THEREOF CONVEYED TO THE COUNTY OF BOULDER IN DEED RECORDED DECEMBER 04, 1972 ON FILM 798 AT RECEPTION NO. 045850, AND EXCEPT THAT PORTION THEREOF CONVEYED TO THE COUNTY OF BOULDER IN DEED RECORDED DECEMBER 04, 1972 ON FILM 798 AT RECEPTION NO. 045851 AND RE-RECORDED DECEMBER 19, 1972 ON FILM 800 AR RECEPTION NO. 47728.

NOTES:

1. THIS SURVEY DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A TITLE SEARCH BY HARRIS KOCHER SMITH TO DETERMINE OWNERSHIP OR EASEMENTS OF RECORD. FOR ALL INFORMATION REGARDING EASEMENTS, RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND TITLE OF RECORD, HARRIS KOCHER SMITH RELIED UPON COMMITMENT FOR TITLE INSURANCE, ORDER NO. ABD70601971-2 ISSUED BY LAND TITLE GUARANTEE COMPANY, AND HAVING AN EFFECTIVE DATE OF JANUARY 22, 2019 AT 5:00 P.M.
2. NOTICE: ACCORDING TO COLORADO LAW YOU MUST COMMENCE ANY LEGAL ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT IN THIS SURVEY WITHIN THREE YEARS AFTER YOU FIRST DISCOVER SUCH DEFECT. IN NO EVENT MAY ANY ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT IN THIS SURVEY BE COMMENCED MORE THAN TEN YEARS FROM THE DATE OF THE CERTIFICATION SHOWN HEREON.
3. UTILITIES SHOWN HEREON ARE FROM VISIBLE FIELD INFORMATION AND UTILITY LOCATES PROVIDED BY TOM RICHARDSON, LLC. HARRIS KOCHER SMITH DOES NOT GUARANTEE THESE LOCATIONS OR THAT THE UTILITIES SHOWN HEREON COMPRISE ALL UTILITIES IN THIS AREA, EITHER IN SERVICE OR ABANDONED. FOR THE EXACT LOCATION OF ALL UNDERGROUND UTILITIES, CONTACT THE UTILITY NOTIFICATION CENTER OF COLORADO AND THE APPROPRIATE UTILITY COMPANY PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
4. BASIS OF BEARINGS: BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE WEST LINE OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 29, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN ASSUMED AS BEARING SOUTH 00°08'41" EAST, MONUMENTED AS SHOWN HEREON.
5. THE SURVEYED PROPERTY FALLS WITHIN OTHER AREAS ZONE X (UNSHADED), OTHER FLOOD AREAS ZONE X (SHADED), AND SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREA (SFHA) ZONE AE OF THE FOLLOWING FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAPS: MAP NO. 08013C0584J, DATED DECEMBER 18, 2012; MAP NO. 08507300059F, DATED AUGUST 18, 2004; AND MAP NO. 08507300067F, DATED AUGUST 18, 2004. THE SURVEYED PROPERTY IS ALSO SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING LETTERS OF MAP REVISION: CASE NO. 16-08-1117P, HAVING AN EFFECTIVE DATE OF JANUARY 27, 2017; AND CASE NO. 17-08-1518P, HAVING AN EFFECTIVE DATE OF AUGUST 3, 2018. ZONE X (UNSHADED) IS DEFINED AS AREAS DETERMINED TO BE OUTSIDE THE 0.2-PERCENT ANNUAL CHANCE FLOODPLAIN. ZONE X (SHADED) IS AREAS OF 0.2% ANNUAL CHANCE FLOOD; AREAS OF 1% ANNUAL CHANCE FLOOD WITH AVERAGE DEPTHS OF LESS THAN 1 FOOT OR WITH DRAINAGE AREAS LESS THAN 1 SQUARE MILE; AND AREAS PROTECTED BY LEVEES FROM 1% ANNUAL CHANCE FLOOD. ZONE AE IS DEFINED AS BEING SUBJECT TO INUNDATION BY THE 1% ANNUAL CHANCE FLOOD EVENT WITH BASE FLOOD ELEVATIONS DETERMINED. THE APPROXIMATE LIMITS OF THESE AREAS ARE SHOWN HEREON.
6. THE SURVEYED PROPERTY CONTAINS 20,811,972 SQUARE FEET OR 477.78 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.
7. NO ZONING REPORT OR LETTER WAS PROVIDED BY THE CLIENT FOR THIS SURVEY. AS SUCH, THE CURRENT ZONING CLASSIFICATION, SETBACK REQUIREMENTS, HEIGHT AND FLOOR SPACE AREA RESTRICTIONS, AND PARKING REQUIREMENTS WERE NOT ADDRESSED.
8. THERE WAS NO OBSERVED EVIDENCE OF CURRENT EARTH MOVING WORK, BUILDING CONSTRUCTION OR BUILDING ADDITIONS ON THE SURVEYED PROPERTY DURING THE TIME OF THIS SURVEY.
9. THE SURVEYOR WAS NOT INFORMED OF ANY PROPOSED CHANGES IN RIGHT-OF-WAY. TITLE SCHEDULE B-2 EXCEPTION 9 TAKES EXCEPTION TO RIGHTS OF THE PUBLIC TO USE THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN THE RIGHT-OF-WAY OF S 88TH ST. A PORTION OF THE TRAVEL LANE AND SIDEWALK ALONG THE WEST LINE OF PARCEL 3 IS LOCATED EAST OF SAID WEST LINE BY APPROXIMATELY 10 FEET.
10. NO WETLANDS DELINEATION MARKERS WERE OBSERVED WHILE CONDUCTING THE FIELDWORK FOR THIS SURVEY.
11. THE LINEAR UNITS FOR THIS SURVEY ARE U.S. SURVEY FEET.
12. THE SURVEYED PROPERTY IS SUBJECT TO THE TERMS, PROVISIONS, COVENANTS, CONDITIONS, RESTRICTIONS, OBLIGATIONS AND RESERVATIONS CONTAINED IN THE RECORDED DOCUMENTS IN THE TITLE COMMITMENT AS REFERENCED IN NOTE 1.

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATION:

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THIS MAP OR PLAT AND THE SURVEY ON WHICH IT IS BASED WERE MADE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE 2016 MINIMUM STANDARD DETAIL REQUIREMENTS FOR ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEYS, JOINTLY ESTABLISHED AND ADOPTED BY ALTA AND NSPS, AND INCLUDES ITEMS 1, 2, 3, 4, 6(a,b), 8, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, AND 20 OF TABLE A THEREOF. THE FIELD WORK WAS COMPLETED ON FEBRUARY 28, 2019.

DATE OF PLAT OR MAP: 06/19/2019

AARON MURPHY, PLS 38162
FOR AND ON BEHALF OF
HARRIS KOCHER SMITH

COLORADO LICENSED — AARON MURPHY — 38162 — 06/19/2019 — PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR

CLERK & RECORDER'S CERTIFICATE:

STATE OF COLORADO)
ss.
COUNTY OF BOULDER)

THIS INSTRUMENT WAS FILED FOR RECORD IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY CLERK AND RECORDER OF BOULDER COUNTY AT_____ (A.M./P.M.) ON THE _____ DAY OF _____ A.D., 20____ IN BOOK_____, PAGE_____, MAP_____, RECEPTION NO._____

CLERK AND RECORDER

BY_____
DEPUTY CLERK AND RECORDER

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.
CALL 3 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

CHECKED BY: AWM
DRAWN BY: TWG

HKS HARRIS KOCHER SMITH
1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80203
P: 303.623.6300 F: 303.623.6311
HarrisKocherSmith.com

BRUE BAUKOL CAPITAL PARTNERS,
A COLORADO LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

PHILLIPS 66 - LOUISVILLE
COVER

ISSUE DATE: 06/19/2019 | PROJECT #: 190108

DATE	REVISION COMMENTS
3-26-19	GEN REV

SHEET NO.
1
1 OF 9

NO CHANGES ARE TO BE MADE TO THIS DRAWING WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION OF HARRIS KOCHER SMITH

FILENAME: P:\190108\SURVEY\ALTA - NSP\DRAWING LAYOUT - 1 COVER
LAST EDITED ON: 6/19/2019 8:39:39 AM BY: AARON MURPHY

ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEY

SITUATED IN THE NORTHEAST 1/4 AND SOUTH 1/2 OF SECTION 20, THE NORTH 1/2 OF SECTION 29, AND THE NORTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 28, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M.
COUNTIES OF BOULDER AND BROOMFIELD, STATE OF COLORADO.

SCHEDULE B-2 EXCEPTIONS:

X — INDICATES THE EXCEPTION NUMBER WITHIN THE SCHEDULE B-2 OF THE TITLE COMMITMENT REFERENCED IN NOTE 1. (EXCEPTIONS 1–7 ARE STANDARD EXCEPTIONS) (*ITALIC TEXT IS THE SURVEYOR'S PARENTHETICAL NOTE*)

8 — EXISTING LEASES AND TENANCIES, IF ANY.
(*NOT A SURVEY MATTER*)

9 — THE RIGHTS OF THE PUBLIC TO USE THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN THE RIGHT-OF-WAY OF SOUTH 88TH STREET.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 3) (*NO DOCUMENTS WERE PROVIDED FOR THE SURVEYOR TO EXAMINE A PORTION OF THE TRAVEL LANE AND SIDEWALK ALONG THE WEST LINE OF PARCEL 3 IS LOCATED EAST OF SAID WEST LINE BY APPROXIMATELY 10 FEET.*)

10 — ANY RIGHTS OR INTERESTS OF THIRD PARTIES WHICH EXIST OR ARE CLAIMED TO EXIST IN AND OVER THE PRESENT AND PAST BED, BANKS OR WATERS OF THE GOODHUE DITCH.
(*NO DOCUMENTS WERE PROVIDED FOR THE SURVEYOR TO EXAMINE*)

11 — RESERVATIONS AS CONTAINED IN PATENT OF THE UNITED STATES RECORDED SEPTEMBER 15, 1879 IN BOOK R AT PAGE 591.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 3) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 3; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

12 — RIGHT OF PROPRIETOR OF A VEIN OR LODE TO EXTRACT AND REMOVE HIS ORE THEREFROM SHOULD THE SAME BE FOUND TO PENETRATE OR INTERSECT THE PREMISES AS RESERVED IN UNITED STATES PATENT OF RECORD. THE REFERENCED DOCUMENT IS STORED IN OUR SYSTEM AS IMAGE 13038683.
(AFFECTS THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 20) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 9–13; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

13 — RIGHT OF PROPRIETOR OF A VEIN OR LODE TO EXTRACT AND REMOVE HIS ORE THEREFROM SHOULD THE SAME BE FOUND TO PENETRATE OR INTERSECT THE PREMISES AS SET FORTH IN UNITED STATES PATENT RECORDED MARCH 08, 1915, IN BOOK 75 AT PAGE 78.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 4 (SOUTH 1/2 OF SOUTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 20)) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 4; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

14 — RESERVATIONS MADE BY UNION PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY, IN DEED RECORDED MARCH 31, 1891, IN BOOK 138 AT PAGE 368, PROVIDING SUBSTANTIALLY AS FOLLOWS: RESERVING UNTO SAID COMPANY AND ITS ASSIGNS ALL COAL THAT MAY BE FOUND UNDERNEATH THE SURFACE OF LAND HEREIN DESCRIBED AND THE EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO PROSPECT AND MINE FOR SAME, ALSO SUCH RIGHT OF WAY AND OTHER GROUNDS AS MAY APPEAR NECESSARY FOR PROPER WORKING OF ANY COAL MINE THAT MAY BE DEVELOPED UPON SAID PREMISES AND FOR TRANSPORTATION OF COAL FROM SAME, AND ANY ASSIGNMENTS THEREOF OR INTERESTS THEREIN.
DEEDS REGARDING SAID RESERVATION RECORDED APRIL 14, 1971 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 972843 AND NOVEMBER 24, 1998 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 1874271.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 4 (NW 1/4 OF SECTION 29)) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 4; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

15 — RESERVATIONS MADE BY UNION PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY, IN DEED RECORDED JUNE 13, 1892, IN BOOK 157 AT PAGE 416, PROVIDING SUBSTANTIALLY AS FOLLOWS: RESERVING UNTO SAID COMPANY AND ITS ASSIGNS ALL COAL THAT MAY BE FOUND UNDERNEATH THE SURFACE OF LAND HEREIN DESCRIBED AND THE EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO PROSPECT AND MINE FOR SAME, ALSO SUCH RIGHT OF WAY AND OTHER GROUNDS AS MAY APPEAR NECESSARY FOR PROPER WORKING OF ANY COAL MINE THAT MAY BE DEVELOPED UPON SAID PREMISES AND FOR TRANSPORTATION OF COAL FROM SAME, AND ANY ASSIGNMENTS THEREOF OR INTERESTS THEREIN.
DEEDS REGARDING SAID RESERVATION RECORDED APRIL 14, 1971 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 972843 AND NOVEMBER 24, 1998 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 1874271.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 5, 6 AND 7 (EAST 1/2 OF SECTION 29)) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 5–7; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

16 — MINERAL RESERVATION AND APPURTENANCES THERETO AS RESERVED IN DEED RECORDED MARCH 20, 1918 IN BOOK 417 AT PAGE 38.
DEEDS REGARDING MINERAL RIGHTS RECORDED MARCH 2, 2006 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2760197 AND UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2776374.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 3) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 3, 4, & 9–13; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

17 — EASEMENT AS GRANTED TO MOUNTAIN STATES TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED AUGUST 19, 1921 IN BOOK 465 AT PAGE 99.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 8) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 8; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

18 — ALL COAL, OIL, GAS AND OTHER MINERALS AND APPURTENANCES THERETO AS CONVEYED TO THE BIG FOUR COAL AND COKE CO. BY DEED RECORDED FEBRUARY 16, 1923 IN BOOK 490 AT PAGE 505.
DEED REGARDING SAID MINERAL RIGHTS RECORDED AUGUST 10, 1970 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 950846, DEEDS RECORDED MARCH 2, 2006 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2760197 AND UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2776374.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 4 (SOUTH 1/2 OF THE SOUTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 20)) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 3, 4, & 9–13; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

19 — TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN SUBSIDENCE AGREEMENT RECORDED JULY 20, 1936 IN BOOK 636 AT PAGE 537.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 4 (NORTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 29)) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 4; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

20 — ALL MINERALS UPON, IN OR UNDER THE LAND ALSO THE USE OF SUCH SURFACE AS MAY BE NECESSARY FOR EXPLORING FOR AND EXTRACTING AND CARRYING AWAY THE SAME AS RESERVED IN DEED RECORDED JANUARY 26, 1940 IN BOOK 677 AT PAGE 293.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 9 THROUGH 13) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 9–13; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

21 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO, FOR ELECTRIC LINES, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED DECEMBER 29, 1942, IN BOOK 725 AT PAGE 77.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 3) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 3; SHOWN HEREON*)

22 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO, FOR ELECTRIC LINES, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED DECEMBER 29, 1942, IN BOOK 725 AT PAGE 75.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 4 (NORTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 29)) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 4; SHOWN HEREON*)

23 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO, FOR ELECTRIC LINES, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED DECEMBER 29, 1942, IN BOOK 725 AT PAGE 76.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 4 (SOUTH 1/2 OF SOUTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 20)) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 4; SHOWN HEREON*)

24 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO, FOR ELECTRIC LINES, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED DECEMBER 08, 1950, IN BOOK 878 AT PAGE 568.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 5 AND 6) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 5–6; SHOWN HEREON*)

25 — EACH AND EVERY RIGHT OR RIGHTS OF ACCESS TO AND FROM THE ADJACENT STATE HIGHWAY AS CONVEYED BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED JANUARY 5, 1951 IN BOOK 880 AT PAGE 99 (SOUTH 1/2 OF SOUTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 20), DECEMBER 5, 1950 IN BOOK 878 AT PAGE 508 (NW 1/4 OF SECTION 29) AND JANUARY 4, 1951 IN BOOK 880 AT PAGE 50 (NE 1/4 OF SECTION 29).
(AFFECTS PARCELS 4, 5 AND 6) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 4–6; SHOWN HEREON*)

26 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO THE MOUNTAIN STATES TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY, FOR COMMUNICATION SYSTEM, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED FEBRUARY 19, 1954, IN BOOK 945 AT PAGE 529.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 4 (SOUTHWEST 1/4 OF SOUTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 20)) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 4; EASEMENT IS NOT DESCRIBED AND NO UNDERGROUND TELEPHONE LINE MARKERS WERE FOUND IN THIS AREA–NOTHING PLOTTED*)

27 — ALL OIL AND GAS AS RESERVED IN DEED RECORDED JUNE 16, 1971 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 979459, AND ANY AND ALL ASSIGNMENTS THEREOF OR INTERESTS THEREIN.
(AFFECTS THE SOUTH HALF OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 20.) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 9–13; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

28 — TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN CERTIFICATION RECORDED DECEMBER 04, 1972 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 045852.
(AFFECTS THE SOUTH HALF OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 20.) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 9–13; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

29 — RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS, WHICH DO NOT CONTAIN A FORFEITURE OR REVERTER CLAUSE, BUT OMITTING ANY COVENANTS OR RESTRICTIONS, IF ANY, BASED UPON RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, SEX, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, FAMILIAL STATUS, MARITAL STATUS, DISABILITY, HANDICAP, NATIONAL ORIGIN, ANCESTRY, OR SOURCE OF INCOME, AS SET FORTH IN APPLICABLE STATE OR FEDERAL LAWS, EXCEPT TO THE EXTENT THAT SAID COVENANT OR RESTRICTION IS PERMITTED BY APPLICABLE LAW AS CONTAINED IN INSTRUMENT RECORDED DECEMBER 04, 1972, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 045853.
(AFFECTS THE SOUTH HALF OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 20.) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 9–13; SHOWN HEREON*)

30 — PIPE LINE RIGHT OF WAY AS GRANTED TO INDUSTRIAL GAS SERVICES, INC. BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED JUNE 28, 1973 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 71507.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 8) (*THE LOCATION OF THE EASEMENT IN SECTION 28 IS NOT DESCRIBED; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

31 — RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS, WHICH DO NOT CONTAIN A FORFEITURE OR REVERTER CLAUSE, BUT OMITTING ANY COVENANTS OR RESTRICTIONS, IF ANY, BASED UPON RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, SEX, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, FAMILIAL STATUS, MARITAL STATUS, DISABILITY, HANDICAP, NATIONAL ORIGIN, ANCESTRY, OR SOURCE OF INCOME, AS SET FORTH IN APPLICABLE STATE OR FEDERAL LAWS, EXCEPT TO THE EXTENT THAT SAID COVENANT OR RESTRICTION IS PERMITTED BY APPLICABLE LAW AS CONTAINED IN INSTRUMENT RECORDED AUGUST 05, 1973, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 076913
(AFFECTS PARCEL 13) (*BLANKET OVER EAST 1/2 OF PARCEL 13; NOTHING PLOTTED*)

32 — RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS, WHICH DO NOT CONTAIN A FORFEITURE OR REVERTER CLAUSE, BUT OMITTING ANY COVENANTS OR RESTRICTIONS, IF ANY, BASED UPON RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, SEX, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, FAMILIAL STATUS, MARITAL STATUS, DISABILITY, HANDICAP, NATIONAL ORIGIN, ANCESTRY, OR SOURCE OF INCOME, AS SET FORTH IN APPLICABLE STATE OR FEDERAL LAWS, EXCEPT TO THE EXTENT THAT SAID COVENANT OR RESTRICTION IS PERMITTED BY APPLICABLE LAW AS CONTAINED IN INSTRUMENT RECORDED NOVEMBER 30, 1973, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 087739.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 12) (*BLANKET OVER WEST 1/2 OF PARCEL 12; NOTHING PLOTTED*)

33 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO THE MOUNTAIN STATES TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY, FOR A TEN FOOT WIDE EASEMENT, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED JANUARY 28, 1974, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 092392.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 9 THROUGH 13) (*DITCH CROSSING EASEMENT APPEARS TO BE WITHIN PARADISE DRIVE RIGHT-OF-WAY; NOTHING PLOTTED*)

34 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO THE MOUNTAIN STATES TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY, FOR COMMUNICATION FACILITIES, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED MARCH 09, 1976, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 169083.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 3) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 3; SHOWN HEREON*)

35 — COAL, OIL, GAS AND OTHER MINERALS AS EXCEPTED IN DEED RECORDED NOVEMBER 4, 1977 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 250219.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 2) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 2; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

36 — THE RIGHT OF USE AND AGREEMENT TO MAINTAIN THE COMMUNITY DITCH LATERAL AND WATER THEREIN AND THE USE OF THE COLLECTION RESERVOIR LOCATED ON SAID LAND, AS RESERVED BY FRANK VARRA AND AUDREY A. VARRA IN DEED RECORDED MAY 3, 1978 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 277202. QUIT CLAIM DEED IN CONJUNCTION THEREWITH RECORDED DECEMBER 21, 2009 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3048886.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 5 AND 7) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 5 & 7; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

37 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO, FOR UTILITY LINES, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED JULY 25, 1978, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 290792.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 2, 4 AND OUTLOT "A" OF PARCEL 7) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 2, 4, & 7; SHOWN HEREON*)

38 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO, FOR UTILITY LINES, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED NOVEMBER 21, 1978, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 310494.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 2 AND OUTLOT "A" OF PARCEL 7) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 2 & 7; SHOWN HEREON*)

39 — TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN STORAGE TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION FINAL P.U.D. PLAN RECORDED MARCH 07, 1979 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 326239 AND MODIFICATIONS THERETO RECORDED JUNE 25, 1987 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 859105, DECEMBER 6, 1989 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 1016931, SEPTEMBER 6, 1991 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 1128574, SEPTEMBER 23, 1992 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 1222450, OCTOBER 12, 1993 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 1347513 AND APRIL 1, 1997 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 1687692.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 2, 4, 5 AND 7) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 2, 4, 5, & 7; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

40 — OIL AND GAS LEASE BETWEEN PASQUALE VARRA AND JACQUELINE VARRA AND MARTIN EXPLORATION MANAGEMENT CORP., RECORDED MARCH 19, 1981 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 438394 AND ANY AND ALL ASSIGNMENTS THEREOF, OR INTEREST THEREIN.
AFFIDAVITS OF LEASE EXTENSION OR PRODUCTION RECORDED APRIL 6, 1984 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 613501 AND JULY 27, 1995 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 01533706.
NON-DISTURBANCE AGREEMENTS RECORDED AUGUST 1, 1994 UNDER RECEPTION NUMBERS 01451086 AND 01451087.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 1, 2 AND OUTLOT "A" OF PARCEL 7) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 1, 2, & 5–7; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

41 — OIL AND GAS LEASE BETWEEN FRANK VARRA AND AUDREY A. VARRA AND MARTIN EXPLORATION MANAGEMENT CORP., RECORDED MARCH 19, 1981 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 438395 AND ANY AND ALL ASSIGNMENTS THEREOF, OR INTEREST THEREIN.
CORRECTION OF DESCRIPTION IN LEASE RECORDED MARCH 30, 1981 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 439900.
AFFIDAVITS OF LEASE EXTENSION OR PRODUCTION RECORDED APRIL 6, 1984 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 613505 AND JULY 25, 1995 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 01533706.
RATIFICATION OF OIL AND GAS LEASE RECORDED JULY 27, 1987 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 00866388.
AMENDMENT OF LEASE RECORDED AUGUST 12, 1992 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 01210715.
NON-DISTURBANCE AGREEMENT REGARDING SAID LEASE RECORDED APRIL 24, 1996 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 01601991.
MINERAL, OIL AND GAS ROYALTY DEED RECORDED APRIL 24, 1996 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 01601992. AND RECORDED JUNE 17, 2014 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2014005215, (BROOMFIELD COUNTY RECORDS)
(AFFECTS PARCELS 5, 6, 7 AND 8) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 1, 2, & 5–8; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

42 — TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN ZONING ORDINANCE RECORDED NOVEMBER 19, 1981 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 473304.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 3) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 3; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

43 — TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN ANNEXATION AGREEMENT RECORDED NOVEMBER 19, 1981 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 473305.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 3) (*THE PROVIDED DOCUMENT DOES NOT CONTAIN THE DESCRIPTION EXHIBITS; NOTHING PLOTTED*)

44 — AN EASEMENT FOR AN ACCESS ROAD 25 FEET IN WIDTH FROM CENTRAL AVENUE AS GRANTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO IN DEED RECORDED FEBRUARY 3, 1983 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 531604.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 5 AND 7) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 5 & 7; ACCESS EASEMENT NOT DESCRIBED, POSSIBLE LOCATION SHOWN HEREON*)

45 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO, FOR ELECTRIC FACILITIES AND COMMUNICATION SIGNALS, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED FEBRUARY 03, 1983, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 531605.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 5) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 5; SHOWN HEREON*)

46 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO, FOR UTILITY LINES, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED FEBRUARY 03, 1983, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 531606.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 5) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 5; SHOWN HEREON*)

47 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO, FOR UTILITY LINES, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED FEBRUARY 03, 1983, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 531607.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 5 AND 7) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 5 & 7; SHOWN HEREON*)

48 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO, FOR UTILITY LINES, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED FEBRUARY 03, 1983, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 531608 AND CORRECTION THERETO RECORDED APRIL 14, 1983 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 543534 AND RE-RECORDED MAY 2, 1983 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 546982.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 5 AND 7) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 5 & 7; SHOWN HEREON*)

49 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO AND THE MOUNTAIN STATES TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY, FOR UTILITY LINES, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED JULY 06, 1984, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 632261 AND RE-RECORDED AUGUST 10, 1984 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 00639459.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 5 AND 7) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 5 & 7; SHOWN HEREON*)

50 — OIL AND GAS LEASE BETWEEN WILLIAM H. PELTIER AND HELEN C. PELTIER, LESSOR, AND MARTIN EXPLORATION MANAGEMENT CORPORATION, LESSEE, RECORDED OCTOBER 02, 1984 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 00649918, AND ANY AND ALL ASSIGNMENTS THEREOF OR INTERESTS THEREIN.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 9 THROUGH 13) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 3, 4, & 9–13; PORTION EXCEPTED FROM THE SW 1/4 OF SECTION 20 IS SHOWN HEREON*)

51 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO, FOR UTILITY LINES, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED FEBRUARY 05, 1985, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 00670537.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 2 AND 7) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 2, 5, & 7; SHOWN HEREON*)

52 — EASEMENTS, CONDITIONS, COVENANTS, RESTRICTIONS, RESERVATIONS AND NOTES ON THE PLAT OF STORAGETEK BUILDING SIX SUBDIVISION RECORDED OCTOBER 3, 1985 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 717095.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 7) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 7; SHOWN HEREON*)

53 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO, FOR UTILITY LINES, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED AUGUST 30, 1989, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 01000400.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 2) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 2; SHOWN HEREON*)

54 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO, FOR UTILITY LINES, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED SEPTEMBER 27, 1989, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 01005287.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 2, 4 AND 5) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 2 & 4; SHOWN HEREON*)

55 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO, FOR UTILITY LINES, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED NOVEMBER 21, 1989, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 01014582.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 2 AND OUTLOT "A" OF PARCEL 7) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 2 & 7; NOTHING HEREON*)

56 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO, FOR UTILITY LINES, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED NOVEMBER 05, 1991, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 01140584.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 4 AND 5) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 5; SHOWN HEREON*)

57 — TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN WATER SERVICE AND ANNEXATION AGREEMENT RECORDED APRIL 20, 1992 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 1177287.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 13) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 13; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

58 — MATTERS SET FORTH IN ADDENDUM TO WARRANTY DEED RECORDED NOVEMBER 18, 1994 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 01479704.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 1) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 1; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

59 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO NORTHERN COLORADO WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, FOR WATER PIPELINES, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED DECEMBER 04, 1995, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 01566644.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 3) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 3; SHOWN HEREON*)

60 — TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN SUBDIVISION AGREEMENT RECORDED FEBRUARY 24, 1998 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 1774601.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 7) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 7; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

61 — TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT RECORDED MARCH 15, 1999 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 1916399.
(AFFECTS ALL PARCELS) (*APPEARS TO AFFECT PARCELS 1, 2, & 5–13; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

62 — EASEMENT GRANTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO, FOR UTILITY LINES, AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED JUNE 15, 1999, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 1949887.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 6) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 6; SHOWN HEREON*)

63 — CERTIFICATE OF ORGANIZATION FOR THE NORTHWEST PARKWAY PUBLIC HIGHWAY AUTHORITY RECORDED JUNE 30, 1999 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 1955530 AND RE-RECORDED NOVEMBER 19, 1999 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2000703.
(AFFECTS ALL PARCELS) (*AFFECTS ALL PARCELS; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

64 — TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN STORAGETEK DEVELOPMENT PLAN RECORDED AUGUST 02, 1999 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 1966957.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 2) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 2; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

65 — ANY TAX, LIEN, FEE, OR ASSESSMENT BY REASON OF INCLUSION OF SUBJECT PROPERTY IN THE NORTH METRO FIRE RESCUE DISTRICT, AS EVIDENCED BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED MARCH 27, 2001, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2131725 (BOULDER COUNTY RECORDS) AND OCTOBER 24, 2002 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2002015918 (BROOMFIELD COUNTY RECORDS).
(AFFECTS PARCELS 6 AND 8) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 6 & 8; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

66 — REQUEST FOR NOTIFICATION OF SURFACE DEVELOPMENT RECORDED MAY 17, 2002 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2288487.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 6 (W2 OF SE4 OF SECTION 29)) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 6; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

67 — EACH AND EVERY RIGHT OR RIGHTS OF ACCESS TO AND FROM PORTIONS OF THE NORTHWEST PARKWAY AS CONVEYED BY ACCESS DEED RECORDED JULY 19, 2002 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2309733.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 2, 5 AND OUTLOT "A" OF PARCEL 7) (*AFFECTS PARCELS 2, 5, & 7; SHOWN HEREON*)

68 — TERMS, CONDITIONS AND PROVISIONS OF MULTI-USE EASEMENT AGREEMENT RECORDED JANUARY 22, 2003 AT RECEPTION NO. 2386687.
(AFFECTS PART OF THE SOUTH 1/2 OF THE SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 20) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 2; SHOWN HEREON*)

69 — ANY TAX, LIEN, FEE, OR ASSESSMENT BY REASON OF INCLUSION OF SUBJECT PROPERTY IN THE NORTHERN COLORADO WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, AS EVIDENCED BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED FEBRUARY 12, 1997, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 1676839.
(*CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

70 — ANY TAX, LIEN, FEE, OR ASSESSMENT BY REASON OF INCLUSION OF SUBJECT PROPERTY IN THE MUNICIPAL SUBDISTRICT OF THE NORTHERN COLORADO WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, AS EVIDENCED BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED FEBRUARY 12, 1997, UNDER RECEPTION NO. 1676840.
(*AFFECTS PARCELS 1–5, & 7; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

71 — RESERVATIONS OF ALL COAL, OIL AND OTHER MINERALS AND THE RIGHT TO ENTER UPON AND PROSPECT FOR SAID SUBSTANCES AND OTHER TERMS AND RESTRICTIONS AS RESERVED AND SET FORTH IN DEED RECORDED APRIL 9, 1947 IN BOOK 797 AT PAGE 504.
QUIT CLAIM DEED IN CONNECTION THEREWITH WAS RECORDED OCTOBER 27, 1953 IN BOOK 939 AT PAGE 221.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 8) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 8; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

72 — TERMS, CONDITIONS AND PROVISIONS OF THAT UNRECORDED GRANT OF EASEMENT AND AGREEMENT DATED MAY 9, 1996 BY AND BETWEEN STORAGE TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION AND BOULDER VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. RE-2, A COLORADO SCHOOL DISTRICT.
(A COPY OF SAID DOCUMENT IS STORED AS OUR ESI 34258537)
(AFFECTS SW 1/4 OF SECTION 20) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 3; SHOWN HEREON*)

73 — TERMS, CONDITIONS AND PROVISIONS OF THE FOLLOWING UNRECORDED LEASES:
A. LEASE WITH SPRINT SPECTRUM L.P. DATED JANUARY 31, 2001.
B. LEASE WITH AM QUARTER HORSE & CATTLE CO. DATED NOVEMBER 29, 2004.
(*LEASE DOCUMENTS NOT PROVIDED FOR EXAMINATION*)

74 — REQUEST FOR NOTIFICATION OF SURFACE DEVELOPMENT AS EVIDENCED BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED OCTOBER 15, 2007 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2007013291. (BROOMFIELD COUNTYRECORDS)
(AFFECTS PARCEL 6). (*AFFECTS PARCELS 5–7; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

75 — REQUEST FOR NOTIFICATION OF SURFACE DEVELOPMENT AS EVIDENCED BY INSTRUMENT RECORDED OCTOBER 23, 2007 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2890878.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 1 AND 2, AND PARCELS 5 AND 7). (*AFFECTS PARCELS 1, 2, & 5–7; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

76 — TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY AGREEMENT RECORDED DECEMBER 21, 2009 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3048887.
(AFFECTS THAT PART OF PARCEL 4 LYING IN THE NORTH 1/2 OF THE NW1/4 OF SECTION 29; AND THE SOUTH 1/2 OF THE NE1/4 OF SECTION 29). (*AFFECTS PARCELS 4 & 6; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

77 — TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS, OBLIGATIONS AND EASEMENTS AS SET FORTH AND GRANTED IN RIGHT OF WAY AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN CONOCOPHILLIPS COMPANY AND AUDREY A. VARRA AND THE ESTATE OF FRANK VARRA FOR WATER PIPELINE RECORDED DECEMBER 21, 2009 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3048888.
(*AFFECTS PARCELS 4 & 5; SHOWN HEREON*)

78 — TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY AGREEMENT RECORDED JANUARY 07, 2010 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3051786.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 2 AND 3). (*AFFECTS PARCELS 3, 4, & 9–13; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

NO CHANGES ARE TO BE MADE TO THIS DRAWING WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION OF HARRIS KOCHER SMITH

811 Know what's below.

ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEY

SITUATED IN THE NORTHEAST 1/4 AND SOUTH 1/2 OF SECTION 20, THE NORTH 1/2 OF SECTION 29, AND THE NORTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 28, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M.
COUNTIES OF BOULDER AND BROOMFIELD, STATE OF COLORADO.

SCHEDULE B-2 EXCEPTIONS:

79 MINERAL DEED RECORDED MARCH 9, 2010 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3062656. AND RECORDED MAY 21, 2012 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3224022.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 2) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 2; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

80 EASEMENTS, CONDITIONS, COVENANTS, RESTRICTIONS, RESERVATIONS AND NOTES ON THE MAP OF CONOCOPHILLIPS CAMPUS GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN RECORDED JULY 20, 2010 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3088779.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 1 THROUGH 5 AND 7). (*AFFECTS PARCELS 1–5 & 7; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

81 TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN MEMORANDUM OF NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY AGREEMENT RECORDED AUGUST 27, 2010 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3094682.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 1 THROUGH 8). (*AFFECTS PARCELS 1–8; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

82 TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN MEMORANDUM OF NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY AGREEMENT RECORDED OCTOBER 12, 2010 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3104762.
(AFFECTS PART OF PARCEL 4 IN THE NORTH 1/2 OF THE NW1/4 SECTION 29). (*AFFECTS PARCEL 4; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

83 TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN MEMORANDUM OF NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY AGREEMENT RECORDED OCTOBER 12, 2010 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3104763.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 1 AND 2). (*AFFECTS PARCELS 1 & 2; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

84 TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN ORDINANCE NO. 1568 SERIES 2010 APPROVING AN ANNEXATION KNOWN AS THE CONOCOPHILLIPS ANNEXATION TO THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE RECORDED JANUARY 25, 2013 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3284512.
ANNEXATION MAP NO. 1 RECORDED JANUARY 25, 2013 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3284513.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 1). (*AFFECTS PARCEL 1; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

85 TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN ANNEXATION AGREEMENT RECORDED JANUARY 25, 2013 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3284514.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 1). (*AFFECTS PARCEL 1; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

86 TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN ORDINANCE NO. 1569 SERIES 2010 APPROVING PLANNED COMMUNITY ZONE DISTRICT – COMMERCIAL (PCZD–C ZONING AND GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR PARCEL KNOWN AS THE CONOCOPHILLIPS CAMPUS RECORDED JANUARY 25, 2013 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3284515.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 1 THROUGH 5 AND 7). (*AFFECTS PARCELS 1–5 & 7; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

87 TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN PLANNED COMMUNITY ZONE DISTRICT ZONING AGREEMENT CONOCOPHILLIPS COLORADO CAMPUS GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN RECORDED JANUARY 25, 2013 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3284516.
(AFFECTS PARCELS 1 THROUGH 5 AND 7). (*AFFECTS PARCELS 1–5 & 7; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

88 TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS, OBLIGATIONS AND EASEMENTS AS SET FORTH AND GRANTED IN RESTRICTIVE DRY–UP COVENANT; WARRANTY OF FIRST RIGHT TO DRY–UP CREDIT AND AGREEMENT TO ASSIST BY AND BETWEEN CONOCOPHILLIPS COMPANY AND THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE RECORDED JANUARY 25, 2013 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3284518.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 1). (*AFFECTS PARCEL 1; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

89 TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS, OBLIGATIONS AND EASEMENTS AS SET FORTH AND GRANTED IN SLOPE EASEMENT GRANTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, STATE OF COLORADO RECORDED NOVEMBER 06, 2014 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2014010828.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 6). (*AFFECTS PARCEL 6; SHOWN HEREON*)

90 TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN WELLBORE FARMOUT AGREEMENT RECORDED OCTOBER 27, 2015 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3481913 (BOULDER COUNTY RECORDS AND OCTOBER 27, 2015 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2015013716 (BROOMFIELD COUNTY RECORDS)
(AFFECTS PARCELS 1 THROUGH 5 AND 7). (*AFFECTS PARCELS 1–5, 7, & 9–13; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

91 TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN REQUEST FOR NOTIFICATION OF APPLICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT RECORDED JULY 12, 2016 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 3529919.
(AFFECTS ALL PARCELS). (*AFFECTS ALL PARCELS; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

92 TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN MEMORANDUM OF DEDICATION RECORDED JUNE 20, 2018 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 03661692 (BOULDER COUNTY RECORDS), AND RECORDED JUNE 28, 2018 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2018006671 (BROOMFIELD COUNTY RECORDS).
(AFFECTS ALL PARCELS) (*AFFECTS ALL PARCELS; CANNOT BE PLOTTED*)

93 TERMS, CONDITIONS, PROVISIONS, BURDENS AND OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN EASEMENT DEED RECORDED JANUARY 25, 2006 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2752769.
(AFFECTS PARCEL 9) (*AFFECTS PARCEL 9; SHOWN HEREON*)

KEY MAP



811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.
CALL 3 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

CHECKED BY: AWM
DRAWN BY: TWG

HARRIS KOCHER SMITH
1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80203
P: 303.623.6300 F: 303.623.6311
HarrisKocherSmith.com

BRUE BAUKOL CAPITAL PARTNERS,
A COLORADO LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

PHILLIPS 66 - LOUISVILLE
SCHEDULE B-2 EXCEPTIONS/KEYMAP

ISSUE DATE: 06/19/2019	PROJECT #: 190108
DATE	REVISION COMMENTS
5-20-19	DEN REV

COLORADO LICENSED 38162 06/19/2019 LAND SURVEYOR

SHEET NO. 3

3 OF 9

NO CHANGES ARE TO BE MADE TO THIS DRAWING WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION OF HARRIS KOCHER SMITH

ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEY

SITUATED IN THE NORTHEAST 1/4 AND SOUTH 1/2 OF SECTION 20, THE NORTH 1/2 OF SECTION 29, AND THE NORTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 28, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M.
COUNTIES OF BOULDER AND BROOMFIELD, STATE OF COLORADO.



811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.
CALL 3 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

SCALE: 1" = 100'

CHECKED BY: AWM
DRAWN BY: TWG

HARRIS KOCHER SMITH
1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80203
P: 303.623.6300 F: 303.623.6311
HarrisKocherSmith.com

BRUE BAUKOL CAPITAL PARTNERS, A COLORADO LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

PHILLIPS 66 - LOUISVILLE
SITE

ISSUE DATE: 06/19/2019	PROJECT #: 190108
DATE	REVISION COMMENTS
3-26-19	DEN REV

COLORADO LICENSED PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR 38162 06/19/2019

SHEET NO. 4

4 OF 9

NO CHANGES ARE TO BE MADE TO THIS DRAWING WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION OF HARRIS KOCHER SMITH

FILENAME: P:\190108\SURVEY\ALTA-1 BRUBAKOL LAYOUT - 4.SHTE
LAST SAVED: 6/19/2019 8:51:58 AM BY: PATRICK.MCDONOUGH

138

ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEY

SITUATED IN THE NORTHEAST 1/4 AND SOUTH 1/2 OF SECTION 20, THE NORTH 1/2 OF SECTION 29, AND THE NORTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 28, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M.
COUNTIES OF BOULDER AND BROOMFIELD, STATE OF COLORADO.



811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.
CALL 3 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

SCALE: 1" = 100'

CHECKED BY: AWM
DRAWN BY: TWG

HARRIS KOCHER SMITH
1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80203
P: 303.623.6300 F: 303.623.6311
HarrisKocherSmith.com

BRUE BAUKOL CAPITAL PARTNERS,
A COLORADO LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

PHILLIPS 66 - LOUISVILLE
SITE

ISSUE DATE: 06/19/2019	PROJECT #: 190108
DATE	REVISION COMMENTS
5-28-19	GEN REV

COLORADO LICENSED 38162 06/19/2019 LAND SURVEYOR

SHEET NO.
5
5 OF 9

NO CHANGES ARE TO BE MADE TO THIS DRAWING WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION OF HARRIS KOCHER SMITH

ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEY

SITUATED IN THE NORTHEAST 1/4 AND SOUTH 1/2 OF SECTION 20, THE NORTH 1/2 OF SECTION 29, AND THE NORTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 28, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M.
COUNTIES OF BOULDER AND BROOMFIELD, STATE OF COLORADO.

SEE NOTE #6 SHEET 1
APPROXIMATE LIMITS OF SHADED ZONE X
APPROXIMATE LIMITS OF SFHA ZONE AE

LINE TABLE			LINE TABLE		
LINE	BEARING	LENGTH	LINE	BEARING	LENGTH
L1	S00°00'35"W	30.02'	L4	N89°59'25"W	55.00'
L2	S44°51'26"E	35.44'	L5	S00°00'35"W	50.00'
L3	S00°00'35"W	127.21'	L6	S89°59'25"E	55.00'



811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.
CALL 3 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

SCALE: 1" = 100'
CHECKED BY: AWM
DRAWN BY: TWG

HARRIS KOCHER SMITH
1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80203
P: 303.623.6300 F: 303.623.6311
HarrisKocherSmith.com

BRUE BAUKOL CAPITAL PARTNERS, A COLORADO LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

PHILLIPS 66 - LOUISVILLE
SITE

ISSUE DATE: 06/19/2019
PROJECT #: 190108

DATE	REVISION COMMENTS
3-26-19	GEN REV

COLORADO PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR 38162 06/19/2019

SHEET NO. 6

ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEY

SITUATED IN THE NORTHEAST 1/4 AND SOUTH 1/2 OF SECTION 20, THE NORTH 1/2 OF SECTION 29, AND THE NORTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 28, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M.
COUNTIES OF BOULDER AND BROOMFIELD, STATE OF COLORADO.



Know what's below. Call before you dig.

CALL 3 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

100 0 100 200
SCALE: 1" = 100'

CHECKED BY: AWM
DRAWN BY: TWG

HARRIS KOCHER SMITH
1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80203
P: 303.623.6300 F: 303.623.6311
HarrisKocherSmith.com

BRUE BAUKOL CAPITAL PARTNERS,
A COLORADO LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

PHILLIPS 66 - LOUISVILLE
SITE

ISSUE DATE: 06/19/2019	PROJECT #: 190108
DATE	REVISION COMMENTS
5-20-19	GEN REV

COLORADO LICENSED
38162
06/19/2019
PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR

SHEET NO.
7
7 OF 9

NO CHANGES ARE TO BE MADE TO THIS DRAWING WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION OF HARRIS KOCHER SMITH

ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEY

SITUATED IN THE NORTHEAST 1/4 AND SOUTH 1/2 OF SECTION 20, THE NORTH 1/2 OF SECTION 29, AND THE NORTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 28, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M.
COUNTIES OF BOULDER AND BROOMFIELD, STATE OF COLORADO.



Know what's below. Call before you dig.
CALL 3 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

100 0 100 200
SCALE: 1" = 100'

CHECKED BY: AWM
DRAWN BY: TWG

HARRIS KOCHER SMITH
1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80203
P: 303.623.6300 F: 303.623.6311
HarrisKocherSmith.com

BRUE BAUKOL CAPITAL PARTNERS, A COLORADO LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

PHILLIPS 66 - LOUISVILLE
SITE

ISSUE DATE: 06/19/2019	PROJECT #: 190108
DATE	REVISION COMMENTS
5-20-19	GEN REV

COLORADO 38162 06/19/2019

SHEET NO.
8
8 OF 9

142

ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEY

SITUATED IN THE NORTHEAST 1/4 AND SOUTH 1/2 OF SECTION 20, THE NORTH 1/2 OF SECTION 29, AND THE NORTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 28, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M.
COUNTIES OF BOULDER AND BROOMFIELD, STATE OF COLORADO.



811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.
CALL 3 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

SCALE: 1" = 100'

CHECKED BY: AWM
DRAWN BY: TWG

HARRIS KOCHER SMITH
1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80203
P: 303.623.6300 F: 303.623.6311
HarrisKocherSmith.com

BRUE BAUKOL CAPITAL PARTNERS, A COLORADO LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

PHILLIPS 66 - LOUISVILLE
SITE/LEGEND

ISSUE DATE: 06/19/2019
PROJECT #: 190108

DATE	REVISION COMMENTS
5-20-19	DEN REV

COLORADO LICENSED 38162 06/19/2019 LAND SURVEYOR

SHEET NO.
9
9 OF 9

143

ERO Resources Corp.

April 23, 2021

To: Jordan Swisher, Brue Baukol Capital Partners (Brue Baukol)

From: Heidi Gerstung and Julia Snieder, ERO Resources Corporation (ERO)

RE: Redtail Ridge – 2021 Wildlife Use Assessment

Brue Baukol is planning the proposed Redtail Ridge development in Boulder and Broomfield Counties, Colorado (Figure 1; project area). As part of planning for the project, Brue Baukol requested that ERO complete a survey for wildlife use in the project area (Figures 2a through 2d). ERO conducted a wildlife use transect survey on April 2, 2021 (2021 survey). During the 2021 survey, ERO walked transects throughout the project area to identify tracks, scat, and other signs of wildlife use in the project area including searching for potential den sites. Additionally, ERO conducted a follow-up site visit on April 18, 2021 to make additional notes on wildlife use in the area. The wildlife tracks and signs found during the 2021 survey and follow-up site visit are shown on Figures 2a through 2d and are described in more detail below.

Methods

ERO conducted a pedestrian survey during the 2021 survey along transects spaced 50 meters apart and oriented from east to west across the project area. Three to four biologists walked parallel transect lines, maintaining constant communications and veering off the transect center line as needed. ERO recorded wildlife tracks, scat, and signs such as hair or bones on an aerial map. The 2021 survey was conducted several days after a snowstorm to ensure that the ground was wet enough to show tracks and to ensure that enough time had passed for wildlife in the project area to leave tracks. When tracks and signs were found, ERO identified the species and documented the location of the observations on aerial maps (Figures 2a through 2d). Representative photos of the project area are in the attached Photo Log, and photo points are shown on Figures 2a through 2d.

Survey Results

Coyote

Species Background

In Colorado, coyotes (*Canis latrans*) are classified as a game species (Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) 2021a). Landowners may kill coyotes on their land if coyotes threaten their

Denver
1842 Clarkson St.
Denver, CO 80218
303.830.1188

Durango
1015 ½ Main Avenue
Durango, CO 81301
970.422.2136

Hotchkiss
P.O. Box 932
161 South 2nd St.
Hotchkiss, CO 81419
970.872.3020

Idaho
4001 East Main Street
Emmett, ID 83617
208.365.7684

property or livestock. While coyotes have adapted to survive in human-disturbed environments, coyotes in urban environments will choose to spend their time in natural or seminatural habitat patches within their home ranges and avoid the most developed areas (Poessel et al. 2016). Litters of four to seven young are born from March to May and raised by both parents in dens (NatureServe 2021a). Dens are located in enlarged burrows of other mammals or burrows dug by the female, with the opening often oriented toward the south. Dens may also be aboveground, in places such as at the base of a tree under low overhanging branches, in hollow logs, in rock crevices, or under buildings (Hallett et al. 1985). In urban areas, coyotes will use culverts as den sites (Grubbs and Krausman 2009).

Potential Habitat and Effects

During the 2021 survey, ERO recorded numerous sets of coyote tracks and scat in the project area (Photos 1 through 3; Figures 2a through 2d). Tracks were concentrated along berms and at the tops of ditches where coyotes were better able to see their surroundings. ERO also found several livestock carcasses in the project area that were being scavenged by ravens and were surrounded by coyote tracks (Photo 4; Figures 2a through 2c). These cattle carcasses provide foraging opportunities for scavengers such as coyotes and birds of prey.

During the 2021 survey, ERO also sighted a single coyote three separate times (Figures 2a through 2d). The coyote observed by ERO appeared to be in ill health and exhibited extensive signs of mange, which led ERO to believe it was the same coyote sighted multiple times. Healthy coyotes are active at dawn and dusk, but coyotes infected by sarcoptic mange are more likely to be active during the day and show less fear of humans; this may explain why ERO observed the coyote numerous times during the 2021 survey. Some research suggests that coyotes with mange are more likely to consume food from anthropogenic sources and have higher instances of conflict with humans (Murray et al. 2015). The coyote was spotted twice on the prairie dog colony in the southern portion of the project area and may have been hunting prairie dogs before it was disturbed by surveyors.

While on-site, Harris Kocher Smith (HKS) personnel mentioned to ERO they had observed a pair of coyotes in the project area and believed a den site may be located on the property (HKS, pers. comm 2021). ERO did not find a den site during the 2021 survey.

Red Fox

Species Background

Red foxes (*Vulpes vulpes*) are common in Colorado, especially in open woodlands, pasturelands, riparian areas, and agricultural lands. Red foxes adapt well to urban areas and are often found on the margins of urbanized areas (CPW 2021b). Offspring in litters of 1 to 10 are born in April to May and disperse in the fall (NatureServe 2021b). Fox dens are

located in burrows, under logs, under buildings, or in culverts and are often found on steep south-facing slopes (Goldyn et al. 2003).

Potential Habitat and Effects

The project area provides potential habitat for the red fox, but no tracks or signs of red foxes were observed during the 2021 survey. During burrowing owl surveys previously conducted in 2020 in the project area, ERO observed a few young red fox cubs and an adult red fox taking cover in a culvert in the central portion of the project area along Disk Drive (Figure 2a). ERO examined all culverts in the project area during the 2021 survey and did not find signs of foxes, any fox dens, or signs of denning in these locations. The red foxes seen in 2020 may have experienced mortality due to mange, were killed by other predators, or may have been displaced by coyotes.

Raccoon

Species Background

Raccoons (*Procyon lotor*) thrive in urban areas and can become a nuisance species if anthropogenic food sources are available. Historically, raccoons were only found along riparian corridors on the eastern plains but have now expanded their range into areas with permanent human settlement, irrigated agriculture, and shelterbelts (CPW 2021c).

Potential Habitat and Effects

During the 2021 survey, ERO found raccoon tracks in the mud surrounding standing water on the western edge of the project area near a culvert (Figure 2a). Other water sources in the project area, such as the ponds and the stream in the southeast corner, provide additional suitable habitat for raccoons.

Prairie Dog

Species Background

ERO submitted a prairie dog management plan to Brue Baukol in January 2021 with detailed information on prairie dog species information and recommendations on managing prairie dogs in the project area (ERO 2021a).

Potential Habitat and Effects

During the 2021 survey, the aboveground prairie dog activity in the project area was extremely limited when compared to the amount of activity observed during the 2020 burrowing owl surveys. While some females may have been below ground tending to pups during the 2021 survey, it is also possible that the prairie dog colonies experienced a plague event between May 2020 and April 2021; this would explain the vastly reduced numbers of

prairie dogs observed in the project area during the 2021 survey. Plague events can reduce juvenile abundance by 96 percent and adult abundance by 95 percent (Pauli et al. 2006).

Other Wildlife

The project area is within the CPW-mapped overall range of black bear, mule deer, white-tailed deer, white-tailed jackrabbit, olive-backed pocket mouse, Preble's meadow jumping mouse (along Rock Creek), and a number of bat species (CPW 2020). Additionally, the project area is located within CPW a black bear-human conflict area, mule deer resident population area, mule deer summer range, and white-tailed deer concentration area (CPW 2020). None of these species or signs of these species were observed during the 2021 survey.

Other wildlife observed during the 2021 survey included fox squirrels and cottontail rabbits. Many of the trees around the ponds in the western portion of the project area showed extensive damage to branches from fox squirrels and wood rats (Photo 5). During the 2021 survey, ERO also made note of birds observed and active nesting including a great horned owl nest and two active red-tailed hawk nests (Figures 2a, 2c, and 2d). ERO previously conducted a raptor survey of the project area in 2020 and submitted the results with recommendations to Brue Baukol (ERO 2021b). While three active raptor nests were found during the 2021 survey, ERO did not conduct a full nest survey during the 2021 survey and additional migratory bird nesting occurs in the project area.

Recommendations

There are no established buffers or legal protections for coyotes, red foxes, raccoons, squirrels, or rabbits. These animals are extremely adapted to urban environments and are good at avoiding human encounters.

ERO recommends taking measures to mitigate potential future wildlife-human conflict by:

- Installing signs to educate future occupants on how to interact appropriately with wildlife.
- Encouraging people to keep dogs on-leash in the project area for their protection and to prevent harassment of wildlife.
- Installing secure trash containment in containers with tight-fitting lids.
- Incorporating native grasses, shrubs, and trees into the development to provide existing wildlife with habitat for reproduction, foraging, and protection from predators.

For additional information on prairie dog recommendations and other measures to protect migratory birds, refer to the previously provided memos.

References

Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW). 2020. Species Activity Maps. https://www.arcgis.com/home/group.html?id=0e6f9051b06146018038e9a929ab4910#overview. Last accessed April 21, 2021.

Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW). 2021a. Living with Coyotes in Colorado. https://cpw.state.co.us/learn/Pages/LivingwithWildlifeCoyote.aspx. Last accessed April 21, 2021.

Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW). 2021b. Living with wildlife – red fox. https://cpw.state.co.us/learn/Pages/LivingwithWildlifeRedFox.aspx. Last accessed April 21, 2021.

Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW). 2021c. Species Profile – Raccoon. https://cpw.state.co.us/learn/Lists/Wildlife%20Species/DispForm.aspx?ID=52. Last accessed April 21, 2021.

ERO Resources Corporation (ERO). 2021a. Prairie Dog Management Plan Redtail Ridge.

ERO Resources Corporation (ERO). 2021b. Redtail Ridge – 2020 Migratory Bird Nest Surveys.

Goldyn, B., M. Hromada, and A. Surmacki. 2003. Habitat use and diet of the red fox *Vulpes* in an agricultural landscape in Poland. *Zeitschrift für Jagdwissenschaft* 49:191–200.

Grubbs, S.E. and P.R. Krausman. 2009. Use of urban landscapes by coyotes.

Hallett, D.L., T.S. Baskett, and R.D. Sparrowe. 1985. Characteristics of coyote dens and den sites in central Missouri. *Biological Sciences* 19:49–58.

Harris Kocher Smith (HKS). 2021. Personal communication with Heidi Gerstung, ERO Resources Corporation. April 2.

Murray M., M.A. Edwards, B. Abercrombie, and C.C. St. Clair. 2015. Poor health is associated with use of anthropogenic resources in an urban carnivore. Proceedings of the Royal Society.

NatureServe. 2021a. https://explorer.natureserve.org/Taxon/ELEMENT_GLOBAL.2.102680/Canis_latrans. Last accessed April 15, 2021.

NatureServe. 2021b. https://explorer.natureserve.org/Taxon/ELEMENT_GLOBAL.2.105935/Vulpes_vulpes. Last accessed April 15, 2021.

Pauli, J.N., W.B. Buskirk, E.S. Williams, and W.H. Edwards. 2006. A plague epizootic in the black-tailed prairie dog (*Cynomys ludovicianus*). *Journal of Wildlife Diseases* 42(1):74-80.

Poessel, S.A., S.W. Breck, and E.M. Gese. 2016. Spatial ecology of coyotes in the Denver metropolitan area: influence of the urban matrix. *Journal of Mammalogy* 97:1414–1427.

Attachments: Figure 1; Figures 2a through 2d; Photo Log

Path: P:\10500 Projects\10500 Phillips 66 Site\Maps\Wildlife Survey\10500 Figure 1.mxd



Redtail Ridge 2021 Wildlife Use Assessment

Sections 20, 21, 28, and 29, T1S, R69W; 6th PM

UTM NAD 83: Zone 13N; 488402mE, 4421737mN

Longitude 105.135760°W, Latitude 39.945675°N

USGS Louisville, CO Quadrangle

Boulder and Broomfield Counties, Colorado

Figure 1
Vicinity Map

Prepared for: Brue Baukol
Capital Partners
File: 10500 Figure 1.mxd (GS)
April 21, 2021

ERO Resources Corp.

Portions of this document include intellectual property of ESRI and its licensors and are used herein under license. Copyright © 2021 ESRI and its licensors. All rights reserved.



Redtail Ridge Wildlife Use Transect Survey

- Coyote Scat
- Active Great Horned Owl Nest
- Active Red-tailed Hawk Nest
- Black-billed Magpie Nest
- Nest Box
- Small Nest
- Stick Nest
- Photo Point
- Goose Scat
- Possible Killdeer Nesting Area
- Coyote Sighting
- Coyote Tracks
- Goose Tracks
- Raccoon Tracks
- Wildlife Trail
- Project Area
- Red-tailed Hawk Nest 1/3-Mile Buffer
- Great Horned Owl Nest 300-Foot Buffer
- Prairie Dog Burrows

Figure 2a
Survey Observations

Prepared for: Brue Baukol
File: 10500 Figures 2a-2d.mxd (GS)
April 23, 2021

ERO Resources Corp.

Image Source: Google Earth©, May 2018

Redtail Ridge Wildlife Use Transect Survey

- Coyote Scat
- Active Great Horned Owl Nest
- Active Red-tailed Hawk Nest
- Black-billed Magpie Nest
- Nest Box
- Small Nest
- Stick Nest
- Photo Point
- Goose Scat
- Possible Killdeer Nesting Area
- Coyote Sighting
- Coyote Tracks
- Goose Tracks
- Raccoon Tracks
- Wildlife Trail
- Project Area
- Red-tailed Hawk Nest 1/3-Mile Buffer
- Great Horned Owl Nest 300-Foot Buffer
- Prairie Dog Burrows



Figure 2b
Survey Observations

Prepared for: Brue Baukol
File: 10500 Figures 2a-2d.mxd (GS)
April 23, 2021

ERO Resources Corp.

Image Source: Google Earth©, May 2018



Redtail Ridge Wildlife Use Transect Survey

- Coyote Scat
- Active Great Horned Owl Nest
- Active Red-tailed Hawk Nest
- Black-billed Magpie Nest
- Nest Box
- Small Nest
- Stick Nest
- Photo Point
- Goose Scat
- Possible Killdeer Nesting Area
- Coyote Sighting
- Coyote Tracks
- Goose Tracks
- Raccoon Tracks
- Wildlife Trail
- Project Area
- Red-tailed Hawk Nest 1/3-Mile Buffer
- Great Horned Owl Nest 300-Foot Buffer
- Prairie Dog Burrows



0 125 250 Feet

Figure 2c
Survey Observations

Prepared for: Brue Baukol
File: 10500 Figures 2a-2d.mxd (GS)
April 23, 2021

ERO Resources Corp.

Image Source: Google Earth©, May 2018

Redtail Ridge Wildlife Use Transect Survey

- X Coyote Scat
- b Active Great Horned Owl Nest
- b Active Red-tailed Hawk Nest
- ! Black-billed Magpie Nest
- ! Nest Box
- ! Small Nest
- ! Stick Nest
- Photo Point
- Goose Scat
- Possible Killdeer Nesting Area
- Coyote Sighting
- Coyote Tracks
- Goose Tracks
- Raccoon Tracks
- Wildlife Trail
- Project Area
- Red-tailed Hawk Nest 1/3-Mile Buffer
- Great Horned Owl Nest 300-Foot Buffer
- Prairie Dog Burrows



Figure 2d
Survey Observations

Prepared for: Brue Baukol
File: 10500 Figures 2a-2d.mxd (GS)
April 23, 2021

ERO Resources Corp.

Image Source: Google Earth©, May 2018

Photo 1 - Coyote tracks observed within the project area.

Photo 2 - Coyote tracks observed within the project area.

Photo 3 - Coyote scat observed within the project area.

Photo 4 - Dead cows found within the project area. View is to the east.

Photo 5 - Chewed branch observed within the project area.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Red tail notice I received? Superior resident 22 years.

From: David Donnelly <llcdave3@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2022 6:03 PM
To: Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Red tail notice I received? Superior resident 22 years.

To whom is in charge?
I'm looking on the mailed out flyer and on your website to find ZERO INFORMATION on what is being built???
Why so difficult? What are you hiding is the real question that is obvious in the lack of layman terms.
Please send blue prints and Full disclosure of any proposed building. # of units, size , height etc. Residential, commercial etc. Traffic study impacts and must improvements to accommodate such massive growth! Sewer treatment expansion in Superior already is overflowing with SMELL and Public health air quality.

Really? Looks like someone went out of their way to hide this project info.

Thanks for lack of disclosure.
David Donnelly

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

From: Norma Anderson <norma22@me.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 12, 2022 6:17 PM
To: City Council; Rob Zuccaro
Subject: Open Space Advisory Board decision to approve Brue Baukol Redtail Ridge development plans, June 8, 2022

I've been asked to send this message, written to the Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board, on to members of the City Council and to Mr. Zuccaro. I hope the feelings and thoughts expressed in my letter to Mr. Johnson will be of value when considering Brue Baukol's plans for the Redtail Ridge property. It's so important to make sure the final plans — whether by Brue Baukol or some other developer — take into account the wishes of Louisville's residents. As I wrote in the last paragraph in the message below, once development has occurred — whether the development is in accord with what the Louisville residents want and have made known or not — what's been done can't be undone.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Sincerely,

Norma Anderson

Dear Mr. Johnson,

As the Staff Liaison for the Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board, I'd like to ask you to make sure the entire Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board receives this email, and I'd like to thank you in advance for doing this.

During its June 8th meeting, the Open Space Advisory Board approved Brue Baukol's plans to develop the former StorageTek property "as-is", and I'd like to reiterate the fact there have been a number of messages and comments sent to both the Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board and the Open Space Advisory Board prior to the Open Space Advisory Board's June 8th meeting. It appears as if these messages and comments weren't taken into account by the Open Space Advisory Board. Nor does the Open Space Advisory Board's decision on June 8th reflect the results of the special Louisville election on April 19th that defeated Brue Baukol's development plans, when the matter was presented to Louisville residents in a vote.

Louisville's Municipal Code 16.16.010(e) allows our city to require a larger public land dedication than the minimum at new developments. This has been done at Coal Creek Ranch and Centennial Valley, and should be considered as a requirement for the Redtail Ridge development despite Brue Baukol's determination to minimize open space and public land dedication, and regardless of the numerous times the residents of Louisville have turned down Brue Baukol's proposal(s) as being unacceptable as they've been presented.

I understand three members in attendance at the Open Space Advisory Board didn't understand Louisville's Municipal's Code 16.16.010(e) (see paragraph above), and voted to approve the Brue Baukol proposal "as-is" because they believed they had no choice but to accept what the developer was offering. Sadly, their belief was incorrect, resulting in a decision by the Open Space Advisory Board that runs counter to what the City of Louisville and its citizens want for the development of this property.

From what I understand, the ideas and arguments put forward by messages and comments to Louisville's citizens weren't even mentioned at the Open Space Advisory Board June 8th meeting.

Again, from what I understand about Brue Baukol's plans, the buildings and parking lots in their proposed development will spread far beyond the original StorageTek footprint, destroying much of the ecologically rich portion of the property north of Disc Drive. With the loss of biodiversity becoming a worldwide problem, exacerbated by the negative effects of climate change, I feel — as a Louisville resident — it's vitally important to preserve as much of the property that's under discussion with Brue Baukol as municipal codes allow. Ideally this should have 50% of the land at Redtail Ridge be set aside as open space, including the entire area north of Disc Drive, with its valuable resources of water and trees that support the area's abundant wildlife.

Please make sure this information reaches as many people in public office as possible, because once the land has been turned over to development — without consideration of what the residents of Louisville want, and the benefits of preserving as much current open space as possible — what's developed can't be undone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Norma Anderson
1904 Steel Street
Louisville, Colorado 80027
Email: norma22@me.com
Landline: 303-954-9373
Cell phone: 720-537-5901

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Paradise Lane area

From: Laura Page <lpage53@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 5, 2022 9:43 PM
To: Ashley Stolzmann <ashleys@louisvilleco.gov>; Kyle Brown <kbrown@louisvilleco.gov>; Dennis Maloney <DennisM@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Paradise Lane area

Dear Mayor and Councilmen Brown and Maloney,

In 2010, when the proposed ConocoPhillips development was in play, an amendment to the NW Parkway IGA was finalized - the Campus Drive Amendment - that outlined the uses of the properties abutting the CP land if the City were to annex it. Reading between the lines, it would seem the City was interested in annexing the land when/if the CP development proceeded. Not having the Paradise Lane properties within the City puts additional constraints on the Campus Road alignment because of the current requirement for a buffer between City and County land.

Has the City recently considered annexing that property? Because it is surrounded by the City, it would seem the City would have the right to do so.

Laura Page
920 Rex St, Ward III

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==
This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Addendum 3 Public Comments to OSAB

From: dana bove
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 7:50 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Tonights meeting no Zoom Passcode posted

Ember,

I tried to find a Zoom passcode for tonight's meeting as I was going to comment on the RTR project .There is a meeting ID in the agenda but there is no passcode, or at least none that t I could find.

I'm really disappointed as i was planning on representing our organization's position and comments on this matter. We have been researching eagles and other raptors in the northern Front Range and are very familiar with this area. It is close to one of our ong term study areas at Holmberg. We have documented that territorial bald eagles at Stearns often hunt in the old STK area.

The Stearns territorial bald eagles —as you can see from our data attached-- derive nearly 50% of their prey from prairie dogs. PD's are an integral prey component of other bald eagle nests in the northern Front Range--also see attached. The areas richest in raptors in the northern Front Range are also richest in PDs. These PD rich-areas, like we see in the bald eagle territory west of Hygiene, in the south Rabbit Mtn area, and at Holmberg, are frequented by nesting bald eagles; ferruginous hawks, golden eagles, prairie falcons etc.

Without PDs we lose these raptors. The loss of PDs in the Colorado Front Range is on a pace with the increase in human development.

The Broomfield area was one of the richest raptor areas in the Front Range—due to prairie dogs. Development in Broomfield, one of the fastest growing Counties in Colorado, has essentially wiped out the previously rich raptor habitat. I believe it used to be called Raptor Alley.

Redtail Ridge—like so many developments named after the raptors they extirpate—will be more of the same with the Broomfield development. We will lose some of what remains of prey that sustains these raptors and other predators as well.

Since an apparent omission of a passcode prohibited me from commenting tonight, I'd appreciate it if you would read this comment for our group to the board.

If Louisville can't keep this development from happening, please make sure that 50% of this land is kept as open space with most open and preserved as wildlife habitat.

Thank you

Dana Bove

From: MikesGmail
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 7:24 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Open Space Advisory Board
Importance: High

Ember,

I was very disappointed that I was unable to make it past the roadblocks to attending tonight's meeting. Passcodes that weren't provided and the phone number wouldn't accept the meeting code required. Redtail Ridge is critical to the entire community, and I certainly would have been there in person, had they been an option. I'm really hoping that uninformed, deceptive representatives that caused us to be back in this situation to start with, are not the loudest voice in the room. Voting to overturn the City Councils approval was wrong to start with, now those voices want to create additional costs to the City and a developer who went far beyond due diligence to satisfy the City Councils demands. Please pass this comment on to the Advisory Board and recommend that they not allow further false narratives and blatant lies to interfere with Brue Baukols exceptional plans.

From: cindy Bedell
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 10:06 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: OSAB Vote 6//8/22

Dear OSAB,

On 6/8/22, several OSAB members made the statement that they could not recommend more open space in the Redtail Ridge Development because of the restrictions of the municipal code.

This was incorrect.

As Director Rob Zuccaro presented at the May OSAB meeting, the following municipal code allows more open space to be recommended:

16.16.010 E.

Schools, parks, churches and other community facilities should be planned for as an integral part of the area to the extent possible. Open space, park, and recreation areas must be located in such a manner as to create an area that is usable and accessible to the residents of the subdivision and shall otherwise conform to all applicable city standards and requirements. The need for additional open space, park, and recreation areas shall be based on the following factors: the city's comprehensive plan; topography, drainage, vegetation and other physical conditions; the type and density of the proposed development; the availability of other open space, park and recreation areas; and the overall need within the proposed development for such areas.

Sincerely,

Cindy Bedell
662 W. Willow St.
Louisville, CO 80027

-----Original Message-----
From: Erin Lindsay
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 2:28 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

Hi there,

I'm normally a resident and homeowner in Louisville...but my house burned down in the Marshall Fire. I also have a 3 month old baby who cries nonstop and I'm struggling to recover from an unusually difficult pregnancy. I have zero time - yet I'm emailing you about this proposal.

Require Brue Baukol to make a 50% public land dedication with 40% open space. Making these requirements has a long-standing precedent in Louisville and it's well within your purview. It's also what the citizens of Louisville want, which we've made clear at every public meeting about this project, during the referendum we signed, and again in the special election. It's both your right and your responsibility to make this requirement. Please do it.

Thank you for your time,

Erin Lindsay
826 Trail Ridge Dr.

From: PATRICIA D. MURPHY
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 1:45 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: RE OASB meeting / suggestions

Hello,

I am a resident of Louisville (41 years now)! I live in the Dutch Creek area and have concerns about development of the former Storage Tech campus, AKA "Redtail Ridge."

Please put in my request for preserving at least 40% of this area for open space.

Yours very truly,

Patricia Dimond Murphy
339 S Hoover Ave

From: uittij Gmail account
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 1:32 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

To: Louisville Open Space Advisory Board

When we voters rejected the proposal by Brue Baukol for Redtail Ridge, we did so primarily because it was a poorly-planned concept that does not adhere to Louisville values of reasonable and progressive environmental and economic sustainability that reflects smart growth.
Brue Baukol has continued to ignore that clear message, consistently downplaying their election loss (they thought this was a slam-dunk for them) after spending over 32 times as much on their misleading campaign.
I agree with Matt Jones, who points out that prior public land dedications including Davidson Mesa and Coal Creek Golf Course were much higher than that proposed currently by Brue Baukol.
Along with many other Louisville residents, I support 50% public land dedication, with 40% being open space.
The voters who soundly rejected the RR proposal did so in all good faith that the Open Space Advisory Board and the City Council would ensure adequate open space in this development. We hope your decisions will reflect the will of the voters as you consider this development.
Thank you.
Jane Uitti
209 Matchless St.
Louisville, CO 80027

From: Norma Anderson <norma22@me.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 12, 2022 4:40 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Open Space Advisory Board decision to approve Brue Baukol Redtail Ridge development plan, June 8, 2022

Dear Ms. Ember,

As the Staff Liaison for the Open Space Advisory Board, I'd like to ask you to make sure the entire Open Space Advisory Board receives this email, and I'd like to thank you in advance for doing this.

The Open Space Advisory Board approved Brue Baukol's plans to develop the former StorageTek property "as-is", and I'd like to reiterate the fact there have been a number of messages and comments sent to the Board prior to the June 8th meeting. It appears as if these messages and comments weren't taken into account by the Open Space Advisory Board. Nor does the Open Space Advisory Board's decision on June 8th reflect the results of the special Louisville election on April 19th that defeated Brue Baukol's development plans, when the matter was presented to Louisville residents in a vote.

In addition, Louisville's Municipal Code 16.16.010(e) allows our city to require a larger public land dedication than the minimum at new developments. This has been done at Coal Creek Ranch and Centennial Valley, and should be considered as a requirement for the Redtail Ridge development despite Brue Baukol's determination to minimize open space and public land dedication, and regardless of the numerous times the residents of Louisville have turned down Brue Baukol's proposal(s) as being unacceptable as they've been presented.

I understand three members in attendance at the Open Space Advisory Board didn't understand Louisville's Municipal's Code 16,.16.010(e) (see paragraph above), and voted to approve the Brue Baukol proposal "as-is" because they believed they had no choice but to accept what the developer was offering. Sadly, their belief was incorrect, resulting in a decision by the Open Space Advisory Board that runs counter to what the City of Louisville and its citizens want for the development of this property.

From what I understand, the ideas and arguments put forward by messages and comments to Louisville's citizens weren't even mentioned at the June 8th meeting.

Again, from what I understand about Brue Baukol's plans, the buildings and parking lots in their proposed development will spread far beyond the original StorageTek footprint, destroying much of the ecologically rich portion of the property north of Disc Drive. With the loss of biodiversity becoming a worldwide problem, exacerbated by the negative effects of climate change, I feel — as a Louisville resident — it's vitally important to preserve as much of the property that's under discussion with Brue Baukol as municipal codes allow. Ideally this should have 50% of the land at Redtail Ridge be set aside as open space, including the entire area north of Disc Drive, with its valuable resources of water and trees that support the area's abundant wildlife.

Please make sure this information reaches as many people in public office as possible, because once the land has been turned over to development — without consideration of what the residents of Louisville want, and the benefits of preserving as much current open space as possible — what's developed can't be undone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Norma Anderson
1904 Steel Street
Louisville, Colorado 80027

From: **Tim Stalker**
Date: Wed, Jun 8, 2022 at 11:51 AM
Subject: Letter to OSAB for meeting tonight
To: <EmberB@louisvilleco.gov>

To members of the Louisville OSAB,

I would like to thank you first of all for asking for more information about the Redtail Ridge (RTR) development proposal. There's certainly no reason to rush one's consideration and ultimate decision about how to respond to the current proposal from the developer.

While the packet of information before you addresses many of the questions you raised in the last OSAB meeting, I think there are additional resources for you to consult and I'll outline these here. The development proposal overall fails to meet the relevant requirements in our city code from a number of standpoints, many of which are still outstanding and many of which many from the public have communicated with you about.

In the Louisville Municipal Code (LMC) 16.16.010.D the requirement states that **"Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible."**

Stated simply, the spirit of the requirement is to do exactly as it says, leaving an interpretation in place for what is meant by "extent possible." In the situation of public land dedication at RTR, the development is the last of the city's large areas with hundreds of acres to come under development and so extent possible is also proportionately large. The land preservation required in the site can also be to the extent possible connected, contiguous, and integrated into both a meaningful and enjoyable development and the other areas of the city that throughout its history have done a rather good job applying notions of "extent possible" in land preservation to our other large areas that at the time were thought to be equally significant to the city and developers. Those areas at Centennial Valley and Coal Creek Ranch are now integral to the city and form the basis of how we enjoy our open spaces either in the west at Davidson Mesa or centrally at our golf course and its surrounding open spaces. RTR isn't much different in the sense of how the city interprets its extent in relationship to how we enjoy these other areas. The landscape at RTR has garnered interest in similar threads to how Coal Creek and Centennial Valley took our interest in the late 70s and 80s. The spirit of those public land dedications informs the community's psyche now to be sure. The situation prompted a referendum in April in which the city found itself either siding with a developer or with the city but in both cases the urge was a desire for more open space to the extent possible at RTR.

Brue Baukol, our current developer at RTR, is offering 23% public land preservation, an amount not to the extent possible and really only confined to land deemed undevelopable. Indeed, the preservation of that land is coupled with drainage requirements and designs and are one in the same with the city open space in the plan. While these areas of land preservation are largely undeveloped and have never been developed, they are also inappropriately designed into the site's natural and built drainage needs. While the developer intends to preserve this land to the public, they're also intending to use its natural drainage ways and basins to meet requirements for draining the site, a built site at 2.5M square feet.

The developer can certainly do this but with such a proportionately small land preservation, there will simply be too much pressure on that land to meet the site's engineered drainage needs while at the same time providing open space for the city. The area is in what's called a Zone X flood area, likely outside of the .2% annual chance of damage from a 500 year flood. Although such a designation is provided by FEMA, the designation is provided based on the undeveloped area. What will development mean for the ground in the future with acres of built property? That becomes significant in the land preservation with development too far north of Disc Drive. Across the area from roughly Tape Drive is a natural ridge that drains from south to north into an identified channel, a tributary actually of Rock Creek, the developer wants to preserve for the public. Graphics attached illustrate this and did not make it into your packet for the meeting. I refer you to the Final Master Drainage Report for RTR - https://redtailridgelouisville.com/wp-content/uploads/0121-city-packet/4fa-Final-Master-Drainage-Report.pdf.





These graphics show how the alignment of campus drive, the proposed trail from west to east, and the underpasses and culverts under campus drive, utilize the tributary for drainage and goodhue ditch on the east. While it's good to see the proposed specs for the trails in the site, one must understand how these trails are so intermingled with the drainage pathways, especially north of Disc Drive. In the interest of brevity, the public land dedication in this developer's proposal once again uses the same footprint they've always used, one that was voted down in April and one that provides preservation only to the "extent necessary" to drain the development. Not to the extent possible, nor to the extent

required to both drain the site, compete for drainage from areas to the north and at the same time provide walkable, rideable trailing, especially to the north.

The culverts alone are questionable in how they align adjacent to the underpasses that go under campus drive and are designed for only 10 year flood events. In the final master drainage report, **"Both crossings are composed of a dual box system which includes one lower structure solely for flow conveyance and another raised structure which doubles as a trail underpass for vehicle and pedestrian access during storms up to the 10-year event. The lower RCBC will have a span of 8' with a rise of 5' and the raised trail underpass RCBC will have a span of 10' and rise of 8'."**

I urge you to either deny this proposal or if you approve it approve it with conditions for a greater public land dedication to the extent possible - 50% land dedication with 40% open space. You have the responsibility to check to see how the plan before you adheres to our LMC. If you need more information then ask for more information, particularly around how drainage is specified in coordination with the land preservation offered. Again, the preservation of all land north of Disc Drive is possible without jeopardizing the developer's plans for draining the site and other uses. Require land preservation to the extent possible, not to the extent necessary.

Thank you so much,

Tim Stalker
806 W Dahlia Ct Louisville

From: Cynthia Corne
Subject: Input for OSAB: Tonight's Action Item: RTR June 8 2022
Date: June 8, 2022 at 7:08:55 AM PDT
To: emberb@louisville.gov, rzuccaro@louisvilleco.gov

For the OSAB meeting tonight please:

Dear OSAB Chair and Committee and Planning Director, Zuccaro:
For this evening's agenda topic: "Action Item: Redtail Ridge Preliminary and Final Plat Review"

Thank you all for your volunteer service and for providing your expertise to our community.

1) Please request/provide the horizontal acres covered re: the currently named "Redtail Ridge" during the following time frames:
a) Storage Tek ownership
b) CP ownership
c) RTR proposals from 2020 (the 6MM sq ft proposals which were voted down by Council)
d) RTR proposals from 2021/2 (the 3MM sq ft proposal which was voted down by Citizens in April 2022, less than 2 months ago)
e) The current RTR preliminary and final plats in review.

This information is likely of interest or concern for OSAB: Starting with RTR proposals, the horizontal acres covered (developed) greatly increases - changing from a campus setting or use and developing

over what has been, in essence, a private preserve. Then, even after multiple versions, advice and input, the horizontal development remains unchanged by this investment group.

2) I hope that the OSAB committee does not feel rushed in this review.
a) No one is looking to delay Brue Baukol's projects - prior delays are because they did not adequately reflect input provided to them repeatedly, by Council and Citizens.
b) Even with the recent vote, they have not adjusted their horizontal build, or not much.
c) If OSAB needs environmental impact information, traffic studies, site reviews, to have all members present for these discussions, or anything else, the recent referendum vote certainly reinforced that Open Space is of critical importance for this significant property, and worthy of thought and **advocacy, and the time needed for OSAB members to weigh OSAB's role with the large decisions involved here, and the details needed.**

3) If you move through this "Action Item" to a vote this evening, I suggest the following condition be added to any approval:
"OSAB recommends that City Council approves these plats with the following conditions: Preserve land north of Disc Drive (no development). This parcel and additional land to comprise 50% Public Land dedication, with 40% contiguous Open Space/Preserve. In accordance with Section 16.16.060(C), retention ponds or other land left open solely for the purpose of the development, such as land under power lines, will not be considered as part of the land dedication required under this section."

*Note: City Council can work with Brue Baukol to figure out the details and/or financials to make that happen. OSAB's mission can stay at a higher level to advocate for our citizens, ecosystems, and environment.

Thank you again, and I sincerely hope the members of OSAB will advocate to preserve this undeveloped land.

Sincerely,
Cynthia Corne Musslewhite
438 Jefferson Ave.
Louisville, CO 80027

Addendum #2 to OSAB June 2022 Board packet

Public comments regarding Red Tail Ridge

From: Laura Pederson
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 1:13 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Development OSAB Review 6/8/22

In your Redtail Ridge OSAB review on 6/8/22, please focus on the following top priority:

50% open space and contiguous preserved greenfields

Small pockets of scattered parks and open space will not preserve the viewsheds, critical wildlife habitat, or provide high value trails and open space experiences.

Thanks and Regards,
Laura Parks-Pederson
2297 Cliffrose Lane
Louisville, Co. 80027

From: Gaylynn Potemkin
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 2:31 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: OSAB meeting

Dear board members, Regarding Redtail Ridge:
Please request 50% public land dedication with 40% of that dedicated to open space. Louisville has required substantial public land and open space dedication from large developments in the past.
This has resulted in Davidson Mesa and Coal Creek Golf course.
The developer's suggested 21% is inadequate and not in keeping with historical precedent.
I believe that if the buildings were clustered together, more land would be available for dedication to public use and open space. I fear that the spacing out of the buildings will (intentionally) allow for future development. This is not in Louisville's best interests, nor is it in line with what the citizenry has expressed as their preference; as proven thru the recent special election.
Do not ignore the concerns of Louisville's residents. Your job is to represent their choice thru your recommendation to City Council. Please step up and be the voice of the people of Louisville.
Sincerely,
Gaylynn Potemkin
505 Spruce St, Louisville, CO 80027.

From: justin solomon
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 7:43 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: Susan Larson
Subject: Redtail Ridge Open Space

Dear OSAB Members,

As you consider the draft and final plat before you, I would draw your attention to three critical points; 1) the OSAB has the statutory authority to recommend a public land/open space dedication beyond the 12% minimum, 2) in this instance there is both need and justification for a larger open space dedication, and 3) there is well-established precedent to support such a recommendation. Please indulge me as we look at each of these points in turn.

Statutory Authority

Our City Municipal Code states that “Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible.” (LMC 16.16.010.D). Our City Municipal Code states that “Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible.” (LMC 16.16.010.D)
Louisville’s City Municipal Code (LMC) states that “Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible.” (16.16.010.D). The plan before you does not preserve the property’s natural features, vegetation and wildlife “to the extent possible.”

Additionally, the LMC states the following with respect to open space dedications (17.28.080.A).

A. Open space, in addition to the public use dedications specified in title 16, may be required by the city council upon recommendation by the planning commission. The requirement for additional open space will be based on the following factors:

1. Comprehensive development plan (including matters of state interest);
2. Topography, drainage, vegetation and other such physical conditions;
3. Anticipated socio-economic conditions;
4. Type and density of development and employment;
5. Overall need for open space and recreational facilities.

As discussed in the following section, several of the above listed factors are applicable to this property and the development plan and provide ample justification for a larger open space dedication.

Justification and Need

The portion of the property located north of Disc Drive has never before been developed and retains a largely natural state. The area north of Disc Drive represents the last opportunity to preserve an intact and functional short-grass prairie ecosystem within Louisville’s boundaries. The predominant natural feature of the property is the large prairie dog colonies centered on the area north of Disc Drive. Without preservation of these colonies, the populations of raptors (eagles, hawks, burrowing owls, etc), reptiles, and mammals (coyotes, fox, and bobcat) that rely on the colonies for survival will collapse. The current plan would decimate these colonies.

In consideration of factor #5 above, the need for open space preservation for both humans and wildlife has never been greater. The population of the Front Range is projected to double by 2050. Concurrently, worsening and more extreme climatic conditions will place additional stresses on our existing open spaces and the flora and fauna they support. It is therefore critical that Louisville seize upon this last chance to secure meaningful open space to meet the needs of a growing population and a changing climate.

The City-wide election conducted on April 19 sent a clear message and directive to City government. The citizens of Louisville want less development and more open space for this property. While the ConocoPhillips GDP reduces the size of the development to roughly 2.5 million square feet (sf), the proposed development footprint has not shrunk measurably since the applicant first proposed over 6 million sf of development for the site. The open space dedication remains unchanged from the rejected Redtail Ridge plan. The applicant is proceeding as if the costly election we just underwent holds zero significance and requires no adjustment on their part. It is therefore incumbent upon OSAB and City Council to enact the peoples' will, consistent with city code, as outlined above.

Precedent

Louisville has a long and cherished history of promoting and establishing open space above and beyond the minimum requirements. This is in large part what makes Louisville unique among our peers. There is clear precedence for larger (percentage based) open space dedications when developing large parcels. Specifically, the Centennial Valley and Coal Creek Ranch developments included open space dedications of 35 and 46 percent, respectively. City planners of the day recognized the need to set aside significant acreage with these larger developments and to do so on the front end, thus ensuring contiguous and meaningful acreage was preserved.

The ConocoPhillips PUD, though now expired, provides clear insight into the scale and nature of the development City Planners envisioned for the property. The ConocoPhillips PUD, while still permitting the full 2.5 million sf of development, managed to preserve 260 acres (public and private) or 67-percent as open space, including the area north of Disc Drive. It is a clear example of what was intended for development of this site and what remains possible if the City exercises its right to require a greater dedication. This can be accomplished through City Council and staff working with the applicant to shrink the development footprint in return for allowing greater density and building heights.

It's worth noting that when the applicant purchased the property from ConocoPhillips in a rising real-estate market for $20 million less than CP paid for it years prior, the expired PUD was the established precedent for what the City envisioned and the current GDP was the framework from which it sprung. Why would the applicant have any expectation or entitlement to deviate so dramatically from what was previously planned and approved for the site?

Conclusion

Based on the above, we request that the OSAB act within their statutory authority, act based on the clear need, act on the basis of the election results, and act based on the well-established precedence and reject the current plan. In doing so, you should direct the applicant to put forth a plan that preserves 40% of the property as open space (50% total public land dedication) to include the area north of Disc Drive. Such a request is within your and City Council's authority to request public land dedications above the minimum under City municipal code, is justified based on the election result and a clear need, and backed by significant precedent.

We sincerely appreciate your service to the City and your careful consideration of this plan.

Kindest Regards,

Justin and Susan Solomon
477 Lincoln Ct, Louisville

From: sherry sommer
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 6:56 AM
To: Rob Zuccaro <rzuccaro@louisvilleco.gov>; Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Thank you and a question

Good Morning Rob and Ember!

Thank you for all you're doing to facilitate the public review process for OSAB!

Would it be possible

—To correct a couple of points that were made last month. It's very important that everyone understand these items.

1) OSAB's job is to make a recommendation to Council. That is all.

One commenter indicated that OSAB had to keep in mind how recommended additional open space would be funded and managed. That is the job of Council to figure out, not OSAB.

2) Areas within this property have never been developed. The same commenter indicated that this entire property was not valuable enough to set aside as open space. That is not true.

We were not able to have a tour or drone footage of the property. You've been working on another way to give an objective overview of what is out there, and I really appreciate this.

—In addition to getting names and addresses of those commenting tonight, would it be possible to announce how many are on Zoom as the public comment process starts?

The numbers will change during the meeting, but it would be helpful to have a point in time count.

Sherry Sommer

From: Diane Shepard
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 6:31 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge open space

Good Morning,

It's another big day for us who are trying to save Redtail Ridge from over-development. I will be listening in to your meeting tonight, as I do most lately, to hear how you will advocate for open space designation on that property.

While the property certainly will be developed, I advocate for 50% Public Land Dedication with 40% Open Space. Your group is the one to state our vision and hopefully you will recommend

more open space than is stated in the current plan. I would love to see walking trails in that area that we could all use. To be clear, I'd like to use walking trails that are not bordered by roads with traffic noise and air pollution wafting along next to me. To that end, I hope the OSAB will recommend preserving the area north of the former Disc Drive, which has never been developed, and which amounts to about 140 acres.

I find walking in nature to be restorative and as vital to my health as eating meals. I prefer to walk every day and that means I need areas nearby to get out to because we don't always have time for a longer trip into the foothills. Use of the trails in Boulder County have experienced significant increased traffic in recent years which is another indication that the people value these resources.

Having a true open space in Louisville at RTR would be beneficial to people and the environment. Redtail Ridge has some of the last undisturbed views of the mountains in Louisville as well as sunrise vistas. Both views are important. Trails there could add value to our neighborhood. I live in Coal Creek Ranch which is devastated from the Marshall Fire. Environmentally, we need more open space to balance out the overuse of our natural resources in this area. More trees and less pavement are so very necessary.

As members of the Louisville OSAB you have the responsibility of requiring more open space than is being proposed. In the special election, voters clearly spoke out that we want more and better planned open space in this last undeveloped property of this size in Louisville. Please don't let this opportunity go by without making recommendations that will benefit us all for decades to come. You can vote to make recommendations for more open space acquisition. You can provide additional recommendation on open space issues. Please don't simply accept the offer that is on the table now.

Thank you for all your work on behalf of open space in our community. If any of you have been personally effected by the Marshall Fire, I hope you are making progress with remediation, rebuilding and healing.

Diane Shepard

From: Richard Tarde
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 2:09 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Please request 50% public land dedication with 40% open space for Redtail Ridge Development

Hi Ember –
Please request that the developer of Redtail Ridge give a 50% public land dedication (155 acres) with 40% of that (124 acres) dedicated to open space. This matches the Louisville historical precedent for both Davidson Mesa and the Coal Creek Golf Course developments. It is what the citizens of Louisville deserve, and this is more in concert with what has made Louisville a great place to live.

The Redtail Ridge development has been contentious for good reason. I feel that we are letting developers pull us away from what makes our town great. Please note that the advertising that the developer sent around for the last election was incorrect on many points, it was close to propaganda. The developer also spent huge sums of money to mislead us. I do not trust them because of this, they have only a profit motive. Please support Louisville to keep us a great town!

Thank you,
Richard Tarde
421 W Sycamore CT
Louisville, CO 80027

From: Richard Morgan
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 5:39 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Open Space

Open Space Advisory Board Members,

Don Brown shared with me an email he sent to the Open Space Advisory Board earlier regarding an upcoming decision about open space dedication at Redtail Ridge to be decided/discussed at the board's meeting on June 8. I support Don's comments appended below, and I urge you to codify your earlier 2019 recommendation of the Redtail Ridge public land dedication.

It should be noted that Louisville Staff calculated the minimum public land dedication required for the project pursuant to MC Sec. 16.16.060 as approximately 40 acres. The developer's application meets the minimum requirement, and moreover, **the developer is offering to exceed the minimum requirement by over 200% or 90+ acres.**

In December 2019, a majority of the OSAB participated in a site visit with the developer, staff and other department advisory boards. From that physical site visit, the OSAB determined that the public lands being offered by the developer are **the highest value open space property with the application lands.** OSAB previously approved the essence of the current land dedication proposal at that time. Nothing has intervened to cause OSAB to materially reconsider its prior approval.

I appreciate that you'll give this your full attention. Thank you for your service to our community.

Richard Morgan
644 W. Pine Street

Don Brown's 6/6/22 email to Open Space Advisory Board:
Dear Boardmembers,

I am writing in strong support of the Open Space plan as proposed by Brue Baukul on their submission.

First, this is a generous offer and is more acreage than is required for the 2010 Conoco Phillips plan.

Second, approving and overall development-level open space plan will create more significant open space than leaving such dedications to the ensuing sit PUD plans.

Third, the opponents are asking for unreasonable amounts, incorrectly analyzing this dedication/development to the development of the golf course and other past developments.

Finally, this type of massive extraction from a developer will continue to set the precedent that our City is too onerous to work, an image we need to work hard to overcome if we are to ever do anything in the McCaslin corridor.

This plan as submitted is reasonable, generous and good for our Community.

Nothing has changed since this very board approved a largely similar plan. Accordingly, there is no reason to overrule your previous decision.

Thank you for your service to our community.

Don

_____

Richard Morgan

From: Sondra Thorsland
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 5:10 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Comments for Open Space Board

Hello -
I have reviewed the Redtail Ridge agenda item for June 8th meeting. I support the developer's proposed land dedication as stated - reasonable and what I would expect. Please approve and move forward with this plan asap. Thank you for your service.

Sondra and Bjorn Thorsland
2229 Wagon Way
Louisville, CO 80027

Dear Members of OSAB,

I greatly appreciate you allowing yourselves more time to gather information about the Redtail Ridge development proposal. because your recommendation will weigh mightily on how the Planning Commission and the City Council view this proposal.

The Redtail Ridge property is the last large property that will be developed in Louisville. This is our last chance to add a significant amount of open space to our treasured collection for generations to come. Our citizens highly value our open space. It is the reason some people choose to live in Louisville. The pressure on our existing open space will only grow as the City's population and that of the surrounding area grows.

I would like to offer my thoughts on the current proposal.

Does this development proposal meet the requirements of our City Code? *NO*

Our City Municipal Code states that **"Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible."** (LMC 16.16.010.D)

The current plan does not preserve the natural features "to the extent possible." The ConocoPhillips PUD showed what IS possible. Their plan, which included the same amount of development that Brue Baukol is targeting, would have preserved **67%** of the property – 222 acres of private common space plus another 39 acres of public dedication. ConocoPhillips also committed to conveying an additional 20 acres to the north of the property by fee or conservation easement.

Brue Baukol, on the other hand is offering to dedicate to the City 23% of the property, including the additional 18 acres added since your last meeting. (This does not account for the 80-acre exemption which only applies to determination of the *minimum* public dedication. The percentage I ask you to focus on is the amount of this property that will actually be saved from development.) This proposed set-aside is less than North End (25%), less than Centennial Valley (34.5%) and less than Coal Creek Ranch (46.1%). Given what we have reluctantly learned over the past decades of global warming, there is now a scientifically-backed call for a minimum of 30% of land to be preserved in order for Earth to stay below a 1.5°C gain in temperature.
https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.aaw2869

As proposed, this development will unnecessarily exterminate over 110 acres of prairie dog colonies. The colonies support numerous raptors and other animals. Given the web of life, their numbers will no doubt plummet, too. Slaughtering the prairie dogs is not preserving the natural features of the property.

The land north of Disc Drive was not previously developed by Storage Tech so has been undisturbed and home to birds and wildlife for at least the last 37 years, if not more. Some of the natural features, even within the proposed public land areas, are likely to be destroyed during construction, rather than being preserved. Please ensure that the developer will not use any open space land as a staging area as was proposed in previous construction documents.

Are there issues with the current plan? *Yes*

1. First and foremost, the "open space" is bisected twice by Campus Road. The lack of contiguity, the proximity to Campus Drive, and the relatively narrow configuration hugely devalue the open space from an ecological and human-enjoyment standpoint.
2. Section 16.16.010B of the City Code requires that "Pedestrian links to trail systems of the city should be made where feasible. **Buffering** from collection and arterial streets must be provided by earthen berms, landscaping, leafing patterns, or other appropriate materials. None of these buffering features are apparent on the north-south trail on the east side of the property that borders the Northwest Parkway.
3. The Campus Road underpasses may flood since they will also serve as drainages for the development.
4. Since the 2020 survey for federally protected burrowing owls was conducted by Brue Baukol's consultant, the recommended survey zone has been expanded almost 10-fold from 150 feet to 1,320 feet. Given the number of prairie dog holes on this property, it is critical that a new survey

be conducted using the much larger survey area. The other wildlife surveys were only conducted twice at one time of year so could not give a full picture of the wildlife and birds that frequent this area throughout the seasons.

5. Given that the development footprint has hardly changed from the first 6MM sq ft iteration to the current 2.5MM sq ft development, Brue Baukol has shown no propensity to protect the land by consolidating the development; the footprint has stayed largely the same. Our City must use its lawful authority to force protection now. Any additional private open space to be added during the PUD process for each lot will likely be dispersed throughout the property.

How much is the developer giving up? *Very little*

The NW Parkway Intergovernmental requires a buffer between Louisville and Boulder County. The applicant would not be able to develop the land at the northwest corner of this property anyway due to the IGA. The existing ponds are needed for drainage from the development so those areas can't be developed. There is an easement that crosses the northwest portion of the property that prevents development in that area. There is also an easement associated with the Goodhue Ditch.

How beneficial is the additional 18 acres being offered? *Counterproductive*

Although a deeper buffer along US 36 is laudable, this could be accomplished during the PUD process by regulating the siting of the buildings. Adding open space to this location just adds additional maintenance responsibilities to the Louisville. What IS needed is more acres contiguous with the proposed open space in the north section of the property in order to preserve the existing flora and fauna.

What about the additional off-property 40-acre conservation easement being offered? *Marginally beneficial*

This land falls within Boulder County and is already within a Rural Preservation Area. At least two of the properties included in the proposed easement currently have vacated homes on them. Other new homes surround this land. Boulder County is resistant to trails crossing agricultural land so it seems doubtful at this time that Louisville could get BC to agree to partner for a trail along the Goodhue Ditch to the north. Any additional open-space offering should be contiguous with the previous configuration.

What do our citizens want? *More and better-quality open space*

Throughout the last two years of public meetings regarding proposals for this property, public comments have overwhelmingly been in favor of a smaller-scale development and more open space. The defeat by referendum for the GDP amendment proposal was a decisive statement by our citizens that they were unhappy with the proposal. Though proponents of this development point to the relatively small vote spread, given the massive spend on false advertising by the advocates prior to the vote that surely swayed many voters, the "no" vote should be seen as unequivocal. Yet little in the resubmitted plan has changed, other than the fewer sq ft of development as limited by the original GDP. Brue Baukol has thumbed its nose at our citizenry.

Of course, the City cannot just take what it wants. It must abide by its regulations. But as noted at the beginning of this letter, the developer can maximize their development while still preserving more of the land. More open space does not constitute a taking.

RECOMMENDATION

The Louisville Municipal Code requires that **"Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible."** This plan does not do that. I ask that you recommend denial to the Planning Commission. This will not stop the development from review. You are simply giving your recommendation.

If, however, you deem to approve it, I ask that you do so with the condition that no commercial development occur north of Disk Drive, a greenfield area that has long allowed birds and wildlife to be free of human intervention. Preventing development north of Disk Drive would preserve ~40% of the land as open space. The currently-proposed 24 acres of public dedication for other than open space should be *in addition* to that. In total, this is considerably less than the 67% (private and public) of land preservation the City assumed it was getting when the GDP was originally approved for ConocoPhillips.

Thank you for your careful consideration of this development.

Laura Page
920 Rex St

From: Heather North
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 9:06 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Louisville's Future with Redtail Ridge

To whomever it may concern,

It's another big day for us who are trying to save Redtail Ridge from over-development. My husband and I will be at the meeting tonight, as we do most lately, to hear how you will advocate for open space designation on that property. We have ONE SHOT AT THIS and once it's gone...it's gone. I was talking with a patient who also lives in Louisville about how wonderful and lucky we are to have had previous commercial developments that came to an agreement with the city with large plots of usable land for the community and for nature/the environment. Don't let this development slip through the cracks. In 2022 we should be even more focused on preservation that can marry with development even more, especially with our special election that spoke very clearly about what the community truly wants. Everyone I talk to discusses open space, trails, nature, and the environmental care as wishes for this development as well as why they have decided to choose this area as our home.

While the property certainly will be developed, **we advocate for 50% Public Land Dedication with 40% Open Space**. Your group is the one to state our vision and hopefully you will recommend more open space than is stated in the current plan. Environmental advocates around the world are pushing for an increase of density so that more open space can be left and preserved. I would love to see walking trails in that area that we could all use. To be clear, we'd like to use walking trails that are not bordered by roads with traffic noise and air pollution wafting along next to me. This type of "open space" is just an afterthought and quite useless as are discarded pizza crusts. **To that end, I hope the OSAB will recommend preserving the area north of the former Disc Drive, which has never been developed, and which amounts to about 140 acres. This agreement is somewhat similar to other large commercial**

builds in Louisville's not so recent past. Again in 2022 this should be an absolute requirement and not even up for discussion.

Having a true open space in Louisville at RTR would be beneficial to people and the environment as well as our economy. Redtail Ridge has some of the **last undisturbed** views of the mountains in Louisville as well as sunrise vistas. Environmentally, we need more open space to balance out the overuse of our natural resources in this area. More trees and less pavement are so very necessary.

As members of the Louisville OSAB you have the responsibility of requiring more open space than is being proposed. In the special election, voters clearly spoke out that we want more and better planned open space in this last undeveloped property of this size in Louisville. Please don't let this opportunity go by without making recommendations that will benefit us all for decades to come. You can vote to make recommendations for more open space acquisition. You can provide additional recommendations on open space issues. Please don't simply accept the offer that is on the table now.

Thank you for all your work on behalf of open space in our community.
Regards,
Heather and Ewen North
142 Fairfield Lane - Louisville

From: Ewen North
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 9:07 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Future of Redtail Ridge and our Special Election

To whomever it may concern,

It's another big day for us who are trying to save Redtail Ridge from over-development. My wife and I will be at the meeting tonight, as we do most lately, to hear how you will advocate for open space designation on that property. We have ONE SHOT AT THIS and once it's gone...it's gone. I was talking with a patient who also lives in Louisville about how wonderful and lucky we are to have had previous commercial developments that came to an agreement with the city with large plots of usable land for the community and for nature/the environment. Don't let this development slip through the cracks. In 2022 we should be even more focused on preservation that can marry with development even more, especially with our special election that spoke very clearly about what the community truly wants. Everyone I talk to discusses open space, trails, nature, and the environmental care as wishes for this development as well as why they have decided to choose this area as our home.

While the property certainly will be developed, **we advocate for 50% Public Land Dedication with 40% Open Space**. Your group is the one to state our vision and hopefully you will recommend more open space than is stated in the current plan. Environmental advocates around the world are pushing for an increase of density so that more open space can be left and preserved. I would love to see walking trails in that area that we could all use. To be clear, we'd like to use walking trails that are not bordered by roads with traffic noise and air pollution wafting along next to me. This type of "open space" is just an afterthought and quite useless as are discarded pizza crusts. **To that end, I hope the OSAB will recommend preserving the area north of the former Disc Drive, which has never been developed, and which amounts to about 140 acres. This agreement is somewhat similar to other large commercial**

builds in Louisville's not so recent past. Again in 2022 this should be an absolute requirement and not even up for discussion.

Having a true open space in Louisville at RTR would be beneficial to people and the environment as well as our economy. Redtail Ridge has some of the **last undisturbed** views of the mountains in Louisville as well as sunrise vistas. Environmentally, we need more open space to balance out the overuse of our natural resources in this area. More trees and less pavement are so very necessary.

As members of the Louisville OSAB you have the responsibility of requiring more open space than is being proposed. In the special election, voters clearly spoke out that we want more and better planned open space in this last undeveloped property of this size in Louisville. Please don't let this opportunity go by without making recommendations that will benefit us all for decades to come. You can vote to make recommendations for more open space acquisition. You can provide additional recommendations on open space issues. Please don't simply accept the offer that is on the table now.

Thank you for all your work on behalf of open space in our community.
Regards,
Heather and Ewen North
142 Fairfield Lane - Louisville

From: Naomi E Heiser <Naomi.Heiser@Colorado.EDU>
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 9:26 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge planning

Dear Open Space Advisory Board and staff,

I've been a Louisville resident since 2000 and have raised a family here. We treasure the open spaces, trails, parks, and recreational opportunities the city has so carefully created. These are special amenities in any case, but particularly helpful after the trauma of the Marshall Fire. Green spaces, trees, flowering plants, natural sounds are all so healing for our community.

After learning a lot about Redtail Ridge, leading up to the recent vote, I would like to advocate for a plan that includes more open space, trails, parks, and recreational opportunities than the one that was voted down. I have always admired Matt Jones for his practicality and caring nature, and his ideas about requiring 50% public land dedication, with 40% of that being open space, seem to be in line with other land areas in our community. A commitment to providing this much open space, as well as trails and parks (with areas dedicated to children) would reflect the values of the Louisville I know and love!

Thank you for your time,

Naomi Heiser
440 W. Sycamore Ct.
Louisville, CO

From: Mike Martin
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 9:57 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Red Tail Ridge

Hello:

I live at 597 S. Manorwood Lane in Louisville.

I LOVE this town and want to ensure that this development follows the Louisville tradition/practice of 50% public land designation with 40% open space.

I believe the developer can achieve their required results AND meet the above guidelines that have helped to make Lousiville what it is today.

I trust you, the OSAB, are strongly considering these requests, but I thought it worthwhile to express my opinion.

Many thanks for your dedication to this important project and keep up the good work!

Best,
Michael J Martin
597 S. Manorwood Lane
Louisville, CO 80027

From: Michiko Christiansen
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 11:06 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Osab

Dear OSAB members:

It is important to me to see the OSAB to require 50% public land dedication with 40% open space.

I was looking at the map of Louisville, the acreage is about 8,066 - 8.52 mi2 equal roughly 5120- 5452 acres. Open space is about 2000 acres within the city. The remaining 3126- 3452 consists of housing, green backs, some undeveloped areas, roads, cemetery, and other I may have missed. Looking at the ratio 3126- 3452 vs 2000 (open space), we are a small city.

It is important for us to create buffer zone to prevent density feeling and being interlocking with other cities. Making those recommendation will benefit for all of us in terms of mental, physical, spiritual and environmental health by having more open spaces. We really need to focus to rebuild and healing the City as a whole for those who are effected by the Marshall Fire.

Thank you for your work in the community.

M. Christiansen

From: Cathern H Smith
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 11:58 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: REVISED Redtail Ridge: Let's do it right.

Dear Members of the Open Space Advisory Board,

Let's do it right. When you act upon Brue Baukol's pending request, take the time to work with the staff and your counsel to set out the reasons for your recommendation. You have special expertise, but the Planning Commission and the City Council will only benefit from your expertise, if you take the time to capture your analysis on paper.

A Fresh Assessment is Necessary and Appropriate

Following the special election, you are called upon –not to ratify the decision of an earlier board, but to conduct your own analysis and make a recommendation. It would make no sense for the City to go through the special election only to have OSAB and the rest of the City automatically adopt the same position defeated by the voters. Common sense says that OSAB must look at the developer's application in light of current conditions, current standards, and make a fresh assessment. It is for you to weigh the significance of the applicant's proposed reduction in open space from the defeated proposal.

12% is a Floor, Not a Ceiling

The comments of many other citizens speak to the need for much more public land. Both the ConocoPhillips GDP and Louisville Municipal Code Sec. 16.16.060 establish a minimum public land dedication of 12%. The GDP cross-references the Code saying "a public land dedication of **at least** 12% will comply with Section 16.16.060(B) of the Louisville Municipal Code." See GDP General Note 5 (emphasis added). Neither the GDP or the Code establish a maximum amount to be dedicated. Significantly, the GDP doesn't specify an amount, leaving room for you to exercise your discretion. If the staff have not adequately explained the criteria OSAB applies, then ask for more information. Given the size of this parcel of land and the historical public land dedications for other large projects, the proposed dedication is puny. And, in light of the environmental and climate crises inadequate.

Clarification of How the Dedicated Land Calculation is Made

The GDP cross-references § 16.16.060(B). The effect of § 16.16.060(B) is to exclude "[d]edications of rights-of-way for public streets, drainage easements, utility easements or other public purposes" from the calculation of dedicated public lands.

The GDP does not cross reference Section 16.16.060(C) which excludes "[r]etention ponds or other land left open solely for the purpose of the development, such as land under power lines" from the calculation.

Please clarify which provisions of the Code and the GDP apply to this application and incorporate the correct calculation into your recommendation.

Make Brue Baukoll Meet Their Burden to Prove Compliance with the General Design and Construction Standards

The City Code recognizes that the "[p]lanning, layout and design of a subdivision are of utmost concern." § 16.16.010. This section of the Code provides standards that are to be applied when decisions are made on preliminary and final plats. The burden to prove that these general design and construction standards are met falls squarely upon the applicant. Here, Brue Backol.

Please carefully question the applicant to determine whether "natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, [have been] preserved **to the extent possible**." § 16.16.010(D) (emphasis added). Brue Backol has the burden of showing that they cannot do more.

Please satisfy yourselves that the buffering requirement for collection and arterial streets through earthen berms, landscaping, leafing patterns, or other appropriate materials required by § 16.16.010(B) is met throughout the property.

Before voting, please take the time to be sure that you understand how the applicant has complied with each provision of § 16.16.010 (not just the sections highlighted here).

Finally, from where I stand, the number of plans submitted by the applicant simply reflects the quality of their submissions, and their stubborn clinging to a singular vision. Brue Baukol's vision is out of synch with the citizens' vision, the City Code, and other applicable standards. Recommend that the City Council require a public land dedication of 50%.

I ask that the OSAB make the following recommendation to the Planning Commission:

Denial. This proposal does not meet the requirements of LMC 16.16.010.D: "Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be **preserved to the extent possible**." nor 16.16.010B for the north-south trail on the east side of the property: "...Buffering from collection and arterial streets must be provided by earthen berms, landscaping, leafing patterns, or other appropriate materials.

If, instead, the Board chooses to approve, we ask that the following conditions be mandated:
1. No development, other than the proposed roadways, shall be allowed north of Disk Drive.
2. The amount of open space shall total no less than 40% of the property that falls within Louisville and the total amount of public dedication shall be no less than 50%.
3. If the amount of open space thus situated north of Campus Drive (excluding the roadways and easements) is less than 40% of the property, the excess shall be located on the east, west, and/or south perimeters of the property.

If the Board would instead prefer to recommend a lower public-land dedication percentage, we ask that OSAB require that any additional open space above that already proposed be located contiguous to the open space already proposed within Louisville."
Thanks for your service to our community.
Best,

Cathern Smith
Ward III

From: sherry sommer
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 12:01 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Letter for OSAB

Members of Louisville's Open Space Advisory Board,

Tonight I will address your responsibility as a recommending body as it relates to the City of Louisville's Public Involvement Policy. I will focus on comments made during your May 11th meeting by Board Members and by a member of the public.

I call on you to make a recommendation to preserve 40% of the property in question as contiguous open space, north of Disk Drive, with a total of 50% public land dedication. Other speakers will address how this dedication is supported by code; I will focus on how it is supported by public engagement.

Board Comments:

I wholeheartedly support the direction set for the Board by Mr Blankenship's recommendations in your May 11 meeting. His statements accurately point out the lack of responsiveness by the applicant in light of our referendum and special election. His comments also reflect the directives set by the City of Louisville's Public Involvement Policy.

Mr Blankenship made the following comments (paraphrased):

OASAB needs to respect the mandate of voters' expressed through the referendum petition and election. The proposal before us does not reflect the voters' mandate. We need to make recommendations to City Council that will reflect the mandate—doing otherwise will further delay this process and create unnecessary costs, time, and work.

What has not changed in this proposal?

This proposal was submitted months ago and does not reflect the results of our special election. While the ConocoPhillips GDP reduces the size of the development to roughly 2.5 million square feet (sf), the proposed development footprint has not shrunk measurably since the applicant first proposed over 6 million sf of development for the site. The open space dedication remains unchanged from the rejected Redtail Ridge plan. The applicant is proceeding as if the costly election we just underwent is insignificant and requires no adjustment on their part.

How does the City of Louisville's Public Engagement Policy apply in this case? Why should the Board recommend a 50% public land dedication to include 40% contiguous open space?

- Voluntary Participation - The process will seek the support of those participants willing to invest the time necessary to make it work.

Resident groups have demonstrated that they are committed to preservation of open space and habitat through consistent involvement in City processes since the first proposal of RTR was submitted. Louisville Wildlife Advocates, No on Redtail Ridge, Louisville Southeast Gateway, and Citizens for a Vibrant, Sustainable Louisville have worked to research issues, to advocate for the preservation of wildlife habitat and open space, and to encourage involvement by hundreds of residents.

- Time, Financial and Legal Constraints - The process will operate within an appropriate time frame and budget and observe existing legal and regulatory requirements.
- Accountability - The process will reflect that participants are accountable to both their constituents and to the success of the process.

As was noted by the Chair of your Board in the previous meeting, referring a proposal that does not reflect the mandate of the referendum and the election will only result in more delays and a costlier process. Accountability to constituents will result in a successful process.

As we have seen throughout this process, a lack of responsiveness to residents' concerns has resulted in time consuming delays for the investor, residents, and the City. To take one example, if Council Member Brown's suggestion to set aside land north of Disk Drive as a public land dedication had been taken up, there would have been no referendum and no special election. Development that took into account resident input could have started in September.

It is incumbent for you to make a thoughtful decision that reflects the mandate of the voters. This may mean taking more time to come to your decision.

- Remembering that no single voice is more important than all others, and that there are diverse opinions to be considered;

- Ensuring that decisions and recommendations reflect the needs and desires of the community as a whole.

Some have dismissed the resident led referendum petition as reflective of only a small minority of voters. Likewise, they dismiss the and results of our special election, with claims that a 5% margin was not decisive. These arguments are groundless and disrespectful of the immense outpouring of resident support and effort in the face of almost insurmountable obstacles including the Marshall Fire. Residents have clearly and strongly spoken in favor of open space at RTR.

I would argue that the 'single voice' that has spoken most loudly through this process, has been that of Brue Baukol.

—The referendum petition garnered 783 signatures, almost double required by the City of Louisville. Signature gatherers found that the vast majority of residents were in favor of more open space at the site.

—Open space is supported by the vast majority of residents who voted in the special election. Both the Yes and Citizens for a Vibrant Sustainable Louisville Campaigned on open space at this site.

—If there is a 'single voice' that was over represented in the special election, it would be that of Brue Baukol. Brue Baukol financed the Yes campaign with at least 95% of total donations. (We do not have financial reporting on the non profit that was set up to collect additional funds through the Secretary of State's Office) The Yes Campaign outspent Citizens for a Vibrant, Sustainable Louisville at least 32:1. It is estimated that the election results were skewed by about 20 points by that amount of spending.

As an advisory board, it is your job to represent the voices and concerns of the community as a whole and to take the referendum and election results seriously.

• identifying their concerns and issues early in the process.

Residents have advocated tirelessly to advocate for more open space and preservation of habitat for the past three years. It is now up to you to make a recommendation to City Council that reflects public engagement.

Public Comments: May 11th Meeting

I would also like to correct two statements made during the public hearing which are incorrect:

1. It would be too costly to maintain more open space at this site. OSAB should not recommend a larger public land dedication.

In fact, your job is only to recommend land to be preserved in a public land dedication. It is up to City Council to decide how to fund maintenance of open space.

2) There is no land worth saving at this site.

In fact, the property north of Disk Drive has never been developed. Additionally, the PUD for the 2010 plan called for restoring the natural prairie at 222 acres of this site. This is possible and should be foremost in your minds as you make your recommendation.

Thank you for your time,

Sherry Sommer
910 South Palisade Court
Lousiville

Addendum #1 to OSAB June 2022 Board packet

Public comments regarding Red Tail Ridge

From: **Laura Page**
Date: Wed, Jun 1, 2022 at 11:48 AM
Subject: Letter to OSAB
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@louisvilleco.gov>

Dear Members of OSAB,

You are tasked, in part, with representing the desires of the public. In regards to the proposed Redtail Ridge development, I believe the recent vote of the public to deny the amendment to the GDP reflected, in part, a rejection of the design of this development. A large percentage of the communications submitted by our citizenry during prior public meetings conveyed dissatisfaction with the composition and amount of land preservation. The applicant has made no adjustments to their plans post-vote that would honor the public's desires.

Our Comprehensive Plan designates this land as rural yet the applicant has shown little willingness to consolidate the total building footprint in a way that would allow for deeper landscape buffers. The ConocoPhillips plan would have surrounded much of their development with native vegetation. In addition to 39 acres of public dedication, their commitment was to preserve an additional 222 acres of the 390 acres that fall within Louisville. The Redtail Ridge applicant, in contrast, has apparently pushed the built boundary out as far as they can go. They are proposing only 66 acres of public open space - **just 17% of the total site,** and a large portion of that is undevelopable anyway due to encumbered easements and buffer zones between the City and County. I concede that more *private* open space will be designated as each subdivision is developed but it will most likely be little bits and pieces distributed throughout the property. This additional open space will not support wildlife.

Because this property is now being subdivided, rather than being built in a cohesive manner for one company, Louisville has only one shot at unifying the open space. Because the developer is not constraining their spread, Louisville must do so through public-land designation.

I greatly appreciate that public and Board input helped ensure that the most environmentally-valuable land will be saved, but the distribution of the land appears to hold limited value for the native flora and fauna. Much of the proposed designation is not more than a football field in width and is bordered by and bisected twice by the proposed extension of Campus Road.

The impact on the native wildlife will be devastating and the full effect may never be known. The land has not been surveyed for burrowing owls under the new recommended research parameters and the applicant has apparently failed to do multi-year and multi-seasonal wildlife assessments. Their suggestion that they can relocate the vast prairie dog colonies is disingenuous at best. For those prairie dogs that cannot be moved, the applicant has not committed to the most "humane" method of dispatch. There is also a proposed trail around the pond on the east side which runs contrary to best practice for wildlife protection.

Because the public dedication meets the minimum City requirements, I don't think you can reject this plan outright but I do ask that if you approve it, you do so with a recommendation that additional land be designated as part of the public dedication. I would like to suggest that 40% of the property be preserved with all the additional land above the current proposal going to open space, preferably all

along the northern portion of the property. Perhaps Disk Drive could form a boundary, given that Storage Tek did not build anything north of that road so it's undisturbed.

40% open space is less than the 67% (including public and private open space) that ConocoPhillips was going to preserve, despite having the same development size. It is also less than the 46% set aside as a condition of the Coal Creek Ranch development. It is slightly more than the 34% set-aside for Centennial Valley which netted the City the Davidson Mesa gem.

This is the last sizable land area in Louisville still to be (re)developed. It is our last chance to save land for future generations. I would hate for the City to not maximize this opportunity, especially for a development that is largely being built on spec by "an entrepreneurial real estate investment firm focused on delivering excellent returns to partners and investors." Your focus should be on what's best for the City, not for the investors.

Thank you for your consideration.

Laura Page
920 Rex St

From: Nancy Paluh
Sent: Monday, June 6, 2022 11:26 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Osab

I voted NO on Red Tail Ridge. There was too much outside money trying to persuade our local voters. Louisville does not need anyone but our residents making our decisions. There was no plan for increased traffic (already 2 buildings and 711 going in on 96th), water or infrastructure. The Monarch's should have had the extra access back when it was built - 2000. Why has it been put on the bottom of Louisville's transportation plan and when an emergency (Marshall fire) does occur it is being used as a pawn? It should have been taken care of 20+ years ago. Same with Avista - let the hospital rebuild and don't use the land as a pawn.
We all know a big developer is only in this for itself - let them sell it and Louisville can start again.

Nancy Holloway (32 yr resident) - 155 w sycamore lane, Louisville

---

From: Angele Sjong
Sent: Monday, June 6, 2022 2:15 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge- Open Space

Dear OSAB Members,

Please work to preserve the land north of Disc Drive! This is certainly doable with the ConocoPhillips GDP so please work with the City and Brue Baukol to make this happen.

Thank you,
Jill Sjong
601 Dahlia Way
Louisville, CO

From: Lynda
Sent: Monday, June 6, 2022 10:02 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: We can

Hello Louisville open space commissioners- You have the important role of protecting and advocating for our land- that can not speak for itself.
Our town is a leader and role model for the nation in many ways and your leadership is appreciated and valuable.
Please provide and preserve all the open space and public lands possible- before it's too late.
Lynda

Sent from my iPhone

From: Brad Pugh
Sent: Monday, June 6, 2022 9:21 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Open Space

Hello,

I am writing to encourage and implore you to require the Redtail Ridge development to commit to a 50% Public Land Dedication with 40% Open Space. The voters sent a clear message in the referendum that the development should dedicate far more land to public benefit, including significantly more Open Space. The LOSAB has a mission, duty, and responsibility to honor that vote and do what is in the best interest of the residents of Louisville.

Please do your duty and fight for more Open Space!

Sincerely,
Brad Pugh

From: Gail Hartman
Sent: Monday, June 6, 2022 8:18 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Comments re: Redtail Ridge

To LOSAB,

I am unable to attend your June 8 meeting and therefore am sending my comments about the Redtail Ridge development via email.

I am a former member of the Louisville Planning Commission and the Boulder County Planning Commission. I wholeheartedly support the recommendation by Matt Jones, Boulder County Commissioner (and founding member of Louisville's OSAB). He is urging LOSAB to require a 50% land dedication with 40% open space. Commissioner Jones has reminded LOSAB that prior land dedications are what gave Louisville Davidson Mesa and the Coal Creek Golf Course.

LOSAB has been given a wonderful opportunity to unanimously represent the citizens of Louisville—made clear by the recent referendum vote—by ensuring the preservation of much more open space at Redtail Ridge than the developer intends to. We look forward to your strong, unwavering voice for open space in our city.

Thank you,

Gail Hartman
Louisville, CO

From: Scott MacLaughlin
Sent: Sunday, June 5, 2022 5:14 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge 40% open space

At your June 8 Advisory Board meeting, I am in support of having Redtail Ridge provide 40% of their land for open space. The Louisville community has consistently and overwhelmingly denounced the building plans for Redtail Ridge. This request is not unreasonable given precedence and the interest of the overall community.

Scott MacLaughlin
948 St. Andrews Lane
Louisville, CO

From: Katharine Rhodes

Sent: Sunday, June 5, 2022 2:34 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: More open space from RTR development

Hello OSAB-

Please support the community of Louisville by requesting a larger dedication of open space from the proposed RTR development. Similar to what was required of Davidson Mesa and Coal Creek Golf Course developments. This is the last large rural corridor on Louisville. Please protect the rural gateway between the sprawl of Broomfield and the town of Louisville.

Thank you,
Katharine Owocki

From: deb owens
Sent: Sunday, June 5, 2022 12:35 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: REDTAIL RIDGE

Dear Open Space Advisory Board,
As a Louisville Resident since 1993, please request on my behalf, 50% Public Land Dedication and 40% Open Space regarding Redtail Ridge.
Thank you

--
Deb Owens
599 West St
Louisville, CO 80027

From: Don Brown
Sent: Monday, June 6, 2022 2:56 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Open Space Plan

Dear Boardmembers,

I am writing in strong support of the Open Space plan as proposed by Brue Baukul on their submission.

First, this is a generous offer and is more acreage than is required for the 2010 Conoco Phillips plan.

Second, approving and overall development-level open space plan will create more significant open space than leaving such dedications to the ensuing sit PUD plans.

Third, the opponents are asking for unreasonable amounts, incorrectly analyzing this dedication/development to the development of the golf course and other past developments.

Finally, this type of massive extraction from a developer will continue to set the precedent that our City is too onerous to work, an image we need to work hard to overcome if we are to ever do anything in the McCaslin corridor.

This plan as submitted is reasonable, generous and good for our Community.

Nothing has changed since this very board approved a largely similar plan. Accordingly, there is no reason to overrule your previous decision.

Thank you for your service to our community.

Don

From: Michelle Willix
Sent: Monday, June 6, 2022 7:55 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Red Tail Ridge

Hello,
I will not be able to attend the meeting this Wednesday. I am driving back from out of state and have poor cell signal.

However, I wanted to make sure I shared my thoughts on red tail ridge development.

I voted no on the special election vote for the proposed plan on Redtail ridge. I voted that way because of several things:

1. not enough open space. I would like to see at least 50% public land with 40% open space and 10% for the proposed park the developers stated.
2. We already have a huge industrial park with tons of open offices. We have a new one going up on courtesy road. Why do we need more when we can't fill what is already there?
3. The traffic issues that would ensue with the previous proposed plan. The suggested solution will not meet the needs sufficiently for what was proposed.

Please keep these thoughts in mind for the June 8 meeting.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,
Michelle Willix

Michelle Willix, LCSW,MPH
Healthy Pathways

From: Tom Lepak
Sent: Monday, June 6, 2022 3:09 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: Maryan Jaross <mjaross@comcast.net>
Subject: Re: comments about Redtail Ridge development

I realize there are conflicting opinions as to the appropriate amount of open space which the proposed Redtail Ridge development should provide.
Regardless of the final open space acreage, it is important that the open space layout be cohesive rather than a hodge-podge scattering of odds and ends to fill out the site.
Subsurface parking or even a few parking garages could free up space which is currently planned for surface paving.

I would like to bring up a different item: What is the "official" position of Avista Adventist Hospital toward any future expansion or relocation plans? Brue Baukol originally planned to have a large senior living center constructed across 88th Avenue from the existing hospital site. Brue Baukol explained this close proximity to the hospital and adjoining clinic was a key component in getting the senior living center developer to want to locate in Redtail Ridge.

The overall Brue Baukol plan (which included the senior living center) was rejected by the City Council.

In Brue Baukol's recent and unsuccessful campaign to win over the Louisville citizens, several Brue Baukol flyers promoted the idea that Avista was interested in buying 40 acres of the Redtail Ridge site so as to build a new and larger hospital. When I asked several Brue Baukol proponents, they explained Louisville risked losing the existing hospital (judged by some to be too small) much as it did in having Medtronic quickly decide to build their new office now under construction in Lafayette. Medtronic was promoted as Brue Baukol's marquis resident in their original application. In the end, Medtronic was just looking for a site and not really committed to Louisville.

What would become of the existing Avista Adventist Hospital if they were to build new and move less than one mile? The City of Boulder has now struggled for years as to how best to repurpose the vacant Boulder Community Hospital. Louisville does not need a similar situation a few years from now. The Avista Adventist Hospital has the right to make plans for their future. The Louisville community deserves to know their plans if they would include Redtail Ridge and staying in Louisville.

Thomas Lepak
846 Saint Andrews Lane
Louisville, CO 80027

On Wed, Sep 1, 2021 at 9:23 PM Tom Lepak <thomas.f.lepak@gmail.com> wrote:
I would first like to thank the entire City Council and staff for your countless hours of research, discussion, public meetings, and now deliberations about Redtail Ridge and its development.

My name is Tom Lepak.
I have lived in Louisville since 2007 and at 846 St Andrews Ln, Louisville, CO 80027 in the Coal Creek Ranch neighborhood since 2008.

Not only am I a city resident but also part owner of a Louisville office building - 890 West Cherry Street. It has served as the corporate headquarters of Casey Industrial, Inc. www.caseyind.com since July 2020.
The building is directly behind the Safeway store on McCaslin and at the corner of Cherry & Dahlia. It is a rather "unique" location for an office building since it has a car wash and an orchid nursery for neighbors.

My comments are both as a resident and business property owner.

I made a point 2 weeks ago to ride my bike slowly throughout the Centennial Parkway office park on the west side of McCaslin. I am sure the developers of this office park, similar to Brue Baukol Capital Partners today, had big dreams 30-odd years ago as the McCaslin corridor was being developed. Did they, like Brue Baukol, paint a rosy picture of how the office park would be vibrantly complete over a 20-year period? Whether they did or did not, it is obvious during my 14 years in Louisville that the Centennial Parkway office park has been stagnant in terms of development. There has always been a wide display of For Sale and For Lease signs on the vacant lots and many of the office buildings. This was the case before the Great Recession, much worse during and shortly thereafter, and yet ever-present even now in 2021. There are many fine companies in this office park and there remains plenty of room for more. Yet, there appears to have been little demand for any new office buildings in recent years. What was wrong with the vision? The roads and utilities are already in place. There is easy access to Highway 36 via McCaslin Blvd. I'm sure the existing businesses along McCaslin would welcome more potential customers within walking distance. Could the lack of a full build-out of the office part have had a lasting, negative impact on the financial viability of many closed McCaslin retail businesses?

The Brue Baukol vision for Redtail Ridge is a hodge-podge of yet-to-be determined office owners or tenants. I do not fault them for having such a vision since this is what commercial real estate developers are in business to provide. Yet, I can only envision that 20 years from now, Redtail Ridge will, like Centennial Parkway now, be host to numerous For Sale and For Lease signs. We have struggled as a community over the past few years to reimagine the McCaslin business corridor and make it a more welcoming gateway to Louisville. Redtail Ridge is promoted as a new gateway for Louisville. If the City Council approves Brue Baukol's ill-defined "Build It and They Will Come" plan, we have to wish them 100% success. Otherwise the City will face a future with two incomplete gateways.

I encourage the City Council members to walk or ride their bikes through Centennial Parkway to help better frame a reference point for your vote.

As for our office building, many of you will recall it was the home of the Bank of Louisville. Once the bank closed, the property was under-utilized for many years with only a few tenants. Maybe the drive-through canopy and bank vault were distractions. Abri Group, of which I am a owner, purchased the property in mid 2019, worked with an architect and the City to develop a new vision for the building, had the entire interior gutted and rebuilt during the first half of 2020, and Casey Industrial (I am an employee) relocated to Louisville July 6, 2020 from our former office in Westminster. We are happy to now call Louisville home. We are an industrial construction company with project experience across the USA. Our home office staff numbers approximately 35. In any given week, 6 to 10 personnel will be away from the office visiting project sites, clients, etc. However, due to the pandemic and with modern connectivity tools, our Louisville in-the-office count rarely exceeds 10 people. We know that number will increase once the pandemic subsides. However, we are realistic to understand that it is not forward-thinking to demand our workforce only work in the office. Employees live in not only Boulder,

Louisville, and Lafayette, but as far away as the hills west of Golden, Parker, Fort Collins, and Fort Lupton. Saving time and gas from not having to commute even a day or two a week is now a valid employment perk and even an expectation for many new hires. I offer this story to simply provide a case study that the office buildings built in 2023 and beyond will have different census and parking and square footage per employee demands. I am a professional engineer and maintained our contractor licenses in several states until recently ceding that responsibility to younger colleagues as I near retirement.

Thank you again for allowing me to present these comments for your reflections.

Tom Lepak
846 Saint Andrews Lane
Louisville, CO 80027

From: Jeffrey Gass
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 7:44 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Red Tail ridge

I am writing in strong support of the Open Space plan as proposed by Brue Baukul on their submission. Nothing has changed since this board approved a very similar plan

First, this is a generous offer and is more acreage than is required for the 2010 Conoco Phillips plan.

Second, approving the overall development-level open space plan will create more significant open space than leaving such dedications to the ensuing sit PUD plans.

The opposition voices are asking for unreasonable amount. This type of massive ask from a developer will continue to set the precedent that our City is too onerous to work with, an image we need to work hard to overcome if we are to ever do anything in the McCaslin corridor.

This plan as submitted is reasonable, shows goodwill by the developer and that he is working on a balance for our Community.

Accordingly, there is no reason to overrule your previous decision.

Thank you for your service

Jeffrey Gass
784 Meadowlark Lane
Louisville, CO 80027

From: Cyndi Thomas
Sent: Monday, June 6, 2022 8:21 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Comments for Open Space Board Mtg June 8

Hello Open Space Advisory Board Members,

I have reviewed the board packet for the Redtail Ridge agenda item for the June 8, 2022 meeting and am in favor of the developer's proposed land dedication as stated. I find the proposal to be reasonable and consistent with the intent of the current governing GDP. I urge you to approve and move this plan forward to the next stage with Planning Commission and City Council. Thank you for your service.

Best,
Cyndi

Cyndi Thomas
1245 Grant Avenue
Louisville, CO 80027

From: rachel cox
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 9:24 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Open Space Request - Red Tail Ridge

Good Morning,

I am writing this email in the hopes of 50% land dedication with 40% of that space dedicated to open space. This is what Louisville is about. We thrive off of open space to recreate. NOT high density development. It's sad what our town and county has become with so much high density development. I am not opposed to change, but it must be right for our community. More high density development is not the answer. Please consider open space for our mental well being, our wildlife, and our peace of mind.

Rachel Cox
2010 Centennial Dr.
Louisville

From: Kim Gustafson
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 9:23 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Redtail Ridge

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Kim Gustafson**
Date: Mon, Jun 6, 2022 at 7:17 AM
Subject: Redtail Ridge
To: <emberb@louisville.gov>

I support the advocacy of 50% of Redtail Ridge to be dedicated as public land in order to preserve and enhance quality of life for the citizens of Louisville.

10% set aside for a park, fire station and trail corridors is a necessary requirement. As part of that 10% I also request outdoor dedicated pickleball courts since Louisville has none at this point. Citizens must go to other nearby towns (Superior, Erie, Broomfied) to play on proper pickleball courts.

The remaining 40% of the public land dedication needs to be open space. Louisville's history of commitment to open space requirements as part of large commercial developments sets us apart from the surrounding East Boulder County communities. Urban sprawl is all around us and Louisville's livability and quality of life as a refuge from the endless sprawl is worth fighting for. Once the land is lost to development it is gone forever.

Thank you for your advocacy in putting Louisville citizens' best interests first as this large development gets underway.

Kim Gustafson
600 Dahlia Way
Louisville

From: Richard Woodruff
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 9:22 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Open Space Plan

Dear Boardmembers: Don Brown provided me with the email he has previously sent to you and I would like to share the information again because I strongly support his comments and concerns. I would also like to emphasize Don's point about how Louisville looks to the outside communities that want to locate here. Louisville does not have a great reputation in the Denver Metro Business Community and to some we are known as the BANANA republic (BANANA standing for Build Absolutely Nothing ANywhere at Anytime.) In my opinion vibrant communities always have a strong core, but also look at change as a positive and not a negative.

Rick Woodruff
820 Mt Evans Ct

Below you will find an email previously sent to you by Don Brown
I am writing in strong support of the Open Space plan as proposed by Brue Baukul on their submission.

First, this is a generous offer and is more acreage than is required for the 2010 Conoco Phillips plan.

Second, approving and overall development-level open space plan will create more significant open space than leaving such dedications to the ensuing site PUD plans.

Third, the opponents are asking for unreasonable amounts, incorrectly analyzing this dedication/development to the development of the golf course and other past developments.

Finally, this type of massive extraction from a developer will continue to set the precedent that our City is too onerous to work, an image we need to work hard to overcome if we are to ever do anything in the McCaslin corridor.

This plan as submitted is reasonable, generous and good for our Community.

Nothing has changed since this very board approved a largely similar plan. Accordingly, there is no reason to overrule your previous decision.

Thank you for your service to our community.

Don Brown

From: Valerie Weber
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 9:03 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Red Tail Ridge

Dear Boardmembers,

I am writing in strong support of the Open Space plan as proposed by Brue Baukul on their submission.

First, this is a generous offer and is more acreage than is required for the 2010 Conoco Phillips plan.

Second, approving and overall development-level open space plan will create more significant open space than leaving such dedications to the ensuing sit PUD plans.

Third, the opponents are asking for unreasonable amounts, incorrectly analyzing this dedication/development to the development of the golf course and other past developments.

Finally, this type of massive extraction from a developer will continue to set the precedent that our City is too onerous to work, an image we need to work hard to overcome if we are to ever do anything in the McCaslin corridor.

This plan as submitted is reasonable, generous and good for our Community.
Nothing has changed since this very board approved a largely similar plan. Accordingly, there is no reason to overrule your previous decision.

Thank you for your service to our community.

Valerie Weber
662 W. Hickory St.
Louisville, CO 80027

From: Bev Snyder
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 11:28 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Red Tail Ridge meeting - Open Space Advisory Board

Good morning,

We are requesting more open space for this area.

We, the voters, made it clear that we do not want this area to be heavily developed.

We, homeowners and voters, want this area to carry the following requirements from the developer -

155 acres - 50% - to be public land dedication
124 acres - 40% - to be open space only
30 acres - 10% - will become a park, trails and the fire station

Louisville required Coal Creek to hold 46% open, Centennial Valley to hold 35% open and they are asking Red Tail to hold 21% open - NOT ACCEPTABLE.

Similiar land dedications have given this town Coal Creek Golf Course and Davidson Mesa - these areas are used by our citizens and greatly appreciated.

Will you honor what us town folk have voted for? What we are asking for?

Thanks for your time,

Bev Snyder and Rolland Fearn
304 Diamond Cir
Lsvl

From: Lizzie Raudenbush
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 12:26 PM

To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Support for Open Space Plan

Dear Boardmembers,

I am writing in strong support of the Open Space plan as proposed by Brue Baukul on their submission.

First, this is a generous offer and is more acreage than is required for the 2010 Conoco Phillips plan.

Second, approving and overall development-level open space plan will create more significant open space than leaving such dedications to the ensuing sit PUD plans.

Third, the opponents are asking for unreasonable amounts, incorrectly analyzing this dedication/development to the development of the golf course and other past developments.

Finally, this type of massive extraction from a developer will continue to set the precedent that our City is too onerous to work, an image we need to work hard to overcome if we are to ever do anything in the McCaslin corridor.

This plan as submitted is reasonable, generous and good for our Community.

Nothing has changed since this very board approved a largely similar plan. Accordingly, there is no reason to overrule your previous decision.

Thank you for your service to our community.

Lizzie Raudenbush
Resident 80027

From: A R
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 12:13 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Plat

Members of the Open Space Advisory Board,

Redtail Ridge is the last significantly sized undeveloped tract of land remaining in Louisville, and as such, it is the last, best opportunity for the Board to advocate for meaningful open space. When voters rejected the Redtail Ridge proposal in the Special Election of April 20, it was clearly a mandate for more thoughtful development than the proposed project offers.

There are precedents for greater percentages of land to be dedicated, and the Board should require at least the same amount of open space now, and certainly not less, as the 21% the applicant has proposed. I would like to see a minimum of 40% open space dedication, which would be more in line with large developments in the past. This region needs to minimize the 'heat island' effect, and open space is an easy and effective way to do so.

Please don't rubber stamp the applicant's proposal just because you can. Louisville deserves better.

Respectfully,
Andrew Rogowski
260 S Lincoln Ave.

From:	Irfan Azeem
To:	Ember Brignull
Subject:	Redtail Ridge proposal
Date:	Wednesday, May 11, 2022 8:50:20 AM

Dear OSAB,

I voted no last month on the special ballot on Redtail Ridge because the plan covers too much of the land with buildings, parking lots, and roads, and does not preserve enough of the natural landscape. Now the developer is back with a new plan. This one has less square footage than the prior one but the same amount of open space. This amount is not enough to support the site's wildlife and promote biodiversity.

I'm writing to you to urge OSAB to require the developer of Redtail Ridge to leave at least 50% of the site unpaved and undeveloped and move Campus Drive so that it doesn't run right through the wildlife habitat, which in the proposed plan is too small to begin with.

--Irfan Azeem

631 West St., Louisville, CO 80027

From: cindy Bedell
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 12:15 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Public Comment for Open Space Board meeting 5/11/22

Dear Open Space Advisory Board,

I am writing about your review tonight of the Redtail Ridge Preliminary and Final Plat Review.

Please recommend more open space and do not approve this version.

The 66.06 acres of proposed Open Space is not sufficient for a parcel of this size with so many important natural features. This parcel of land is our Southeast Gateway to Louisville and a buffer to neighboring Broomfield.

For comparison, 46% of Coal Creek Ranch was dedicated for public uses and over 35% of Centennial Valley was public open space. Our beloved and highly used Davidson Mesa Open space was part of the Centennial Valley open space dedication.

The community demand for open space and preservation of land has only increased since then. In the recent special election, the voters spoke loud and clear that they want more open space in Redtail Ridge.

Please follow the lead of the voters and use your important platform as Open Space Advisory Board members to recommend at least 40% of this parcel be set aside s open space. If everything north of Disc drive were preserved, I believe that could be about 156 or 160 acres. The development could occur on the already disturbed Storage Technology footprint.

Thank you for your consideration,

Cindy Bedell

662 W. Willow St.

Louisville

From: Tam Dalle Molle
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 9:58 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Please approve the Redtail Ridge proposal for open space tonight

Dear Open Space Advisory Board:

Our community has just emerged from a special election that drew participation from more than 7,500 Louisville residents. More than anything, this election served as a clear reminder that Louisville residents love open space, and we thank each of you for your work in helping ensure our access!

We are writing to ask you to approve the Redtail Ridge proposal for open space tonight. We are very impressed that the developer is willing to continue to abide by their earlier agreement with OSAB for 93 acres of parks and open space, even though they could simply offer the 38-acre minimum amount required under the Conoco GDP. It is very clear to us that the developer's proposal is the result of your board's strong collaborative relationship with its partners, and we commend you all for having created that dynamic in the first place.

Compared to the open space required in the Conoco plan, the Redtail plan upholds earlier agreements with OSAB for 93 acres of public land dedication that is far better in every way, including location, quality, and size. There's parkland for families and more trails. Additionally, there's a significant habitat protection and preservation plan in place, which signals a deeper commitment to creating beautiful spaces for our community to enjoy.

We ask that you please approve this proposal and open up access for our community to this open space.

Sincerely,

Mulberry Street
Louisville, CO

From:	heather gardner
To:	Ember Brignull
Subject:	Redtail Ridge
Date:	Tuesday, May 10, 2022 9:42:47 AM

10 May 2022

Dear Open Space Advisory Board,

Our community voted against a gigantic business park in April because the proposed development was far too large, and the amount of proposed dedicated public land was far too small. As our representatives, please do your best to find a healthier balance between the size of the buildings and the amount of open space.

As you consider and discuss each aspect of the current Redtail Ridge proposal, please address the following concerns of the Louisville residents:

- 50% of the property should be dedicated public land.
- Limit the development to 2.5 million sq ft as is prescribed in the 2010 plan.
- The open space should not be carved up or even bisected by roads and parking lots.

When I spoke with Louisville residents about Redtail Ridge before the elections, these are the three major reasons they cited for voting against the proposed development.

Thank you for your careful consideration!

Sincerely,

Heather Gardner
La Farge Ave.
Louisville, CO 80027

From: Aaron Grider
To: Ember Brignull
Subject: Redtail
Date: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 10:02:35 AM

Hi, Ember!!! Hope you and your fam are well… what a crazy couple of years.

And it's remarkable that the community is still attempting to decide what to do with Storage Tek / Phillips 66 / Redtail Ridge after all these years. When I was on the OSAB we were wrestling with it, and it was old news THEN!

Anyway, I support the following three items:

1) OSAB making a decision on trails, open space, roads, and parks by discussing EACH item.

2) a 50% public land dedication at Redtail Ridge.

3) Campus Drive being routed so that it does not cut through the site's open space

Aaron Grider
Colorado, USA

-----Original Message-----
From: Mary Ann Heaney
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 11:12 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Public Lands

Open Space Board,

Please require the Redtail Ridge developer to provide the citizens of Louisville the maximum amount of public land allowable under the City's laws and codes. (50% I believe.)
Louisville citizens have demanded more land than the developer offered during every Planning Commission meeting on this project.
Citizens demanded additional land at every City Council meeting on this project.
The Council and Planning have already soundly rejected the current proposal.
And citizens AGAIN made this desire clear through last month's vote on this project.
PLEASE SUPPORT LOUISVILLE'S CITIZENS.
Not a developer.

Thank you,
MA Heaney
La Farge Ave

From:	Matt Jones
To:	Ember Brignull
Subject:	Counting on you to be open space champs of Redtail Ridge
Date:	Tuesday, May 10, 2022 10:25:04 AM

Louisville voters sent a clear message to the city in the Redtail Ridge referendum--require far more public benefit, including more open space, at the Redtail Ridge site. To honor that vote, and as open space champions, LOSAB should recommend that the developer dedicate 40% of the area to open space. You have the mission, criteria and responsibility to do so.

The developer likes to downplay their election loss. The fact is they suffered a decisive and embarrassing loss. They spent 32 times as much money, not counting untraceable money that may have been spent by a "dark money" nonprofit they incorporated, and lost to a grassroots citizen group by more than five points. In a presidential election five points is a landslide. Had both sides spent the same amount of money the developer would have likely lost by 20 plus points.

You have the mission and criteria to require more open space than is being proposed. First, you are charged to make recommendations for more open space acquisition. That is why you have already recommended to the city council acquisition of part of the Redtail Ridge area as one of your top projects. Secondly, in the development review process you are to "Provide any additional recommendation on open space issues the board finds appropriate." If there was ever reason to use this criterion, this is it for the massive proposal. You are counting on you, members of LOSAB, to be our strong voice for open space.

Louisville has a history of requiring substantial public land and open space dedication for large developments. For perspective, Louisville required 46% of Coal Creek Ranch to be dedicated for public uses and over 35% of Centennial Valley to public open space. The developers proposed 21% of the area being preserved as open space is inadequate for the huge size of this development, not consistent with the referendum message and is not consistent with the LOSAB land preservation mission.

I recommend requiring 50% (155 acres) public land dedication, with 40% (124) of that in open space. The remaining 10% (30) is for the developers proposed acreage for a park, tails corridors and a fire station.

Twenty-two years ago, I helped establish the LOSAB by recommending a compromise to the city council. I served as its first chair. The intention then, and the intention now, is for LOSAB to be champions for aggressively preserving more open space. Please recommend to Council that 40% of the Redtail Ridge be protected as open space.

We are counting on you to be our open space preservation champs!

Matt Jones

Louisville resident

From: David Judd
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 6:55 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail ridge plat

Hello,

I am very sorry to have missed Wednesday's meeting of the Open Space Advisory Board. I hope it is not too late to offer my opinion on the Redtail Ridge open space plans. My point of view is that sustainability is an essential requirement of any such plan. Without that aspect, we might as well build a parking lot. The difficulty, of course is, how to define and then provide for a long-term, stable environment. I cannot answer that and lacking a specific answer my advice is to be aggressive. The Citizen's for a Vibrant, Sustainable Louisville suggest a 50% dedication to public land and I agree with that proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
David Judd

From:	Jill
To:	Ember Brignull
Subject:	Redtail Ridge
Date:	Tuesday, May 10, 2022 9:45:59 AM

Dear OSAB Members,

I am writing to request that in your consideration for Redtail Ridge you please take these into account:

1) Please discuss each item- trails, open space, roads, and parks.

2) Please have a 50% public land dedication.

3) Please reroute Campus Drive so that it does not cut through the open space.

I am writing as I can not attend the meeting tonight as I will be working.

Thank you,
Jill Kranitz
Louisville resident

From: Beth McQuie
Sent: Monday, May 9, 2022 2:26 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: More open space at Redtail Ridge

Dear Louisville Open Space Advisory Board,

I am writing about the latest version of Redtail Ridge. Please do not approve the open space as set forth in the proposal. It is far too small.

Undisturbed open space is one of the treasures of Colorado. Most other states do not have that left. It adds to the quality of life, with views, wildlife, and the potential for walking trails for people. It also increases the property values of homes and businesses around it. I've recently explored some of the nearby communities and find that many of them have huge swaths of open space, with walking trails. Westminster is a good example, with the Big Dry Creek trail and open space. The city of Boulder is surrounded by protected open space. Once built upon, the natural open space is gone forever. We need to be protecting this valuable asset that Louisville has.

The previous Redtail Ridge proposal included nearly 100 acres of open space, not including the portion in Broomfield. I ask that you make this a minimum, and not go backwards with the open space allocations. Please don't punish the many citizens who lobbied for open space in the last Redtail Ridge iteration by taking away those wins.

I request that you leave all of the area north of the former Disk Drive (approximately 140 acres) as open space. Please include walking trails for people and large areas of open space around the three or four ponds that are currently there. Those are habitat for birds, which are at risk of decline already. Putting roads right beside them will scare the birds and other wildlife away.

During Covid, many people discovered the pleasures and health benefits of walking in fresh air. That side of town has no walking trails on open space. We could use more walking trails. I used to walk along Campus Drive some mornings and loved seeing and hearing the birds, prairie dogs, flowers and occasional coyote. The peace and beauty was restorative. Our neighborhood of Coal Creek Ranch, which abuts Redtail Ridge, has many seniors now, who enjoy walking for their health. Please consider our needs and wishes.

The beautiful view of the mountains that can be seen from Campus Drive is one of the last undisturbed views of the mountains in Louisville. Please don't take that away. Views are precious.

To conclude, I ask that you protect as much open space as possible in Redtail Ridge. Please aim to save the approximately 140 acres north of the former Disc Drive. Please also protect the ponds from having roads built near them.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Beth McQuie
972 Saint Andrews Lane, Louisville

From: William G Mertens
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 9:57 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: RTR - OSAB meeting

To whom it may concern,
I do not think I can add much to the excellent letter Matt Jones has already written. I am asking for the same. Please consider recommending 50% public land dedication in the RTR space, with 40% of that as open space. Also, please recommend that Campus Drive be rerouted so that it does not cut through the open space. The current RTR plan looks similar to the one submitted two years ago -- a plan that was soundly rejected by the Planning Board and City Council.

Thank you for your time,

Billy Mertens
917 Eldorado Lane

From: Andy Meseck
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 9:51 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Recommendation for Approval of the Final Redtail Ridge Proposal

Dear OSAB Board,

I am sending this email to strongly encourage OSAB's approval recommendation for the final Redtail Ridge proposal that is currently under review, which includes the subdivision plat proposal and the submitted trail and right of way landscape design. Additionally, I am asking that this move forward due to the inclusion of the 93 acres contained within the plan that was the result of a collaborative effort between prior OSAB boards and Brue Baukol. This was an increase from the originally proposed 38 acres and is much more accessible than what was in the prior plan.

One of the reasons that my family was so strongly in favor of the developer's most recent plan was that it contained more contiguous open space, parks and trails. This was not the case in the Conoco GDP, where the proposed 38 acres of public space was scattered across the site. While the most recent plan was narrowly voted down, the developer has offered to donate more open space, in a much more accessible layout, than what is currently allowed under the Conoco GDP. This collaborative deal is very much in Louisville's best interests, and a recommendation for approval would reflect well for this OSAB board.

Sincerely,

Andy Meseck and the Meseck family
879 Cleveland Ct.

From: Robert P. Muckle
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 10:22 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Comments for Open Space Board

Dear Open Space Board:

I'm writing regarding the Redtail Ridge item on your agenda tonight. I urge you not to support the amount of open space the developer is proposing. Development of a property of this size and with such high quality open space deserves a much higher open space dedication. I encourage you to recommend a dedication of 40% for open space alone, not including other public dedications. In the referendum vote Louisville residents spoke clearly that they wanted less density and more open space on this property. Please don't be dissuaded from advocating for open space by arguments about prior approvals or about "usual" dedications percentages. This is a large property whose development will impact our community for decades to come. If the Open Space Board does't advocate for more open space who will. Again, I urge you to recommend a 40% dedication and let the city council decide how to balance all the considerations involved in this development proposal.

Thank you for your service to the community.

Bob Muckle
Louisville resident.

From: Cory Nickerson
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 10:37 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: RedTail Ridge support

Hello OSAB Board:

As always, thank you for your service to our community! Tonight, I know you will participate in a required public review process for the next stage of redevelopment at Redtail Ridge. I ask for your support of Brue Baukol's proposal to donate more open space and parks, and to continue OSAB's tradition of unanimous support for more open space and parks.

We all know that 93 acres is more than 38 acres, and we also know that open space is better when it's contiguous and offers clear, unobstructed views of our mountains. Tonight, you will be asked whether we want to approve the 93-acre plan for open space and parks or revert back to 38 acres in a much worse location. This should be an easy YES, and I thank you for helping ensure that this long-closed, privately owned land can finally be opened up to our community.

It's important to note that the reason why 93 acres is even a consideration is that previous OSABs successfully collaborated with this developer to ensure more open space, a far better placement, and higher quality. I encourage your unanimous support for more open space.

Sincerely,

Cory Nickerson
Louisville resident

From: Laura Page
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 10:22 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Comment for tonight's meeting

Hello Ember,

Please provide the attached letter to the OSAB for consideration during tonight's meeting.

Thank you.

Laura Page and Celeste Niehaus
920 Rex St

Dear Members of OSAB,

The successful citizen referendum that defeated the proposed amendment to the Conoco Phillips GDP allows you a second opportunity to review the amount and quality of open space you will recommend to City Council. We applaud your previous efforts to ensure that the highest-quality land will be preserved during the development. However, because the alignment of the proposed extension of Campus Drive trisects the proposed open space, the quality of this open space is greatly diminished. We believe there is a need for additional open space land to be dedicated to ensure larger expanses of continuous open space that will better nurture the existing wildlife.

Unlike the now-expired Conoco Phillips development proposal which was for one unified campus, Redtail Ridge will be subdivided into smaller development sections. The City will have no opportunity past this subdivision plat to ensure open-space continuity.

When the CP PUD was approved by City Council in 2010, 38.92 acres of publicly-dedicated land plus 222 of private open space was approved. Combined, that's just shy of 67% of the property. The proposed CP development was surrounded by deep open-space buffers that helped it more closely align with the rural designation required by our Comprehensive Plan. Under the current proposal, just 23% of the property is proposed for public dedication. The City received 46% of the Coal Creek Ranch property and 35% of the Centennial Valley property.

Although there will be additional private open space added during PUD proposals, we want to reiterate that it is unlikely that those added areas will be contiguous with the proposed public open space. The graphics offered by Brue Baukol (below) illustrating full build-out suggest this developer plans to almost fully develop the portion of the property not publicly dedicated. Convert the grey areas below to green and you'll clearly see the much smaller expanse of land that will be preserved under the current proposal than what was approved by Council for the Conoco Phillips proposal.

We call upon this board to ensure there is more uninterrupted open space than currently proposed by Brue Baukol by recommending a deeper public-land dedication on the north end of the property than is currently proposed. Ideally, the Board would recommend that **all land north of Disk Drive be preserved** since that land was not previously developed by Storage Tek and is currently home to a large prairie dog colony that supports additional wildlife species. The prairie dog colony will likely be fully exterminated unless OSAB recommends to preserve it.

We ask that the Board recommend **50% of the property be preserved**, an amount still significantly less than what would have remained undeveloped under the previous Conoco Phillips development.

This property is the last significant land mass in Louisville to be developed. As a community, we highly value our open space. Please do not miss out on this opportunity to preserve an environmentally-supportive expanse of land in keeping with our values.

Thank you for your consideration.

Laura Page and Celeste Niehaus
920 Rex St

From: Laura Pederson
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 7:48 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Development Review

Hello,

In your Redtail Ridge review tonight, please take the following actions.

1. Please engage in a thorough, separate review of each of these items: trails, parks, roads and open space. Each of these topics is important and warrants a thorough individual discussion.

2. Please require a 50% public land dedication. The residents of Louisville have made it clear repeatedly that we do NOT want a sprawling horizontal development that destroys the existing undeveloped land unnecessarily. The residents of Louisville want to preserve as much undisturbed land as possible.

3. Please require that Campus Drive be routed in such a way that it does not disturb or destroy the existing open space. This is de facto critical open space, so Campus Drive North should be moved to protect it.

Please remember that we only have one remaining chance to get this right for generations to come. We are relying on you to do the right and honorable thing. Please keep in mind that the wildlife that has thrived on this property has no where else to go if it is displaced. There is development all around it. They will become roadkill if you don't do whatever you can to protect them, and to preserve as much of this precious land as possible.

Thank you for your time. We will be watching for the results of your meeting with hope and great anticipation.

Best Regards,
Laura Parks-Pederson
2297 Cliffrose Lane

From: Gaylynn Potemkin
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 9:19 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

Dear Board Members,
First I would like to request that you review and address citizen comments regarding the Redtail Ridge Plat.
I want to protest to Mr. Baukol's egregious behavior in attempting to mislead the citizenry of Louisville with the propaganda he sent out during the campaign, stating, (among other falsehoods), that a NO vote would lead to the Conoco-Phillips plan being immediately put in place. What other lies is he perpetrating to persuade the various city boards and committees to ignore the clear voice of the residents' NO vote (even in the face of his deceptive advertising)?
The Plat that continues to be pushed in our faces is as unsatisfactory as it was at the time of the special election!
It is in Louisville's best interest that certain requirements be put in place before any development be allowed to move forward.
These requirements should include, among others, 50% public land dedication, Campus Drive should be routed so as NOT to bisect open space, and land-use determinations should be such as to eliminate the need for underpasses.
The amount of horizontal development is objectionable and needs to be addressed, as well.
Thank you for your consideration of these concerns. Sincerely,
Gaylynn Potemkin, Louisville resident
505 Spruce St.
Louisville

From: Jeff Regier
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 9:11 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

OSAB,
The Retail Ridge project has become a very contentious development proposal within our tight knit community. I think that is safe to say that at every step of the way the public has asked for a smaller development with smaller buildings, less parking lots and more open space. The debate had come to a special election at a great cost financially and emotionally to all of our citizens.
With the seemingly non stop development in all of our surrounding communities, holding onto as much open space as possible is very important.
Please do not make any hasting decisions and at every opportunity take back as much open space as possible. A 50% public land dedication would be ideal.
Additionally, please consider rerouting Campus Drive to provide for more open space.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Jeff Regier
Matchless St.

From: stephanie rowe
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 7:27 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

Dear Members of the Open Space Advisory Board,

Thank you for taking the time to review the most recent proposal for Redtail Ridge and consider it in the context of both the city's municipal code and the wishes and concerns of Louisville residents.

As you know, the majority of Louisville residents who voted against the previous Redtail plan in April cited the loss of undeveloped land suitable for wildlife at Redtail Ridge as their reason for doing so. When advocates for wildlife and open space won the special election, the plan had to be scrapped. Now Brue Baukol is back with a new proposal.

Unfortunately, when it comes to open space (open space = undeveloped land, Open Space = city-managed undeveloped land) this new proposal is the same as the last two submitted by this developer and rejected by the city. Somehow, incredibly, Brue Baukol has managed to reduce the square footage of Redtail Ridge by more than half over the last two years without reducing the overall footprint of the site's built environment.

The former StorageTek site is one of Louisville's most idyllic and biodiverse areas, and constitutes an important corridor for wildlife. Please follow the precedent set by former OSABs, Planning Boards, and City Councils with other large developments in the city and require the developer to set aside a meaningful portion of the site as open space – or as Open Space. **This should be *at least* 50% of the property**.

During your deliberations, please also keep in mind Louisville Municipal Code 16.16.010.D, which states that **"Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible."** The Redtail property's natural features include the physical characteristics of

its topography, its vegetation, its waterways, and the habitat constructions of its wildlife. City law requires that this real-estate investment firm do whatever it can to preserve the natural world out there. This includes designing the concentration of buildings, the size of parking lots, and the placement of roads and trails in a way creates the least possible impact on the natural environment.

Campus Drive, for example, should be moved so that it skirts the edge of the property and allows the open space areas to remain undisturbed.

OSAB has given this site a lot of thought over the years, and knows which parts are most worthy of preservation. This fund of expertise should be augmented with up-to-date wildlife surveys by independent wildlife biologists. Bird specialists should be allowed on the site to look for evidence of burrowing owls and to locate the raptor nests, and prairie dog specialists who are not on the Brue Baukol payroll should be brought in to consult on a site design that minimizes impact on prairie dog colonies and conduct passive relocations – *not* exterminations – of prairie dogs from one part of the site to another in cases where avoidance is not possible. (As it stands, Brue Baukol is on track to exterminate 110 acres of prairie dogs, or roughly 5,500 individuals.)

OSAB can do so much to drive the preservation of this remarkable landscape, wildlife habitat and corridor, and gateway to Louisville. Please exert your considerable influence to do so.

Thank you,

Stephanie Rowe
Louisville

From: Diane Shepard
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 5:56 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Brue Baukol's Redtail Ridge proposal

Hello,

I am writing today in preparation for your meeting tomorrow, May 11th.

I read the letter that Matt K. Jones wrote you and am appreciative that he pointed out what your responsibilities are as members of the OSAB. Specifically:

Louisville voters sent a clear message to the city in the Redtail Ridge referendum--require far more public benefit, including more open space, at the Redtail Ridge site. To honor that vote, and as open space champions, LOSAB should recommend that the developer dedicate 40% of the area to open space. **You have the mission, criteria and responsibility to do so.**

You have the mission and criteria to require more open space than is being proposed. First, you are charged to make recommendations for more open space acquisition. That is why you have already recommended to the city council acquisition of part of the Redtail Ridge area as one of your top projects. Secondly, in the development review process you are to "Provide any additional recommendation on open space issues the board finds appropriate." If there was ever reason to use this criterion, this is it for the massive proposal. **We are counting on you, members of LOSAB, to be our strong voice for open space.**

Louisville has a history of requiring substantial public land and open space dedication for large developments. For perspective, Louisville required 46% of Coal Creek Ranch to be dedicated for public uses and over 35% of Centennial Valley to public open space. The developers proposed 21%of the area being preserved as open space is inadequate for the huge size of this development, not consistent with the referendum message and is not consistent with the LOSAB land preservation mission.

Matt Jones recommend requiring 50% (155 acres) public land dedication, with 40% (124) of that in

open space. The remaining 10% (30) is for the developers proposed acreage for a park, tails corridors and a fire station.
..... the intention now, is for LOSAB to be champions for aggressively preserving more open space.
Please recommend to Council that 40% of the Redtail Ridge be protected as open space.
We are counting on you to be our open space preservation champs!

And in my own words, I am an avid hiker, photographer and nature lover. I do not consider 'open space' to be an area immediately bordered by a busy road that will create sound and air pollution. That is not a way to honor and preserve the intent of 'open space'. Further, we should protect the ponds on the property within dedicated open space. I will be listening to the meeting this week for discussion on the trails, open space, parks, and roads within Redtail Ridge and how these will fit together in the best interests of the land and Louisville residents requests. I would like to see the development be concentrated in the area south of Disk Drive where Storage Tek was located. I support a public land dedication of 50% (155 acres) with 40% (124) of that in open space. The remaining 10% (30) if for developer's proposed acreage for a park, trail corridors, and fire station.

Thank you for listening and all your efforts on the OSAB.

Diane Shepard
St. Andrews Lane
Louisville, CO 80027

From: Cathern H Smith
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 9:46 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Comments for Open Space Board: Rightsize Redtail Ridge

Dear Open Space Advisory Board,

Please rightsize Redtail Ridge by at least doubling the amount of open space. Redtail is the last large parcel of land in Louisville, making this our last opportunity to make a significant addition to open space.

Please also recommend increasing habitat value by decreasing fragmentation --even if this means increasing building heights, relocating retention ponds, or moving parking underground.

Open space frees our souls from the weight of the pandemic, the war in Ukraine, Marshall Fire recovery, and so much else. Open space provides recreational opportunities in a rich and deeply satisfying environment. Property values increase when open space is preserved. Bond rating companies look at the amount of open space because homes in communities with more open

space are more desirable and, therefore, can more easily repay their debt. When discussing why Louisville is a desirable place to live, CNN's Money Magazine specifically pointed to open space. https://money.cnn.com/magazines/moneymag/best-places/2013/snapshots/PL0846355.html These are just some of the reasons that voters on both sides of the special election want more open space.

Open space is valuable not only to humans, but to living beings in all forms. The creatures living upon or from the land that is to be developed can not appear before you. Nesting birds, snakes, insects, prairie dogs, and other mammals, all need nourishing food and homes. As habitat shrinks, the web of life supporting them and us shrinks too. Would it not be ironic for the Redtail hawks to disappear and the name remain?

Use your mandate to "advise ... on matters related to the acquisition, management, restoration, preservation, and use of Open Space lands" to recommend at least doubling the amount of open space. Ordinance No. 1329, Series 200, Chapter 4.01.010. With Coal Creek at 46% and Centennial Village at 35%, this is a reasonable ask. It is consistent with the outcome of the special election, and, a good investment in the future.

Cathern Smith
Ward III

PS - One final ask. Due to the proximity to schools, please ensure that the bike lanes are designed with utmost safety in mind.

From: Justin Solomon **Sent:** Wednesday, May 11, 2022 12:38 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov> **Cc:** Susan Larson
Subject: Redtail Ridge Open Space

Dear Open Space Advisory Board,

I write as you consider the open space plan for the Redtail Ridge parcel. As you know, Louisville held a special election on April 19. The City went to considerable expense to hold the election. The residents of Louisville spoke clearly through the election results, a clear majority voted for more open space, less development, and a smaller footprint. One can only wonder what the final vote tally would have been had the developer not spent $100,000 (mostly corporate money) to sway public opinion, outspending the opposition roughly 35:1. The citizens rejected the former plan and its open space allotment, but it will be up to this Board, City staff and City Council to enact the people's will.

It is within your authority to request more public open space dedication and for City Council to require more open space as a condition of PUD approval. The plan before you tonight allots 89 acres of public land dedication (not just open space). This represents 23% of the total 390-acre parcel. By comparison, Coal Creek Ranch had a 46% public land dedication and Centennial Valley allotted 35%. Additionally, the now expired PUD approved under the ConocoPhillips GDP in 2010 preserved a combined 260 acres of public and private open space, by centering development on the former StorageTek campus. This is the same GDP used to generate the plan under consideration.

Based on the election result and these precedents, an appropriate public land deception for this site would be 40% and all of the ecologically valuable habitat north of Disc Drive, which has never before been developed, should be preserved. This exact provision was proposed for the previous GDP Amendment by Mayor Stotlzman and Councilman Brown. A 40% dedication would be in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan and the site's rural designation, while still allowing Brue Baukol to develop up to the full square footage allowed. This can be accomplished by increasing density and building heights.

I implore you to make a recommendation consistent with the results of the democratic process we just completed.

Please move to preserve the site's designated rural character, and to preserve sustainable wildlife habitat by preserving the prerequisite prairie dog colonies north of Disc Drive. This is Louisville's last opportunity to secure meaning open space for future generations and a growing population. Please send a clear message to City Council and recommend a 40% public land dedication.

Sincerely,

Justin and Susan Solomon
477 Lincoln Ct

From: sherry sommer
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 11:10 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Letter to be included in tonight's OSAB meeting packet

Members of the Louisiville Open Space Baord,

Please note that the plat you are examining is identical to the one submitted for Nawatny Ridge. Land cpverage for 5.8 million square feet of development is being used for a proposal that is capped at 2.56 million square feet.

Advocate for a smaller footprint, one that does not build on greenfields. Development should be clustered south of Disk Drive on the old STK footprint, as Council Member Brown proposed.

Advocate for a 50% land dedication. 40% of this area should be open space. Louisville required that previous large developments include large land dedications. Coal Creek Ranch had a 46% land dedication and Centennial Valley had a 35% land dedication.

The public will be behind you on as you advocate for more land dedication. Our referendum petition collected more than twice the number of signatures required. Our petition circulators what residents wanted to see in a better proposal and the answer was nearly unanimous--more open space and a bigger public land dedication.

The resident group won the special election, even after being outspent 32:1 and even Louisville suffered the most devastating fire in Colorado history. Do no allow Brue Baukol to dismiss our accomplishment.

See webpage below on more information on how protecting a 50% land dedication will protect wildlife on the site:

Louisville SE Gateway - Wildlife

Thank you!

Sherry Sommer
910n South Palisade Ct

PS. It would be really helpful if you went through each point you are being asked to approve--parks, trails,open space, and roads, and comment on each one systematically.
The public needs to be filled in on what you are thinking--it's an important time to educate us and to advocate for a 50% land dedication.

From: Sherry sommer
To: Ember Brignull
Subject: Louisville SE Gateway - Wildlife
Date: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 8:08:59 AM
Attachments: svwXJYyssypDitHPiJ8WaIxZqp2jYeikLDZuYjeLnrzduKHnS9E44s27dRn0X7iBbUHj8oMIx3JXjOPnZe-BZqJGlSugaHcukH3MQClAn7PK_PhO1XJQA0AumCoZOciW1w=w1280.jpeg
j5ixRbVUml3cZiVynUlxyoAFMmtSlZvLmEFzn-7eFUSG9sUdT6zUc-AbT67Y1UyX93WO1ahpPL7nKtjctRb2q8_T1l1SEix1ESecvVRtOHKYcJJgyXIRDc3ZUxJG17es7g=w1280.jpeg
TOogrF3ys5do1KngSO4Xy3e98NQ8KhvwSHz_Aa9-46ydgCdmysIr3hjonPgfKKeOQ7tWs3P9EDjSpxyWnIqIfVQjXFruwb7jYZ5Q2DwxgXuq9HSGBazS3ejGX-Wm-d3WSQ=w1280.jpeg
_T9GZ2a84RAyhihgyAvFFHUM07J-t3Y3ibhktg8a1DQ92yXAkri5qp3ZuVggrOdreCdrPP1u7rYpOtXjQvbUyhA=w1280.jpeg
5eJSC-NmInft9I1pjDT8p50bKQmj67In-3iX95iCIegDVhKwFcc688aj9idxU3MRJOvoEYYYvJPshIaUVtdhTTbJ_XmsJg8Z92qPe473gE6EuXd_C_Jkd075x859PdwjSA=w1280.jpeg

---

Please include this page from the resident created website in the packet for tomorrow's meeting.

Sherry Sommer

https://sites.google.com/view/public-engagement-louisville/sustainability/wildlife

Louisville SE Gateway - Wildlife

Wildlife

(response to 6th GDP)

The GDP includes no wildlife protection.

Many species call the former StorageTek / Phillips66 site home. Some of these animals are visible from the roads surrounding the property. Because the site is private property, however, and Brue Baukol is not allowing Louisville residents access to it, we have to rely on the developer's own reports to understand the types of wildlife in the interior of the property, their numbers, and their distribution across the site.

In the new GDP, structures are not clustered and no apparent effort was made to utilize surrounding topography and open space to create a visual buffer. Such a spread out development will devastate the wildlife on site. By wiping out wetlands and nearly all of the prairie dog habitat, there will be little left of the habitat upon which so much of Louisville's wildlife currently depends.

The GDP includes no limit on parking lots, roads, or concrete coverage. The sustainability document states that the project will not provide more

parking than the City's minimum requirements. However, this is still a huge addition to the built footprint as can be seen from the GDP drawings.

Bald Eagle on Utility Pole on the Site, January 2021

The RTR sustainability document states that the project will "Implement a habitat management plan for the full site (400+ acres)", but the GDP allows only 38 acres of open space

photo of a morning on the site by Chris Wheeler ***"Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible."*** *~ City of Louisville Municipal Code*

"We value Ecological Diversity . . . where the City, through its management of parks and open space and its development and landscape regulations, promotes biodiversity by ensuring a healthy and resilient natural environment, robust plant life and diverse habitats."

~City of Louisville Comprehensive Plan

The GDP does not adhere to Municipal Code 16.16.010.

"Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible."

(Louisville Municipal Code, Title 16: Subdivisions: Chapter 16.16: Design Standards: section 010: item D (16.16.010.D))

By city ordinance, Brue Baukol must make every effort to protect the "natural features" of the land at Redtail Ridge. The natural features of a wild landscape include topographical elements constructed by wildlife at

the site: nests, dens, and burrows. These constructions are not incidental to the landscape; they are as inherent to it as its hills and valleys, rocky outcroppings, streams, wetlands, thickets, and, as the ordinance notes, trees.

Preserving a property's "natural features . . . to the extent possible" requires developers to think about them at the design stage. Buildings, roads, and parking lots must be situated in the landscape in such a way that creates minimal impact on the existing topography. Louisville's Municipal Code language sets forth a rigorous standard requiring focused, demonstrable effort at preservation.

110 acres of active prairie dog habitat will be destroyed

Brue Baukol's 2020 survey of the prairie dog populations at the Redtail site estimates 142 acres of active prairie dog colonies. These colonies consist of visible burrow entrances connected by complex networks of tunnels. The map at right, prepared by Brue Baukol's environmental consultants on January 6, 2021, shows the distribution of colonies at the site.

The map below, included in the GDP packet submitted to Louisville's planning department in January 2021, shows the distribution of buildings, roads, and parking lots Brue Baukol plans for the site. It is clear from comparing the two maps that considerable development is proposed for what are currently active prairie dog colonies.

In the Prairie Dog Management Plan submitted to the planning department as part of its GDP application, Brue Baukol recognizes the overlap between its proposed development and the prairie dog colonies that are among the natural features of the site: "Construction activities

associated with the proposed Redtail Ridge development are anticipated in several areas currently occupied by prairie dogs. **It is estimated the project would impact 110.65 acres of active prairie dog colony"** (page 5; emphasis added).

There are 142 acres of prairie dog habitat on the site. The approximately 30 acres of prairie dog habitat located in Broomfield must be conserved as a result of a conservation easement. No other areas of active prairie dog habitat are planned for conservation in the Jan 2021 Prairie Dog Management Plan. The black cross-hatched areas shown above are prairie dog towns planned for removal.

Concentrating buildings on former StorageTek footprint could protect nearly all prairie dog habitat

Because the buildings, roads, and parking lots proposed for Redtail Ridge are scattered all over the property, Brue Baukol's environmental consultants concede that relocation of the prairie dogs elsewhere on the property is unfeasible. Their recommendation is that the developer try to either relocate the prairie dogs off-site or donate them to a raptor or black-footed ferret rehabilitation program. If these options are not feasible, they recommend extermination of the prairie dogs on the 110.65 acres of active colonies for which development is slated.

Prairie dog colonies are among the natural features at the Redtail Ridge site. According to Louisville Municipal Code 16.16.010D, Brue Baukol MUST make every effort to preserve those colonies. Relocating, donating, or killing the prairie dogs that build and maintain the colonies' burrows is a destruction of these natural features.

The clear solution to preserving the prairie dog colonies at Redtail Ridge, and protecting the ecosystems that rely on the prairie dogs – from raptors to coyotes, foxes, and snakes – is to concentrate the buildings, roads, and parking lots in the section of the property where there are no colonies. This is the section right in the middle, where the StorageTek facility once stood.

Louisville's Planning Commission and the City Council must enforce adherence to city laws and ordinances, including Municipal Code 16.16.010.

Environmental impacts of the last GDP were a central concern of Boulder County officials and staff.

From Boulder county communication November 1, 2019[i]

"The applicant's response to City comments includes this: "a Burrowing Owl survey will be conducted in accordance with Colorado Parks and Wildlife's recommended protocol ***if development is planned*** *in potential habitat during the owls' migratory season" (emphasis added). Staff strongly recommends that an ongoing survey begin now, with the next breeding season. It is vital to establish baseline conditions, and to have several years of data before "development is planned in potential habitat." Such work could be added to the forthcoming Prairie Dog Management Plan, because the species are closely connected.*

Similarly, for raptors the developer's responses state, "Biological assessments will be conducted as construction proceeds to determine whether ***any protected species*** *are present" (emphasis added). This is necessary, of course, but raptor surveys should, again, begin now, and proceed in subsequent years to establish a baseline for the many species*

that might use the area. These include Swainson's hawks, which are only here during the summer, and rough-legged hawks, which are only here during the winter. There are many other raptors – hawks, eagles, and owls -- that likely use the location now, for either breeding or hunting. Staff also notes that all species of raptors are "protected species."

For jumping mouse and fringed orchid, the developer's responses include, "...we will consult with Colorado Parks & Wildlife and the U.S. Forest Service...." The latter should be the US Fish and Wildlife Service, which administers the Endangered Species Act.

The final master drainage report should consider including defined setbacks (per Louisville's determination) from all water features including lakes, creeks, wetlands, and ditches. "

Notes

[i] November 1, 2019. Included in the city council agenda and meeting packet for August 4, 2020 on page 66. https://www.louisvilleco.gov/home/showpublisheddocument?id=27894 page 1203 of 1282

Wildlife impacts identified by county that are not addressed in new GDP:

- Prairie dog management plan does not include protection of habitat.
- A commitment is needed for follow up burrowing owl surveys and raptor monitoring. Bird monitoring needs to address seasonality of species.
- If endangered species consultations have occurred, communications have not been made public

Bald Eagle feeding on prairie dog along Dillon road between 88th and 96th street-- half mile from the site February 22, 2021

From: Tim Stalker
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 10:01 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Letter of the Louisville Citizens Open Space Advisory Board

To the Louisville Opens Space Advisory Board:

While the developer of its proposed plan for the Redtail Ridge site is over and done with the community of Louisville, open to no further communication with the public, and after proceeding the way it has over the past three years to ignore advice and recommendations about how the site should be developed, the Louisville community is by no means through with this developer. The public voted down Brue Baukol's most recent plan by 5 percentage points, in the most exemplary and broad grassroots exercises in democratic participation in the city's history around land development. Before you is yet another plan also constructed against the community's wishes for greater open space expressed on both sides of the referendum. Had that been an election conceived and campaigned for on equal footing with no anti-democratic involvement from the developer and its lobbyists, the outcome would have been even more decisive at 20 points or greater against the developer.

You're representing the community on the Louisville Citizens Open Space Advisory Board. You're not representing the developer to citizens. Within your mission, the city ordinance governing your responsibility, and in representation of the citizens of Louisville, you are responsible for using the criteria available to you to require more open space than is proposed. You should require that the public land dedication be 50%, putting it in line and in spirit with Louisville's other large developments, including Coal Creek Ranch and Centennial Valley. These open space dedications are the pride and joy of the city. 10% of the dedication at Redtail Ridge should be for the developer's proposed space for a park, trail corridors, and fire station. The other 40% should be for continuous open space. It's in the city's comprehensive plan and in the city's municipal code 16.16.010 where "natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible." Natural features include all that are found in open space, especially at Redtail Ridge, including topographical elements constructed by wildlife at the site, eg. flyways, nests, dens, and burrows. These constructions are not incidental to the landscape; they are as inherent to it as its hills and valleys, rocky outcroppings, streams, wetlands, thickets, and, as the

ordinance notes, trees.

Does the plan before you preserve these natural features to the extent possible? No. Does it honor the spirit of the community that repeatedly and historically wants greater open space dedications? No. Does it meet the expectations of contemporary sustainability and ecological biodiversity? No.

The open space portion of the public land dedication in the plan before you is out of line with the city's municipal code and comprehensive plan, is unequivalent to the public land dedications in the city's other large developments, does not honor the April referendum message, and is not consistent with your board's ordinance and land preservation mission.

If anything is to be the go-to group for open space preservation, it's the Louisville Citizens Open Space Advisory Board. Louisville is counting on you.

Thank you,

Tim Stalker
Louisville resident

From: Milt Strickler
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 6:22 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject:

Dear OSAB:

I was a petitioner and volunteer for the effort to scale back the development at Redtail Ridge. During my six months of involvement, I talked to hundreds of Louisville residents. A clear majority of the people I spoke with wanted most, if not all, of the property preserved as open space.

I understand that a representative of Brue Baukol recently talked about how close the special election was. We "only" won by five points. This disingenuous comment obscures the fact that we won despite a massive advertising campaign against us. Had the playing field been level in terms of spending and media saturation, I'm sure the margin would have been much greater.

I consider that an acceptable compromise would be to preserve ---- at the very least----- the 160 acres north of Disc Drive and to construct the needed Monarch access road with the least disruption to wildlife.

The city council passed this decision to the voters, and they have spoken clearly. Please recommend an open space dedication of at least fifty percent.

Sincerely,
Milt Strickler
400 West St.

From: Ember Brignull
To: Jan Branham
Subject: FW: Red Tail Ridge
Date: Monday, May 16, 2022 7:16:23 AM

Ember Brignull, Open Space Superintendent
Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Department
emberb@louisvilleco.gov
https://www.louisvilleco.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Karen Braverman <kpbraver@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2022 5:26 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Red Tail Ridge

Hello,

I would like to submit my input for the future of RedTail Ridge.

Besides lots of open space, it would be great if some housing for the aging population could be added to the plans.

I have lived on Saint Andrews Lane in Louisville since 1993. We are the original owners and our home survived the Marshall Fire, although it is severely smoke damaged.

There is so little housing available in Louisville and I know plenty of us would love some new builds without stairs, such as ranch or patio homes.

With the size of RedTail Ridge, it seems there is space to incorporate mixed use development so hopefully some housing for the over 55 folks could be considered.

Thank you.

Karen Braverman
853 Saint Andrews Lane
Louisville, Co. 80027

303-818-7196

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Meredyth Muth

From: Weiyan Chen <weiyanch@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 1, 2022 6:59 PM
To: Ember Brignull
Subject: Re: More Open Space for Redtail Ridge Property

Dear OSAB members,

I have been living in Louisville for past 10 years. One of the most important factors for me to choose to live in Louisville is the open spaces. When the weather permits, I walk or bike on the open space every day. During the pandemic, the open spaces are my physical and metal sanctuary, particularly during the lock down time. Many of our neighbors and friends feel the same way.

After the Marchall fire, I am extremally lucky that my house is still standing, although it is only 3 houses away from being completely burned down. The climate change is real and on our doorsteps. Last few years, the number of ozone alert days in the front range have kept broken the records year by year, Louisville is part of the front range. No one can escape ozone. Majority of the residents have voted 'No' to the Redtail Ridge plan, which is too massive to Louisville and only contributes to ozone issue or climate change.

We, the residents love our hometown and our open spaces. Please designate 50% of the land to our open space, in this way you will help to keep the city's tradition going with less contribution to climate changes and ozone.

Thank you

Weiyan Chen

146 Cherrywood Lane

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Ember Brignull
To: Jan Branham
Subject: FW: OSAB
Date: Monday, May 16, 2022 4:47:49 PM

Ember Brignull, Open Space Superintendent
Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Department
emberb@louisvilleco.gov
https://www.louisvilleco.gov

From: Michiko Christiansen <chikochrist@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 5:08 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: OSAB

Dear members of OSAB,

1. I would like to hear the discussion on each areas: trails, parks, open space and roads align with the residents comments.

2. It is important to have this development be concentrated in the area south of Disk Drive where Storage Tek was located. A public land dedication of 50% (155 acres) with 40% (124) of that in open space will be a greatly beneficial to sustainability, net zero, environmental and our community . And for theremaining 10% (30) if for developer's proposed acreage for a park, trail corridors, and fire station.

Thank you

M. Christiansen

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not

Attachment 27

From: Ember Brignull
To: Jan Branham
Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge Proposal
Date: Monday, May 16, 2022 4:48:21 PM

Ember Brignull, Open Space Superintendent
Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Department
emberb@louisvilleco.gov
https://www.louisvilleco.gov

From: Katherine Little <kat.little99@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 4:35 PM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: Paul Little <plittle@ptlittle.com>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Proposal

Dear OSAB Members,

1) In tomorrow's meeting, please discuss trails, open space, roads, and parks. Please don't make any hasty decisions.

2) **We ask that there be a 50% public land dedication at Redtail Ridge.**

The plan under consideration on Wednesday has the same amount of horizontal development as the sprawling plan the developer submitted two years ago -- a plan that was soundly rejected by the Planning Board and City Council. If the last two years -- and the special election last month! -- have made anything clear, it's that Louisville residents want more undeveloped land at Redtail.

3) **We ask that Campus Drive be routed so that it does not cut through the site's open space**. Moving Campus Drive North would protect open space and potentially eliminate two underpasses. A detention pond should be moved to allow for better routing.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Katherine Anderson and Paul Little
Louisville Residents

Attachment 27

Meredyth Muth

From: Celeste Niehaus <cmniehaus1180@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 1, 2022 4:37 PM
To: Ember Brignull
Subject: Redtail Ridge open space

Dear Members of OSAB,

First of all, thank you for your work on this issue. My concern lies primarily in the small amount of open space proposed and the way any development will affect wildlife.

The impact on the native wildlife will be devastating and the full effect may never be known. The land has not been surveyed for burrowing owls under the new recommended research parameters and the applicant has apparently failed to do multi-year and multi-seasonal wildlife assessments.

This is the last sizable land area in Louisville still to be (re)developed. It is our last chance to save land for future generations. I would hate for the City to not maximize this opportunity, especially for a development that is largely being built on spec by "an entrepreneurial real estate investment firm focused on delivering excellent returns to partners and investors." Your focus should be on what's best for the City, not for the investors.

Also, if within your purview, please urge the parks department to create a dog park in the small park section of this land. That would be the only reason I, personally, would find this land usable.

Thank you for your consideration.

Celeste Niehaus
920 Rex St, Louisville, CO 80027

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Meredyth Muth

From: Qian Wu <qwu_us@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 1, 2022 9:25 PM
To: Ember Brignull
Subject: More open space for Redtail Ridge

Dear members of Open Space Board,

I am writing to you to request to allocate more open space for Redtail Ridge.
Recent referendum on Redtail Ridge shows that people of Louisville do not support large development at Redtail Ridge.
We do not know what the developer will do with the property, the only way to ensure we will NOT have any very large development at the site is to allocate more open space for Redtail Ridge.
Your decision will have impact for generations to come. They will thank you for leave more open space for them to explore and to enjoy.

Best,
146 Cherrywood Ln
Qian Wu

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Carolyn H Anderson
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 7:03 AM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge development

Please consider these points outlined by Citizens for a Vibrant, Sustainable Louisville before approving the Brue Baukol plans for the former Storagetek/
ConocoPhillips property:

1. A detailed analysis of Brue Baukol's submission to the requirements of the Conoco-Philips GDP. The comparison should identify any discrepancies.

2. A current traffic report. PPLAB will approve trail networks as well as parks dedication in the Plat. How will traffic impact the park and trail experience? Is it possible to build a protective berm along the bike trail adjacent to 96th Street? What level of traffic can be anticipated along other roadways which are currently 'protected bike lanes'? Could PPLAB request all bike lanes be separated from roadways for safer and more positive experience?

3. The City does not have an acting Parks and Open Space Director. How will this affect decision making of PPLAB?

Carolyn H Anderson
200 Summit Blvd, apt 333
Broomfield CO 80021
formerly
354 Troon Court
Louisville CO 80027

From: Norma Anderson
Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 1:57 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: Ashley Stolzmann <ashleys@louisvilleco.gov>; Caleb Dickinson <cdickinson@louisvilleco.gov>; Christopher Leh <leh@louisvilleco.gov>; Deb Fahey <dfahey@louisvilleco.gov>; Maxine Most <mmost@louisvilleco.gov>; Kyle Brown <kbrown@louisvilleco.gov>; Dennis Maloney <DennisM@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge and Brue Baukol

Dear Parks and Public Landscaping Board,

It appears as if Brue Baukol is trying to do an end-run around Louisvile's reluctance to accept their plans for the former Conoco/Philips site, after having already been turned down by the City Council, and failed in a public vote held in April.

Brue Baukol seems determined to remake this Louisville site by utilizing plans that have been deemed inappropriate for our beautiful city. The fact Brue Baukol is asking for both preliminary and final approval of their proposed plat in one decision reeks of an attempt to avoid city inquiry and discussion.

Please take into account the struggles that have occured between the residents and citizens of Louisville and Brue Baukol already over this property, and make sure your planning efforts give a lot of thought — and seek public reaction — to any proposal Brue Baukol brings before you.

This is neither the time nor the circumstances for your Board to be rushed into an agreement that isn't in keeping with a well-informed Louisville citizenry.

Thank you,

Norma Anderson
1904 Steel Street
Louisville, Colorado 80027

-----Original Message-----
From: Alex Bradley
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 10:24 AM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Brue Baukol Plat consideration

Parks and Public Landscaping Board,

I am writing to express my hopes for the review process for the Brue Baukol Red Tail Ridge Plat. The citizen just rejected what had been proposed so I am hoping that the Board looks hard at what is now being brought forth and that it addresses many of the concerns that were raised by the community. When considering their proposal please consider the following:

- The plan that just failed the citizen vote had the open space/park/trails right by the road. Does the new plan move the open space/parks/trails away from the road to a more desirable location? If the spaces/trail are near the road, has an analysis been done on how much traffic will actually travel through that area to see if the trails and spaces will be impacted? Assuming that the Monarch students will ride their bikes along the trails and bike lanes in the development (and hopefully people traveling to and front work), can anything be done to make them safer (not having the bike paths

in the road, having the bike and pedestrian paths clearly marked/separate….)

- Are the paths and bike lanes in the development conducive to people walking and commuting to work from all directions?

- Does the new plan being brought forth meet all of the requirements that were in the Conoco-Philips GDP? If not, what are the differences? Are they acceptable (considering that the citizens just rejected the original plan)?

Also, without having a Parks and Open Space Director, how is this plan being considered/evaluated? Does a director need to be in place for the Board to receive the required feedback/recommendations?

Thank you for working hard to ensure that the citizens' desires for this development are put to the forefront.

Cheers,
Alex Bradley
1385 Caledonia Circle, Louisville

From: joy brook
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 11:50 AM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Due process and consideration for breathing

Parks and Public Landscaping Board

Please request more information before making a decision including:

1. A detailed analysis of Brue Baukol's submission to the requirements of the Conoco-Philips GDP. The comparison should identify any discrepancies.

2. A current traffic report. PPLAB will approve trail networks as well as parks dedication in the Plat. How will traffic impact the park and trail experience? Is it possible to build a protective berm along the bike trail adjacent to 96th Street? What level of traffic can be anticipated along other roadways which are currently 'protected bike lanes'? Could PPLAB request all bike lanes be separated from roadways for safer and more positive experience?

3. The City does not have an acting Parks and Open Space Director. How will this affect decision making of PPLAB?

Brue Baukol does not rule our future. This process can not be rammed through without due process and consideration for our city's future. The first consideration is our citizens. I did not work hard all my life and pay taxes to have someone else get a free ride and trash our town. The traffic is already horrible and I wanna be able to go somewhere without being stuck in a traffic jam. Our citizens have more rights than outside dirty money. This man has tried to buy our votes and now he is trying to short circuit our process and our voices. It is our air we are trying to breathe. Thank you for doing your job and looking out for our children.

Tane Mahuta E Tu!

Blessings to the Creator, trees! Stand Tall!

From: Michiko Christiansen
Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 1:40 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Questions for you

Those three questions that would need to be answered before you make any more decisions. Please request more information which it is vital to have a thorough research.

Thank you.
M. Christiansen

1. A detailed analysis of Brue Baukol's submission to the requirements of the Conoco-Philips GDP. The comparison should identify any discrepancies.

2. A current traffic report. PPLAB will approve trail networks as well as parks dedication in the Plat. How will traffic impact the park and trail experience? Is it possible to build a protective berm along the bike trail adjacent to 96th Street? What level of traffic can be anticipated along other roadways which are currently 'protected bike lanes'? Could PPLAB request all bike lanes be separated from roadways for safer and more positive experience?

3. The City does not have an acting Parks and Open Space Director. How will this affect decision making of PPLAB?

-----Original Message-----
From: Mark Dayan
Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 3:27 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Brue Bakol / Red Tail Ridge / Storage Tek / Cononco space

I just voted against this now what is going on? The answer is still NO!
We need a study for this space not a rush to overbuild Thanks Mark Dayan
946 Saint Andrews LN
Louisville, CO 80027

From: Joel Hayes
Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 5:51 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Red Tail Ridge Plat proposal

Dear Parks and Public Landscaping Board Members:

I write to ask you not to grant preliminary or final approval of the Plat proposed recently by Brue Baukol. Rather, I would ask you to take the time necessary to make a detailed analysis of the proposal, including looking at whether it in fact complies with Conoco-Phillips CDP requirements. I would also ask that you make a thorough review of trails, traffic and other quality of life issues. If possible, I suggest waiting until Louisville has an Parks and Open Space director who can provide leadership on all of these issues.

Above all, I object to considering granting both preliminary and final approval in the same meeting, especially so soon after an election on this very development. Doing so would deny the public any real opportunity to have a voice in the decision, and create unnecessary controversy. I believe that a thoughtful, inclusive process can result in a much better development, one that the community can get behind.

Thank you for your service to our fair town.

Joel Hayes
187 Harper St.
Louisville CO

From: Mary Ann Heaney
Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 2:52 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: REDTAIL RIDGE

Parks and Public Landscaping Board,

Please require additional, more detailed, information before making a decision on the preliminary approval of BrueBaukol's Plat.

Please request:

1. **A detailed analysis** of Brue Baukol's submission to the requirements of the Conoco-Philips GDP. This comparison is needed to identify any discrepancies between their plan and the requirements.

2. **A current traffic report**. The Conoco-Philips GDP was approved more than an decade ago. Traffic has changed TREMENDOUSLY since then and is projected to increase even more.

In addition:

- How will current and increasing traffic volumes impact park and trail users' access, parking, and experience?
- Please consider requiring a substantial protective berm to separate the bike trail from high volume, high speed traffic when adjacent to 96th Street. Speeds can reach 60 mph or more on that street. Maximum protection is needed!
- What is the current level of traffic along other roadways which are currently 'protected bike lanes' (as opposed to those when the ConocoPhillips Plan was approved)? And what is anticipated as traffic increases over at least the next decade?
- Please require that ALL bike lanes be separated from roadways for safety using current "best practice" methods (e.g. wide lanes, double-line traffic separation striping, green lane striping indicators where needed, etc). Please ensure bike lanes are designed to prioritize safety for both cyclists and pedestrians. Again, speeds are excessive on most roads involved in this project. And as the site will be a commercial hub, it will generate additional, dangerous to cyclists, heavy truck traffic.
- Please require underpasses rather than less protective raised crosswalks wherever crossings are on roads where traffic speeds exceed 25 mph.

3. **Please increase park and trail volumes** to the greatest extent possible.

4. e don't currently have an acting Parks and Open Space Director. **Who will actually approve this plan?**

5. Do NO grant final approval of the Plat without a sufficient interim time for review and comments on the preliminary Plat after approval.

Thank you.
mary ann
heaney
1117 la
farge ave

From: David Judd
Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 1:40 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: redtail ridge park review

Hello,

According to Citizens for a Vibrant, Sustainable Louisville, Baukol Partners has asked the Parks and Public Landscaping Board for preliminary and final approval of their plat proposal. I think it is improper to offer a decision ,preliminary or final, without careful consideration of the proposal in light of the recent election. The most appropriate approach is a detailed analysis of the proposal which takes into account public input. Without public input, such a decision would be a rubber stamp. Please do not give any form of approval to the plan at the May, 5th meeting.

Sincerely,
David Judd

From: Jill
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 10:50 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

Dear PPLAB Members

You are being asked for preliminary and final approval of the Redtail Ridge Plat.

I am asking that you do not give preliminary approval at this time for the following reasons:

—Most importantly, this Plat was submitted *before* the special election. It appears to be identical to what was submitted in the proposal that was denied in our election. This Plat needs to be updated to reflect the results.

—-We need an updated traffic study. The park and the vast majority of bike trails are adjacent to busy roads.

—The majority of the bike trails are protected bike lanes. I can understand making protected bike lanes when a road is being retrofitted to accommodate bikers.
In this case, all the construction is new. We can do better. The public would be better served by bike paths that are separated from roads by at least 20 feet and a berm. Bikers should not be taking second place to cars. Paths will be more likely to be used if bikers enjoy their experience.

We need to know if there is adequate space for a berm adjoining 96. This berm should be bigger due to the very busy nature of this road.

—Why does Campus Drive dip down on the NE and NW sections of the park?

—Can you make your decision before the final alignment of Campus Drive is decided?

—-We do not have an acting Parks Director. How will the City make up for this absence?

You are likely to have other observations. I look forward to tuning into the meeting tomorrow.

Thank you very much, Jill Kranitz
Louisville resident

From: Erin Lindsay
Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 7:13 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

Hi there,

I normally live in Louisville. My house just burned down though. I was 7 months pregnant with my first baby at the time. I now have a 2 month old to care for as I try to rebuild and fight with my insurance company. All this is to say, my life is hectic and my time is precious - yet I'm still writing to you about my concern for the Redtail Ridge project.

I'm concerned about Brue Baukol's request to get final approval on Thursday. Please don't do that. This project deserves more scrutiny, especially with this builder. We need to have sufficient details on what they plan to build. We need to analyze those details. We need to know how their plan will impact traffic, open space, etc. We also need to know how their rebuild will impact the citizens of Louisville who have been impacted by the fire, as we attempt to do our own construction while the Redtail Ridge project moves forward. Please do not fast track anything. Give this the necessary consideration our town and citizens deserve.

Even in the midst of the aftermath of the fire, we all showed up and collectively voted no on the previous plans for this site. This is despite the devastation we were dealing with and despite the nearly 6 figures spent on the "yes" campaign. Clearly, the citizens of Louisville care about this project. Please do the right thing here.

Thank you for your time and take care,

Erin Lindsay
826 Trail Ridge Dr.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Katherine Little
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 10:21 AM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: Paul Little <plittle@ptlittle.com>
Subject: meeting wiith Brue Baukol

To Parks and Landscaping board members,

Please request more information from Brue Baukol before making a decision. In particular, we'd like you to ask for:

1. A detailed analysis of Brue Baukol's submission to the requirements of the Conoco-Philips GDP. The comparison should identify any discrepancies.
2. A current traffic report. PPLAB will approve trail networks as well as parks dedication in the Plat. How will traffic impact the park and trail experience? Is it possible to build a protective berm along the bike trail adjacent to 96th Street? What level of traffic can be anticipated along other roadways which are currently 'protected bike lanes'? Could PPLAB request all bike lanes be separated from roadways for safer and more positive experience?
3. The City does not have an acting Parks and Open Space Director. How will this affect decision making of PPLAB?

Thank you,

Katherine Anderson and Paul Little
Louisville Residents

From: Beth McQuie
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 9:37 AM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge this Thursday

Dear Louisville Parks and Recreation Board,

I am writing about the latest version of Redtail Ridge, which you will be discussing this week. Please do not approve it as proposed.

I live within walking distance of Redtail Ridge. I am also a senior, as are many of my neighbors. Many of the people on Saint Andrews Lane and adjoining streets built homes there around 1995, raised their children there and are now empty nesters. (This was the case before the fire, and it seems quite a few people are planning to rebuild.) The demographics of the neighborhood have changed over the years, as we age. I would like to see something there that is of benefit to seniors.

I do not support having either a large park, similar to Community Park, or soccer fields on the portion that adjoins 88th Ave. This would bring more traffic to the area. We already get a lot of traffic on 88th, due to the Monarch schools and Avista Hospital. We don't need more traffic of people coming to soccer games or concerts.

A better location for a community park, if one is even needed, would be in a portion of Redtail Ridge that was previously developed, where the Storage Tek footprint is.

A better location for soccer fields would be along 96th, near where it joins Pine St. There is already a playing field near there. There is a large empty field next to it. Why not add the soccer fields there?

I would prefer that you keep the portion of Redtail Ridge that is near 88th, Avista and the Monarch campus as open space with walking trails. We do not have good walking trails on our side of town and could use them. Many people have discovered the benefits of walking, especially since Covid. Walking trails would be better suited to seniors than playing fields. In addition, that area has never been developed and is a prime spot for natural open space. Please don't destroy that. Beautiful open spaces are one of Colorado's treasures. They also add value for surrounding areas. Finally, adding something like another Community Park would entail using a lot of water, which is becoming more and more scarce every year. We should be conserving water, not adding lawns that would require it.

Thank you for your consideration.

Beth McQuie

From: Billy Mertens
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 6:11 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Requests for RTR review

Hi. I would like to request the board members ask for the following information from Brue Baukol in their meeting tomorrow.

1. A detailed analysis of Brue Baukol's submission to the requirements of the Conoco-Philips GDP. The comparison should identify any discrepancies.
2. A current traffic report. PPLAB will approve trail networks as well as parks dedication in the Plat. How will traffic impact the park and trail experience? Is it possible to build a protective berm along the bike trail adjacent to 96th Street? What level of traffic can be anticipated along other roads which are currently 'protected bike lanes'? Could PPLAB request all bike lanes be separated from roadways for a safer and more positive experience?

3. The City does not have an acting Parks and Open Space Director. How will this affect decision making of PPLAB?

Thank you very much for your time.
Billy Mertens
917 Eldorado Ln, Louisville, CO 80027

-----Original Message-----
From: Heather North
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 3:33 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

Dear PPLAB Members

You are being asked for preliminary and final approval of the Redtail Ridge Plat.

I am asking that you do not give preliminary approval at this time. The city of Louisville just had a vote and the "no" vote won despite lots of dirty oil/gas money being spent by the other side in a ratio of 20:1. This should mean that you are now listening to the MAJORITY of voters and pumping the brakes to make this development something our city can be proud of and something that mirrors our goals and mission as a community. Our vote made a clean push for more open space, less development and a revisit of this plan.

—This Plat was submitted before the special election. It appears to be identical to what was submitted in the proposal that was denied in our election. This Plat needs to be updated to reflect the results.

—-We need an updated traffic study. The park and the vast majority of bike trails are adjacent to busy roads.

—The majority of the bike trails are protected bike lanes. I can understand making protected bike lanes when a road is being retrofitted to accommodate bikers.
In this case, all the construction is new. We can do better. The public would be better served by bike paths that are separated from roads by at least 20 feet and a berm. Bikers should not be taking second place to cars. Paths will be more likely to be used if bikers enjoy their experience.

We need to know if there is adequate space for a berm adjoining 96. This berm should be bigger due to the very busy nature of this road.

—Why does Campus Drive dip down on the NE and NW sections of the park?

—Can you make your decision before the final alignment of Campus Drive is decided?

—-We do not have an acting Parks Director. How will the City make up for this absence?
You are likely to have other observations. I look forward to tuning into the meeting tomorrow.
Regards,
Ewen and Heather North
142 Fairfield Lane Louisville

From: Laura Page
Sent: Thursday, May 5, 2022 12:25 AM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge proposal

Dear Board Members,

In regards to the Redtail Ridge plan, I find this proposed park land dedication to be a poor one. This property is isolated from almost the entire population of Louisville. It will only be accessible along busy and dangerous 88th St and 96th St. Given the remote location and the busy roads leading to it, I'm sure most people will choose to drive there. Driving is not something the City should be encouraging.

Some residents have said there is a need for more playing fields but when I asked the City employee in charge of our fields, he said that land within the City proper has already been identified, including the drainage bowl behind the Rec Center. The City just needs to dedicate funding and staffing time to develop these areas, areas that are **much** more accessible to our residents.

I would prefer that the Board consider requiring cash in lieu, instead of park land on the Redtail Ridge property to help fund this development. The portion of the property thus proposed for park land would hopefully become dedicated open space to help support the existing native wildlife.

I do applaud the use of native vegetation for landscaping. I also greatly appreciate that bike lanes will be separated from car lanes, though I would hope the City will require a deeper buffer between the trail and the Parkway on the east side of the property.

Laura Page
920 Rex St

-----Original Message-----
From: Gary Pawlas
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 5:38 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Citizen Feedback on upcoming Parks and Public Landscaping Board Meeting Thursday May 5

Dear Louisville Planning Board,
My name is Gary Pawlas and I'm a Louisville resident residing at 546 Hoptree Ct.
I am writing about tomorrow night's Parks and Public Landscaping Board Meeting.

I understand that Brue Baukol has asked for preliminary AND final approval of their Plat at this meeting. If this is true, I ask that multiple stages of approval NOT be granted in one meeting.

Instead a detailed analysis/comparison of Brue Baukol's submission should be made to the requirements of the Conoco-Philips GDP. Most importantly the analysis must identify any discrepancies and those discrepancies be presented to the public for review and comment.

Regards,
Gary

Gary Pawlas
546 Hoptree Ct., Louisville

From: Laura Pederson
Sent: Thursday, May 5, 2022 9:02 AM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Development Proposal

Hello,

I am writing to urge you to request additional information about the Redtail Ridge development plan before taking any action.

We need to understand how their current submission varies from the previous Conoco-Phillips

GDP. We need an analysis of the traffic implications for trails, parks, bike lanes, etc.

The Redtail Ridge development is too big and too important to rush through the approval process. Please be deliberative and thorough before making any decisions.

Thanks and Regards,

Laura Parks-Pederson

2297 Cliffrose Lane

Louisville, Co.

From: Gaylynn Potemkin
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 12:45 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge - didn't we just vote NO on this??

Dear PPLAB Members,
The Plat that is being submitted for review is the same one that was voted down in the recent special election. I can't believe that the election results are essentially being ignored!!
As a citizen who put in a lot of work to make sure that Louisville's best interests were represented by that vote I'm incensed that something like this is happening!
I'm asking that preliminary approval NOT be given at this time.
There are many things that must be reviewed prior to any approval. To name a few, an updated traffic study, dedicated bike lanes, the alignment of Campus Drive, the list goes on! Also perhaps the intent of "green space" should be clarified for the developers!
I also think it would be prudent to put a hold on this process until the position of Parks Director can be filled, and that said individual be informed as to the actual, truthful details and ramifications of the issue.
The majority of Louisville residents have made their voices heard, their preferences known. That was done in full and reasonable expectation that those positions will be honored, and considered in whatever action is taken with respect to the future development of Redtail Ridge.

I urge you to do the right thing, don't cave to the pressure of dark money, and rush the approval through at this pivotal point in it's development. See you on Zoom tomorrow night.
Sincerely,
A. Gaylynn Potemkin
505 Sprue St.
Louisville

From: Brad Pugh
Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 4:49 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Parks and Public Landscaping Board Meeting

Hello,

I'm writing to express my concerns about the issue being considered at the upcoming Redtail Ridge Parks and Public Landscaping Board Meeting. Please note my concerns below and pass them along to the appropriate people.

1. A detailed analysis of Brue Baukol's submission to the requirements of the Conoco-Philips GDP. The comparison should identify any discrepancies.

2. A current traffic report. PPLAB will approve trail networks as well as parks dedication in the Plat. How will traffic impact the park and trail experience? Is it possible to build a protective berm along the bike trail adjacent to 96th Street? What level of traffic can be anticipated along other roadways which are currently 'protected bike lanes'? Could PPLAB request all bike lanes be separated from roadways for a safer and more positive experience?

3. The City does not have an acting Parks and Open Space Director. How will this affect decision making of PPLAB?

Thanks

Brad Pugh
2523 N Franklin Ave
Louisville, CO 80027

—

From: stephanierowe
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 1:02 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Please do not recommend approval the Redtail Ridge Preliminary and Final Plat

Dear Parks and Landscaping Advisory Boardmembers,

I see that you will be discussing the final subdivision plat proposal and the proposed trail and right of way landscape design in the construction documents for Redtail Ridge this Thursday. I am writing to ask you to reject these plans for two reasons:

1. This proposal was submitted to the planning department before the City of Louisville special election on Redtail Ridge and lacks consideration for the mandate provided by the majority of voters.

2. The proposal presented in this meeting package does not meet the minimum requirements for a subdivision plat application and is not ready for your consideration.

I hope that you will recommend denial of the proposal because it doesn't reflect the mandate of the election. Alternatively, I hope you will continue the review to another meeting date when the public and your board have enough information to evaluate the proposed parks and trails in relation to a complete subdivision plat application.

Thank you in advance for reading a more detailed explanation for these reasons

Stephanie Rowe
631 West St., Louisville, CO 80027

Explanation

(1) This proposal was submitted to the planning department before the City of Louisville special election and lacks consideration for the mandate provided by the majority of voters.

The subdivision plat was submitted prior to the special election on April 19.[i] A new plan should not have been brought forth that shows approximately the same development area and open space as the plan that was struck down by voters.[ii] During the election, the lack of adequate open space (that is, undeveloped land) on the site was the most commonly cited reason for voting against Redtail Ridge. The clearest mandate from this election is the need to decrease the footprint of Redtail Ridge and preserve as much of the land in its wild state as possible.

(2) The proposal presented in this meeting package does not meet the minimum requirements for a subdivision plat application and is not ready for your consideration.

The proposal presented only includes the tracts associated with public land dedications in the tract summary table. It doesn't show the other subdivision lot boundaries or land uses. It is impossible to evaluate the location of a trail or open space without knowing the proposed adjacent land use or building heights.

The current proposal does not meet the code requirements for a complete proposal. LMC Sec. 16.12.050 lists the contents required for a preliminary plat. Neither the preliminary nor final subdivision plat provide the date of preparation, approximate location and dimensions of all proposed streets, alleys, easements, lot lines, front building setback lines, nor do they give the maximum height proposed for all buildings and structures as required in this section. LMC Section 16.12.090 also identifies the contents required for a final plat, and includes the requirement that the applicant include a guarantee for public improvements. No such guarantee is included in this packet.

The proposal also lacks the required Subdivision Improvement Agreement: "A Subdivision Improvement Agreement (SIA) will also be required for installation of public infrastructure such as roads, trails, water lines, sewer lines, and a sewer lift station" (5/5/22 meeting packet, pg. 6). The **PCZD agreement** that carries with the land along with the CP GDP explains the requirement for a subdivision agreement in section 1.5: "Prior to the presentation and acceptance of a final subdivision plat by the City Council, the Owner shall execute a subdivision agreement with the City that guarantees the construction of all required public improvements and completion of all landscaping improvements upon public lands set forth on the approved final PUD development plan landscape plans." The Parks and Landscape Advisory Board should be to review the language of this guarantee.

[i] Though there is no date on the plat, plat beginning on page 27 was submitted at the same time as the final subdivision plat beginning on page 37. There is no date, except that the cover pages say, "plotted Friday 1/21/22" The utility and surface improvement pages were last updated on April 5, 2021.

[ii]

	
Redtail Ridge General Development plan that was voted down in April 2022 The gray areas in A and C would become open space under the ordinance. (11.6 acres of Open Space in Parcel C and 8.4 acres of Open Space in A an additional 9.3 acres of open space location TBD)	Subdivision plat showing open space proposed post-election.

From: Daniel Rupp
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 6:57 AM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: Jennifer Singer-Rupp <jsingerrupp@gmail.com>
Subject: No to approval of the RTR plat

For Thursday's meeting concerning the approval of the RTR plat, I am asking the Board to request more information before making a decision including:

1. A detailed analysis of Brue Baukol's submission to the requirements of the Conoco-Philips GDP. The comparison should identify any discrepancies.

2. A current traffic report. PPLAB will approve trail networks as well as parks dedication in the Plat. How will traffic impact the park and trail experience? Is it possible to build a protective berm along the bike trail adjacent to 96th Street? What level of traffic can be anticipated along other roadways which are currently 'protected bike lanes'? Could PPLAB request all bike lanes be separated from roadways for safer and more positive experience?

3. The City does not have an acting Parks and Open Space Director. How will this affect decision making of PPLAB?

Thanks, Daniel Rupp

From: Cathern H Smith
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 11:23 AM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge: Additional Information Needed and Plat Approval Beyond Scope of Authority

Dear Members of the Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board,

Additional information and analysis are needed before this Board can advise the City Council. One of the functions of this Advisory Board is to assist the City Council and staff determine what the community needs and what it desires.

Following the Special Election, I do not think you can assume that a document developed without the opportunity for significant community input reflects the needs and desires of the community. Our community needs time to digest the proposal and provide input. Afterall, we are talking about 8% of the land in Louisville and the manifest desire of the community for thoughtful development as expressed in the results of the April 19th Special Election.

Significantly, a quick review of Brue Baukol's submission shows that it is not consistent with the Conoco-Phillips GDP with regard to road placement; It also appears to reduce the amount of undeveloped land. Alarmingly, Brue Baukol's cover letter says industrial use is planned. Industrial use is *not* authorized under the Conoco-Phillips GDP. We need to take a step back and carefully compare Brue Baukol's submission to the Conoco-Philips GDP. Common sense says there are too many red-flags and too many unknowns.

Also, there is no staff analysis of whether Brue Baukol's submission is consistent with the Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan--even though identification of issues relating to the Master Plan is a primary purpose of this Advisory Board. See City Council Resolution 65, Series 2015, Sections 2.A and 2.B.

Finally, I urge the Board to consult with counsel before "approving" any plats. I reviewed City Council Resolution 65, Series 2015, setting forth the powers and duties of this Board. There is no mention of plats in the discussion of the Board's responsibilities. Accordingly, this Advisory Board does not have authority to approve plats, whether final or preliminary.

Please do not rubber-stamp Brue Baukol's submission. Let's give the community an opportunity to heal from the April Special Election and come together with a thoughtful response to Brue Baukol's submission.
Thank you for serving Louisville,
Best,
Cathern Smith
Ward III

From: Bev Snyder
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 2:20 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: RTR

Good afternoon,

We are taking time to write about Red Tail Ridge and where do we go from here.

We are wondering how not having a Director in place for the Parks and Open Space department is impacting decisions of the PPLAB?

We understand PPLAB will have approval for trail networks and a bike path along 96 and parks dedication.

Auto traffic is very concerning. Perhaps a berm can be built along 96 to protect bike riders. Can bike lanes be seperated from roads?

And before a decision is made we would very much like the Board to review/reguest a detailed analysis of Baukols submission to the requirements of the Conoco-Philips GDP.

Please continue to listen to the voters about this property.

Thank you very much for your time,

Bev Snyder and Rolland Fearn
304 Diamond Cir
Lsvl

From: sherry sommer
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 12:00 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Plat

Dear PPLAB Members

You are being asked for preliminary and final approval of the Redtail Ridge Plat.

I am asking that you do not give preliminary approval at this time.

—This Plat was submitted before the special election. It appears to be identical to what was submitted in the proposal that was denied in our election. This Plat needs to be updated to reflect the results.

—-We need an updated traffic study. The park and the vast majority of bike trails are adjacent to busy roads.

—The majority of the bike trails are protected bike lanes. I can understand making protected bike lanes when a road is being retrofitted to accommodate bikers.
In this case, all the construction is new. We can do better. The public would be better served by bike paths that are separated from roads by at least 20 feet and a berm. Bikers should not be taking second place to cars. Paths will be more likely to be used if bikers enjoy their experience.

We need to know if there is adequate space for a berm adjoining 96. This berm should be bigger due to the very busy nature of this road.

—Why does Campus Drive dip down on the NE and NW sections of the park?

—Can you make your decision before the final alignment of Campus Drive is decided?

—-We do not have an acting Parks Director. How will the City make up for this absence?

You are likely to have other observations. I look forward to tuning into the meeting tomorrow.

Thank you for you time,

Sherry Sommer
910 South Palisade Court Louisville

-----Original Message-----
From: sherry sommer
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 2:39 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: PPLB tomorrow

The alignment for Campus Drive has not been given public input.

This alignment cuts through Open Space. And it dips through the park.

Please do not approve before the alignment has been set in a better way.

Sherry

From: Tim Stalker
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 1:55 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge plan

To the PPLAB Members:

On April 19th the community of Louisville voted "No" (against) a development proposal and plan for Redtail Ridge that appears to be the same plan with parks and landscaping that you are considering at your meeting tomorrow. I'm asking that you remove this plan from consideration or not approve it at your meeting without much more information. It's no longer viable in terms of road placement, underpass dimensions, etc., all of which was in the plan Louisville turned down in the referendum. I suspect that this must have been placed on your board's agenda sometime prior to the referendum.

The current plan from 2010 was never developed and expired, making the road placement in the plan before you irrelevant today. There's no way for your board to make decisions about or advise on matters related to parks and public landscaping at Redtail Ridge without a viable plan identifying where public landscapes are to be located in relationship to undefined roadways with no approved alignment.

Furthermore, how is the PPLAB supposed to proceed in the absence of a Parks Director, either acting or some other capacity?

Thank you so much,

Tim Stalker
806 W Dahlia Ct
Louisville

From: David Sweedler
Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 2:56 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: I am asking the Louisville Parks and Public Landscaping Board for an extension at their May 5th meeting to better help citizens understand and provide input on Redtail Ridge GDP

Members of the Parks and Public Landscaping Board,

Please do not provide Brue Bakol with approval of the Redtail Ridge Development Plan at your May 5th meeting until another meeting. Not enough time has passed to allow Louisville citizens to review or comment on this major land use decision. Hire the new Parks and Public Landscaping director before you approve this plan. We need an extension before we can consider such a major change to Louisville.

This proposal is not ready to be considered. The proposal only shows the tracts containing open space and doesn't show how the remainder of the land will be subdivided or used. Demand that Brue Baukol submit a complex application prior to review by the City of Louisville.

The open space proposal ignores the will of the voters. This plan does not add any new public or private open space to the plan that was just rejected.

This proposal is unlikely to comply with the Conoco Philips GDP, the zoning document under which the plat is submitted, because of the changed alignment of Campus Drive. It is premature to evaluate open space and trails when the road configuration is not determined.

This is an enormous land use decision and should involve the staff director of Parks, Recreation, and Open space. This agenda item should be continued to another meeting when the new-hire has a chance to get up to speed on this issue and weigh-in.

Regards,
David Sweedler

From: Chris
Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 4:06 PM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge - It's about Open Space!

Hi Dean,

I have been following (and writing about) the proposed Redtail Ridge for two years. When all the arguments pro and con are stripped away, this is really a debate about one thing **- open space.**

Brue Baukol stubbornly regards 'open space' as open areas between its buildings. The citizens of Louisville see open space as protected environments in the vein of Davidson Mesa, Daughenbaugh, etc. Throughout the entire Redtail Ridge process, Brue Baukol has refused to devote any meaningful open space in their plans. Had the Denver developer been more sensitive to our community's needs and desires, they would have already broken ground on Redtail Ridge. Had 4 member of Louisville's City Council listened to the needs of its citizens, it would have driven a harder bargain for meaningful open space. Because both developer and four elected officials have not listened, our City had to endure a Special Election that was primarily funded by the developer. The result was division in our community at a time we need unity.

I ask the Parks and Public Landscaping Board to do what neither developer nor 4 members of our City Council have done thus far: to truly listen. The citizens of Louisville rightly demand for meaningful open space that reflects the values of our community. Nearly all who voted "No" in the recent Special Election cite "not enough open space" as the primary reason for their opposition.

The people of Louisville have another chance. So does the environment at Redtail Ridge. It IS possible for Brue Baukol to develop Redtail Ridge while devoting meaningful open space. It's possible to have both. I hope you and the Board will set the tone for the continued negotiations by demanding what the people of Louisville have now made loud and clear: we need more open space at Redtail Ridge.

Thank you.

Chris Wheeler
525 La Farge Ave.

From: Sally Wilkinson
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 8:51 AM
To: Dean Johnson <deanj@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Public Review Process for Redtail Ridge

• This proposal is not ready to be considered. The proposal only shows the tracts containing open space and

doesn't show how the remainder of the land will be subdivided or used. They should not provide a recommendation without the context of a complete application.

• The open space proposal ignores the will of the voters. This plan does not add any new public or private open space to the plan that was just rejected.

• This proposal is unlikely to comply with the Conoco Philips GDP, the zoning document under which the plat is submitted, because of the changed alignment of Campus Drive. It is premature to evaluate open space and trails when the road configuration is not determined.

• This is an enormous land use decision and should involve the staff director of Parks, Recreation, and Open space. This agenda item should be continued to another meeting when the new-hire has a chance to get up to speed on this issue and weigh-in.

Sincerely,

Sarah J. Wilkinson

TO: CITY OF LOUISVILLE – PLANNING COMMITTEE

AS RESIDENTS OF PARADISE LANE FOR NEARLY 50 YEARS WE FULLY SUPPORT THE APPROVAL OF THE CURRENT PLAN FOR REDTAIL RIDGE. HOWEVER, IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN THE BEAUTY, TRANQUILITY AND REAL ESTATE VALUE OF OUR RESIDENTAL/AGRICULTURAL PROPERTY, WE WOULD LIKE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS TO BE A PART OF THE COMMITMENT ONCE THE LAND IS DEDICATED TO OPEN SPACE.

- ALL DWELLINGS & OUTBUILDINGS ON THE PROPOSED OPEN SPACE NEED TO BE DEMOLISHED IN ORDER TO NEGATE THE FIRE HAZARD THEY NOW REPRESENT, AS WELL AS THE POSSIBILITY OF SQUATTERS, AS WE HAVE HAD IN THE PAST. DWELLINGS HAVE NOT BEEN OCCUPIED FOR OVER 10 YRS.
- WATER RIGHTS SHOULD STAY WITH THE PROPERTIES IN ORDER FOR THE LAND TO BE MAINTAINED PROPERLY.
- IF LAND IS LEASED TO AN OUTSIDE PARTY, ALL HOLDING PENS FOR LIVESTOCK SHOULD BE KEPT TO THE NORTH/WEST SIDE OF THE OPEN SPACE LAND SO THAT THE WEINING NOISE OF THE CALVES DOES NOT DISTURB US HOMEOWNERS AND THE MANURE ODORS ARE FILTERED BEFORE REACHING OUR HOMES. ALL LEASES NEED TO BE APPROVED BY PARADISE LANE OWNER/RESIDENTS. NOT WITHHOLDING UNDUE APPROVAL OF LEASE.
- A CLEANUP OF THE OPEN SPACE PROPERTIES, INCLUDING THE FENCING, PASTURES, DOWN AND DEAD TREES AND REMOVAL OF ALL OF THE DEAD WOOD STACKED OVER VARIOUS AREAS OF THE LAND. ALL OF THIS IS NECESSARY, FIRST AND FOREMOST BECAUSE IN IT'S PRESENT CONDITION, IT PRESENTS AN EXTREME FIRE HAZARD!!

WE APPRECIATE YOUR CONSIDERATION IN THIS ISSUE THAT IS VITAL TO US AS WE ARE DIRECTLY IMPACTED ON A DAILY BASIS AS LONGTERM HOMEOWNERS.

LARRY & KAREN THOMPSON
9250 PARADISE LANE
BROOMFIELD, CO 80020
PHONE: 303-775-1996-LARRY 303-775-2013
E:MAIL: kkt9250@gmail.com

Dear Planning Commissioners:

I just wanted to express my thanks to you all for your thoughts and willingness to understand the complexity of RedTail Ridge proposal.
I commended one of you asked about any other options on Campus Drive. I believe it is important to see what the other options are and compare to the current plan. The other options may not be great however we can use the weak options to make it better than the current plan on the Campus Drive. It will be a great benefit such as having "Great Mind think alike" by working with the residents of Louisville. It is vital to continue to ask to see the physical options that was previously worked on.
For example: It is important to have the Campus Drive as a one-way road. How? Entering 88th and exiting 96th on right turn only lane. In this design, can have one round a about giving the drivers options to exit either to 88th and 96th. No traffic signal on 96th will give the environment sustainability and supporting Net zero policy. The State of Colorado just enacted new rules to reduce greenhouse gas emissions with the goal of improving air quality by taking the equivalent of 300,00 cars off the road each year.
With the new construction will be happening on the Flatiron Mall district, we need a new traffic study from the Flatiron location to be implemented with the 88th and 96th traffic study.

Secondly, here is my concern, I have noticed on the proposal map plan, there are two small green areas southwest of Tape Drive which it will be given or convert to open space. I much rather have the southwest of Tape Drive area to be exchanged to the second pond/lake area as an open space and have them to develop on the southwest of the Tape Drive. I would like to see more open space around both pond/lakes to preserve the natural surroundings.
Without a visual aid, it is difficult for me to describe the layout in words, and I hope this gives you a basic idea.

Thank you for your service. Please continue to reject the current plan and encourage them to revise according to the codes and by laws.

M. Christiansen
543 Adams Ave
Louisville, CO 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: RTR: Denial

From: Cynthia Corne <ccorne@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 4:41 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>; Jeff Durbin <jdurbin@louisvilleco.gov>; Rob Zuccaro <rzuccaro@louisvilleco.gov>; Lisa Ritchie <lritchie@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: RTR: Denial

Dear Planning Commission:

The citizens of Louisville are reasonable people who care about a healthy community, thriving economy, improving climate, sharing our ecology with wildlife, and specifically, clean air. And, I believe fairness in government matters including development and economic development.

Do you see Louisville citizens opposing CTC expansions in large numbers (e.g. the new Bolder Innovation Campus)?
No. In general, we elect our leaders, and go about our lives.

And then, there is Storage Tek/ConocoPhillips/Nawatny Ridge/RTR/RTR/RTR.

1) And the same horizontal plat since Brue Baukol got involved, with goals for outdated concrete and parking lots.
***By now, the **impacts to carbon emissions** should be well-understood, and, if not, the Planning Commission has every right to request a f**ull climate impact study** re: the impact to the soil, wildlife, and air quality - from grading, concrete parking lots, buildings, and 20K cars per day. And the construction traffic as well. We need to be going the other way. **What are the proposed carbon offsets?**

2) Construction Chaos: How many construction vehicles per day? How many road closures and/or narrowed lanes?
Have you seen how much traffic there already is at this site during busy times of day?
*What agreements are in place with CDOT/Boulder Turnpike/36 and E-470? and CDOT/42/95th?
3) No tenants named. "Trust us." Let us grade over the whole Campus development.
4) At buildout, an additional 20,000 TWENTY THOUSAND cars per day.
This completely ignores the recent EPA Air quality downgrade to severe status for the Front Range.
5) Combining Preliminary and Final Plat steps.
***Why do these separate steps exist in the Municipal Code if not for this VERY type of situation.
6) For the record, Council specifically excluded heavy industrial from the CP PUD. Brue Baukol should be required to indicate the planned commercial uses, especially since they want to grade over the property.

So, please create a motion to Deny this applicant's preliminary and final plat on the basis that the pros and detail provided do not outweigh the risks and unknowns, and overreaching plans. The applicant needs to propose a phased approach with less disruption e.g. grading, at a minimum, and much fewer cars forecast given the air quality and heavy traffic already in existence. These other reasons for denial as well - one of these reasons would be enough:

- 1) Does not adequately meet the requirements of 16.04.020 and the authority granted for the purpose:
    1. A. To promote the health, safety, convenience, order, prosperity and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the city.

2. It only serves to meet the unbending business case, and cost models for a now-Newport Beach owned applicant, who looks to subdivide this land like a suburb, in order to resell it or lease it.

- This GDP needs separate preliminary and final plats - the applicant has failed to provide the needed detail for each definition, and continues to add Code-required information during the process without adequate review time - for the public, boards, and planning commission. The distinctions between preliminary and final exist for this very situation.
- Permission to grade the entire property before the PUD would violate item 1, and the Comprehensive Plan/Campus setting.
- Construction traffic chaos - City Staff needs to be able to focus on Marshall Fire recovery/traffic design and more. To oversee plans for construction traffic for this development is not an obligation nor a priority for the City. As demonstrated from the referendum vote, Louisville citizens have other priorities and want to ensure the Code is followed.
    1. Many are not opposed to this development in general. Many of us are opposed to this application.
- 20K additional cars at full buildout - with no partnerships or agreements with CDOT or E-470
-
-
- Common sense is failing here. With increased traffic at 287 and E470 and at 36/Interlocken and McCaslin and 36, better planning is needed. We already have traffic jams on 42, especially before and after Dillon Road, all the way to South Boulder Road.

I believe City Council suggested max of 1.6MM sq. feet at one point, perhaps the applicant could re-start there, with a phased, success-based plan, where tenants and commercial uses are known before plats are subdivided like a residential area.

Too many risks, too much overreach. Ignoring the community. Predictable air quality and traffic chaos.

Thank you.

Cynthia Corne
438 Jefferson Ave.
Louisville, CO

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge Testimony

(cannot accept texts)

From: Clif Harald <clif.harald@firstflatironconsulting.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 2:52 PM
To: Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Testimony

Planning Commission Members,

The stature of Colorado's Front Range continues to evolve as one of the country's most dynamic ecosystems for innovation in biosciences and advances in health care.

Yet in biosciences alone, real estate brokers report tenant demand for 1.3M to 1.6M square feet of lab space in the Denver/Boulder market, with a 0% vacancy rate in Boulder lab real estate. And we've all seen how urgently health care systems and hospitals must expand to meet the accelerating demand from Louisville and other north metro area residents for their services.

The proposed life sciences campus at Redtail Ridge would help meet these needs and significantly address the life-critical missions served by bioscience companies and health care organizations.

As a Louisville resident with years of experience in Boulder County community economic development, I also value the local economic benefits of Redtail Ridge which include an estimated $1M annually in *net* new city revenue averaged over the first 20 years of the project. This additional revenue couldn't be more timely as we work to recover and rebuild from the Marshall Fire. And the jobs associated with redevelopment of Redtail Ridge would help revitalize our struggling retail centers.

Thank you for your dedication to the orderly and deliberate evolution of Louisville's built environment. I encourage the Planning Commission to look favorably upon the life-critical and local economic benefits of Redtail Ridge and to approve the project's preliminary and final plat.

Clif Harald
First Flatiron Consulting, LLC
LinkedIn
Mobile: 303-908-2333

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge

From: Beth McQuie <bmcquie@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 9:50 AM
To: Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

Dear Louisville Planning Commission,

I am writing about the latest version of Redtail Ridge.

I am not opposed to having a life and bioscience campus in Louisville. However, there are some factors that I hope you will consider.

The traffic plan seems problematic to me. Having Campus Drive come out on 96th, near the fire station, could create traffic jams, in my opinion. There is already a traffic light at 96th and the tollway. Campus Drive would join 96th just a few hundred feet from that. In addition, if Avista Hospital builds along 96th, they might want their own traffic light, too, for easy of entry of emergency vehicles. This hasn't been taken into account, from what I can tell.

Please do not widen 88th Street. That is just behind my home and the additional traffic would add to noise and pollution. Our neighborhood was destroyed in the Marshall Fire. Please don't add to our misery.

I would prefer that the plan have a smaller footprint. It could cover just the area that the StorageTek facility did. That way, open space could be maintained north of the former Disc Drive and our small-town feeling could continue. We could have a buffer of open space between Redtail Ridge and the main part of town.

This area is designed as a RURAL District in the 2013 Comprehensive Plan. Does the current Redtail Ridge plan seem rural? Not to me. It appears that it will cover the majority of the land with buildings and concrete parking lots. Although the limit is 3 stories, per the Comp Plan, in the past, the developer has pushed for higher buildings. Please do not allow that.

The Louisville Vision Statement, as stated in the 2013 Comprehensive Plan, includes a core value of maintaining Our Livable Small Town Feel. Redtail Ridge should demonstrate this.

Thank you for considering these points.

Beth McQuie

972 Saint Andrews Lane, Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Drainage Plans
Attachments: 2n_Redtail Ridge Filing No. 1 - Existing Onsite Easement Exhibit.pdf

Importance: High

From: sherry sommer <hellosherry2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 8:51 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Drainage Plans

Planning Commissioners,

I needed clarification on grading in the public land dedication at RTR and got these maps.

Maybe they will be of use to you as well.

Sherry Sommer

Hi Sherry,

Per our discussion this afternoon, here are the best grading plans we have that cove the public land dedication tracts that are slated for open space.

Thanks,
Rob

Rob Zuccaro, AICP
Planning and Building Safety Director
303-335-4590 (D)
303-335-4592 (O)

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

City of Louisville

COLORADO • SINCE 1878



811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

CALL 3 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

100 0 100 200
SCALE: 1" = 100'

DESIGNED BY: TMW, JMR
CHECKED BY: MAW
DRAWN BY: TMW, JMR

HARRIS KOCHER SMITH
1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80203
P: 303.623.6300 F: 303.623.6311
HarrisKocherSmith.com

BRUE-BAUKOL CAPITAL PARTNERS

REDTAIL RIDGE - FILING NO. 1
DRAINAGE PLAN NW

ISSUE DATE: 03-03-2020	PROJECT #: 190108
DATE	REVISION COMMENTS
04-06-2020	SECOND SUBMITTAL PER CITY COMMENTS
04-05-2021	FIRST SUBMITTAL NEW PROGRAM
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-

PRELIMINARY NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

SHEET NO.
ST - 8
ST - 8 OF ST - 45

ALL CHANGES ARE TO BE MADE TO THE DRAWING WHICH IS WRITTEN RESPONSIBILITY OF HARRIS KOCHER SMITH

FILEPATH: P:\190\DWG\ENGINEERING\DRAWINGS\2021 MASTER DRAINAGE PLAN DWG_LAYOUT_DRAINAGE PLAN NW
14 XREFs: cfent logo, e-base, e-legal, e-util, key map, p-base-f2, p-base-f3, p-base-f2, p-dmp, p-land[U], p-legal-f1, p-ply[xl[U], p-util[U], stamp - storm, storm - f1 - stamp
PLOTTED: THU JAN 21 2021 2:24:38PM BY PAT HEDELAR



Know what's below. Call before you dig.

CALL 3 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

SCALE: 1" = 100'

DESIGNED BY: TMW, JMR
CHECKED BY: MAW
DRAWN BY: TMW, JMR

HARRIS KOCHER SMITH
1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80203
P: 303.623.6300 F: 303.623.6311
HarrisKocherSmith.com

BRUE-BAUKOL CAPITAL PARTNERS

REDTAIL RIDGE - FILING NO. 1
DRAINAGE PLAN NE

ISSUE DATE: 03-03-2020 | PROJECT #: 190108

DATE	REVISION COMMENTS
04-06-2020	SECOND SUBMITTAL PER CITY COMMENTS
04-05-2021	FIRST SUBMITTAL NEW PROGRAM
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-

PRELIMINARY NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

SHEET NO.
ST - 9
ST - 9 OF ST - 45

ALL CHANGES ARE TO BE MADE TO THE ORIGINAL DRAWING ONLY. ANY REUSE WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION OF HARRIS KOCHER SMITH IS PROHIBITED

FILEPATH: P:\190\DWG\ENGINEERING\DRAINAGE\20210211 MASTER DRAINAGE PLAN.DWG, LAYOUT: DRAINAGE PLAN NE
14 XREFS: client logo, e-base, e-legal, e-util, key map, p-base-f1, p-base-f2, p-dmp, p-land[U], p-legal-f1, p-ply/a[U], post[U], stamp - storm, storm - f1 - stamp
PLOTTED: THU JAN 21 2021 2:23 pm BY PAT HERLIHY

NO CHANGES ARE TO BE MADE TO THIS DRAWING WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION OF HAYNES HOWENSTEIN



SUMMARY OF APPROXIMATE EARTHWORK QUANTITIES	
CUT VOLUME	1,230,796 CY
FILL VOLUME	981,149 CY
NET (IMPORT)	249,647 CY (EXPORT)

NOTE: EARTHWORK VOLUMES ARE UNADJUSTED AND DO NOT ACCOUNT FOR UTILITY SPOILS, PAVEMENT SECTION, SOIL COMPACTION/SWELL, BUILDING LAYOUT, BUILDING FOUNDATION, ETC.

REDTAIL RIDGE TOTAL SITE - CUT & FILL MAP

SCALE: 1" =250'



KEY MAP

1"=2000'

SOURCE: P:\REDTAIL\RIDGE\PHASE1\REDTAIL RIDGE PHASE 1 GRADING\CIVIL\SHEETS\REDTAIL RIDGE PHASE 1 GRADING - TOTAL SITE.DWG - LAYOUT: CUT & FILL MAP
PLOTTED: 10/7/2021 7:59:19 AM By: Tim Stoker

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Insufficient review by PPLB of Redtail Ridge proposal

Importance: High

From: sherry sommer <hellosherry2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 4:36 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Insufficient review by PPLB of Redtail Ridge proposal

Members of the Louisville Planning Commission,

The Louisville Parks and Public Landscaping Board unanimously recommended approval of the Redtail Ridge draft and final plat in May 2022. **This approval was premature and ill-informed.**

Please consider:

The Board recommendation was not based on sound analysis:

— The Board did not ask if the proposal met City code.

— The Board did not evaluate the proposed park, open space, roads, or trails.

— Thirty residents submitted email comments and eight residents spoke at the Board meeting, but the Board did not address public comments.

The Board has not communicated that it is cost prohibitive to develop a park in the NW corner of the site.

— Residents learned of this prohibition during the May 2022 Board meeting. The Board didn't address the issue during the meeting.

— During the meeting a Board Member admitted, "That area wouldn't be developed as a Park for years, if ever.

— Allan Gill, Project Manager for the Parks Department stated that the land in the NW corner of the property is far too hilly and expensive for the City to develop as a park and recreation space.

— Dean Johnson, Parks Superintendent, stated that the Parks Department was considering other sites in the City for a new park.

Brue Baukol has led the public, Planning Commission, and City Council to believe that land designated as a park would be suitable for use as soccer fields, and other public recreation.

— Jordan Swisher, Senior Vice President, Brue Baukol Capital Partners, told City Council on July 27, 2021 "The Parks Board appreciated the proximity of the park to the schools" (42:13) and "I can just imagine taking my daughter to soccer practice on the fields by Monarch on a Saturday."

— During the July 27, 2021 meeting, Geoff Baukol stated, "Imagine the convenience of having sports fields on this site. We have listened and responded to what residents have asked for and have gone above and beyond." (58:32)

The Yes Campaign sold the park as one of the main attractions when marketing the previous proposal in the run-up to the April 2022 special election:

10) What could the 15 acres of recreational fields be used for?

By voting YES, more than 15 acres of this land would be set aside for public use and parks, and would be owned by the City. Allowable uses here would include new ballfields, dog parks, soccer fields, tennis and pickleball facilities, and other uses that can help our citizens stay active and enjoy the outdoors. Since there are no provisions for recreational uses or fields in the ConocoPhillips plan, voting NO would take away these options for public use.

11) Would a dog park be allowed under the Redtail Ridge plan?

Yes! Dog parks are an allowable use under the Redtail plan, but not under the ConocoPhillips plan. The developer would be required to donate this land to the City of Louisville for this and other uses as determined by the city.
(Source: Yes for Louisville website)

From our perspective, it is clear that the Parks Board had not done their due diligence when considering the feasibility or practicality of the City utilizing the public dedication in the NW corner of the site as a park. The Board seemingly has taken the developer at their word that this land is suitable for a park and that the City will use it as such, despite at least one member of the Board and City staff indicating the opposite. In rubber stamping their recommendation for approval, the Board has vacated their responsibility to represent the best interests of the City and its residents. Please consider this oversight as you consider the plan before you.

Sincerely,

Sherry Sommer
Citizens for a Vibrant, Sustainable Louisville

910 South Palisade Court
Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Rdge proposal

Importance: High

From: Carolyn H Anderson <chageo@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 4, 2022 12:31 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Rdge proposal

To: Louisville Planning Commission members:

From: Carolyn H Anderson, Property at 354 Troon Court

Re: Redtail Ridge proposal

I am writing, again, to express my dismay at and rejection of the proposed development at Redtail Ridge:

- The site is slated to be graded entirely under the current proposal by Brue Baukol, in its entirety. That is against the current requirements of Louisville code, which specifies that the natural beauty and topography of the city will be preserved to the extent possible, preservation of with natural vegetation specifically mentioned. This preservation requirement is especially important as the effects of climate change increase more rapidly than has been predicted (witness this week's prediction of 95-degree days all week long).

1. • The commission should require a 50% public land dedication for this parcel.

- • While the area developed may have been reduced in the current Brue Baukol proposal, the impact on local traffic, noise, air quality, impact on the micro climate, and yet unknown emissions from potential industrial facilities.
- • The original proposal suggested a marijuana growing facility might be a customer. With a K-12 school facility next door? That is unacceptable to me, and I do not even have children at the school.

We lost all in the December Marshall Fire. While we no longer live in Coal Creek Ranch, I still plan to live not far away. This has been our neighborhood for 21 years, longer than we have lived in any other home during our 54 years of marriage. We frequently travel 88th Street, we shop in Louisville, we use medical offices and services in Louisville, we use the library, and likely will rejoin the recreation center. The traffic increase of 20,000 more vehicles per day is not acceptable.

Louisville is our home. I do not want to see any more large parking lots serving vacant commercial and office space. There is a huge amount of vacant office and commercial space all over Louisville, Boulder, Broomfield. Retail space seems not to be surviving much anywhere around us. We still have three large retail (including grocery) stores in Louisville. Flatiron Crossing is in decline and demolition and reconstruction will soon be underway according to a recent Boulder Camera article, with plans to redevelop the empty Nordstroms into office space. We already have vacant office space in Louisville. People continue to work from home.

Please reject this unsatisfactory development plan by Brue Baukol for Redtail Ridge. It doesn't meet our City's code.

Sincerely,

Carolyn H Anderson

200 Summit Blvd, Apt 333

Broomfield CO 80021

Property owner at 354 Troon Court, Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge and Brue Baukol

Importance: High

From: Norma Anderson <norma22@me.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 4, 2022 12:17 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: Norma Jean Auer Anderson <norma22@me.com>
Subject: Redtail Ridge and Brue Baukol

Dear Steve Brauneis, Ben Diehl, Dietrich Höfner, Keaton Howe, Tamar Kranz, Jeff Moline and Allison Osterman,

I've followed the Redtail Ridge plans put forward by Brue Baukol from the beginning, and have been very consistent in my view that Brue Baukol is not the appropriate developer for the area known as Redtail Ridge, nor are the plans put forward by Brue Baukol suitable or appropriate to Louisville and what we stand for as a city and community. Repeatedly, Brue Baukol has tried to find ways around the objections Louisville residents have put forward when reviewing their (Brue Baukol's) plans, including forcing a special election Louisville had to pay for, to show again our disapproval of the plans put forward by Brue Baukol. With one exception, our City Council has turned down Brue Baukol's plans, that one exception was when one of the City Council members voted to have it put to a public vote (the one I just mentioned, where Brue Baukol was again defeated).

You will be having a meeting about Brue Baukol and whether it meets requirements for subdivisions in Louisville, per Louisville's Municipal Code, and it does not. The meeting will be on September 8th, and I hope you'll turn down Brue Baukol and its plans as Louisville has done in the past.

Here's how the plans put forth by Brue Baukol fail to meet the Louisville Municipal Code (LMC):

1. Grading: The current proposal calls for the entire site to be graded, including the open space and areas that will not contain buildings, roads, and parking lots. All of the natural drainage will be altered, the health of the soil severely degraded, trees and other vegetation destroyed, and wildlife habitat obliterated.

Grading the entire site is contrary to the mandate to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible:

LMC 16.04.202 (N): "To preserve and enhance to the extent reasonably possible the natural beauty and topography of the city and areas of historical or archeological importance and to ensure appropriate development with regard to such natural, historical and archaeological sites and features."

LMC 16.16.010 (D): "Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible."

A question the Planning Commission needs to ask: Does the current plan demonstrate that every effort has been made to "preserve and enhance to the extent reasonably possible" the natural features, including trees, of this property? Grading the entire site doesn't sound like any effort has been made. The proposal for Redtail Ridge

does not contain an inventory of the trees on the site, nor plans to preserve them or a justification for destroying them.

There's a reason for the LMC's mandate here: Vegetation acts as a carbon sink. When land is graded, carbon stored there is released into the atmosphere. Recovery of soil and vegetation is a slow process, and drought makes it even slower. Vegetation and the wildlife it houses also promote biodiversity, which is now more endangered than ever.

Grading the site is contrary to the mandate to preserve natural drainage:

LMC 16.16.020 (B): "Drainage areas, wherever possible, should be left in a natural state and no encroachments shall be made on the natural channel area."

Grading the property will destroy natural channels carved into the land over time. This includes historic Goodhue Ditch, which the developer plans to cover with a four-lane road. Natural vegetation holds water better than artificial channels and naturally mitigates flooding.

2. Open Space: The public land dedication in the current Redtail Ridge does not meet the minimum requirement.

Brue Baukol's proposed public land dedication includes areas that should be excluded from the calculation:

LMC 16.16.060 (B) 1: "A minimum of 12 percent for nonresidential subdivisions and a minimum of 15 percent for residential subdivisions of the total land area of the tract being subdivided shall be dedicated, exclusive of subsection A of this section, for park, school, or other public purposes as determined by the city council and shall be delineated on the final plat. Land dedicated for public use must be suitable, as determined by the planning commission, for the type of development and/or the use for which it is intended."

This (below) lists the features that cannot be counted towards the 12% dedication:

LMC 16.16.060 (A): "Dedications of rights-of-way for public streets, drainage easements, utility easements or other public purposes shall be required and shall be made by the subdivider on the plat unless otherwise directed by the city council."

The proposed public land dedication at Redtail Ridge includes streets, drainage easements, and utility easements.

The LMC explicitly instructs the Planning Commission to determine whether the land granted in the public dedication is suitable for its purpose.

LMC 16.16.060 (B) 1: "… Land dedicated for public use must be suitable, as determined by the planning commission, for the type of development and/or the use for which it is intended."

Because the land at Redtail Ridge is intended for use as open space and to provide a natural buffer mitigating the sense of urban sprawl, the Planning Commission must decide whether the land proposed for dedication is suitable for these purposes.

For open space, the purpose of which is the preservation of biodiverse natural areas and light human recreation, the land north of Disc Drive is the most suitable. This area of the site has never been developed. It is the richest in vegetation, water, and wildlife.

To preserve these "natural features" (LMC 16.04.020 (N) and LMC 16.16.010 (D)), the Planning Commission should require a 50% public land dedication at Redtail Ridge, with a 40% open space dedication north of Disc Drive. This would mean clustering all of the development on the southern half of the property, as it was when StorageTek occupied it.

3. Community Impact. Brue Baukol's current Redtail Ridge plan is less than half the size of the 6.1 million square feet the company proposed for the site in 2020, yet it still occupies the same massive, sprawling footprint. The impact of the development on local traffic, air quality, and quality of life remains enormous.

This is in spite of the LMC's clear instructions that the city should minimize the negative impacts of development:

LMC 16.04.020 (O): This section requires City Council and the Planning Commission "To regulate the use of land within the city on the basis of the impact thereof on the community or surrounding areas."

The development proposed for the area north of Disc Drive would impact nearby neighborhoods and Monarch High School with dust, noise, and fumes from construction; traffic; and the long-term possibility of emissions from industrial facilities. This includes an anticipated 20,000 additional car trips on Louisville roads daily.

At the last meeting, Louisville's city attorney told the Planning Commission the only question they have to address is whether the plan for Redtail Ridge meets the criteria of the Municipal Code or not. Since it does not, please take this into consideration.

Sincerely,

Norma Jean Anderson
1904 Steel Street
Louisville, Colorado 80027
norma22@me.com
(Home phone) 303-954-9373
(Cell phone) 720-537-5901

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Comments on Redtail Ridge Preliminary and Final Plant
Open Space Needs Assessment
by John Leary, 1116 Lafarge Ave

The intent of my comments is not to "weigh" in on the amount of open space needed in the Redtail Ridge to satisfy the requirements of the Louisville Municipal Code (LMC). It is simply to urge you to follow the LMC in making your determination on this matter.

I listened, from afar, to your deliberations on this matter in your last meeting and lost much sleep over a relatively simple issue. Specifically, statements were made to the effect that the amount of public land dedication[1] proposed by the applicant exceeded the amount that was required by the LMC. Such references represent a serious misunderstanding of how the LMC addresses the requirements for open space.[2]

The amount of open space required for a development is whatever the City Council, with input from the Planning Commission, decides is needed. The 12% figure in Section 16.16.060 of the LMC is the minimum amount of land that must be set aside, not necessarily what is needed. The amount of opens space needed is determined by applying the principles, policies and requirements of Sections 16.04.020, 16.12.050, 16.16.060,16.16.010 and 17.28.080[3]. It is important to note the requirements of these sections could, in some cases, be met within the 12%, while in other cases, it could take multiples of the 12%.

As an aside, these requirements occur in different phases of the development process, e.g., in the platting and PUD processes. This makes it important not to allow decisions in one phase to inappropriately eliminate options available in later phases.

While many of the principles, policies and requirements of the above mentioned LMC Sections demand your attention in order to determine the amount of open space needed for the Redtail development, the following is one example[4] of a requirement that was short thrifted at your last meeting.

Subpart D of Section 16.16.010(D) – General design and construction standards states:

"Natural features, historical and archaeological sites and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible."

[1] Hereon I will use the term open space as that is the subject of misunderstanding.
[2] It is worth noting the applicant has repeatedly stated this misunderstanding throughout the process.
[3] There may be more sections of the LMC dealing with open space requirements, but these sections are sufficient to give context to the meaning of "minimum" in 16.16.016.
[4] This example is not meant to suggest it is the only issue needing to be be addressed. You will find others if you review all the policies and requirements, as some of you may have done, dealing with open space.

Section 16.12.050(S) requires the preliminary plat to show the "location of significant natural features such as trees, woodlands, lakes, hills, streams, wetlands, and floodplains, and historical and archaeological sites." I see nothing in the public record that satisfies this requirement.

Back to the standard in 16.16.010(D), the preliminary and final plats must show how the "to the extent possible" standard will be met. I ask you – based on the information you have, are you assured the trees on this property are being preserved to "the extent possible?" Do you have any idea how much open space would be necessary to preserve trees?

An aerial view of the site, overlaid on the plat maps of projected open space, is one way of making this assessment. There are aerial views on the County Assessor's Property Search that at least give an idea of some of the natural attributes of the property. During the last GDP process, I did some relatively rough overlays of what needs to be preserved and sent them to the Commission. My work got little discussion, but that was not in the more demanding plat process.

We are all aware this development is very contentious in our community. Determining the amount of open space in the Redtail development involves a lot of judgments that will always have elements of disagreement. Take for example defining "to the extent possible." Given the opportunities for honest disagreement we need to do everything we can to eliminate process disagreements. If you internalize the above-mentioned sections of the LMC it will become evident why the 12% is referred to as a minimum. It simply rationalizes the application of all the criteria in the various parts of the LMC.

In summary, you need to be fair to both the public and the applicant. You can only do this through a good faith effort to understand and follow our municipal code.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge not meeting Municipal Code

Importance: High

From: Scott MacLaughlin <STMacLaughlin@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 4, 2022 12:39 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge not meeting Municipal Code

I am honestly getting tired of writing emails stating that Brue Baukol has one again violated multiple sections of the Municipal Code. He has demonstrated over the years that he is dishonest and cannot be trusted (remember when he said his original plan could not be changed due to economics?). Please send a clear message to Baukol that his dishonest approach will not be tolerated and he needs to meet the intent and spirit of the Code or sell the land to someone who will.

The citizens of Louisville are not going away, so I'd suggest you stand up to Baukol at the upcoming Planning Commission on September 8.

Scott MacLaughlin
948 St. Andrews Lane, Louisville (First Responder firefighter who lost his home and cars was battling the Marshall Wildland Fire in Louisville)

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==
This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge

Importance: High

From: Brad Pugh <bpugh1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 3:50 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

Hello,

I'm writing to express my continued concern about the proposed plan for Redtail Ridge. Specifically:

1. The current Grading plan that would grade the entire site is destructive and doesn't comply with the relevant standards set forth in Louisville's municipal code.
2. The current proposed public land dedication includes areas that should be excluded from the calculation. The proposed land dedication falls short of the spirit of open space and doesn't stand up to scrutiny when compared to what is called for in the Louisville municipal code.
3. The current plan, while reduced, still has a significant impact in terms of local traffic, air quality, and quality of life in general for our small town. The proposed development proposed for the area north of Disc Drive would impact nearby neighborhoods and Monarch High School in profoundly negative ways.

Sincerely,

Brad Pugh

Brad Pugh
303.819.4232

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Red Tail Ridge

Importance: High

From: Bev Snyder <bev@wisegator.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 8:18 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Red Tail Ridge

Good morning,

We are AGAIN writing to you about this subject and I am confused as to why.

The city would not accept the comments and requests given by us citizens of Louisville CO so they required an election - wasting money to get the same response from our town.

Now, we are still having the same discussions about this property.

PLEASE pay attention to the comments below. Please pay attention to the comments and requests you have heard for the last several years. Please pay attention!

2. **OPEN SPACE**. The public land dedication in the current Redtail Ridge does not meet requirements of the code.

A. Brue Baukol's proposed public land dedication includes areas that should be excluded from the calculation:

- **LMC 16.16.060 (B)1**: "A minimum of 12 percent for nonresidential subdivisions and a minimum of 15 percent for residential subdivisions of the total land area of the tract being subdivided shall be dedicated, exclusive of subsection A of this section, for park, school, or other public purposes as determined by the city council and shall be delineated on the final plat.

The problem? Subsection A lists the features that cannot be counted towards the 12% dedication:

- **LMC 16.16.060 (A)**: "Dedications of rights-of-way for public streets, drainage easements, utility easements or other public purposes shall be required and shall be made by the subdivider on the plat unless otherwise directed by the city council."

The proposed land dedication at Redtail Ridge includes streets and trails. Thanks to Commission comments at their previous meeting, drainage easements, steep land, and land previously earmarked as buffer has just been excluded. Proposed land dedication outside of the Plat cannot count toward the 12%.

B. The LMC explicitly instructs the Planning Commission to determine whether the land granted in the public dedication is suitable for its purpose:

- LMC 16.16.060 (B)1: "… Land dedicated for public use must be suitable, as determined by the planning commission, for the type of development and/or the use for which it is intended."

Because the land at Redtail Ridge is intended for use as open space and to provide a natural buffer mitigating the sense of urban sprawl, the Planning Commission must decide whether the land proposed for dedication is suitable for these purposes.

For open space, the purpose of which is the preservation of biodiverse natural areas and light human recreation, the land north of Disc Drive is the most suitable. This area of the site has never been developed. It is the richest in vegetation, water, and wildlife.

To preserve the site's most important "natural features" (per LMC 16.04.020 (N) and LMC 16.16.010 (D)), **the Planning Commission should require a 50% public land dedication at Redtail Ridge, with a 40% open space dedication north of Disc Drive. This would mean clustering all of the development on the southern half of the property, as it was when StorageTek occupied it.**

The development proposed for the area north of Disc Drive would impact nearby neighborhoods and Monarch High School with dust, noise, and fumes from construction; traffic; and the long-term possibility of emissions from industrial facilities. This includes an anticipated 20,000 additional car trips on Louisville roads daily.

At the last meeting, Louisville's city attorney told the Planning Commission that the only question they have to address is whether the plan for Redtail Ridge meets the criteria of the Municipal Code or not. **It does not**.

Thank you for you time,

Bev Snyder and Rolland Fearn
304 Diamond Cir Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Communication from Citizens for a Vibrant, Sustainable Louisville

From: sherry sommer <hellosherry2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 5, 2022 5:23 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Communication from Citizens for a Vibrant, Sustainable Louisville

Planning Commissioners and Planning Director Zuccaro,

I am forwarding this week's communication from Citizens for a Vibrant, Sustainable Louisville:

Commissioners need to know that this plan does NOT meet the requirements for subdivisions in Louisville's municipal code (LMC). Here's where it falls short:

1. **GRADING**. The current proposal calls for the **entire site to be graded** – including the open space and areas that will not contain buildings, roads, and parking lots. All of the natural drainage will be altered, the health of the soil severely degraded, trees and other vegetation destroyed, and wildlife habitat obliterated.

A. Grading the entire site is contrary to the mandate to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible:

- **LMC 16.04.020 (N)**: "To preserve and enhance to the extent reasonably possible the natural beauty and topography of the city and areas of historical or archeological importance and to ensure appropriate development with regard to such natural, historical and archaeological sites and features."

- **LMC 16.16.010 (D)**: "Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible."

Does the current plan demonstrate that every effort has been made to "preserve and enhance to the extent reasonably possible" the natural features, including trees, of this property? Grading the entire site doesn't sound like any effort has been made at all. The proposal for Redtail Ridge does not even contain an inventory of the trees on the site, much less plans to preserve them – or a justification for destroying them.

There's a reason for the LMC's mandate here: Vegetation acts as a carbon sink. When land is graded, stored carbon is released into the atmosphere. Recovery of soil and vegetation is a slow process, and drought makes it even slower. Vegetation and the wildlife it houses also promote biodiversity – now imperiled more than ever.

B. Grading the site is contrary to the mandate to preserve natural drainage:

- LMC 16.16.020 (B): "Drainage areas, wherever possible, should be left in a natural state and no encroachments shall be made on the natural channel area."

Grading the property will destroy natural channels carved into the land over time. This includes historic Goodhue Ditch, which the developer plans to cover with a four-lane road. Natural vegetation holds water better than artificial channels and naturally mitigates flooding.

2. **OPEN SPACE**. The public land dedication in the current Redtail Ridge does not meet requirements of the code.

A. Brue Baukol's proposed public land dedication includes areas that should be excluded from the calculation:

- LMC 16.16.060 (B)1: "A minimum of 12 percent for nonresidential subdivisions and a minimum of 15 percent for residential subdivisions of the total land area of the tract being subdivided shall be dedicated, exclusive of subsection A of this section, for park, school, or other public purposes as determined by the city council and shall be delineated on the final plat.

The problem? Subsection A lists the features that cannot be counted towards the 12% dedication:

- LMC 16.16.060 (A): "Dedications of rights-of-way for public streets, drainage easements, utility easements or other public purposes shall be required and shall be made by the subdivider on the plat unless otherwise directed by the city council."

The proposed land dedication at Redtail Ridge includes public purposes such as streets and trails. Thanks to Commissioner comments at their previous meeting, drainage easements, steep land, and land previously earmarked as buffer has been excluded. **Note:** Proposed land dedication outside of the Plat cannot count toward the 12%.

B. The LMC explicitly instructs the Planning Commission to determine whether the land granted in the public dedication is suitable for its purpose:

- LMC 16.16.060 (B)1: "… Land dedicated for public use must be suitable, as determined by the planning commission, for the type of development and/or the use for which it is intended."

Because the land at Redtail Ridge is intended for use as open space and to provide a natural buffer mitigating the sense of urban sprawl, the Planning Commission must decide whether the land proposed for dedication is suitable for these purposes.

For open space, the purpose of which is the preservation of biodiverse natural areas and light human recreation, the land north of Disc Drive is the most suitable. This area of the site has never been developed. It is the richest in vegetation, water, and wildlife.

To preserve the site's most important "natural features" (per LMC 16.04.020 (N)and LMC 16.16.010 (D)), **the Planning Commission should require a 50% public land dedication at Redtail Ridge, with a 40% open space dedication north of Disc Drive. This would mean clustering all of the development on the southern half of the property, as it was when StorageTek occupied it.**

3. **COMMUNITY IMPACT**. Brue Baukol's current Redtail Ridge plan is less than half the size of the 6.1 million square feet the company proposed for the site in 2020, yet it still occupies the same massive, sprawling footprint. **The impact of the development on local traffic, air quality, and quality of life remains enormous.**

This is in spite of the LMC's clear instructions that the city should minimize the negative impacts of development:

- **LMC 16.04.020 (O)**: This section requires City Council and the Planning Commission "To regulate the use of land within the city on the basis of the impact thereof on the community or surrounding areas."

The development proposed for the area north of Disc Drive would impact nearby neighborhoods and Monarch High School with dust, noise, and fumes from construction; traffic; and the long-term possibility of emissions from industrial facilities. This includes an anticipated 20,000 additional car trips on Louisville roads daily.

At the last meeting, Louisville's city attorney told the Planning Commission that the only question they have to address is whether the plan for Redtail Ridge meets the criteria of the Municipal Code or not. **It does not**. Please make sure, with your comments and letters, that each Commissioner understands this.

See you all on Thursday.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Correction: Communication from Citizens for a Vibrant, Sustainable Louisville

Importance: High

From: sherry sommer <hellosherry2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 6:33 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Correction: Communication from Citizens for a Vibrant, Sustainable Louisville

Note: Section 2 A, final paragraph should include:

80 acres was exempted from the public land dedication requirement because STK provided a recreation facility at the site.

The recreation center no longer exists.This exemption needs to be questioned.

Planning Commissioners and Planning Director Zuccaro,

I am forwarding this week's communication from Citizens for a Vibrant, Sustainable Louisville:

Commissioners need to know that this plan does NOT meet the requirements for subdivisions in Louisville's municipal code (LMC). Here's where it falls short:

1. **GRADING**. The current proposal calls for the **entire site to be graded** – including the open space and areas that will not contain buildings, roads, and parking lots. All of the natural drainage will be altered, the health of the soil severely degraded, trees and other vegetation destroyed, and wildlife habitat obliterated.

A. Grading the entire site is contrary to the mandate to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible:

- **LMC 16.04.020 (N)**: "To preserve and enhance to the extent reasonably possible the natural beauty and topography of the city and areas of historical or archeological importance and to ensure appropriate development with regard to such natural, historical and archaeological sites and features."

- **LMC 16.16.010 (D)**: "Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible."

Does the current plan demonstrate that every effort has been made to "preserve and enhance to the extent reasonably possible" the natural features, including trees, of this property? Grading the entire site doesn't sound like any effort has been made at all. The proposal for Redtail Ridge does not even contain an inventory of the trees on the site, much less plans to preserve them – or a justification for destroying them.

There's a reason for the LMC's mandate here: Vegetation acts as a carbon sink. When land is graded, stored carbon is released into the atmosphere. Recovery of soil and vegetation is a slow process, and drought makes it even slower. Vegetation and the wildlife it houses also promote biodiversity – now imperiled more than ever.

B. Grading the site is contrary to the mandate to preserve natural drainage:

- **LMC 16.16.020 (B)**: "Drainage areas, wherever possible, should be left in a natural state and no encroachments shall be made on the natural channel area."

Grading the property will destroy natural channels carved into the land over time. This includes historic Goodhue Ditch, which the developer plans to cover with a four-lane road. Natural vegetation holds water better than artificial channels and naturally mitigates flooding.

2. **OPEN SPACE**. The public land dedication in the current Redtail Ridge does not meet requirements of the code.

A. Brue Baukol's proposed public land dedication includes areas that should be excluded from the calculation:

- **LMC 16.16.060 (B)1**: "A minimum of 12 percent for nonresidential subdivisions and a minimum of 15 percent for residential subdivisions of the total land area of the tract being subdivided shall be dedicated, exclusive of subsection A of this section, for park, school, or other public purposes as determined by the city council and shall be delineated on the final plat.

The problem? Subsection A lists the features that cannot be counted towards the 12% dedication:

- **LMC 16.16.060 (A)**: "Dedications of rights-of-way for public streets, drainage easements, utility easements or other public purposes shall be required and shall be made by the subdivider on the plat unless otherwise directed by the city council."

The proposed land dedication at Redtail Ridge includes public purposes such as streets and trails. Thanks to Commissioner comments at their previous meeting, drainage easements, steep land, and land previously earmarked as buffer has been excluded. **Note:** Proposed land dedication outside of the Plat cannot count toward the 12%.

B. The LMC explicitly instructs the Planning Commission to determine whether the land granted in the public dedication is suitable for its purpose:

- **LMC 16.16.060 (B)1**: "… Land dedicated for public use must be suitable, as determined by the planning commission, for the type of development and/or the use for which it is intended."

Because the land at Redtail Ridge is intended for use as open space and to provide a natural buffer mitigating the sense of urban sprawl, the Planning Commission must decide whether the land proposed for dedication is suitable for these purposes.

For open space, the purpose of which is the preservation of biodiverse natural areas and light human recreation, the land north of Disc Drive is the most suitable. This area of the site has never been developed. It is the richest in vegetation, water, and wildlife.

To preserve the site's most important "natural features" (per **LMC 16.04.020 (N)**and **LMC 16.16.010 (D))**, **the Planning Commission should require a 50% public land dedication at Redtail Ridge, with a 40% open space dedication north of Disc Drive. This would mean clustering all of the development on the southern half of the property, as it was when StorageTek occupied it.**

3. **COMMUNITY IMPACT**. Brue Baukol's current Redtail Ridge plan is less than half the size of the 6.1 million square feet the company proposed for the site in 2020, yet it still occupies the same massive, sprawling footprint. **The impact of the development on local traffic, air quality, and quality of life remains enormous.**

This is in spite of the LMC's clear instructions that the city should minimize the negative impacts of development:

- **LMC 16.04.020 (O)**: This section requires City Council and the Planning Commission "To regulate the use of land within the city on the basis of the impact thereof on the community or surrounding areas."

The development proposed for the area north of Disc Drive would impact nearby neighborhoods and Monarch High School with dust, noise, and fumes from construction; traffic; and the long-term possibility of emissions from industrial facilities. This includes an anticipated 20,000 additional car trips on Louisville roads daily.

At the last meeting, Louisville's city attorney told the Planning Commission that the only question they have to address is whether the plan for Redtail Ridge meets the criteria of the Municipal Code or not. **It does not**. Please make sure, with your comments and letters, that each Commissioner understands this.

See you all on Thursday.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Third underpass and buffered trails at RTR

From: sherry sommer <hellosherry2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 11:07 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>; Adam Blackmore <ablackmore@louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Third underpass and buffered trails at RTR

Members of the Planning Commission,

Please note that OSAB had four conditions for their approval of the Redtail Ridge Proposal. Condition 4 was continued work on creating safe trails and the possible addition of a third underpass. The Board had listened to resident requests to require buffered trails on bike paths along roads and berms to protect trails adjacent to 96.

At the last Commissioner meeting it was made clear that the applicant and the City do not intend to pursue condition 4.

It is not the right of an applicant to dismiss a recommending board's condition of approval.

Condition 4 is fully compliant with our LMC:

LMC 16.16.010 (B): The residents **must have available to them, within the area, safe and convenient movement t**o points of destination or collection. Modes of travel, including but not limited to motor vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle travel, to achieve this objective should not conflict with each other or abutting land uses. To the extent possible, there shall exist an internal pedestrian circulation system separate from the vehicular system that allows access to adjacent parcels as well as to parks, open space or recreation facilities within the subdivision. Pedestrian links to trail systems of the city should be made where feasible. **Buffering from collection and arterial streets must be provided by earthen berms, landscaping, leafing patterns, or other appropriate materials.**

It is the responsibility of the Louisville Planning Department and Planning Commission follow through on the conditions given by OSAB in their vote to recommend and to uphold all of the requirements of the LMC.

Please address this issue in your deliberations.

Sincerely,

Sherry Sommer
Citizens for a Vibrant, Sustainable Louisville
910 S Palisade Court
Louisville

For ease of reference--excerpt from Planning Commission Packet, 8/11/2022:

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY BOARD:

The Open Space Advisory Board (OSAB) reviewed the proposal on May 11, 2022 and continued the review to June 8. 2022 (see Attachment Nos 12 and 13 for minutes). **OSAB voted unanimously to approve the proposal with the following conditions:**

1. A legal commitment by the developer to rehabilitate and dedicate the 47.4acres in Boulder County (paradise lane properties) for jointly managed Louisville and Boulder County Open Space.

2. The developers follow the current city standards for underpasses consistent with the McCaslin Underpass at Harper Lake.
3. OSAB participation in the PUD review process.
4. **The developers and city continue to work on creating safe trails and the possible addition of a 3rd underpass.**

Staff has begun work on the structure and management agreement with Boulder County on the acquisition of the Paradise Lane Properties. While final decisions on rehabilitation (e.g. removal of structures) and arrangement of the ownership and conservation easement structure have not been made yet, staff intends to develop provisions in the SIA and have a condition prior to recording the final plat that the property be deeded to the City or County.

For design standards related to the underpass, staff intends to add language to the SIA that at a minimum the underpasses be designed with corten steel fencing, LED lighting, and stone veneer headwall treatment with street name and City logo.

Under LMC Sec. 4.02040, OSAB is tasked with reviewing and providing comments to the Planning Commission on any development proposals immediately adjacent to or materially impacting open space lands.

The recommendation for the third underpass was at the location where the proposed off-street trail crosses Rockcress Drive at the Rockcress Drive and Northwest Parkway intersection. The applicant has notified staff that they do not intend to modify their application to add this third underpass.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Requirements of Federal Law and City Code with reference to construction of Campus Drive

From: sherry sommer <hellosherry2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 10:13 AM
To: Ember Brignull <emberb@Louisvilleco.gov>; Adam Blackmore <ablackmore@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Fw: Requirements of Federal Law and City Code with reference to construction of Campus Drive

Members of Planning Commission,

This correspondence is related to Federal Law and our City Code pertaining to construction of Campus Drive over a section of Goodhue Ditch.

Please forward this email to our City Attorney for examination.

Per the Final Drainage Report, the Army Corps of Engineers has issued the required exemption for construction of Campus Drive over the Goodhue Ditch:

As the Ditch crossing will disturb waters of the US, the Project team has engaged the services of ERO Resources Corporation to assist in obtaining the required permitting. A copy of ERO's Preconstruction Notification (hereinafter referred to as "PCN") can be found in Appendix B. Per correspondence with the Army Corps of Engineers, the Goodhue Ditch Crossing, (NWO-2020-00467-DEN) will be issued an exemption for this project. It will be considered construction of an irrigation ditch, which is exempt under, Section 404(f), and does not require a permit, which is referenced in Regulatory Guidance Letter 07-02. P 13

Emails inadvertently left in the packet indicate that a step required in the permitting process was circumvented. The emails are between Heidi Gerstung, ERO Resources, Jordan Swisher of Brue Baukol, and Nicholas Franke of the Army Corp of Engineers:

Mark West

From: Heidi Gerstung <hgerstung@eroresourc
Sent: Friday, March 27, 2020 8:57 AM
To: Jordan Swisher; Mark West
Cc: Moneka Worah; Abigail Sanocki
Subject: FW: Update on Goodhue Ditch Crossing,

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Good morning Jordan and Mark,

While I was preparing this email, we just got one from Nick; but here you information on it...

Great news! Please see below for the Corps update on this project.

This has happened to us before on other ditch projects when the consulta agricultural activities in ditches are what is exempt - so if the company tha reconstruct it, they do not need a 404 permit. But technically if it is relate not own the ditch, then it is not exempt.

Please let us know if you have any questions, thanks!

Heidi Gerstung
Ecologist

ERO Resources Corporation
Consultants in Natural Resources and the Environment
1842 Clarkson Street | Denver, CO 80218
303.830.1188 O | 720.468.2103 C | hgerstung@eroresources.com | https

a permit. You can reference Regulatory Guidance Letter 07-02, which goes
and is not considered construction of an irrigation ditch.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns on this. And of c

Source: Final Drainage Report

The Drainage Report states that this is a roadway construction, not irrigation, project. The emails indicate that an exemption cannot be granted for construction projects.

Based on the Ditch crossing at the intersection of Via Varra and Northwest Parkway just north of the Broomfield Business center, a 54" RCP has been sized for the Ditch crossing. Preliminary calculations indicate that a 54" RCP conveys 50 cfs, which was used for design on the Site. A maintenance road with a minimum 15-feet wide easement is required, and the roadway crossing will also incorporate the ability for maintenance equipment to cross.

The Drainage Report also indicates that permission from the Ditch Owner is required and has been requested. This permission letter is not included in publicly accessible information on 8/04/2022.

A crossing of the Ditch by Campus Drive is planned, subject to Ditch Company's approval, with the proposed development. The Ditch will continue to outfall per historic conditions at the existing location on northeast property boundary. The Ditch Company has been contacted regarding the requirements of the proposed Ditch revisions. The proposed Ditch crossing has been designed and included in a separate plan set for approval by the Ditch Company according to the Ditch Company requirements. P. 13 Final Drainage Report

The letter from the Ditch owner is also required in the Final Plat per City Code:Sec. 16.12.09:

Final plat contents.
B Other documents required at the time of submission of the final plat shall be:

1. Preliminary engineering drawings and outline specifications for all public facilities to be installed, i.e., water and sewer utilities, streets, and related improvements, bridges, and storm drainage;

2.

.Agreements made with ditch companies when needed

The City of Louisville is required to cooperate with all entities partner to intergovernmental agreement regarding open space lands. Are we also under the same requirements for water flowing through open space?

Section 15-5. Open Space - Effect of Article. (d) With respect to open space lands which are jointly owned by the City with another governmental entity and which are the subject of an intergovernmental agreement or a conservation easement, affect or limit the management of such lands in accordance with the terms of such agreement or easement;

Streams and Open Water

Under existing regulations, waters tributary to navigable waters are subject to the Corps' jurisdiction (jurisdictional). The Goodh topographic quadrangle and on the National Hydrography Data

stream (Figure 1, Figure 2). The Goodhue Ditch is a tributary of South Platte River. The Goodhue Ditch contains a defined bed a portions of the banks. ERO mapped approximately 0.052 acre o the project area during the 2019 site visit. The Goodhue Ditch h Corps (Corps File No. NWO-2019-00148-DEN, Corps 2019).

Wetlands

Jurisdictional wetlands meet the Corps' definition of wetlands a surface tributary connection to interstate or navigable waters o mapped approximately 0.08 acre of wetlands abutting the Good 1). ERO collected data from two data points (DP) near the Good

Thank you for your attention in this important matter

Sherry Sommer
910 South Palisade Court
Louisville, Colorado

Documents

Army Corps of Engineers regulatory doc 07-02

https://www.nap.usace.army.mil/Portals/39/docs/regulatory/rgls/rgl07-02.pdf

City Code
Municode Library

Municode Library

MunicodeNEXT, the industry's leading search application with over 3,300 codes and growing!

Final Drainage Report:
https://www.louisvilleco.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/35576/637934895636070000

Streams and Open Water

Under existing regulations, waters tributary to navigable waters are subject to the Corps' jurisdiction (jurisdictional). The Goodh topographic quadrangle and on the National Hydrography Data

stream (Figure 1, Figure 2). The Goodhue Ditch is a tributary of South Platte River. The Goodhue Ditch contains a defined bed a portions of the banks. ERO mapped approximately 0.052 acre o the project area during the 2019 site visit. The Goodhue Ditch h Corps (Corps File No. NWO-2019-00148-DEN, Corps 2019).

Wetlands

Jurisdictional wetlands meet the Corps' definition of wetlands a surface tributary connection to interstate or navigable waters o mapped approximately 0.08 acre of wetlands abutting the Good 1). ERO collected data from two data points (DP) near the Good

Mark West

From: Heidi Gerstung <hgerstung@eroresourc
Sent: Friday, March 27, 2020 8:57 AM
To: Jordan Swisher; Mark West
Cc: Moneka Worah; Abigail Sanocki
Subject: FW: Update on Goodhue Ditch Crossing,

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Good morning Jordan and Mark,

While I was preparing this email, we just got one from Nick; but here you information on it...

Great news! Please see below for the Corps update on this project.

This has happened to us before on other ditch projects when the consulta agricultural activities in ditches are what is exempt - so if the company tha reconstruct it, they do not need a 404 permit. But technically if it is relate not own the ditch, then it is not exempt.

Please let us know if you have any questions, thanks!

Heidi Gerstung
Ecologist

ERO Resources Corporation
Consultants in Natural Resources and the Environment
1842 Clarkson Street | Denver, CO 80218
303.830.1188 O | 720.468.2103 C | hgerstung@eroresources.com | https

a permit. You can reference Regulatory Guidance Letter 07-02, which goes
and is not considered construction of an irrigation ditch.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns on this. And of c

Streams and Open Water

Under existing regulations, waters tributary to navigable waters are subject to the Corps' jurisdiction (jurisdictional). The Goodh topographic quadrangle and on the National Hydrography Data

stream (Figure 1, Figure 2). The Goodhue Ditch is a tributary of South Platte River. The Goodhue Ditch contains a defined bed a portions of the banks. ERO mapped approximately 0.052 acre o the project area during the 2019 site visit. The Goodhue Ditch h Corps (Corps File No. NWO-2019-00148-DEN, Corps 2019).

Wetlands

Jurisdictional wetlands meet the Corps' definition of wetlands a surface tributary connection to interstate or navigable waters o mapped approximately 0.08 acre of wetlands abutting the Good 1). ERO collected data from two data points (DP) near the Good

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge Development Proposal

Importance: High

From: Peter Bandurian <pbandurian@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 7, 2022 2:55 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Development Proposal

I am writing to protest against Brue Baukol's latest proposal for a Redtail Ridge development. The bottom line is that the proposal does not meet the Louisville Municipal Code subdivision requirements. One can get in the weeds, the details, of how the public land dedication includes land that should not be included and the suitability of such land. Also, the proposal is so large as to negatively impact Louisville's quality of life: air quality and excessively increases traffic. But the real punch in the nose to the residents of the city of Louisville is the intention to grade the entire site. This is counter to the desire of maintaining as much as feasible the natural topography, historical archaeological features and beauty of the area. There is no natural open space in this plan and this is completely unacceptable.

The Brue Baukol proposal does not meet the Louisville Municipal Code in detail nor in spirit and should be rejected.

Sincerely, Peter Bandurian
139 Lincoln Cir, Louisville, CO 80027

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge

Importance: High

From: Charlene Bandurian <clbandurian@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 7, 2022 4:49 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

Planning Commission:

I am struck by the blatant disregard for the desires of the citizens of Louisville by Brue Baukol.

Everything that is wrong is contained in his proposal to grade the entire site as a first step. By grading the site, the wildlife, the natural open space and environment is ruined. This is the exact opposite of what the Louisville citizenry have desired for the entire time this space has been been available.

I strenuously object to this Brue Baukol plan. The Planning Commission should not accept this plan. If accepted, it will then become a matter of time before more buildings and roads will be added because the entire ecosystem has been destroyed.

It is as if a deaf ear has been turned to the Louisville citizenry and all because of monetary gain.

No!

Charlene Bandurian, (resident of Louisville since 1984)
139 Lincoln Circle
Louisville, Co 80027

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge development proposal

Importance: High

From: Peter Bandurian <pbandurian@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 7, 2022 1:41 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge development proposal

I am writing to protest against Brue Baukol's latest proposal for a Redtail Ridge development. The bottom line is that the proposal does not meet the Louisville Municipal Code subdivision

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge Agenda Item, September 8, 2022

Importance: High

From: cindy Bedell <cyndilarson@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 7, 2022 3:26 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: Meredyth Muth <meredythm@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Agenda Item, September 8, 2022

Dear Louisville Planning Commission,

I am writing about the Redtail Ridge Preliminary and Final Plat which is on your agenda for the **9/8/22** Planning Commission meeting.

You are tasked with making a recommendation about the fate of this land, which constitutes about 8% of the land area in the City of Louisville.

This land is full of natural features and previously undeveloped green fields which constitute our visual buffer and entrance to Louisville's south east gateway. You have an opportunity and a moral obligation to make a recommendation to save more of this area for open space.

Municipal Code 16.16.060 states:

*3. In determining which of the above policies to implement, the planning commission and the city council will consider **the size of the development** and its adequacy for accommodating a suitable public use site; the community facility aspects of the comprehensive development plan and the school district's master plan; **existing parks and other public uses in the area**; the topography, geology, and location of land in the subdivision available for dedication; **the needs of the people in the area; and any other appropriate factors**. If land is dedicated to the city, it shall be free of all liens and encumbrances.*

5.C. Retention ponds or other land left open solely for the purpose of the development, such as land under power lines, will not be considered as part of the land dedication required under this section.

During the August 11th Planning Commission meeting the question arose of how to take into account the results of the recent election, where citizens of Louisville overturned City Council's approval of the Redtail Ridge Mater Plan (Ordinance 1811, Series 2021). The main reason most referendum petition signatures gave for signing the referendum was they want more open space at this location. Therefore, obviously the results of the election are relevant to your decision tonight under municipal code 16.16.060.

Also many residents stated we need more open space in this area, both undeveloped buffer land and walking trails. Adding hundreds or thousands of visitors and employees to this area will significantly increase the need for open space and other public uses in the area. (Do we have an estimate of employees and daily visitors, or just the projected additional traffic of 20,600+ more vehicle trips per day to Louisville and surrounding roadways?)

Land left undeveloped or graded for the purpose of new roads should not be calculated in the the public land dedication.

During the May 2022 Open Space Advisory Board meeting, Director Zuccaro referred to these ordinances which allow the recommendation for more open space:

Sec. 16.16.010
***D**.Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible.*

E*.Schools, parks, churches and other community facilities should be planned for as an integral part of the area to the extent possible. Open space, park, and recreation areas must be located in such a manner as to create an area that is usable and accessible to the residents of the subdivision and shall otherwise conform to all applicable city standards and requirements. The need for additional open space, park, and recreation areas shall be based on the following factors: the city's comprehensive plan; topography, drainage, vegetation and other physical conditions; the type and density of the proposed development; the availability of other open space, park and recreation areas; and the overall need within the proposed development for such areas.*

At the Open Space Advisory Board June meeting, several board members stated they were not allowed to recommend more open space. They
did not seem to remember or understand what Director Zuccaro said at the May 2022 meeting. I encourage you to take into consideration this
faulty review process when you hear that the Louisville Open Space Advisory Board approved the open space dedication for this plat.

You can recommend more open space, and you should. It is your moral imperative.

We can and should preserve at least 160 acres of this land as quality, undisturbed, and contiguous open space.
One way to facilitate contiguous open space north of Disc Drive would be to cluster the approved 2.56 mil sq ft development below Disc Drive around the old Storage Technology footprint..
Also if the buildings are sited below grade, this would reduce the visual impact. Underground parking will further reduce the amount of impervious surface and heat island impact of concrete surface parking.

Brue Baukol Capital Partners has offered 47.40 acres, outside of the City of Louisville in unincorporated Boulder County, and which
is already under a restrictive IGA which limits the development which could occur on that land. This area should be protected, and
this is good; however this should not be counted in the total public land dedication. We need more open space within the City of Louisville subdivision plat.

Brue Baukil has also offered a strip of steep 18 acres open space along Highway 36, which is not quality open space.
I believe that this land was previously determined to be undesirable as open space by the City of Louisville.

Finally, I'd like to point out that Louisville Attorney Kelly stated on 8/3/21 (see page 55 of the 8/3/21 city council meeting packet) that there are
5 criteria where council can require additional public land dedication. She said that if you use the code, and do it reasonably, your decision
should be upheld. I have copied that in very large print below because I could not paste it smaller in yahoo mail:

CITY COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

SUBJECT: ORDINANCE NO. 1811, SERIES 2021, REDTAIL RIDGE GDP
DATE: AUGUST 3, 2021 PAGE 5 OF 10

- Louisville Municipal Code Sec. 16. 16.060 further details this requirement, which
is formalized with the final plat but typically the intent is designated within a General Development Plan. This minimum public land dedication requirement is separate from any additional open spaces or public lands that the City Council may require through other Municipal Code sections including, including Sec. 17.28.080, which states the City Council may require additional public use dedications based on five criteria:

1. Comprehensive development plan (including matters of state interest);
2. Topography, drainage, vegetation and other such physical conditions;
3. Anticipated socio-economic conditions;

4. Type and density of development and employment;
5. Overall need for open space and recreational facilities;

Please carefully consider your recommendation and preserve as much as possible of our small town gateway.

Thanks for your consideration,

Cindy Bedell
662 W Willow St
Louisville, CO 80027

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Redtail Ridge plans does not meet the criteria of the Municipal code. I encourage you to continue to ask good and hard questions. Please do not approve Mr. Baukol's plan. Thank you for your service and for all you do.

M. Christiansen
543 Adams Ave.
Louisville CO 80027

Dear Planning commissioners:

Thank you for asking important and good questions at the August meeting regarding the RedTail Ridge. I encouraged you continue to do by examining the codes and asking the hard and important questions such as "WHY". It is important to find out why this development layout plan was designed this way.

I believe transparency and clarification are essential to our understanding WHY. It will help us to adhere to the Municipal codes.

It is important to have the 40% land dedication above Disc Drive with 50% public land dedication as it mentioned in the Municipal code. My question is for you to ponder on, WHY the developer wants to grade over the property?

Having no development above north of Disc Drive and clustering development south on Tape Drive where Storage Tek was occupied do provide many beneficial outcomes for the city of Louisville.

Financially, Emotionally, Spiritually, Mentality, Physically, Stability, environmentally sustainability, community, and accountability to our future generations

For example, this traffic route in the developer's plan.

These are the reasons why they should not create Campus Drive from 88th to the light signal toward to 96th.

1. FINANCIALLY - Save Electricity and construction cost – it will be on us paying for it which we don't need to do so.
2. MENTALITY – No more Stacking. (Reminder there is a new signal by 7-11 store and in fact, it already started to stack up almost all day now which I drive on Hwy 42/ N 96th often).
3. SPIRTUALLY - Night sky required
4. PHYSCIALLY – No More Carbon Dioxide emitted
5. COMMUNITY - No need to work with Mr. Baukol's plan on Campus Drive. We can create a team to work with the school district, RTD and Federal Transportation Department. It is our motto "ONE COMMUNITY"
6. EMOTIONALLY - The road itself does not to extend to 96th, we can adapt and survive.
7. ENVIROMENTALLY SUSTAINABILTIY - Convert into open space, save the drainage and natural habitat
8. STABILITY – Conserving our land
9. ACCOUNTABILITY TO OUR FUTURE GENERATIONS - Our next-door neighbor Broomfield are redeveloping the Flatirons mall; this will bring more complication into 88th and 96th/Northwest Parkway.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Comments on Redtail Ridge for 8 September 2022

Importance: High

From: Joshua Cooperman <jhcooperman@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 8, 2022 1:59 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Comments on Redtail Ridge for 8 September 2022

Dear members of the Planning Commission,

I write you today regarding your consideration of preliminary and final subdivision plats for the Redtail Ridge development. While I do not oppose development at the Phillips 66 Rural Special District, I do oppose the most recent proposal for the Redtail Ridge development. I request that you deny approval of the current application for subdivision plats. After explaining my general objections to the current proposal, I detail the legal reasons for denying approval on the basis of Louisville's municipal code and plans. In case my reasoning does not persuade you, I then make some suggestions for improving the current proposal. Finally, I offer some constructive ideas for the Redtail Ridge development, all of which are absolutely essential for ensuring this development's environmental sustainability.

The current proposal for the Redtail Ridge development has not been sufficiently revised since the special election this past spring; accordingly, virtually all of the issues with the previous proposal for the Redtail Ridge development remain. Of course, you must judge the current proposal on its own merits, but I was disappointed and, quite frankly, insulted that the developer did not make more substantial changes in response to the community's feedback. Most significantly, under the previous and current proposals, Redtail Ridge would be woefully unsustainable. This lack of sustainability is reflected in most, if not all, of the issues that led our community to vote down the previous proposal: for instance, too large of a development footprint, too little open space, and too much traffic. Louisville needs a much more sustainable development. I will explain how to achieve such a development just before concluding my letter.

I now argue that you should not approve the current proposal for the Redtail Ridge development as this proposal fails to conform to Louisville's municipal codes and plans. I must respectfully disagree with City staff's findings on several points, but I wish nonetheless to acknowledge City's staff typically excellent work.

First, Louisville's Comprehensive Plan specifies the policies that a special district must meet. The current proposal fails to meet two of these policies.

Policy 1 states that a special district must have its "specific character expectations" "articulate[d] and define[d]" "in customized general development plans adopted by City Council". The current proposal relies on a general development plan customized for a markedly different development that never came to fruition.

Policy 3 states that a special district must "encourage internal services which meet the daily needs of the people working in the district". The current proposal does not include any residential development, thus failing to meet the daily need of housing for people working in the district. (I fully recognize that this special district is not currently zoned for residential development; the current zoning clearly conflicts with this overarching special district policy.)

Second, section 16.04.020 of Louisville's municipal code specifies the purposes that a subdivision must meet. The current proposal fails to meet several of these purposes.

Purpose A states that a subdivision must "promote the health, safety, convenience, order, prosperity, and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the City". The current proposal's lack of environmental sustainability jeopardizes the development's ability to promote the health, safety, prosperity, and welfare of Louisville's future inhabitants.

Purpose F states that a subdivision must "avoid congestion of population" and "provide for the proper distribution of population and supportive land uses". The current proposal's lack of residential development fails to provide for the proper distribution of population, which would allow those who work in the Phillips 66 Rural Special District also to live in the Phillips 66 Rural Special District.

Purpose H states that a subdivision must "protect the character and the social and economic stability of all parts of the City". The current proposal's expansive footprint and grading plans fail to protect the character of the Phillips 66 Rural Special District. The current proposal's effects on the City's existing social and economic stability is largely unknown. For instance, would increased traffic in the

City's southeast deter trips to the City's existing businesses? I also suggest that you read my guest opinion in the Daily Camera regarding the economic impact of the previous Redtail Ridge development proposal. (https://www.dailycamera.com/2022/04/10/joshua-cooperman-redtail-ridge-economic-boon-or-bust/)

Purpose K states that a subdivision must "provide for the safe and efficient circulation of traffic throughout the City, the avoidance of congestion in the streets and highways and along pedestrian and bikeways". The current proposal would result in a substantial increase in traffic, jeopardizing its safe and efficient circulation. Bicycle lanes along 96th Street, Dillon Road, and 88th Street would be subject to considerably more congestion.

Purpose M states that a subdivision must "mitigate the pollution of air, streams and ponds, assure the adequacy of drainage facilities, safeguard the water table, and encourage the wise use and management of the natural environment". The current proposal would result in considerable increases in air pollution stemming from the substantial increase in traffic. The current proposal's expansive footprint and grading plans do not represent wise uses or management of the natural environment.

Purpose N states that a subdivision must "preserve and enhance to the extent reasonably possible the natural beauty and topography of the City and areas of historical and archeological importance and to ensure appropriate development with regard to such natural, historical, and archeological sites and features". The current proposal's expansive footprint and grading plans completely fail to preserve and enhance, to the extent possible, the City's natural beauty and topography and to ensure appropriate development with regard to natural features.

Purpose S states that a subdivision must "otherwise plan for and regulate the use of land so as to provide planned and orderly use of land and protection of the environment in a manner consistent with constitutional rights". The current proposal's lack of environmental sustainability as well as its expansive footprint and grading plans fail to adequately protect the environment.

Third, section 16.16 of Louisville's municipal code specifies the design standards that a subdivision must meet. The current proposal fails to meet at least two of these design standards.

Standard D in section 16.16.010 states that a subdivision must ensure that "natural features, historical and archeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees must be preserved to the extent possible". The current proposal's expansive footprint and grading plans directly conflict with this standard. Moreover, this section states that "the applicant . . . must demonstrate" that the standards are met.

Standard B in section 16.16.020 states that a subdivision must ensure that "drainage areas, wherever possible, should be left in a natural state and [that] no encroachments shall be made on the natural channel area". The current proposal's grading plans directly conflict with this standard.

While I maintain that the current proposal for the Redtail Ridge development fails to conform to Louisville's municipal codes and plans, I appreciate that many of the policies and standards in these codes and plans are subject to interpretation. Accordingly, I wish to make some suggestions for improving the current proposal.

Throughout the various rounds of development proposals for Redtail Ridge, the community has continually expressed the desire for a smaller development footprint and its concomitant open space. If you decide to approve the current proposal, then I implore you to recommend that the developer dedicate more open space, which would result in a smaller development footprint. In particular, I hope that all of the land north of Disk Drive will be preserved as undisturbed open space. A larger open space dedication could also help to address the current proposal's failings with regards to some of the subdivision purposes and standards.

Louisville's municipal codes and plans provide multiple justifications for a larger open space dedication. Part E of section 16.16.010 states that "the need for additional open space, park, and recreation areas shall be based on the following factors: the City's Comprehensive Plan; topography, drainage, vegetation, and other physical conditions; the type and density of the proposed development; the availability of other open space, park, and recreation areas; and the overall need within the proposed development for such areas".

With regards to the City's Comprehensive Plan, this plan lists "promoting ecological diversity", providing "integrated open space and trail networks", and supporting "sustainable practices" among Louisville's core community values. A larger open space dedication would further promote ecological diversity, provide more integrated open space and trail networks, and further support sustainable practices.

With regards to topography, drainage, vegetation, and other physical conditions, a larger open space dedication could substantially reduce the amount of grading, allowing for preservation of natural topography, drainage, vegetation, and habitat.

With regards to the proposed development's type and density, as demonstrated by the ConocoPhillips plans, a denser development with smaller footprint is most definitely possible, allowing for a larger open space dedication.

With regards to the availability of other open space and the overall need within the proposed development, the Redtail Ridge development would daily bring thousands of people to southeast Louisville. These people would want to and should be able to enjoy the City's open spaces. With little open space currently available for enjoyment in southeast Louisville, a larger open space dedication is necessary to accommodate the people traveling to the Redtail Ridge development.

Furthermore, the exemption of eighty acres annexed by the City in 2009 from the open space dedication requirement should be nullified as the reason for this exemption no longer exists.

Throughout the various rounds of development proposals for Redtail Ridge, the community has continually expressed concerns about the concomitant increases in traffic. Given the current zoning of the Phillips 66 Rural Special District and the currently allowed development square footage, there are unfortunately limited options to mitigate the increased traffic. If you decide to approve the current proposal, then I implore you to recommend that the developer provide for substantial traffic demand management. In particular, in addition to requesting a strengthening of the current traffic demand management plan, you should recommend that development cannot proceed without public transportation to the Phillips 66 Rural Special District. The development of Redtail Ridge presents an opportunity for public transportation also to the Colorado Technology Center, the Monarch campus, and Avista Adventist Hospital.

Finally, I wish to offer a vision for Redtail Ridge that would address all of the community's principal concerns while making the development considerably more sustainable. We desperately need to rezone the Phillips 66 Rural Special District to allow for mixed-use and residential development. I fully realize that such a rezoning is contrary to the Comprehensive Plan, but, quite frankly, the Comprehensive Plan is dead wrong in this case. The current zoning condemns people who would work at Redtail Ridge not only to find housing elsewhere, but also to commute from elsewhere. Rezoning would allow for people who work there also to live there, removing the need to commute to work as these people could walk or bike. Furthermore, we need to significantly improve the pedestrian and bicycle connections to the neighboring residential development in Broomfield so that the people living there can sustainably travel to Redtail Ridge. In combination with my suggestion to require public transportation, there would be substantial reductions in traffic to and from the development. Residential development at Redtail Ridge should be high density in line with a smaller development footprint. (High density development is more environmentally sustainable too.) The developer has previously indicated an interest in residential development, and City Council truly wishes to make progress on affordable housing. The rezoning of the Phillips 66 Rural Special District would likely represent the single most significant advance for affordable housing in Louisville. For these reasons I urge you to do everything in your power to realize this vision for Louisville.

Thank you for considering my thoughts.

Best,
Josh

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: RTR: Compromise, Ignoring the Muni Code and "Shall" re: Planning: Redtail Ridge 2022 Preliminary and Final

From: Cynthia Corne <ccorne@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 7, 2022 7:27 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: Jeff Durbin <jdurbin@louisvilleco.gov>; Rob Zuccaro <rzuccaro@louisvilleco.gov>; Lisa Ritchie <lritchie@louisvilleco.gov>; City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>; Cynthia Corne <ccorne@bluesleeves.com>
Subject: RTR: Compromise, Ignoring the Muni Code and "Shall" re: Planning: Redtail Ridge 2022 Preliminary and Final

Dear Planning Commission,
Thank you sincerely for your valuable service to our community.

If you review the Municipal Code mandates ("shall" statements), and the importance of this RedTail Ridge parcel, perhaps you will also see concerns for the process followed and suggest to this applicant that they produce new plans which match the desires for the City of Louisville. Please continue the visible and confident leadership from Planning Commission. The prior Planning Commission meeting was impressive - the questions and approach. A positive solution has been in front of this applicant for several years. "No/less development north of Disc Drive." I digress (since that is not what you are reviewing).

Also, so long as the applicant intends to grade over the majority of the land and natural features, the community will not support this preliminary/final plat. Based on Muni Code, Planning Commission should not approve this overrun of natural resources and resulting intent for the "future inhabitants" of Louisville.

Please consider the following input for your Sept. 8th review of the unchanged Redtail Ridge 2022 Preliminary and Final Plats. Topics included:
1. Planning Commission's Critical Role
2. Parcel Importance: Entrance to Louisville and Boulder County
3. Air Quality and Traffic Concerns: general and vis-a-vis EPA downgrade
4. Code Compliance. "Shall" = Mandatory. See a list at bottom. City Planning Staff could be requested to show how applicant has met. Line by line review is needed by our boards. Too much has been glossed over. Not sure why.
5. Preliminary and Final Plats Combined. Should not be allowed. Why does the Municipal Code include these steps if not for this type of situation?
6. OSAB: Notice Not given. Please ignore outcomes of their review.
7. Parks Board: Role and Code requirements glossed over. Public comments not considered. Board did not meet their obligations.
8. Unknown Tenants: = Significant economic and environmental risk for Louisville. Taxpayers, community, and surrounding area. No grading should be allowed unless/until more is known.
9. Compromise has always been achievable. No development north of Disc Drive - or something closer to that. **How about "closer to that?"** Applicant will not budge, yet wants to grade over most of the property in their first steps/phase. So, Planning Commission, please hold them to all of their requirements.
10. Administrative Note: C.

> Sec. 16.12.070 After reviewing the final plat to assure its acceptability, the city manager shall present the plat to the planning commission for review.

Others have likely been filling in for City Manager Durbin. Note: I do not believe this final plat would pass City Manager Durbin's review, who recently returned, so perhaps he should be given an opportunity to scrutinize the processes and recommendations.

More detail below:

Re: the Redtail Ridge 2022 Preliminary and Final Plat Review

1. Planning Commission's Critical Role

a. This type of parcel is the reason the Planning Commission exists. To apply your full purpose and look out for the City of Louisville, our community, taxpayers, and future generations. And, to not waste City Council's time on a proposal which attempts to gloss over critical requirements for Louisville.

a1. Please evaluate the applicant's proposal for its match to the Comprehensive Plan and how it complies with Municipal Code - requirements, mandates, and intentions.

a2. Please keep in mind: this applicant has had multiple years to incorporate citizen input, yet has kept the devastating horizontal intent the same.

Compromise has been achievable and still is. How refreshing would it be for the Planning Commission to suggest to them, "Have you considered no development north of Disc Drive? It seems the community and City Council would accept that and grant height exceptions in the other areas. Or something closer to that? Do you (applicant) understand that the community will not accept grading over the entire property and that plan does not meet the requirements of the municipal code?"

**As a result, Planning Commission could keep your September 8th review short. They have not met the requirements of the municipal code and have taken up significant staff time and cost to the City without showing willingness to compromise on any of the most basic and reasonable environmental concerns. Not just concerns. Mandates.

2. **Entrance to Louisville and Boulder County:** To see this unique, even iconic, parcel for what it is: mostly undeveloped land with campus zoning which is the southern entrance to Louisville and to Boulder County. A first impression for people from all over the world to this historically significant area of Colorado.

3. To consider **air quality and traffic concerns** generally, and even mores, with a recent EPA downgrade to Severe status.

- This is new, yet doesn't the Planning Commission have a critical role to even more closely review increased traffic and pollutants?
- For reference:

Sec. 16.04.020. - Purpose.

SHARE LINK TO SECTIONPRINT SECTIONDOWNLOAD (DOCX) OF SECTIONSEMAIL SECTIONCOMPARE VERSIONS

The regulations in this title are designed and enacted in accordance with the authority granted to the city including, but not limited to, subdivision authority granted in C.R.S. § 31-23-201 et seq. and the land use authority granted in C.R.S. § 29-20-101 et seq., the "Local Government Land Use Control Enabling Act of 1974," for the following purposes:

A.

To promote the **health, safety, convenience, order,** prosperity and **welfare** of the present and future inhabitants of the city;

E.

To provide for adequate light, air and privacy and to secure safety from fire, flood and other danger;

4. **Code Compliance:** To ensure that the "shall" statements from the Municipal Code have truly been adhered to by the applicant, and reviewed by City staff. It is reasonable to ask the City Attorney to expect the applicant to do the most required instead of the least.

- Specifically in 17.08 Definitions. **Shall = Mandatory.**
- I urge the Planning Commission to have City staff provide a line by line compliance update of the "shall statements" in sections 15, 16, and 17. See the bottom of this email for a listing from Chapter 16.12 of the Municipal Code.

- **Sec. 17.08.005. - General interpretation.**

  SHARE LINK TO SECTIONPRINT SECTIONDOWNLOAD (DOCX) OF SECTIONSEMAIL SECTIONCOMPARE VERSIONS

  The words and terms used, defined, interpreted, or further described in this title may be construed as follows:

  A.

  The particular controls the general.

  B.

  The word "shall" is always mandatory and not directory. The word "may" is permissive.

5. Preliminary and Final Plats Combined
a. Why does the Municipal Code have separate sections for Preliminary and Final Plats if not for EXACTLY this type of development? They should not be combined for this complex and potentially disruptive development - e.g. 20 year - construction.

6. OSAB Notice not given. Prior to the second OSAB meeting, the applicant made significant changes to their plans which did not allow the 15 day period for OSAB members to consider those changes.
- Also, while surrounding area impacts are relevant, the information was presented in such a way that was confusing as to the actual Open Space and usability calculations within the City of Louisville. Yet, OSAB went ahead and voted. OSAB's recommendation should have no bearing on discussions.
****Planning Commission - please look at Open Space with your own lens aligned with code requirements.**

7. The Parks Commission review was similar. They did not understand their mission, sections of the Code to consider, nor consider public comments.

8. Unknown Tenants/Community Partners
**Please note: With prior owners, the Community knew who the tenants were (e.g. StorageTek, Conoco Philips) and that they were/to be part of the community. With this owner, we do not know who the tenants will be. Yet, they are asking to grade over the entire ecosystem in their first phase and divide into newly defined parcels.
**We also know the owner is now based in Newport Beach, California. They have some local partners, but let's be clear this is an investment for this land owner, who will likely sell the subdivided areas. It is warranted for the citizens and tax payers to require more information before grading of land and 20 years of congestion to be considered.

Thank you for considering this input. Normally, I summarize more cleanly. I am disappointed to spend time here. The process laid out by Planning Staff for this applicant has skipped critical steps and I'm not sure why. It is disappointing that a plat, with this much unchanged proposed horizontal devastation is even at this stage. It does not preserve as much natural features as reasonable - as mandated in the code.

Also citing 16.04.030

- ## Sec. 16.04.030. - Authority.

SHARE LINK TO SECTIONPRINT SECTIONDOWNLOAD (DOCX) OF SECTIONSEMAIL SECTIONCOMPARE VERSIONS

No final plat of a subdivision shall be approved and accepted by the city council unless it conforms to the provisions of this title.

(Ord. No. 423-1973, § 1-103; Code 1977, § 16.04.030)

Some common sense is being missed here. Or brazen overreach.
Finally, you are the experts, and I prefer to spend my volunteer time on other community matters. Yet, this is important to prevent unnecessary chaos and potentially irreversible damage. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Cynthia

Cynthia Corne Musslewhite
438 Jefferson Ave.
Louisville CO

==========

Appendix:
One of many sections which should be reviewed by Planning Commission or City Council, for compliance, line by line, formally, before Council review.

Sec. 16.12.050. - Preliminary plat—Contents.

SHARE LINK TO SECTIONPRINT SECTIONDOWNLOAD (DOCX) OF SECTIONSEMAIL SECTIONCOMPARE VERSIONS

The contents of the preliminary plat shall be as follows:

A. Proposed name of the subdivision;

B. Location and boundaries of the subdivision as part of a larger area;

C. Contours at two-foot intervals if the slope is less than ten percent (spot elevations may be required if land is too flat for contours) and five feet where the slope is greater than ten percent;

D. Date of preparation, scale, and north sign (designated as true north);

E. Name, address and telephone number of owner and licensed surveyor, licensed engineer or designer of the plat;

F. Total acreage involved;

G. Location and dimensions of all existing streets, alleys, easements, drainage areas, irrigation ditches and laterals, and other significant features within or adjacent to the tract to be subdivided;

H. Approximate location and dimensions of all proposed streets, alleys, easements, lot lines, front building setback lines, and parks and other areas to be dedicated for public use;

I. Delineation of and technical material pertaining to areas of state interest as identified in chapter 17.32 and in other applicable ordinances;

J. Zoning on and adjacent to the tract;

K. Site date including the number of residential lots and typical lot sizes;

L. Density of development (number of dwelling units per acre of residential and open space land);

M. Proposed uses other than single-family residential;

N. The location and size of existing utilities within or adjacent to the tract including water, sewer, electricity, and gas (may be placed on a separate plat);

O. Proposed street names;

P. Preliminary drainage plan;

Q. Such preliminary information as may be required by the planning commission in order to adequately describe proposed utility systems, surface improvements, or other construction projects contemplated within the area to be subdivided in order to assure that the subdivision is capable of being constructed without an adverse effect upon the surrounding area;

R. Application form for rezoning, if required for the development of the subdivision;

S.

Location of significant natural features such as trees, woodlands, lakes, hills, streams, wetlands, and floodplains, and historical and archaeological sites;

T. Location of the nearest existing or proposed schools intended to serve the residents of the subdivision;

U. Buffering proposed from collector and arterial streets and, where appropriate, adjacent uses;

V. Any proposed use, height, area, or bulk limitations which do not violate applicable city zoning regulations;

W. Development phases or stages proposed in order to assure the availability of public services and the orderly development of the subdivision;

X. Any modifications proposed by the subdivider pursuant to section 16.24.010;

Y. The maximum height proposed for all buildings and structures;

Z. Proposed pedestrian and bikeways; and

AA. For residential subdivisions, the location and nature of open space, park, and recreation common areas proposed for the residents, in addition to the required public use dedications.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: RTR: Compromise, Ignoring the Muni Code and "Shall" re: Planning: Redtail Ridge 2022 Preliminary and Final

Importance: High

From: Cynthia Corne <ccorne@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 7, 2022 7:27 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: Jeff Durbin <jdurbin@louisvilleco.gov>; Rob Zuccaro <rzuccaro@louisvilleco.gov>; Lisa Ritchie <lritchie@louisvilleco.gov>; City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>; Cynthia Corne <ccorne@bluesleeves.com>
Subject: RTR: Compromise, Ignoring the Muni Code and "Shall" re: Planning: Redtail Ridge 2022 Preliminary and Final

Dear Planning Commission,
Thank you sincerely for your valuable service to our community.

If you review the Municipal Code mandates ("shall" statements), and the importance of this RedTail Ridge parcel, perhaps you will also see concerns for the process followed and suggest to this applicant that they produce new plans which match the desires for the City of Louisville. Please continue the visible and confident leadership from Planning Commission. The prior Planning Commission meeting was impressive - the questions and approach. A positive solution has been in front of this applicant for several years. "No/less development north of Disc Drive." I digress (since that is not what you are reviewing).

Also, so long as the applicant intends to grade over the majority of the land and natural features, the community will not support this preliminary/final plat. Based on Muni Code, Planning Commission should not approve this overrun of natural resources and resulting intent for the "future inhabitants" of Louisville.

Please consider the following input for your Sept. 8th review of the unchanged Redtail Ridge 2022 Preliminary and Final Plats. Topics included:
1. Planning Commission's Critical Role
2. Parcel Importance: Entrance to Louisville and Boulder County
3. Air Quality and Traffic Concerns: general and vis-a-vis EPA downgrade
4. Code Compliance. "Shall" = Mandatory. See a list at bottom. City Planning Staff could be requested to show how applicant has met. Line by line review is needed by our boards. Too much has been glossed over. Not sure why.
5. Preliminary and Final Plats Combined. Should not be allowed. Why does the Municipal Code include these steps if not for this type of situation?
6. OSAB: Notice Not given. Please ignore outcomes of their review.
7. Parks Board: Role and Code requirements glossed over. Public comments not considered. Board did not meet their obligations.
8. Unknown Tenants: = Significant economic and environmental risk for Louisville. Taxpayers, community, and surrounding area. No grading should be allowed unless/until more is known.
9. Compromise has always been achievable. No development north of Disc Drive - or something closer to that. **How about "closer to that?"** Applicant will not budge, yet wants to grade over most of the property in their first steps/phase. So, Planning Commission, please hold them to all of their requirements.
10. Administrative Note: C.

Sec. 16.12.070 After reviewing the final plat to assure its acceptability, the city manager shall present the plat to the planning commission for review.

Others have likely been filling in for City Manager Durbin. Note: I do not believe this final plat would pass City Manager Durbin's review, who recently returned, so perhaps he should be given an opportunity to scrutinize the processes and recommendations.

More detail below:
Re: the Redtail Ridge 2022 Preliminary and Final Plat Review

1. Planning Commission's Critical Role
a. This type of parcel is the reason the Planning Commission exists. To apply your full purpose and look out for the City of Louisville, our community, taxpayers, and future generations. And, to not waste City Council's time on a proposal which attempts to gloss over critical requirements for Louisville.
a1. Please evaluate the applicant's proposal for its match to the Comprehensive Plan and how it complies with Municipal Code - requirements, mandates, and intentions.
a2. Please keep in mind: this applicant has had multiple years to incorporate citizen input, yet has kept the devastating horizontal intent the same.

Compromise has been achievable and still is. How refreshing would it be for the Planning Commission to suggest to them, "Have you considered no development north of Disc Drive? It seems the community and City Council would accept that and grant height exceptions in the other areas. Or something closer to that? Do you (applicant) understand that the community will not accept grading over the entire property and that plan does not meet the requirements of the municipal code?"

**As a result, Planning Commission could keep your September 8th review short. They have not met the requirements of the municipal code and have taken up significant staff time and cost to the City without showing willingness to compromise on any of the most basic and reasonable environmental concerns. Not just concerns. Mandates.

2. **Entrance to Louisville and Boulder County:** To see this unique, even iconic, parcel for what it is: mostly undeveloped land with campus zoning which is the southern entrance to Louisville and to Boulder County. A first impression for people from all over the world to this historically significant area of Colorado.

3. To consider **air quality and traffic concerns** generally, and even mores, with a recent EPA downgrade to Severe status.

- This is new, yet doesn't the Planning Commission have a critical role to even more closely review increased traffic and pollutants?
- For reference:

Sec. 16.04.020. - Purpose.

SHARE LINK TO SECTIONPRINT SECTIONDOWNLOAD (DOCX) OF SECTIONSEMAIL SECTIONCOMPARE VERSIONS

The regulations in this title are designed and enacted in accordance with the authority granted to the city including, but not limited to, subdivision authority granted in C.R.S. § 31-23-201 et seq. and the land use authority granted in C.R.S. § 29-20-101 et seq., the "Local Government Land Use Control Enabling Act of 1974," for the following purposes:

A.

To promote the **health, safety, convenience, order,** prosperity and **welfare** of the present and future inhabitants of the city;

E.

To provide for adequate light, air and privacy and to secure safety from fire, flood and other danger;

4. **Code Compliance:** To ensure that the "shall" statements from the Municipal Code have truly been adhered to by the applicant, and reviewed by City staff. It is reasonable to ask the City Attorney to expect the applicant to do the most required instead of the least.

- Specifically in 17.08 Definitions. **Shall = Mandatory.**
- I urge the Planning Commission to have City staff provide a line by line compliance update of the "shall statements" in sections 15, 16, and 17. See the bottom of this email for a listing from Chapter 16.12 of the Municipal Code.

- **Sec. 17.08.005. - General interpretation.**

  SHARE LINK TO SECTIONPRINT SECTIONDOWNLOAD (DOCX) OF SECTIONSEMAIL SECTIONCOMPARE VERSIONS

  The words and terms used, defined, interpreted, or further described in this title may be construed as follows:

  A.

  The particular controls the general.

  B.

  The word "shall" is always mandatory and not directory. The word "may" is permissive.

5. Preliminary and Final Plats Combined
a. Why does the Municipal Code have separate sections for Preliminary and Final Plats if not for EXACTLY this type of development? They should not be combined for this complex and potentially disruptive development - e.g. 20 year - construction.

6. OSAB Notice not given. Prior to the second OSAB meeting, the applicant made significant changes to their plans which did not allow the 15 day period for OSAB members to consider those changes.
- Also, while surrounding area impacts are relevant, the information was presented in such a way that was confusing as to the actual Open Space and usability calculations within the City of Louisville. Yet, OSAB went ahead and voted. OSAB's recommendation should have no bearing on discussions.

****Planning Commission - please look at Open Space with your own lens aligned with code requirements.**

7. The Parks Commission review was similar. They did not understand their mission, sections of the Code to consider, nor consider public comments.

8. Unknown Tenants/Community Partners
**Please note: With prior owners, the Community knew who the tenants were (e.g. StorageTek, Conoco Philips) and that they were/to be part of the community. With this owner, we do not know who the tenants will be. Yet, they are asking to grade over the entire ecosystem in their first phase and divide into newly defined parcels.
**We also know the owner is now based in Newport Beach, California. They have some local partners, but let's be clear this is an investment for this land owner, who will likely sell the subdivided areas. It is warranted for the citizens and tax payers to require more information before grading of land and 20 years of congestion to be considered.

Thank you for considering this input. Normally, I summarize more cleanly. I am disappointed to spend time here. The process laid out by Planning Staff for this applicant has skipped critical steps and I'm not sure why. It is disappointing that a plat, with this much unchanged proposed horizontal devastation is even at this stage. It does not preserve as much natural features as reasonable - as mandated in the code.

Also citing 16.04.030

- ## Sec. 16.04.030. - Authority.

SHARE LINK TO SECTIONPRINT SECTIONDOWNLOAD (DOCX) OF SECTIONSEMAIL SECTIONCOMPARE VERSIONS

No final plat of a subdivision shall be approved and accepted by the city council unless it conforms to the provisions of this title.

(Ord. No. 423-1973, § 1-103; Code 1977, § 16.04.030)

Some common sense is being missed here. Or brazen overreach.
Finally, you are the experts, and I prefer to spend my volunteer time on other community matters. Yet, this is important to prevent unnecessary chaos and potentially irreversible damage. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Cynthia

Cynthia Corne Musslewhite
438 Jefferson Ave.
Louisville CO

==========

Appendix:
One of many sections which should be reviewed by Planning Commission or City Council, for compliance, line by line, formally, before Council review.

Sec. 16.12.050. - Preliminary plat—Contents.

SHARE LINK TO SECTIONPRINT SECTIONDOWNLOAD (DOCX) OF SECTIONSEMAIL SECTIONCOMPARE VERSIONS

The contents of the preliminary plat shall be as follows:

A. Proposed name of the subdivision;

B. Location and boundaries of the subdivision as part of a larger area;

C. Contours at two-foot intervals if the slope is less than ten percent (spot elevations may be required if land is too flat for contours) and five feet where the slope is greater than ten percent;

D. Date of preparation, scale, and north sign (designated as true north);

E. Name, address and telephone number of owner and licensed surveyor, licensed engineer or designer of the plat;

F. Total acreage involved;

G. Location and dimensions of all existing streets, alleys, easements, drainage areas, irrigation ditches and laterals, and other significant features within or adjacent to the tract to be subdivided;

H. Approximate location and dimensions of all proposed streets, alleys, easements, lot lines, front building setback lines, and parks and other areas to be dedicated for public use;

I. Delineation of and technical material pertaining to areas of state interest as identified in chapter 17.32 and in other applicable ordinances;

J. Zoning on and adjacent to the tract;

K. Site date including the number of residential lots and typical lot sizes;

L. Density of development (number of dwelling units per acre of residential and open space land);

M. Proposed uses other than single-family residential;

N. The location and size of existing utilities within or adjacent to the tract including water, sewer, electricity, and gas (may be placed on a separate plat);

O. Proposed street names;

P. Preliminary drainage plan;

Q. Such preliminary information as may be required by the planning commission in order to adequately describe proposed utility systems, surface improvements, or other construction projects contemplated within the area to be subdivided in order to assure that the subdivision is capable of being constructed without an adverse effect upon the surrounding area;

R. Application form for rezoning, if required for the development of the subdivision;

S. Location of significant natural features such as trees, woodlands, lakes, hills, streams, wetlands, and floodplains, and historical and archaeological sites;

T. Location of the nearest existing or proposed schools intended to serve the residents of the subdivision;

U. Buffering proposed from collector and arterial streets and, where appropriate, adjacent uses;

V. Any proposed use, height, area, or bulk limitations which do not violate applicable city zoning regulations;

W. Development phases or stages proposed in order to assure the availability of public services and the orderly development of the subdivision;

X. Any modifications proposed by the subdivider pursuant to section 16.24.010;

Y. The maximum height proposed for all buildings and structures;

Z. Proposed pedestrian and bikeways; and

AA. For residential subdivisions, the location and nature of open space, park, and recreation common areas proposed for the residents, in addition to the required public use dedications.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Proposal Doesn't Meet City Code

Importance: High

From: Melissa DuBois <meldubois@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 8, 2022 1:30 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Proposal Doesn't Meet City Code

Hello,

I would like to encourage the Planning Commission to reject the Redtail Ridge development proposal, because the proposal does not meet city code requirements in the following ways:

- The current proposal calls for the **entire site to be graded** – including the open space and areas that will not contain buildings, roads, and parking lots. All of the natural drainage will be altered, the health of the soil severely degraded, trees and other vegetation destroyed, and wildlife habitat obliterated. Grading the entire site is contrary to the mandate to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible (LMC 16.04.020 (N), LMC 16.16.010 (D)).

- The grading of the site is also contrary to the mandate to preserve natural drainage (LMC 16.16.020 (B)).

- Brue Baukol's proposed public land dedication includes areas that should be excluded from the calculation. According to LMC 16.16.060 (B)1, a minimum of 12% of the land being subdivided for nonresidential subdivisions shall be dedicated, exclusive of subsection A of this section, for park, school, or other public purposes as determined by the city council and shall be delineated on the final plat. Land dedicated for public use must be suitable, as determined by the planning commission, for the type of development and/or the use for which it is intended." Subsection A of LMC 16.16.060 lists the features that cannot be counted toward the 12% dedication: Dedications of rights-of-way for public streets, drainage easements, utility easements or other public purposes shall be required and shall be made by the subdivider on the plat unless otherwise directed by the city council." **The proposed land dedication of the Redtail Ridge proposal includes streets, drainage easements, and utility easements.**

- **The LMC explicitly instructs the Planning Commission to determine whether the land granted in the public dedication is suitable for its purpose:** **LMC 16.16.060 (B)1**: "… Land dedicated for public use must be suitable, as determined by the planning commission, for the type of development and/or the use for which it is intended."

Because the land at Redtail Ridge is intended for use as open space and to provide a natural buffer mitigating the sense of urban sprawl, the Planning Commission must decide whether the land proposed for dedication is suitable for these purposes.

For open space, the purpose of which is the preservation of biodiverse natural areas and light human recreation, the land north of Disc Drive is the most suitable. This area of the site has never been developed. It is the richest in vegetation, water, and wildlife.

To preserve these "natural features" (**LMC 16.04.020 (N)** and **LMC 16.16.010 (D)**), the Planning Commission should require a 50% public land dedication at Redtail Ridge, with a 40% open space dedication north of Disc Drive. This would mean clustering all of the development on the southern half of the property, as it was when StorageTek occupied it.

- **COMMUNITY IMPACT**. Brue Baukol's current Redtail Ridge plan is less than half the size of the 6.1 million square feet the company proposed for the site in 2020, yet it still occupies the same massive, sprawling footprint. **The impact of the development on local traffic, air quality, and quality of life remains enormous.**

  This is in spite of the LMC's clear instructions that the city should minimize the negative impacts of development:

- **LMC 16.04.020 (O)**: This section requires City Council and the Planning Commission "To regulate the use of land within the city on the basis of the impact thereof on the community or surrounding areas."

The development proposed for the area north of Disc Drive would impact nearby neighborhoods and Monarch High School with dust, noise, and fumes from construction; traffic; and the long-term possibility of emissions from industrial facilities. This includes an anticipated 20,000 additional car trips on Louisville roads daily.

I strongly urge the Planning Commission to reject the Redtail Ridge proposal, as it DOES NOT meet the requirements for subdivisions in Louisville's municipal code.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Melissa DuBois
Louisville Resident
657 Owl Drive

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: NO on approval for current Redtail Ridge plan

Importance: High

From: A G <agreves13@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 7, 2022 4:58 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: NO on approval for current Redtail Ridge plan

Members of the Louisville Planning Commission,

I understand that you will be considering the Redtail Ridge Filing No. 1 Preliminary and Final Subdivision Plat again this week. As a resident of Superior who accesses the proposed area for parenting and work on a daily basis, and as a local volunteer in the realm of open space preservation, I am highly invested in the use of this land. I urge you to vote NO on this current proposal, as it does not meet criteria in Louisville's Municipal Code.

One of the greatest concerns that requires your full attention and effort is the grading plan for this proposal. It is unconscionable that the entire site would be graded, including open space. This is completely counterintuitive to open space and would decimate habitat, wildlife, biodiversity, vegetation & the associated carbon sink, trees, soil, and natural drainage. It preserves nothing. Along with that, what is the plan, if any, for all the prairie dogs throughout this site? The historical range for this keystone species has shrunk by 95%- in large part due to habitat destruction and human encroachment. Every decision that impacts them matters, and thoughtless complicity in their destruction only contributes to the greater problems we are experiencing locally, and on this planet. Stewardship is the lesson we hope to pass along to our kids and students. What a shame it would be to deliver the opposite action and example just right across the street from schools. I urge you to uphold the LMC (16.04.020 (N), 16.16.010 (D)) through the legitimate preservation that is called for. As is, the proposal would create enormous abuse of this land.

Though the grading plan alone necessitates a full stop on this proposal, there are other aspects that also do not meet code. Open space dedication is one such piece. The public land dedication in the current Redtail Ridge plan does not meet requirements of the LMC. Features such as streets and trails do not count in the 12% calculation (LMC 16.16.060 (B)1). The planning commission should require a 50% public land dedication and clustered development to substantially minimize the harm to intended open space, including wildlife, and to provide a natural buffer to mitigate urban sprawl. You can do this. Additionally, the LMC clearly states (16.04.020 (O)) that the city council and planning commission must “regulate the use of land within the city on the basis of the impact thereof on the community or surrounding areas." This current proposal would negatively impact quality of life through its massive footprint and needless destruction. It would affect air quality, noise/light pollution, sustainability, traffic (note: selling out to an environmental nightmare is not the way to create much needed emergency road access!!!), alter drainage, etc. It is also irresponsible and cost prohibitive to suggest that the NW corner of the site be utilized as a park.

Please listen to your residents and affected locals, and do not approve this proposal. It does not meet Louisville Municipal Code, would ravage natural assets, and is geared toward nothing more than greed and profit.

Thank you.

Amber Greves
Superior, CO

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Letter in Support of Campus Drive Extension and Completion
Attachments: Letter to Louisville Planning Commission and City Council 9-8.pdf

Importance: High

From: Meghan Mosher <mosher.meghan@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 8, 2022 10:35 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>; City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>; bvs.board@bvsd.org
Subject: Letter in Support of Campus Drive Extension and Completion

To the members of the City of Louisville Planning Commission,

Please find attached a letter from the Monarch High School and Monarch K8 communities in support of approval for the Redtail Ridge - Preliminary and Final Plat, as it appears to be the only feasible and permanent solution to the accessibility of our campuses and safety of our staff, students, and families. Although we recognize the political nature of these decisions, we urge you to look above politics and recognize the longstanding safety issues facing our students and our school communities and approve the application. As far as we understand, there is no alternative beyond approval of the Redtail Ridge plat for development of the property that would result in Campus Drive's improvement in the near future.

Thank you,
/s

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Each of the 5 factors in the City Code Supports More Open Space

Importance: High

From: Cathern H Smith <cathernsmith@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 8, 2022 1:51 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Each of the 5 factors in the City Code Supports More Open Space

Dear Planning Commission:

This comment letter explores some of the ways the 5 factors articulated in Louisville's City Code support the need for more open space. As you deliberate about the need for open space, be mindful that the applicant is requesting an exemption to supersize its lots. Thereby, pitting their desire to maximize the developed space against our need for open space.

By way of reminder, the City Code says that the need for open space "shall be based on the following factors: [1] the city's comprehensive plan; [2] topography, drainage, vegetation and other physical conditions; [3] the type and density of the proposed development; [4] the availability of other open space, park and recreation areas; and [5] the overall need within the proposed development for such areas." LMC Section 16.16.010(E). As set forth below, each of these factors supports more open space.

1. The City's Comprehensive Plan. Promoting Ecological Diversity, providing Integrated Open Space and Trail Networks, and supporting Sustainable Practices are among Louisville's Core Community Values. The Comprehensive Plan envisions that the City will achieve these goals by "ensuring a healthy and resilient natural environment" with "robust plant life and diverse habitats;" "that the needs of today will be met without compromising the needs of future generations;" and that the natural environment will be preserved for community benefit. The articulated community benefits include ecological diversity, interconnected trails, and outstanding views.

   Redtail Ridge is 8% of the land in Louisville. Significant non-fragmented open space is needed so that Redtail's environment, plant life, and habitats will be healthy, resilient, and robust. These qualities require scale and contiguous land.

   To retain its rural character and assessable open space, Louisville needs this 2.5 million square feet development to be buffered with significant open space. Otherwise, there will just be undifferentiated, fully developed suburbia where Louisville and Broomfield merge.

2. Topography, drainage, vegetation and other physical conditions of Redtail Ridge. As a result of climate change, Colorado now suffers from drought punctuated by flooding. Events like the 2013 flood are expected to become more common. Natural vegetation holds water better and naturally mitigates flooding. Impervious surfaces like parking lots carry pollution into the watershed and promote flooding. Additionally, alteration of the current waterflow will alter the ecosystem making accomplishment of the Comprehensive Plan goals more difficult to meet.

   The existing vegetation serves as a carbon sink and habitat. This functionality will be lost where the property is graded or paved. There is no quick fix once the land is graded or otherwise degraded through development. At that point, recovery is a long term process.

Finally, the survival of our species rests on our ability to recognize that we are part of nature. It is in our best interest to preserve as much undeveloped land as possible.

3. Type and density of the proposed development. The proposed non-residential development is sprawling with slivers of open space at the edges. Fragmented, non-contiguous open space is not ecologically functional and will not achieve the goals of the City's Comprehensive Plan. Large blocks of open space are needed. The project is insufficiently dense and will be even less dense should the Commission approve super-sized lots.

4. Availability of other open space, park and recreation areas. The nearby open spaces cannot absorb the pressure that will be caused by thousands of extra visitors coming from Redtail. Extrapolating from the anticipated 20,000 additional car trips daily, assuming just one person per car at full buildout and that each person commutes to and from work and eats lunch, there will be at least 6,666 additional people coming into Louisville . [These assumptions probably understate the number of people coming in as there will be some car-pooling.] These 6,000 plus people will be looking for places to picnic, stroll, and exercise.

In addition, for the safety of Monarch students, Redtail should provide recreational opportunities for its users that will minimize commingling.

Finally, prairie dogs are a keystone species. Preservation of the existing colony requires more open space.

5. Overall need within the proposed development for such areas. Sterling Bar's development plan does not address the open space needs of the people who will be coming to Redtail. Rather than put pressure on other open space like Davidson Mesa, Redtail should provide similar recreational opportunities for people and undisturbed habitat for other life forms.

There are positive benefits from seeing, not just being in open space. Hopefully, Monarch students, hospital patients, other users of Redtail, and people just driving by will benefit from the view shed.

Please spend some time exploring the Code's requirements with your counsel and so that much needed Open Space is created. We should be aiming for Open Space with the same qualitative benefits to our community as we get from Davidson Mesa -- a place to get away from it all, see the sunset, hear the meadowlark, and let go of the stresses of our everyday lives.

Best regards,

Cathern Smith, Ward III

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Site-Wide Grading of Redtail Ridge Does Not Comply with the City Code

Importance: High

From: Cathern H Smith <cathernsmith@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 7, 2022 4:58 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Site-Wide Grading of Redtail Ridge Does Not Comply with the City Code

Dear Planning Commission,

Because the applicant wants to grade virtually all of Redtail Ridge, questions about soil health are front and center. Boulder County Parks and Open Space just published in its Fall 2022 issue of Images an article titled *Healthy Soil is the Foundation*.

This article defines "Soil health [as] the ability of a soil to perform ecosystem services, such as cycling nutrients, filtering and storing water, providing a physical medium for the growth of plants, and a habitat for organisms." As explained in the article, optimal functioning of the soil happens when we:

1. Maintain soil surface cover;
2. Maximize plant diversity;
3. *Minimize soil disturbance (emphasis added);*
4. *Maintain continuous growing plant life*, (emphasis added); and
5. Incorporate livestock.

The entire article is available at https://bouldercountyopenspace.org/i/agriculture/healthy-soil-is-the-foundation/

Site-wide grading is not just environmentally unsound, it violates the purposes of Louisville's municipal code. Site-wide grading will harm rather than "safeguard the water table"; discourage rather than "encourage the wise use and management of the natural environment"; and destroy rather than "preserve and enhance to the extent reasonably possible the natural beauty and topography." § 16.040.010(M), (N), LMC.

Approval of the plats would also be inconsistent with other applicable city law - in violation of 16.12.075(A)(2). Louisville's Municipal Code requires Sterling Bay to demonstrate that "natural features, historical and archeological sites" as well as vegetation, including trees are being preserved to the extent possible." Section 16.16.010 (Stating that "The applicant …. must demonstrate" that the standards articulated therein are met.) The application includes no information demonstrating either (1) that these valuable resources are "being preserved" or (2) the extent of preservation that is possible. Instead, the application proposes widespread destruction.

The Code squarely places the burden on the developer to show why development cannot be clustered on the southern half of the property as Storage Tek did. With clustering and underground parking, a Public Land dedication of 50% and an Open Space Dedication in the land north of Disc Drive of 40% is feasible. Let's do it!

Best,

Cathern Smith
Ward III

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge

Importance: High

From: Justin Solomon <jsolly90@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 8, 2022 9:12 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

Dear Planning Commission,

Thank you for your service to the City. As you consider the Redtail Ridge plan before you, I ask that you consider City code with respect to open space. City code requires that the historical and natural features of the parcel be preserved to the "extent possible". The plan before you falls woefully short of that requirement. The footprint (area of ground disturbance) for the current plan (2.56 million sf) is unchanged from when the applicant first proposed over 6 million sf of building space for the site. Clearly the applicant has made no effort to limit the development's impact to the natural and historical features to the "extent possible" as required by City code.

Clustering of development would allow for full build-out of 2.56 million sf. This is consistent with both ConocoPhillips development plan and the former StorageTek campus, which both limited development to south of Disc Drive. Consolidating development south of Disc Drive would allow the most ecologically intact and biodiverse habitat north of Disc Drive to be preserved to everyone's benefit.

I would also call to your attention that the current plan would have nearly the entire site graded, including areas currently designated for public open space. Per City code, any area used by or supporting the development, such as retention ponds and utility corridors cannot be counted towards the public land dedication. The applicant is currently claiming such areas as open space. Once an area is graded the natural biodiversity, soil composition, and drainage pattern is lost and can never be fully restored. Its value as open space at that point is questionable at best. Accepting graded areas as open space is in violation of the requirement under City code to preserve natural features to the extent possible.

This plan has been moving through the review process as a draft and final with little real scrutiny or understanding of what it proposes in relation to City code and the long-term impacts (environmental, traffic, pollution, etc) to our City. The current plan violates City code on multiple fronts and is fundamentally unchanged from the plan that was rejected by City residents in April 2022. I humbly and respectfully ask that this commission take the time to carefully consider if this plan is meeting all the requirements of City code and to give it proper scrutiny. There is too much at stake to move forward with anything less than full understanding and compliance.

Sincerely,

Justin Solomon
477 Lincoln Ct

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Preliminary Plat/Redtail Ridge

Importance: High

From: sherry sommer <hellosherry2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 7, 2022 12:50 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>; Adam Blackmore <ablackmore@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Preliminary Plat/Redtail Ridge

- **Planning Commissioners, It is up to you to determine:**

LMC 16.12.075 (1): Whether the preliminary plat conforms **to all of the requirements** of this title

LMC 16.12.075 (2) Whether approval of the plat will be consistent with the city's **comprehensive plan, applicable zoning requirements** and other applicable federal, state and city laws

Please consider these issue and questions as you make your determination

1) LMC 16.12.050(P) Preliminary drainage plan is required

The issue: Drainage analysis was done by ERO Consulting in 2019 for the first iteration of this proposal.

The question: Can this document be used for the current proposal? The disclaimer from ERO consulting indicates otherwise.

"The natural resources and associated regulations described in this memo are **valid as of the date of this memo** and may be relied upon for the specific use for which it was prepared by ERO under contract to Brue Baukol Capital Partners. Because of their dynamic natures, **site conditions and regulations should be reconfirmed by a qualified consultant before relying on this memo for a use other than that for which ERO was contracted."**

2) LMC 16.12.050(S) Location of significant natural features such as trees, woodlands, lakes, hills, streams, wetlands, and floodplains, and historical and archaeological sites are required

The issue: The proposal does not inventory trees.

The question: Have the preliminary Plat requirements been met?

3) LMC 16.12.050 (U) Buffering proposed from collector and arterial streets and, where appropriate, adjacent uses is required

The issue: The applicant has not demonstrated responsiveness to OSAB recommendations to provide buffering for bike lanes along roadways, including 96.

The question: Have the preliminary Plat requirements been met?

4) 16.16.010 (C)

The layout of lots, blocks, and buildings and other structures must provide desirable settings for buildings and other structures, **make appropriate use of natural contours, protect the view,** provide for adequate light and air, and afford privacy and protection from adverse noise and traffic for the residents and neighbors.

16.16.040(B) Blocks shall be at least 400 feet in length and not more than 1,320 feet in length between street intersections **unless adjacent to a railroad right-of-way, a freeway or arterial street, or unless topographical conditions justify a variation of the requirement.**

The issue: The applicant is proposing super blocks.

The question: Do any/all of the proposed super blocks conform to the requirements of our code?

5) The property is PCZD with a commercial PU-C/Commercial overlay. While industrial uses are allowed this is not zoned PU/I Industrial

The issue: The letter of request submitted with the current proposal is dated April 2021 and is no longer applicable. Proposed biotech uses include a variety of industrial applications.

The question

: **How does the applicant intend to conform to the PU-C overlay?**

Reference Materials

September 23, 2019

To: Mrs. Jordan Swisher, Brue Baukol Capital Partners
From: Heidi Gerstung, ERO Resources Corporation
Re: Phillips 66 Site – Delineation of the Goodhue Ditch and Rock Creek

Background

Brue Baukol Capital Partners retained ERO Resources Corporation (ERO) to conduct a wetland delineation along the Goodhue Ditch and Rock Creek within portions of the Phillips 66 Site (property) in Boulder and Broomfield Counties, Colorado (project area; Figure 1). ERO reviewed the entirety of the property on January 17 and 21, 2019 to determine if any areas within the property had characteristics of a water of the U.S. (WUS) and had a defined surface connection to the South Platte River, the closest traditionally navigable water. An approved Jurisdictional Determination was subsequently completed for the property, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) determined that portions of the property (the Goodhue Ditch and its abutting wetlands and Rock Creek and its abutting wetlands) were jurisdictional (Corps File No. NWO-2019-00148-DEN, attached).

On August 23, 2019, Heidi Gerstung and Anna Wistrom with ERO surveyed the project area for wetlands, streambeds, and open water (2019 site visit).

The natural resources and associated regulations described in this memo are valid as of the date of this memo and may be relied upon for the specific use for which it was prepared by ERO under contract to Brue Baukol Capital Partners. Because of their dynamic natures, site conditions and regulations should be reconfirmed by a qualified consultant before relying on this memo for a use other than that for which ERO was contracted. ERO assumes the landowner or municipality is responsible for obtaining all federal, state, and local permits for construction of the projec

Monday, April 05, 2021

VIA: EMAIL AND COURIER

Mr. Rob Zuccaro Planning Director City of Louisville 749 Main Street Louisville, CO 80027

RE: Redtail Ridge Preliminary Master Plat and Subdivision Filing No. 1

Dear Mr. Zuccaro,

On behalf of Brue Baukol Capital Partners ("Developer" or "Applicant"), thank you for the opportunity to present a preliminary master plat and final plat for Redtail Ridge. For this submittal, we are providing an 80%-90% set of construction documents. This letter shall serve as part of our written request as may be required or anticipated under the Louisville Municipal Code.

Master Preliminary Plat and Final Plat - Description of Request & Intent of Development

Brue Baukol Capital Partners aims to create a master-planned community on the former Storage Tek / ConocoPhillips site.

Consistent with the zoning submittals provided to date (the ConocoPhillips Campus GDP 1st Amendment), the proposed master preliminary plat divides the entire property into unique development areas which will each be home to: 1) Flex industrial, 2) Office, 3) support retail for the tenants and community.

The objective of the Redtail Ridge Preliminary Plat is to delineate the master development rights-of-way and super blocks. Additionally, the Preliminary Plat will demonstrate how site roadway access and public utilities are designed to interface with existing public infrastructure to adequately serve the development of the site.

Revisions and subsequent final subdivision plats to dedicate the remainder of the right-of-way indicated in the Preliminary Plat and to establish the remaining development lots will be submitted at a later date.

1555 Blake Street, Suite 210, Denver, CO 80202-1866 | 303.500.8959 | W BrueBaukol.com

Description of Each Modification Request

- Street cross-sections shall be modified from Section 16.16.030 to such standards as set forth in the packet and as agreed upon in coordination with City Staff.
- A final plat for a portion of the overall property is being submitted for review and processing prior to Developer receiving approval of the preliminary plat for the overall property. Applicant understands that the approval of the final plat is dependent on the approval of the preliminary plat for the overall site.
- Proposed right of way landscaping shall differ from standards set forth in Section 16.16.20 to as set forth in the packet in order to conserve water and enhance the overall natural design aesthetic for Redtail Ridge. A Landscape Design Narrative and Case Studies are included for additional support/rationale for this modification request.
- Additional modifications may be included in future planned unit development applications and will be noted in such applications.

Other Comments/Remarks

Please note that some of the submittal items outlined in the "Public Hearing Application Packet" for Preliminary and Final Subdivision Plat are not contained with the submittal, including the following:

- Certification of Mineral Interest Notifications. These will be provided 30 days prior to hearings and have been sent in anticipation of hearing given in connection with the GDP application.
- Certified Real Estimate Appraisal. A current appraisal has not been performed to date. Any derived land values are determined by current land pricing or relevant comparable land sales.
- Agreements made with Ditch Companies. These will be finalized throughout the subdivision process.

Sincerely,

Jay Hardy
Senior Vice President
Brue Baukol Capital Partners

No Backdoor Conversion to Industrial - Make Redtail Ridge Conform to the City Code

The Planning Commission must act to ensure that Redtail Ridge fully complies with the City Code now and in the future. Brue Baukol , the developer, recently, announced a pivot to biotechnology. The City Code requires developments to "promote the health, safety, convenience, order, prosperity and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the city." § 16.04.020(A); § 16.12.075(A). Questions need to be asked and answered.

Biotechnology can mean many things. An online dictionary defines biotech as "the exploitation of biological processes for industrial and other purposes, especially the genetic manipulation of microorganisms for the production of antibiotics, hormones, etc." https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-1-d&q=definition+biotechnology. At the University of Colorado, Biotech includes Computational Biology and the following types of engineering: Aerospace—Bioastronautics; Chemical & Biological—Biomaterials, Biopharmaceuticals and Tissue; Electrical, Computer and Energy—Optics, Nanostructures and Bioengineering; and Mechanical- Biomedical. We need to know what Brue Baukol means by biotechnology.

The property is currently a Planned Community Zoned District with a commercial PUD-C overlay. Generally, industrial activity requires an industrial PUD-I overlay. Here, however the permitted uses probably allow for some industrial activity. But in my opinion, the applicant cannot convert a PUD-C/Commercial Overlay to a PUD-I/Industrial Overlay through the backdoor (i.e., by using one of the 13 permitted uses to completely change the character of Redtail so that it is exclusively or primarily industrial). If this were permissible, no developer would ever apply for a PUD-I/Industrial Overlay. This section of the Code would become meaningless, leaving concerns about pollution, congestion, and public utilities unaddressed.

It is the job of the Planning Commission to ask enough questions to determine whether the planned biotechnology center is truly commercial. If it is not, the general development plan must be amended so that the current commercial PUD-C/Commercial overlay is replaced by an industrial PUD-I/Industrial overlay.

Cathern Smith
608 West Street
Louisville, CO 80027
(202) 841-4016

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

To: Elizabeth Kay Marchetti
Subject: RE: Safety for students and teachers at Monarch Schools

From: sherry sommer <hellosherry2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 6:09 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: rob.price@bvsd.org; City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>; Glen Segrue <glen.segrue@bvsd.org>; Mark Sibley <mark.sibley@bvsd.org>
Subject: Fw: Safety for students and teachers at Monarch Schools

Planning Commissioners,

Safety of students and teachers at Monarch schools is of paramount concern.

For this reason, I am asking that you inquire into status of an emergency access road for the Monarch campuses.

Last March The City of Louisville posted an update on emergency access at the school but we have not gotten any further information.

Please note: Construction of this access road does not depend on approval of the Redtail Ridge proposal.

Could you please inquire into the status of this critical project?

Sincerely,

Sherry Sommer
910 South Palisade Court
Louisville, CO

Monarch Emergency Access Update

Post Date:03/08/2022 2:52 PM
The City of Louisville is committed to improving resiliency across the community. The Marshall Fire highlighted the importance of better emergency notification systems and evacuation routes. Emergency access at the Monarch Campus remains a concern. City staff have met with Boulder Valley School District and Boulder County staff to help facilitate short-term improvements. While this is a school district project and would likely require permitting from Boulder County, City staff will continue to offer support.

Access and transportation improvements associated with any future development on neighboring properties may be a potential long-term solution; however, this current effort is focused on providing short-term solutions specific to emergency access. The City will continue to pursue overall improvements to evacuation planning and emergency notification systems.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: RedTail Ridge letter for commission

Importance: High

From: Tim Stalker <tstalker28@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 8, 2022 2:48 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: RedTail Ridge letter for commission

To the Louisville Planning Commission:

As a planning commission you're faced with the difficult task of either supporting or not supporting the current development proposal before you. If you're looking to city staff, the Parks and Open Space Advisory Boards, and the general public, support is difficult to find. While city staff have admirably worked with this developer and on your and the community's behalf to come up with a meaningful response as for how best to proceed in your decision making, the layout and language of the city's municipal policy that this plan must adhere to make it very difficult to find in city code legal acceptance of this plan. Politically city membership on the boards is in favor of the plan, but not legally. There wasn't any attempt to analyze city code, with any effort, to discover what in the development plan is legally feasible for the city.

The OSAB, for example, made the mistake of believing there's no justification to condition a greater percentage of public land dedication, deciding instead to accept additional acres that aren't even in the plat before you, opting instead to find a distraction in ground that's not even within the subdivision, let alone city limits. As a commission you have to find this mistake especially egregious because it doesn't meet city code for the plat review - **Sec. 16.08.020. - Definitions** ***"Plat means a subdivision as it is represented as a formal document by drawings and writing."***

The Parks and OSAB omitted or neglected to perform an examination of the plat's grading contours and existing over-lot grading and cut-and-fill maps to discover the manner in which the subdivision doesn't adhere to code **Sec. 16.16.010 for subdivisions. - General design and construction standards** - *"D. Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible"* and *"E. .... Open space, park, and recreation areas must be located in such a manner as to create an area that is usable and accessible to the residents of the subdivision and shall otherwise conform to all applicable city standards and requirements. The need for additional open space, park, and recreation areas shall be based on the following factors: the city's comprehensive plan; topography, drainage, vegetation and other physical conditions; the type and density of the proposed development; the availability of other open space, park and recreation areas; and the overall need within the proposed development for such areas."*

Even city staff have a difficult time finding justification for the development in city code. It's difficult to match the parameters of the plat with city code to be sure, especially around the percentage of public land dedication that can be broken down as follows with the city staff's evaluation and adjustments in your packet:

> **69.3 acres or a percentage of 22.4%**

City staff only evaluate a portion of this dedication based on city code **Sec 16.60.060** to say it meets the **"minimum" of 12%**. In last month's packet and meeting commentary, they applied code **Sec. 16.04.020 N and**

16.60.060 only to tracts A, B, H, and I in the northwest corner of the site to say it was favored for ***"the location of the park and open space public land dedication intended to cover previously undeveloped areas of the property and natural drainage ways that include the most valuate habitat on the property."*** Per city code and the staff's evaluation of it, this is the only land in the site that meets city code **16.60.060 N.** There is no mention of an evaluation of the land dedications in the site's other tracts and that's because it will all be developed and graded for the needs of the development and dedicated only after the criteria under code sec 16.04.020 N have been destroyed and not preserved and enhanced.

> **50.77 acres in tracts A, B, H, I or a percentage of 16.4% is the amount of code compliant land dedication.**

The Problem with the Land Dedication in Tract C

This dedication will only be part-and-parcel of several functions the tract will serve for the development first and that do not meet city code for public land dedications, including:

- **Easement Access**
- **Drainage grading and development**
- **Buffer zone per Boulder county**
- **Roadway grading and slope**
- **Trail and public access**

Public access is tied up with functions for the tract that compete for unencumbered access and contiguous land dedication site-wide.

The Problems with Drainage in Tract C and How it Diminishes Public Access

The final drainage report for the plat identifies dual box underpasses under campus drive that are to be **built for 10-year flood events**. The entire drainage report is based in part on **outdated FEMA floodplain insurance rate maps from 2012**. These maps were identified in 2017 as being woefully outdated and appeared recently in the news again related to the country's numerous 1000-year floods this summer.

"FEMA's maps do not account for climate change, according to two studies released [in 2017]. Rising sea levels and more intense rain can lead to greater storm surges, and therefore more flooding, but current maps don't factor in those risks. 'FEMA's flood maps look backward in time and determine the size of the 100-year and 500-year floodplain based on past events,' says the NRDC." ->
https://www.sofarocean.com/posts/flood-maps-are-outdated-heres-how-to-fix-them

Also see -> **https://www.nrdc.org/experts/joel-scata/femas-outdated-and-backward-looking-flood-maps**

The developer's final drainage report offers its criteria for minor and major flood events at the 5-year and 100-year rain amounts per hour:

> ***"For this report, the 5-year and 100-year storm events have been analyzed. The 5-year storm is considered the minor event and the 100-year storm is considered the major event. One-hour rainfall P 1 values were taken from NOAA Atlas 14, Volume 8, and Version 2 for the Site. The P 1 values for the 5-year and 100-year storms are 1.08 inches and 2.49 inches, respectively."*** Final drainage report page 6.

According to this, RedTail Ridge and Louisville saw two 100-year flood events this summer alone when over 2 inches of rain fell in one hour twice. In tract C of the subdivision this would have taken out the trail system under campus drive and no doubt north of it as well. To accept it in the percentage of the public land dedication

is not only against code, it's dangerous as currently aligned.

The Problem with Land Dedicated after Development

There was discussion in last month's meeting that tract C and D in the plat compare in some way to how Coyote Run, another public land dedication that was made to Louisville in the past, was accepted. There's no comparison because Coyote Run is situated between two housing developments and, while it was dedicated after development/grading, it does not serve the same functional needs of that development as those compare to tract C at Redtail Ridge. Tract C is proposed to be situated next to a 370 acre commercial/industrial complex with a number of needs to provide functions for that development that Coyote Run in Louisville does not begin to match in scope and alignment.

It seems the city has a couple of options to augment the amount of land in the public dedication that does not meet municipal code. It can ask for compensation of some amount of acreage monetarily **per code Sec. 16.16.060 B.2**:

> ***"If the city council so determines, the subdivider shall pay to the city in cash an amount equal to the applicable percentage established in subsection B.1 of this section of the total appraised value of the land to be subdivided in lieu of the dedication of land required in this section. Any appraisal required to establish the value of land in this section shall be done at the expense of the subdivider."***

Of course to go this route the city would have to determine if in fact it plans to develop tracts A, B, H and I in the future, in which case if does plan to develop it, then it would have to a ask for compensation of the value of those tracts, plus the acreage in tract C and probably tract D that don't meet code for public dedication.

Another option is to require the developer to dedicate a greater amount of acres to the city. There's currently no land north of the campus drive alignment offered, even though the public has weighed in numerous times for the city to ask for a dedication of land north of campus drive to disc drive perhaps at an amount that can feasibly meet city code, honor the comprehensive plan, and that fits in contextually with the manner in which large tracts of land have been dedicated in the past. This will augment the dedication of tracts C and D, allowing that dedication to proceed while offsetting its use for the development by providing unencumbered land that's truly contiguous with the rest of the site's public land dedication. Ask for 40-50% public land dedication that includes tracts C and D in that percentage. This will also allow for later development of tracts A, B, H, and I.

The Problem with Tracts A, B, H, and I

These tracts are identified by the developer as a likely place for the city to build a park, possible soccer fields, and a fire station. In time this will take the public land dedication/preservation per code down to well below the 12% required minimum. These tracks' natural features and topography will also have to be destroyed for such development as well.

You have work to do as a planning commission to fill in the lack of judgement and diligence on the part of your advisory boards. On the part of city staff you have been provided analysis and evaluations on either a need-to-know basis or an ask-to-know basis, rather than a full inventory of concerns and analyses from which to develop an informed decision. Listen to the community feedback on the project as it's well informed and well researched. The city municipal code isn't difficult to apply to this plat. What makes it difficult is using political frames of mind to evaluate a legal interpretation of the code.

I ask you as a commission to carefully consider the manner in which land is to be dedicated from this developer. **Don't be distracted by land dedications outside of the plat and outside the city limits**. In terms of our

municipal code it's very difficult for staff, the advisory boards, and the public to find the current plat acceptable as proposed. We can't have a development go on in the city that doesn't meet code.

Thank you,

Tim Stalker
806 W Dahlia Ct - Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Please have parks and recreation address concerns of public

Importance: High

From: joy brook <joyalbrook@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 8, 2022 2:13 PM
To: Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Please have parks and recreation address concerns of public

Members of the Louisville Planning Commission,

The Louisville Parks and Public Landscaping Board unanimously recommended approval of the Redtail Ridge draft and final plat in May 2022. **This approval was premature and ill-informed.**

Please consider:

The Board recommendation was not based on sound analysis:

— The Board did not ask if the proposal met City code.

— The Board did not evaluate the proposed park, open space, roads, or trails.

— Thirty residents submitted email comments and eight residents spoke at the Board meeting, but the Board did not address public comments.

The Board has not communicated that it is cost prohibitive to develop a park in the NW corner of the site.

— Residents learned of this prohibition during the May 2022 Board meeting. The Board didn't address the issue during the meeting.

— During the meeting a Board Member admitted, "That area wouldn't be developed as a Park for years, if ever.

— Allan Gill, Project Manager for the Parks Department stated that the land in the NW corner of the property is far too hilly and expensive for the City to develop as a park and recreation space.

— Dean Johnson, Parks Superintendent, stated that the Parks Department was considering other sites in the City for a new park.

Brue Baukol has led the public, Planning Commission, and City Council to believe that land designated as a park would be suitable for use as soccer fields, and other public recreation.

— Jordan Swisher, Senior Vice President, Brue Baukol Capital Partners, told City Council on July 27, 2021 "The Parks Board appreciated the proximity of the park to the schools" (42:13) and "I can just imagine taking my daughter to soccer practice on the fields by Monarch on a Saturday."

— During the July 27, 2021 meeting, Geoff Baukol stated, "Imagine the convenience of having sports fields on this site. We have listened and responded to what residents have asked for and have gone above and beyond." (58:32)

The Yes Campaign sold the park as one of the main attractions when marketing the previous proposal in the run-up to the April 2022 special election:

10) What could the 15 acres of recreational fields be used for?

By voting YES, more than 15 acres of this land would be set aside for public use and parks, and would be owned by the City. Allowable uses here would include new ballfields, dog parks, soccer fields, tennis and pickleball facilities, and other uses that can help our citizens stay active and enjoy the outdoors. Since there are no provisions for recreational uses or fields in the ConocoPhillips plan, voting NO would take away these options for public use.

11) Would a dog park be allowed under the Redtail Ridge plan?

Yes! Dog parks are an allowable use under the Redtail plan, but not under the ConocoPhillips plan. The developer would be required to donate this land to the City of Louisville for this and other uses as determined by the city.
(Source: Yes for Louisville website)

From our perspective, it is clear that the Parks Board had not done their due diligence when considering the feasibility or practicality of the City utilizing the public dedication in the NW corner of the site as a park. The Board seemingly has taken the developer at their word that this land is suitable for a park and that the City will use it as such, despite at least one member of the Board and City staff indicating the opposite. In rubber stamping their recommendation for approval, the Board has vacated their responsibility to represent the best interests of the City and its residents. Please consider this oversight as you consider the plan before you.

Joy Brook

🌲Tane Mahuta E Tu! 🌲
🌍Blessings to the Creator, trees! Stand Tall!🌲⛰️🌞

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge Subdivision Plat, September 22, 2022

From: cindy Bedell <cyndilarson@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 12:17 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>; Rob Zuccaro <rzuccaro@louisvilleco.gov>; Meredyth Muth <meredythm@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Subdivision Plat, September 22, 2022

Dear Planning Commission,

Re: Redtail Ridge Subdivision Plat, continued to September 22, 2022

As you consider this development application, I urge you to recommend more open space. It is your moral imperative to do so! The citizens of Louisville have spoken loud and clear that they want more of our southeast Gateway preserved.

As a reminder, here are sections of the Louisville Municipal Code that gives you the authority to recommend more open space:

Sec. 17.28.080. - Open space.

A.Open space, in addition to the public use dedications specified in title 16, may be required by the city council **upon recommendation by the planning commission**.

The requirement for additional open space will be based on the following factors:
1.Comprehensive development plan (including matters of state interest);
2.Topography, drainage, vegetation and other such physical conditions;
3.Anticipated socio-economic conditions;
4.Type and density of development and employment;
5.Overall need for open space and recreational facilities.

-
- **Sec. 16.16.010**

> D. Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible.

> E. Schools, parks, churches and other community facilities should be planned for as an integral part of the area to the extent possible. Open space, park, and recreation areas must be located in such a manner as to create an area that is usable and accessible to the residents of the subdivision and shall otherwise conform to all applicable city standards and requirements. **The need for additional open space, park, and recreation areas shall be based on the following factors: the city's comprehensive plan; topography, drainage, vegetation and other physical conditions; the type and density of the proposed development; the availability of other open space, park and recreation areas; and the overall need within the proposed development for such areas.**
>
> This part of the city needs more open space and parks, especially with thousands of more visitors and employees coming to Redtail Ridge. A development of this magnitude requires far more than the minimum public land dedication. Utility easements and land not in the City of Louisville should not count towards the public land dedication.

I was very dismayed to hear that the applicant plans to destroy all of the natural features of this land - to grade most of the 389 acres - including mass destruction of vegetation, wildlife habitat, wildlife such as thousands of prairie dogs, and removal of most, if not all of the mature trees that provide habitat for raptors and protection against a complete concrete heat island. This is in direct noncompliance with 16.16.010 D. You should deny this plat application for this reason, (among many other reasons such as plans to cover almost the entire plat with buildings and parking lots, 20,600+ more vehicle trips per day, etc.).

Requiring more quality contiguous open space could assist with compliance of preservation of natural features, especially Open Space Preservation land and Open Space Preserve land sections. For your easy reference, I have copied the classifications of open space below.

Thank you for your careful consideration of the future for this incredibly important large parcel of land at our southeast gateway which represents
8% of our total Louisville land!

Sincerely
Cindy Bedell
662 W. Willow St
Louisville

The four classifications of Open Space:

https://library.municode.com/co/louisville/codes/code_of_ordinances

Sec. 4.03.010. - Classification and management.

Open space shall be managed in a manner consistent with good stewardship and sound ecological principles that benefits citizens of Louisville by promoting native plants, wildlife, wildlife and plant habitat, cultural resources, agriculture and scenic vistas and appropriate passive recreation. It is intended that the differing classifications of open space will require different management policies to provide reasonable levels of protection consistent with the intended uses of the land. The city shall manage its open space according to the following classifications:

A.Open space—Preserve.

1. Land under this classification is characterized by a moderate to high level of relative ecological importance with lower levels of habitat fragmentation. Where open space—preserve land is adjacent to other open space or other city-owned land, the adjacent land shall include, where possible, a sufficient buffer area to permit the successful management of the open space—preserve land.

2. This land shall be managed in a manner that preserves and promotes the long-term viability of native plants and native wildlife, restoration, restoration potential and ecologically sound agricultural use. Management of city-owned lands surrounding open space—preserve lands shall, to the extent possible under and consistent with the management criteria for the classification of such surrounding land, not be in conflict with the management required under this section.

3. Visitation for research purposes and formal supervised educational visitation may be permitted in this classification. No or very low levels of passive recreational activities shall be permitted.

4. When there is a real conflict between human use and any area or item of ecological importance in this classification, preference shall be given to sustaining the area or item of ecological importance.

B. Open space—Protected land.

1.Land under this classification shall be characterized by a moderate to high level of relative ecological importance with higher levels of habitat fragmentation.

2. This land shall be managed in the same manner as open space—preserve land, except that management may permit passive recreational activities so long as:

a. The passive recreation activities are designed to encourage resource protection, long-term ecological viability of native plants and native wildlife, restoration, ecologically sensitive agricultural use, research, and education; and

b. The recreational impacts are contained in order to prevent any adverse effect on open space—preserve land.

3. Moderate to moderately high visitation levels may be permitted in this classification.

4. When there is a real conflict between human use and any area or item of ecological importance in this classification, preference shall be given to sustaining the area or item of ecological importance.

C. Open space—Visitor land.

1. Land under this classification shall be characterized by a lower level of relative ecological importance with higher levels of habitat fragmentation.

2. Open space—visitor land shall be managed so that recreational opportunities are designed to encourage resource protection with minimal landscaping using native plants and limited irrigation.

3. Moderate to high levels of visitation may be permitted in this classification.

D. Open space—Other lands.

1. Open space—other lands shall be managed to include construction of entryway features and trail rests, planting of trees, and other buffer plantings. Reasonable attempts shall be made to minimize the impact of entryway features and trail rests on the land, and to use native trees and plants.

2. High levels of visitation and passive recreation activities consistent with existing patterns may be permitted in this classification.

E. Notwithstanding the foregoing, all current uses and all uses contemplated in any intergovernmental agreement or other contractual obligation of the city in existence before the enactment of this chapter will be allowed unless and until the city council recommends a change and takes all necessary legal steps to implement such a change. The board may recommend such a change to council at anytime.

F. City decisions regarding open space identification, classification and management shall consider the best information available.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: RedTail Ridge

Importance: High

From: Terrerushton <terrerushton@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 5:25 PM
To: Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: RedTail Ridge

Members of the Louisville Planning Commission,

During this April's election, it seemed that both sides of the electorate could agree on one thing: it's imperative that we keep Avista Hospital in Louisville.

With the preliminary and final plat for Redtail Ridge before you, we urge you to uphold the community's priority interests in moving Avista to a new home by approving the plat. As you all know, Avista was interested in looking for a safer, more accessible location even before the Marshall Fire — and the urgency to move into a better location has only intensified since then.

Avista's new build-out would be included in Phase 1 of the redevelopment at Redtail Ridge. Think how wonderful it can be to move Avista into a brand new facility, with state-of-the-art medical equipment, more beds, and much easier access. And by moving Avista to Redtail Ridge, we can provide immediate relief to the residential streets in the area.

If you support Avista and its role in keeping our community safe and healthy, please approve the preliminary and final plat for Redtail Ridge without delay.

Sincerely,

Terre Rushton, former Avista Board Member
Louisville resident since 1984
671 W. Ash Street
303-665-6889 home

Please excuse any typos. This is sent from my mobile device.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Key Code Provisions for Redtail Ridge

Importance: High

From: Cathern H Smith <cathernsmith@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 7:51 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Key Code Provisions for Redtail Ridge

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

Louisville's City Code sets out different standards for actions on (1) Preliminary Plats; (2) Final Plats; (3) Additional Open Space; (4) Public Land Dedications; and (4) Modifications. The chart below contains hyperlinks to the key LMC provisions and a brief summary. If you follow a hyperlink, you will find embedded hyperlinks for code provisions incorporated by reference.

As I have not seen anything in your packets discussing modifications as such, more information is presented about them. Essentially, a modification functions as an exemption to a requirement in the City Code. There is a higher bar for approval of modifications – as there should be. The information in your packets does not clearly identify the substance and number of modifications requested or analysis of compliance with the Code's requirements. An example of a modification is the applicant's request to supersize lots on Redtail Ridge. Please ask Staff to identify all modifications and explain why each requested modification complies with the Code.

	Key LMC Provisions	
Preliminary Plat	§ 16.12.075 § 16.12.050	Standards for approval, approval with modifications, or denial with express references to 16.04.020, 16.16, the City's Comprehensive Plan, and other law. Enumerates what the contents of the preliminary plat "shall be."
Final Plat	§ 16.12.075 § 16.12.090	Standards for approval, approval with modifications, or denial with express references to 16.04.020, 16.16, the City's Comprehensive Plan, and other law. Enumerates what the contents of the final plat "shall be."

Additional Open Space	§ 16.16.010(E)	"The need for additional open space, park, and recreation areas shall be based on the following factors: the city's comprehensive plan; topography, drainage, vegetation and other physical conditions; the type and density of the proposed development; the availability of other open space, park and recreation areas; and the overall need within the proposed development for such areas."
Public Land Dedication	§ 16.16.060(B)	"Land dedicated for public use must be suitable, as determined by the planning commission, for the type of development and/or the use for which it is intended."
Modifications of Louisville's City Code	§ 16.24.010	"No modification shall be granted if it would be detrimental to the public good or impair the basic intent and purposes of this title or title 17. Any modification granted shall be in keeping with the intent of the comprehensive development plan of the city." City Council acts on *advice of* Planning Commission.
	§ 16.24.030	Requires compliance with 16.24.020, 16.24.010, and the specified review criteria. Includes a requirement that the modification is necessary due to "unique physical circumstances or conditions" such that "the property cannot reasonably be developed in conformity … with titles 16 and 17 resulting in a hardship." The applicant did not create the hardship. The modification does not "alter the essential character" of the district or impair use or development of adjacent property. There are no reasonable alternatives and "no additional dwelling units shall result from approval of the modification."

Thanks for all that you do.

Cathern Smith
Ward III

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Further info—campus drive alignment.

Importance: High

From: sherry sommer <hellosherry2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 12:12 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Further info—campus drive alignment.

Your current packet includes side by side comparison of current and previously approved versions of Campus Drive.

This comparison is counterproductive and deceptive—that this was a previously approved alignment is totally irrelevant.

We are in a totally new public review process and evidence must be considered with fresh eyes.

Sherry Sommer

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Comparison of Previously-Approved v

Sherry

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Do you have time to read this one? Campus Drive Alignment

Importance: High

From: sherry sommer <hellosherry2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 11:46 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Fw: Do you have time to read this one? Campus Drive Alignment

Planning Commissioners,

Commissioner Howe's questions 9/8/22 regarding Campus Drive were excellent. Please continue gathering information and discussing Campus Drive.

Here are some items to consider:

1) Throughout the election, campaign materials of Yes for Louisville--which was 95% funded by Brue Baukol-- stated that a No vote would lead to adopting the 2010 GDP--and that the Campus Drive alignment was part and parcel of that GDP.

Campaign materials stated "all of special requirements and community benefits, such as more Open Space and safer Campus Drive access, would go away since they are not attached to the Conoco plan."

Now you are being presented with the same plan for Campus Drive that has been part of Brue Bakol's presentations since 2020 and are being asked to accept as is.

-- Would a Campus Drive alignment--which is different from that in the 2010 plan- require a modification to the GDP to be used? Would it require an amendment?

--If so, shouldn't we be discussing if the currently proposed alignment qualifies for a modification or amdendment?

--Would the proposed alignment-- which will definitely lead to congestion-- even qualify for a modification?

LMC 16.24.010. - Modifications

The city council, upon advice of the planning commission, may authorize modifications where a subdivider proposes a plat that does not fully comply with the regulations in this title or title 17. **No modification shall be granted if it would be detrimental to the public good or impair the basic intent and purposes of this title** or title 17. Any modification granted shall be in keeping with the intent of the comprehensive development plan of the city.

2) So far we have seen two possible alignments for Campus Drive.

There is the alignment tied to the GDP--The County Commissioners will not allow an exit through Paradise Lane. So the version that comes with the 2010 plan cannot be adopted.

There is the alignment being proposed by Brue Baukol. This proposal will impede traffic flow along 96th which is not acceptable according to our code. Our code clearly states that we must plan to avoid congestion:

LMC 16.04.020 A, B, C, K:

A.**To promote the health, safety, convenience, order, prosperity and** welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the city;.

B.To provide for the proper arrangement of streets in relation to existing or planned streets and to provide for the **safe and efficient circulation of traffic throughout the city, the avoidance of congestion in the streets** and highways and along pedestrian and bikeways;

C.

To provide for **adequate and convenient open spaces** for motor vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle traffic, utilities, **access of firefighting apparatus**, civil defense, recreation, and sites for schools, educational facilities, and related structures;

K To provide for the **safe and efficient circulation of traffic** throughout the city, **the avoidance of congestion i**n the streets and highways and along pedestrian and bikeways;

--What are other possible alignments of Campus Drive? Are there truly only two possible routes that this road could travel?

--Is the claim of the Yes Campaign--that the Campus Drive alignment currently being proposed is the very best and only reasonable option in the universe of choices-- actually true? LMC 16.24.010, 5 requires

That there are **no reasonable alternatives** that would remove the need for the requested modification or would reduce the amount of the modification.

3) **Currently, Campus Drive has been proposed as a four lane road.** This appears to be too large for a development of this type. Roads in a similar development, Centennial Valley, have been reduced down to two lanes. The Tech Center has two lane roads. The City is committed to road diets.

--Are four lanes needed in this development? Why or why not?

--Does a two or four lane Campus Drive better match current City policy of establishing road diiets?

Brue Baukol is clearly using whatever means possible to get a proposal passed that suits their interests, without regard for the implications for our community.

We can see from the Campaign materials that quick construction of Campus Drive was used to scare residents into voting yes. Fear for the safety of children is a powerful tool and one that should not have been to manipulate residents and get votes.

Now that the election has passed, we are being asked to adopt the alignment that was supposed to go away with the No vote--and that alignment clearly does not meet our code.

Do not let Brue Baukol cherry pick from the 2010 GDP to suit their purposes. And please do not approve an alignment of Campus Drive that does not meet the standards of our code.

Thank you so very much for your work,

Sherry Sommer
910 South Palisade Court

For ease of reference:

Commissioner's meeting. 9/8/22 (1:52:08)

Commissioner Howe: Can you think of any way to improve...It seems that the Campus Drive to 96th St is going to be really congested driving those streets..I'm sure we all understand that. Have you considered any other layouts for Campus Drive, any other paths that could be taken to elongate the junction between it and 96th and the East West corridor?

Jay Hardy, Senior VP, Brue Baukol: I'm being a little sarcastic here, but I think this is well into the second full year of having the same question answered. We could obviously take it all the way up to the North, we can't do that because of Boulder County or because of the set back. This plan was reviewed by City Staff, it was reviewed by the Boulder Valley School District, it was reviewed by our traffic engineers, by the Fire Department, then validated by the City's traffic engineers so the only other one was where the road goes up and ties into Paradise Lane, that was discussed but then you run into the buffer issue on the North. This was the one that four collective jurisdictions jurisdictions felt was the best route.

Source: Yes for Louisville Website

YES FOR LOUISVILLE

The April 19 special election is a forced choice between two general development plans that have both been approved by City Council. Voting YES upholds City Council's approval to redevelop the old StorageTek site according to the 2021 Redtail general development plan (GDP), and **voting NO reverts back to the GDP that was approved in 2010 when ConocoPhillips owned the land.**

1) Why is there a special election on April 19?

The special election asks voters to reaffirm City Council's approval of the 2021 Redtail Ridge redevelopment plan, which would replace the existing 2010 ConocoPhillips plan. If voters reject Council's approval and support development according to the ConocoPhillips plan, then **all of special requirements and community benefits, such as more Open Space and safer Campus Drive access, would go away since they are not attached to the Conoco plan.**

16) Can Campus Drive be expanded under the ConocoPhillips plan?

Yes, but the roadway would begin much later due to a more complex land use pattern **that would require** it to cut through an existing easement from BVSD, privately owned land, AND Boulder County land. It would also most likely require an eminent domain claim that would further add costs and delays to this much-needed extension.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Engineer's concerns/RTR

Importance: High

From: sherry sommer <hellosherry2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 3:18 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Engineer's concerns/RTR

Planning Commissioners,

Could you please ask if all the concerns on this list which is found in the packet of 9/8 have been accounted for?

I do not see any follow up memo confirming that the items have been dealt with. I do not recall any public discussion of the items on this list.

Thank you,

Sherry Sommer
910 South Palisade Court

Memorandum Department of Public Works **To:** Rob Zuccaro, Planning Director

From: Craig M. Duffin, City Engineer

CC: Kurt Kowar, Director of Public Works Kevin Trott, Civil Engineer III

Justin Ferron, Civil Engineer III **Date:** April 20, 2021

Re: Redtail Ridge (Conoco Phillips Campus) GDP- 1st Amendment (7th Submittal) Public Works completed a review of the subject Development Referral Application received by

the Engineering Division on March 29, 2021. Staff comments are:

GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – 1st Amendment Page 2 of 3

1. The City of Louisville "City Limit" is not shown accurately on the plan. The City of Louisville boundary is not the southerly extension of the easterly right of way line, north of the Broomfield Fire Station. S. 96th St. adjacent the property was annexed by STC in 1978. The annexation included a 50' right of way centered on east line of Section 20.
2. On the eastside of S. 88th St. there is an existing 5' walk between Tape Dr. and Campus Dr. The Redtail Ridge project is proposing a multiuse path in the same area. There is an undeveloped lot a southeast

corner of Campus Dr. and S. 88th St. Will the multiuse path be extended northerly adjacent the undeveloped lot to Campus Dr. or will the multiuse path end and transition to the existing 5'walk?

3. Please confirm that all existing easements that cross proposed dedicated City property/easements are shown.
4. Noted use of the perimeter symbol around development and inclusion of property adjacent Paradise Lane. Are these properties included in the development? They do not appear annexed to Louisville. Revise.
5. City of Louisville boundary is not shown along westerly property line of unincorporated Boulder County or along S. 88th St. Revise.

CIRCULATION PLAN

Sheet 3 of 3

1. General Notes, 2, The "Right In" on Sorrell Ave. and Rockcress Dr. are not shown.
2. Plan indicates a Multi-use Path and On Street Bicycle Lanes on southside of Campus Dr.

   and connecting to S. 88th St. Is there adequate right of way at southeast corner of S. 88th St. intersection to complete the trail extension?

115

3. At northeast corner of Parcel C, noted the hardscape trail extension easterly to the Northwest Parkway and continuation on the westside of S. 96th St. up to and thru Campus Dr. intersection. Was the trail extension easterly to the NW Parkway a request City and County of Broomfield? PW previous comment mentioned pedestrian traffic may use old S. 96th St. as an alternative access to the Campus Dr.
4. Trail connections/extensions beyond the boundary of the development will require further discussion and clarification to determine how, when and the party's responsible for the construction.

PHASING EXHIBIT - Sheet 1 of 3

1. Due to scale of the drawing, the wet utilities are difficult to understand. Appears water, sanitary and storm will be installed in Campus Dr., Sorrell Ave., the easterly portion of Rockcress Dr. and along the east property line of Parcel C.
2. Confirm that the developer will provide an acceptable access to the proposed sanitary sewer lift station during interim and final development. Construction/maintenance of the sanitary sewer lift station access shall be clearly stipulated in the Subdivision Agreement/Plat.
3. Offsite improvements are not shown (e.g. sanitary sewer force main), however are understood for this development. The offsite work shall be clearly discussed and clarified prior to approval of Plat.
4. Please add a note mentioning that the Phased Work in the Park/Open Space areas are shown on Public Lands, Sheet 3 of 3.

Sheet 2 of 3
1. Add the Multi-use Path on Campus Dr. west of Sorrell Ave. and along S. 88th St. Not

sure if this is the correct phase for construction. PUBLIC LANDS - Sheet 3 of 3

1. Please clarify the types of "Public Lands" (i.e. Open Space, Parks, Public Safety Parcel, Trails, etc.) that will be dedicated to the City. Currently the Legend indicates only Open Space as Public Land.

TRAFFIC AND MOBILITY STUDY

1. Staff will provide detailed crash data to address staff comment regarding "Current Study Area Traffic Safety Concerns".
2. 96th and Dillon Commercial Development, staff will provide traffic report and request response about impact of current St. Louis Parish and Innovation Campus Development as compared to data used in study.
3. Pedestrian crossing at Campus Dr. Staff will evaluate the impact of a raised crosswalk with rectangular rapid flashing beacon on Campus Dr adjacent the Monarch School

Attachment #17

Attachment #2

116

Memo to Rob Zuccaro, Planning Director Continued Re: Redtail Ridge GDP 1st Amendment - 7th Submittal
Page **3** of **5**

Campus that serves BVSD, Avista Hospital, cut thru and development traffic, emergency

vehicles, snow removal equipment, etc.
4. There are recommendations for offsite improvements that require further discussion and

clarification in the Subdivision Agreement. FINAL MASTER UTILITY REPORT

1. The Operations Division is concerned about water quality on Paradise Lane and current flushes (bi weekly – monthly) to bring up the chlorine level in the line. The water line on Paradise Lane is 6" ductile iron installed in mid to late 80's and "private" (no to low maintenance). The 96th Street 8" ductile iron water main was installed in late 70's for STK. The condition mentioned is currently a maintenance issue. Will the development improve water quality in the area?
2. City will monitor water and sanitary sewer flows from the development to confirm utility report assumptions were reasonable/conservative. Will inform district/developer if there are any issues during future development.

Justin Ferron comments: Tech Memo 1 Water Flows:

1. Page 15: It is stated that peak flow events will not occur during multiple day
periods. However, this has occurred in 2020 where we had >97% peak day usage and 4 days following the peak event had >90% peak day usage. The same can be seen for >90% usage trend in 2019. We will send you 2020 data to include in the report which is reflective of recent demand trends. We feel the discussion should adjust the filter firm capacity to 10.5 MGD (our filter firm capacity 10.5/13 = 0.8). In this case it would put the Low-

High max day demand calculations all above the filter firm capacity. Please add the 2020 data, add a 90% percentile to the charts, and adjust the discussion conclusions as needed. A few general typos to fix as well.

Tech Memo 2 Water Infrastructure:

1. Page 1: It states "*Increased demand from Redtail Ridge will likely require the WTPs to operate at elevated filter flow rates (up to 5 gpm/sf rather than the current 2-2.5 gpm/sf) which will likely result in shorter filter run times. During max months, backwashing may be necessary every day depending on raw water quality. Increased backwashing has the potential to result in increased maintenance due to increased usage of backwash pumps and associated equipment*"

Based on the CDPHE design criteria section 4.3.1.2 the filter rates which be running at its max design to meet demand. This would have a major impact on operations and may not be possible in the summer. The memo also does not address the declining rate calculations needed to run the filters under these conditions, if needed. In addition to the

Attachment #17

Attachment #2

117

Memo to Rob Zuccaro, Planning Director Continued Re: Redtail Ridge GDP 1st Amendment - 7th Submittal
Page **4** of **5**

regulatory requirement, can we add discussion regarding what the recommended max filter flow rates should be?

2. Page 1-2: The City considers filter firm capacity to be 10.5 MGD not 11 MGD. We feel it is important to note specifically spell out that the filter firm capacity is calculated by taking total combined plant flow North at 8 MGD and South at 5 MGD for a total of 13 MGD and taking out one filter out of the two at the south plant which is a reduction of 2.5 MGD (13 MGD -2.5 =10.5 MGD). In addition, this paragraph implies that our filter firm capacity is only in place when the "worse case" of having a filter down for "1-2 hours" for backwashing. This doesn't take into account filter to waste time, or if any of our 6 filters are down for any reason other than backwashing. Although rare, a filter could go down early or be out of service for any given reason other than backwashing which could drastically adjust our filter firm capacity. Also, we were thinking that it would be beneficial to add some discussion on the scenario of having a filter out at each plant which would reduce the total capacity to 13 MGD – 2.5 MGD -2.0 MGD = 8.5 MGD.
3. Page 2 (Last Paragraph): States "*The Mid zone, where Redtail Ridge is located, has a 3.5 MG tank which provides storage volume to meet emergency and fire flow needs, as well as, operational volume for daily flow variations. In the event of a fire during max day demand, the City's WTPs would be capable of providing max day demand, while the Mid Zone tank would provide the fire flow demand. Fire flow requirements stipulate the minimum fire flow and duration required of 4,000 gpm for 4 hours, or 960,000 gallons, would be provided by the tank. Similarly, in the event of a water line break, the tank's emergency storage volume would provide the necessary shortage to the Mid Zone. In general, a tank is sized to provide one-third of the tank's volume to each need: emergency, fire flow and*

operational storage. In practice, considerations are made to provide the optimal balance between providing a robust system, controlling capital costs, and managing water quality."

Calculated demands in the Mid-Zone for 2020 showed an average of 1.40 MGD for the year and a Max of 3.58 MGD. This will result in an average demand of 1.40 + 1.19 + .96 fire flow = 3.55 MGD which is over the max tank capacity. Using Max figures it would be a demand of 3.58+1.71(Max irrigation and indoor) + 0.96 +fire flow = 6.25. This is not achievable and would require that the North Plant solely supply the low and high zones, with no operational flexibility as well as helping support the Mid-Zone to meet demands. Operational levels of the tank are currently 10 -17 ft. or 1,902,460 – 3,234,182 gallons in order to achieve proper storage, turnover for WQ, and a buffer to help with demand changes. There is not capacity in the tank to supply Redtail during peak months from the 3.5 Tank at full buildout. Can we add some discussion like: "The City understands that storage expansion may not be needed for Phase 1 of the project however additional storage may be needed at the completion of future Phases."

Attachment #17

Attachment #2

118

Memo to Rob Zuccaro, Planning Director Continued Re: Redtail Ridge GDP 1st Amendment - 7th Submittal
Page **5** of **5**

PROPOSED OVERLOT GRADING

1. The applicant's quantities of earthwork for the entire site include 1.9 million cubic yards of fill dirt.

1. Trucking routes shall be approved by the jurisdiction having authorization over the road network. Provide routing information with the Overlot Grading permit application.
2. Soil material brought to the site and used below pavements shall be as recommended by the Geotechnical Engineer and approved by the City. Material testing for road subgrade shall be provided at depth and spacing meeting City Design and Construction Standards. Test results shall be submitted to the City with appropriate mapping so that staff can confirm quantity/depth and results of testing are consistent with road construction procedures and City Standards. Noted earthwork depths at street locations ranges from 5' cut to 14' fill.

REDTAIL RIDGE TOTAL SITE – CUT & FILL MAP

1. Noted cuts of 0.5' to 21' and fills from 0' to over 35' at locations on the site. Applicant shall notify utility companies that traverse the site about the level of earthwork to determine if relocation of their facility is necessary when considering the earthwork.

REDTAIL RIDGE LIFT STATION ACCESS EXHIBIT

1. Public Works will provide additional comments with submission of the Plat concerning the 1400' L x 26' W Temporary Lift Station access.
2. Please provide auto turn vehicle tracking templates for vehicles that will access the site for maintenance/repair (e.g. Vacuum Truck, Tandem, Grader, Truck/Trailer, etc.).

3. Access lane shall connect to round-about at a 90 degree angle for approximately 50’ similar to a street connection at an intersection.
4. Is the Temporary Lift Station access road located in an easement or will this be by agreement/permission?
5. Materials required to provide the temporary access (e.g. hard surface materials, signs, delineators, gates, etc.) will be considered during the Plat review process. Maintenance of the access shall be provided by the applicant.
6. The temporary access as shown is conceptual and will require further input/review prior approval and inclusion on the public improvement civil plans.
7. When will a formal paved access be provided through the lot?

G:\Subdivisions\Commercial\Redtail Ridge\Documents\Correspondence\Comments\2021 04 20 Redtail GDP Referral Comments 7th Submittal.docx

Attachment #17

Attachment #2

119

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Just how large is the Redtail Ridge Subdivision to deny?

Importance: High

From: Tim Stalker <tstalker28@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 1:16 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Just how large is the Redtail Ridge Subdivision to deny?

All in the service of another suburb the city envisions avoiding in its comprehensive plan:

Stormwater Management Plan - https://www.louisvilleco.gov/home/showdocument?id=35874&t=637953165037276959

The size of the subdivision at Redtail Ridge is massive in scale and area both. According to the stormwater management plan there will be an excess of 250,000 cubic yard soil surplus (excess) that the developer plans to store on site. **This amount of soil is the equivalent to an area 900 feet long X 300 feet wide X 25 feet deep.**

But more importantly, the total amount of earth to be moved via cut and fill **combined will be 2,211,945 cubic yards. That is an amount of soil that would fill a 1/4 mile (1320 feet) square space 20 feet deep.**

This would require 15-20 land levelers operating around the clock in the site through the time in "Filing 1" in the stormwater management plan submitted with the developer's final plat.

The developer never changed their dates from 2021: roughly July 2021 to July 2023. Who knows when the actual start dates would be??

Filing 2 earthwork isn't yet identified in the stormwater management plan but would require additional earthwork.

For comparison, the I-70 project through Denver only displaced 1.7 million cubic yards of soil by digging the corridor out for about 2 years of work. The redtail ridge project would be larger than that and certainly one of the largest projects in Boulder County ever.

The developer isn't a builder. They are a leveler for people who build on top of the ground. This pattern was used to develop Louisville between 1961-2007 with suburbs the city is now having to redevelop as urban centers," **Louisville Comprehensive Plan PP. 10.**

Deny this plan. It's massive, destructive, and outdated and would set the city back decades from moving forward with community supported development.

Thank you,

Tim Stalker - 806 W Dahlia Ct. Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge Plat is Non-Compliant with LMC Title 16 and Comprehensive Plan

Importance: High

From: Tim Stalker <tstalker28@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 11:18 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Plat is Non-Compliant with LMC Title 16 and Comprehensive Plan

To the Louisville Planning Commission:

This letter explains how the Redtail Ridge plats are inconsistent with the Louisville Comprehensive Plan and fail to comply with title 16 regulations for subdivisions in the Louisville Municipal Code (LMC). This is a deep dive into code sections 16.16.010, 16.24, and 16.04.020 and the specifics of the non-compliance. This is also a close reading of the comprehensive plan and the nature of how the plats are inconsistent with it. I urge you to read this in its entirety because there isn't enough time to present this material and discuss it with my available time of 3 minutes at the planning commission on 9/22/2022 this week. Above all know that there is very little public support for approving Redtail Ridge plats as reflected in the city-wide referendum and the continued non support you are receiving from the public.

It would be helpful to you to have the public land dedication map available to you as the tracts are referenced throughout the letter - https://www.louisvilleco.gov/home/showdocument?id=35878&t=637953165046964770 and also the comprehensive plan available here -> https://www.louisvilleco.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/358/635575239200370000

Sec. 16.16.010 A. *Subdivision design must conform to the purposes of this title and be consistent with the city's comprehensive plan.*

- The plat's shortcomings and inconsistencies with the comprehensive plan pertain to the manner in which it proposes another suburban subdivision in the city, which would essentially put another "inflexible suburban block pattern" (comp plan pp. 10) on the city's south side, the last large area in the city that's not developed.
-

- The history of this developer's proposals over the last few years have received very little public support for its intended land uses that are so typical of suburban patterns that prevent walkability, interconnectedness, and that minimize and place on the fringe public land dedications and infrastructure while only emphasizing single purpose properties.

- **The comprehensive plan addresses this in one of its most specific visions regarding block patterns:**

  "It is important for the Comprehensive Plan to enable the development of more urban block patterns, building stock and ***community supported land uses.*** *Urban block patterns, like that in Old Town and Downtown Louisville, have high resiliency and flexibility in accommodating development and redevelopment over time.* ***Typical suburban block patterns have not demonstrated similar resiliency****."* **Comprehensive Plan PP. 10**

- **In the Comprehensive Plan's focus on the McCaslin Boulevard suburban district, for example, the issues pertaining to the need to redevelop the suburb as an urban center are clear:**

  "Future public and private investment is needed to transform this area from an auto oriented suburban retail center, to a walkable mixed-use transit supportive urban center. As properties redevelop over time, attention will be given to ***enabling a more inter-connected block structure that introduces a walkable street network, and the possibility of a mixture of uses, to an area that currently consists of large single purpose properties.****"* **Comprehensive Plan PP. 27 - See also the McCaslin Blvd Small Area Plan pp. 15,** *"Project Principles and Measures of Success"*

- Does the city really want to accept another suburban subdivision at Redtail Ridge, this time for an immense corporate, regional suburb,

to be forever tied to its inflexible pattern as well, while at the same time trying to transform the problems with suburban areas of the city where these patterns have failed or are failing?

-
- The comp plan explains clearly that the city has to address its suburbs while **cautioning against additional suburban pattern developments in favor of urban type developments.** It's not the vacancy of mostly retail and commercial office space that's so much the problem in the city's suburbs; it's the development pattern of suburbs that is the problem in the city the comprehensive plan so clearly describes, i.e single purpose retail, commercial and industrial.
-
- Why approve the suburban development pattern in these plats now that are the same patterns with much larger scale as those approved and "built between 1961-2007," as identified in the comp plan, pp. 10, while spending considerable time and money on redevelopment proposals and a re-envisioning of these older suburbs to recast them as urban centers? **Approving this plat would be the direct opposite of the visions defined in the comprehensive plan and would be destructive for the city.**

- Furthermore, the current plat even contains plans for blocks that exceed 1320 feet in length under **16.16.040**, a modification the planning commission can deny, given the problems suburban blocks this size would pose for the city in the future as it attempts to grapple with redeveloping smaller suburban blocks now where they have failed.

Sec. 16.24.010. - Modifications - states in part: ***"Any modification granted shall be in keeping with the intent of the comprehensive development plan of the city."*** Indeed, denial of this modification would be completely in line with Louisville's comprehensive plan!

This plat is also inconsistent with the comprehensive plan because it does not meet the city's title 16 laws for subdivisions, especially its general design and construction standards.

Sec. 16.16.010 B. *The residents must have available to them, within the area, safe and convenient movement to points of destination or collection. Modes of travel, including but not limited to motor vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle travel, to achieve this objective should not conflict with each other or abutting land uses. To the extent possible, there shall exist an internal pedestrian circulation system separate from the vehicular system that allows access to adjacent parcels as well as to parks, open space or recreation facilities within the subdivision. Pedestrian links to trail systems of the city should be made where feasible. Buffering from collection and arterial streets must be provided by earthen berms, landscaping, leafing patterns, or other appropriate materials.*

- Bike and pedestrian trails within tracts C and D are in too severe of conflicts with land uses for drainage, easement access, and roadway placement that will cause conflicts between bike and pedestrian traffic on the site's single trail through these areas.
- Tracts D and I are disconnected with no open space, trail access, and connections between them, putting too much pressure for competing bike and pedestrian traffic on the single planned trail.
- The site isn't walkable because there is such little pedestrian interconnectedness that will have to compete too much over too great of distances with vehicular traffic both within and commuting traffic to and from the site from areas outside of the city.
- The subdivision is simply too large and meant for single use properties for which even PUD proposals will have a difficult time meeting pedestrian requirements for walkability and connectedness.

Sec. 16.16.010 D. *Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible.*

- City staff only evaluate tracts A, B, H, and I as meeting this regulation even though building a proposed park in this area will take the open space preservation to below the 12% in time.

- Where natural features could be preserved to the extent possible in tracts C and D, especially, natural features are destroyed for the development with grading and fill to bring them into compliance for the appropriate roadway slope as aligned, easement access and drainage to the detriment of its public use dedication and integrated connectedness per the comprehensive plan.
- The planning commission may deny this sort of modification under **Sec. 16.24.030. - Modification review criteria:**

> **Sec. 16.24.030 A.** *In granting any modification for a subdivision plat that is not processed concurrently with a planned unit development, city council shall find that the application complies with section 16.04.020 and section 16.24.010 and all of the following requirements, insofar as applicable, have been satisfied:*
>
> > *1. That there are unique physical circumstances or conditions such as irregularity, narrowness or shallowness of the property, or exceptional topographical conditions, or other physical conditions peculiar to the affected property;*
> >
> > *2. That because of such physical circumstances or conditions, the property cannot be reasonably developed in conformity with the provisions of title 16 and title 17 resulting in a hardship;*
> >
> > *3. That such hardship has not been created by the applicant;*
>
> **The planning commission would have to deny this modification**

- **because of a hardship the developer has caused themselves** by placing too much of a burden on these tracts to be modified for the development;
- **because of its platted footprint size**, especially north to south, but also east to west without a connection between tracts D and I;

- **because of the developer's campus drive alignment** with no indication of the buffer size required by boulder county in the IGA for this tract;
- **and because of the unique drainage needs for such a large suburban layout** and its natural drainage way in the Rock Creek Tributary that prevents, again from the developer's own doing, integration into the tributary's own public land dedication between tracts I and C and I and D.

Sec. 16.16.010 E. The planning commission could also require more open space to alleviate these problems in its northern tracts: *"**The need for additional open space, park, and recreation areas shall be based on the following factors:"***

- **the city's comprehensive plan** - its vision for walkable development with integrated open space and much public support vs. additional suburb block patterns and fringe open space with competing uses that garner little public support (referendum, repeated public commentary at planning and board meetings, etc).
- **topography and drainage** - because of the property's close proximity to natural drainage and topography that the developer chooses to modify for the development with the addition of underpasses, grades to the natural drainage way, and grades for the 4-lane campus roadway, as well as easement access in such competing use scenarios with its constrained public land dedication in tracts C and D. These tracts are to be dedicated only after they are significantly altered for the development. While tracts E,F,G,J, and K are also to be dedicated after modification, these tracts are narrowly confined to the site's trail system for that particular land use. In these tracts there isn't the extent of conflicts in land uses posing issues requiring more open space in the same constricted way tracts C and D do.

- **vegetation and other physical conditions** - a single trail with no secondary trail to offset the competing uses in tracts C and D without additional open space between tracts C and I and D and I.
- t**he availability of other open space, park and recreation areas** - presumed city-wide. The comprehensive plan identifies that 26% of land in Louisville is open space and open space with public infrastructure, and yet in this plat, there is only about 16% and less in time of the open space dedication that is code compliant in tracts A, B, H and I. With such a large subdivision proposed at Redtail Ridege, an equally significant amount of land needs to be dedicated, bringing it into consistency with other areas of the city that have such widespread public support, i.e. Davidson Mesa, Coal Creek, and others.
- **the overall need within the proposed development for such areas** - Although the plat proposes no modifications to excavate tracts A,B,H and I, and, although these areas meet title 16 requirements in and of themselves currently at least for public land dedication, they do not, however, meet title 16 requirements in conjunction with all the tracts not meeting the specification. The land dedication in its entirety must meet title 16 provisions for the plat, not merely certain tracts within the plat.

- By requiring more open space between tracts C and I and D and I, the issues of competing uses, constrained public use, and disconnectedness could be offset and alleviated with a land dedication also in a tract with a secondary trail across the site from tract D to I. A logical area to do that would be by extending tract D across the subdivision with an additional underpass under Sorel Avenue.
- There was discussion in the 9/8/2022 planning commission meeting that tract C and D in the plat compare in some way to how Coyote

Run, another public land dedication that was made to Louisville in the past, was accepted.

- There's no comparison because Coyote Run is situated between two housing developments and, while it was dedicated after development/grading, it does not serve the same functional needs of that development as those compare to the complexity of tracts C and D at Redtail Ridge.
- Tracts C and D are proposed to be situated next to a 370 acre commercial/industrial complex and 4 lane roadway with a number of purposes in too small of an area to provide functions for the Redtail Ridge development that Coyote Run in Louisville does not begin to match in scope, alignment, and non-compliance to LMC title 16.

According to the purposes of the subdivision the plat fails on several points as well, outlined below:

Sec. 16.04.020 - Purpose

Sec. 16.04.020 A. *To promote the health, safety, convenience, order, prosperity and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the city;*

- The proposal is inconvenient along the north central and northeastern connections between tract I and tracts C and D.
- There's no connection between tracts I and D.
- There's no open space between the development and the trail, easement and Rock Creek Tributary drainage way, the main watercourse that drains the site outside of the development to its lowest point in tract C.
- Underpasses are only built to 10-year flood specifications.

Sec. 16.04.020 C. *To provide for adequate and convenient open spaces for motor vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle traffic, utilities, access of firefighting apparatus, civil defense, recreation, and sites for schools, educational facilities, and related structures;*

- No open space south along Rock Creek Tributary, trail, and easement, causing these uses to be too constricted along a major drainage way with immediate proximity to graded and sloped land in the development.
- Trail between tracts I and C isn't fully positioned within an open space dedication, only the trail within tracts C and D is identified within a land dedication.
- In washouts, access will be disrupted for repairs of the single trail and underpasses during what are becoming rather routine 100-year flood events.
- No additional and alternative open space trail connection and trail between tracts I and D.

Sec. 16.04.020 E. *To provide for adequate light, air and privacy and to secure safety from fire, flood and other danger;*

- Modificatons to the property within its areas of open space dedication in tracts C and D and the trail connection between C and I, while not in a floodplain, pose continued risk of flooding, especially at what are becoming rather routine 100-year flood events.
- The nature of how such a colossal development with public land dedications confined to the site's fringe natural drainage basin in tract C do pose a safety risk.
- There are no alternative/secondary trail routes across the subdivision from east to west in the site's northern area that would be useful in times of trail disrepair.

Sec. 16.04.020 G. *To ensure that public facilities and services are available and will have sufficient capacity to serve the development;*

- Combined with overflow from the property's development and water not captured by the development's drainage system, the subdivision's natural drainage system is not adequate in capacity for

the property **because the development is aligned in too close proximity to it's major drainage way in the Rock Creek tributary.**
- There's not enough open space in tracts C and D and around the tributary between tracts C and I to absorb runoff from up to 100-year flood events or greater.

Sec. 16.04.020 I. *To conserve and enhance the value of land throughout the city and the value of buildings and improvements upon the land;*

- **The proposed development subordinates the value of its open space to the city by minimizing the size of the public land dedication** with no improvements and infrastructure other than trails site-wide.
- The proposed development creates **problematic land value and use conflicts in tracts that are too small and constrained**, functioning with too many purposes.
- The **open spaces are poorly connected within the subdivsion and not connected to the rest of the city to the west**, making them of less value and use to both the city and the subdivsion.

Sec. 16.04.020 J. *To minimize the conflicts among the uses of land and buildings placed on the land;*

- **Too many uses, none of which are primarily for public access in tracts C and D and the connecting trail to tract I.**
- These tracts pose significant issues with conflicting uses, making them non compliant.
- Their primary uses for drainage, roadway grade and slope, and easement access diminish and subordinate these areas' percentage of the overall public land dedication in these tracts and the subdivision as a whole.
- **Tracts C and D are too small, narrow, and constricted to functionally serve as open space for the city in such a competing context of uses.**

Sec. 16.04.020 K. *To provide for the safe and efficient circulation of traffic throughout the city, the avoidance of congestion in the streets and highways and along pedestrian and bikeways;*

- The site's single trail system and connection between tracts I and C only will cause bicycle and pedestrian congestion within the subdivision.
- There's no connection between the trail system and areas adjacent to the subdivision's northwest tracts.
- Bike and pedestrian traffic cannot circulate into neighborhoods and areas northwest of the subdivision.

Sec. 16.04.020 M. *To mitigate the pollution of air, streams and ponds, assure the adequacy of drainage facilities, safeguard the water table, and encourage the wise use and management of the natural environment;*

- The site's drainage report is based on FEMA insurance rate **maps that evaluate flood potential by looking backward** in time rather than with models for future flood concerns and rapidly changing climate and landscape vegetation that affect precipitation amounts, duration, and intensity.
- The development provides no provision and accounting for drainage overflow when the internal drainage system reaches capacity in 100-year or greater flood events.
- Dual culvert and trail underpasses co-mingling under campus drive.

Sec. 16.04.020 N. *To preserve and enhance to the extent reasonably possible the natural beauty and topography of the city and areas of historical or archeological importance and to ensure appropriate development with regard to such natural, historical and archaeological sites and features;*

- Only a portion of previously undeveloped areas of the subdivision in tracts A, B, H and I are preserved to the extent reasonably possible at the time of this plat proposal, but these tracts are identified for additional development (grading and fill) for a park and fire station that will eventually take the percentage of open space preservation

below the 12% minimum while confining this public infrastructure to the pedestrian inaccessible tracts B and H from all areas of the subdivision.

- Valuable spaces in the property the developer proposes to develop are not preserved.
- Site-wide the open space dedication fails this provision because the spaces in tracts C, D, E, F, G, J, and K are not preserved but rather destroyed to be dedicated after grading for the intent of the development. The PC must inquire further about the intended use of the identified 250,000 cubic yard soil excess the developer intends to store on site. From this overall excess of soil, topsoil should be separated out from subsoil and building debris from the former storage tek site removed. Subsoil cannot be distributed as new topsoil fill for restoration of public lands. All excess subsoil should be removed.
- There was discussion in the 9/8/2022 planning commission meeting that tract C and D in the plat, for example, compare in some way to how Coyote Run, another public land dedication that was made to Louisville in the past, was accepted. There's no comparison because Coyote Run is situated between two housing developments and, while it was dedicated after development/grading, it does not serve the same functional needs of that development as those compare to the complexity of tracts C and D in this property.
- Tracts C and D are proposed to be situated in the site's main drainage basin next to a 370 acre commercial/industrial complex and 4 lane roadway.
- Coyote Run in Louisville does not begin to match in scope, alignment, and non-compliance to the lack of preservation to any extent reasonably possible.

Sec. 16.04.020 S. *To otherwise plan for and regulate the use of land so as to provide planned and orderly use of land and protection of the environment in a manner consistent with constitutional rights.*

- Land uses are too disordered and concentrated/ constrained in competing ways to the detriment of environmental protection for the Louisville community in the site's open space tracts, especially in tracts C and D of the property and the single trail connection without a dedicated open space for it between tracts C and I.
- Most of the open space tracts as well as the development itself are to undergo significant environmental degradation because of a lack of development precision at scale.
- The developer is proposing to develop 14.74 million square feet as a footprint for others to build only 2.55 million square feet. The excess 12.19 million square feet are imprecise sprawl in a suburban pattern, one of the principal components of environmental degradation worldwide.

Thank you so much for your attention to this complex development proposal. It is the job now for the planning commission to represent the community and to send a loud and clear message that we cannot accept plats that are inconsistent with the city's comprehensive plan and the laws in title 16 governing subdivisions. Listen to the community and understand the urgency and importance of not approving these plans.

Thank you so much,

Tim Stalker - 806 W Dahlia Ct Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Questions for City Staff and Developer - RTR

Importance: High

From: Tim Stalker <tstalker28@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 4:05 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Questions for City Staff and Developer - RTR

To the Planning Commission:

There are a number of very important questions pertaining to grading that need to be asked and cleared up as you continue to evaluate the grading in the RTR property:

1) There are 3 cut-and-fill maps showing the grading numbers within the site, all of which were created about 10 days apart from March 21-March 31, 2021. The most recent map in the stormwater mgmt plan shows a soil excess in the site of 249,000 cubic yards. The map created on 3/21/2021 shows a soil deficit in the site of 1.9M cubic yards. How did BB come up with such drastically different cut and fill numbers over this time?

In an April 20, 2021 meeting city engineering staff noted the 1.9M cubic yard deficit. Which are the correct numbers and how come these versions are so massively different? Is there a staff memo from city engineers that shows the matter has been cleared up?

2) There appears to be only one over-lot grading map in existence that uses and notes the 1.9M cubic yard soil deficit?

3) Grading contours in the plat reflect this over-lot map but the one with the 1.9M cubic yard soil deficit that BB would have to truck in (158,000

dump truck loads)? Can they explain why the contours in the plat are reflective of the over-lot map that shows the 1.9M cubic yard deficit?

4) How does the developer intend to store 250,000 cubic yards of soil on the site with only one small stockpile location shown on the stormwater mgmt plan that isn't big enough to contain this amount of excess soil? Note that this is the equivalent of a 300 yard X 100 yard space filled with 25 feet of soil. But the stockpile location is only 120 feet long apparently, way too small to store soil.

5) How long will BB store the soil? Where will its location be in relationship to the publicly dedicated tracts?

6) Will they be separating out former building debris from storage tek, as well as topsoil from subsoil?

7) Will they be distributing subsoil into public land dedication tracts as new subsoil with which to restore vegetation on?

Thank you so much,

Tim Stalker - 806 W Dahila Ct Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

TO: CITY OF LOUISVILLE – PLANNING COMMITTEE

AS RESIDENTS OF PARADISE LANE FOR NEARLY 50 YEARS WE FULLY SUPPORT THE APPROVAL OF THE CURRENT PLAN FOR REDTAIL RIDGE. HOWEVER, IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN THE BEAUTY, TRANQUILITY AND REAL ESTATE VALUE OF OUR RESIDENTAL/AGRICULTURAL PROPERTY, WE WOULD LIKE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS TO BE A PART OF THE COMMITMENT ONCE THE LAND IS DEDICATED TO OPEN SPACE.

- ALL DWELLINGS & OUTBUILDINGS ON THE PROPOSED OPEN SPACE NEED TO BE DEMOLISHED IN ORDER TO NEGATE THE FIRE HAZARD THEY NOW REPRESENT, AS WELL AS THE POSSIBILITY OF SQUATTERS, AS WE HAVE HAD IN THE PAST. DWELLINGS HAVE NOT BEEN OCCUPIED FOR OVER 10 YRS.
- WATER RIGHTS SHOULD STAY WITH THE PROPERTIES IN ORDER FOR THE LAND TO BE MAINTAINED PROPERLY.
- IF LAND IS LEASED TO AN OUTSIDE PARTY, ALL HOLDING PENS FOR LIVESTOCK SHOULD BE KEPT TO THE NORTH/WEST SIDE OF THE OPEN SPACE LAND SO THAT THE WEINING NOISE OF THE CALVES DOES NOT DISTURB US HOMEOWNERS AND THE MANURE ODORS ARE FILTERED BEFORE REACHING OUR HOMES. ALL LEASES NEED TO BE APPROVED BY PARADISE LANE OWNER/RESIDENTS. NOT WITHHOLDING UNDUE APPROVAL OF LEASE.
- A CLEANUP OF THE OPEN SPACE PROPERTIES, INCLUDING THE FENCING, PASTURES, DOWN AND DEAD TREES AND REMOVAL OF ALL OF THE DEAD WOOD STACKED OVER VARIOUS AREAS OF THE LAND. ALL OF THIS IS NECESSARY, FIRST AND FOREMOST BECAUSE IN IT'S PRESENT CONDITION, IT PRESENTS AN EXTREME FIRE HAZARD!!

WE APPRECIATE YOUR CONSIDERATION IN THIS ISSUE THAT IS VITAL TO US AS WE ARE DIRECTLY IMPACTED ON A DAILY BASIS AS LONGTERM HOMEOWNERS.

LARRY & KAREN THOMPSON
9250 PARADISE LANE
BROOMFIELD, CO 80020
PHONE: 303-775-1996-LARRY 303-775-2013
E:MAIL: kkt9250@gmail.com

Dear Planning Commissioners:

I just wanted to express my thanks to you all for your thoughts and willingness to understand the complexity of RedTail Ridge proposal.
I commended one of you asked about any other options on Campus Drive. I believe it is important to see what the other options are and compare to the current plan. The other options may not be great however we can use the weak options to make it better than the current plan on the Campus Drive. It will be a great benefit such as having "Great Mind think alike" by working with the residents of Louisville. It is vital to continue to ask to see the physical options that was previously worked on.
For example: It is important to have the Campus Drive as a one-way road. How? Entering 88th and exiting 96th on right turn only lane. In this design, can have one round a about giving the drivers options to exit either to 88th and 96th. No traffic signal on 96th will give the environment sustainability and supporting Net zero policy. The State of Colorado just enacted new rules to reduce greenhouse gas emissions with the goal of improving air quality by taking the equivalent of 300,00 cars off the road each year.
With the new construction will be happening on the Flatiron Mall district, we need a new traffic study from the Flatiron location to be implemented with the 88th and 96th traffic study.

Secondly, here is my concern, I have noticed on the proposal map plan, there are two small green areas southwest of Tape Drive which it will be given or convert to open space. I much rather have the southwest of Tape Drive area to be exchanged to the second pond/lake area as an open space and have them to develop on the southwest of the Tape Drive. I would like to see more open space around both pond/lakes to preserve the natural surroundings.
Without a visual aid, it is difficult for me to describe the layout in words, and I hope this gives you a basic idea.

Thank you for your service. Please continue to reject the current plan and encourage them to revise according to the codes and by laws.

M. Christiansen
543 Adams Ave
Louisville, CO 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: RTR: Denial

From: Cynthia Corne <ccorne@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 4:41 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>; Jeff Durbin <jdurbin@louisvilleco.gov>; Rob Zuccaro <rzuccaro@louisvilleco.gov>; Lisa Ritchie <lritchie@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: RTR: Denial

Dear Planning Commission:

The citizens of Louisville are reasonable people who care about a healthy community, thriving economy, improving climate, sharing our ecology with wildlife, and specifically, clean air. And, I believe fairness in government matters including development and economic development.

Do you see Louisville citizens opposing CTC expansions in large numbers (e.g. the new Bolder Innovation Campus)?
No. In general, we elect our leaders, and go about our lives.

And then, there is Storage Tek/ConocoPhillips/Nawatny Ridge/RTR/RTR/RTR.

1) And the same horizontal plat since Brue Baukol got involved, with goals for outdated concrete and parking lots.
***By now, the **impacts to carbon emissions** should be well-understood, and, if not, the Planning Commission has every right to request a f**ull climate impact study** re: the impact to the soil, wildlife, and air quality - from grading, concrete parking lots, buildings, and 20K cars per day. And the construction traffic as well. We need to be going the other way. **What are the proposed carbon offsets?**

2) Construction Chaos: How many construction vehicles per day? How many road closures and/or narrowed lanes?
Have you seen how much traffic there already is at this site during busy times of day?
*What agreements are in place with CDOT/Boulder Turnpike/36 and E-470? and CDOT/42/95th?
3) No tenants named. "Trust us." Let us grade over the whole Campus development.
4) At buildout, an additional 20,000 TWENTY THOUSAND cars per day.
This completely ignores the recent EPA Air quality downgrade to severe status for the Front Range.
5) Combining Preliminary and Final Plat steps.
***Why do these separate steps exist in the Municipal Code if not for this VERY type of situation.
6) For the record, Council specifically excluded heavy industrial from the CP PUD. Brue Baukol should be required to indicate the planned commercial uses, especially since they want to grade over the property.

So, please create a motion to Deny this applicant's preliminary and final plat on the basis that the pros and detail provided do not outweigh the risks and unknowns, and overreaching plans. The applicant needs to propose a phased approach with less disruption e.g. grading, at a minimum, and much fewer cars forecast given the air quality and heavy traffic already in existence. These other reasons for denial as well - one of these reasons would be enough:

- 1) Does not adequately meet the requirements of 16.04.020 and the authority granted for the purpose:
    1. A. To promote the health, safety, convenience, order, prosperity and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the city.

2. It only serves to meet the unbending business case, and cost models for a now-Newport Beach owned applicant, who looks to subdivide this land like a suburb, in order to resell it or lease it.

- This GDP needs separate preliminary and final plats - the applicant has failed to provide the needed detail for each definition, and continues to add Code-required information during the process without adequate review time - for the public, boards, and planning commission. The distinctions between preliminary and final exist for this very situation.
- Permission to grade the entire property before the PUD would violate item 1, and the Comprehensive Plan/Campus setting.
- Construction traffic chaos - City Staff needs to be able to focus on Marshall Fire recovery/traffic design and more. To oversee plans for construction traffic for this development is not an obligation nor a priority for the City. As demonstrated from the referendum vote, Louisville citizens have other priorities and want to ensure the Code is followed.
    1. Many are not opposed to this development in general. Many of us are opposed to this application.
- 20K additional cars at full buildout - with no partnerships or agreements with CDOT or E-470
-
-
- Common sense is failing here. With increased traffic at 287 and E470 and at 36/Interlocken and McCaslin and 36, better planning is needed. We already have traffic jams on 42, especially before and after Dillon Road, all the way to South Boulder Road.

I believe City Council suggested max of 1.6MM sq. feet at one point, perhaps the applicant could re-start there, with a phased, success-based plan, where tenants and commercial uses are known before plats are subdivided like a residential area.

Too many risks, too much overreach. Ignoring the community. Predictable air quality and traffic chaos.

Thank you.

Cynthia Corne
438 Jefferson Ave.
Louisville, CO

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge Testimony

(cannot accept texts)

From: Clif Harald <clif.harald@firstflatironconsulting.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 2:52 PM
To: Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Testimony

Planning Commission Members,

The stature of Colorado's Front Range continues to evolve as one of the country's most dynamic ecosystems for innovation in biosciences and advances in health care.

Yet in biosciences alone, real estate brokers report tenant demand for 1.3M to 1.6M square feet of lab space in the Denver/Boulder market, with a 0% vacancy rate in Boulder lab real estate. And we've all seen how urgently health care systems and hospitals must expand to meet the accelerating demand from Louisville and other north metro area residents for their services.

The proposed life sciences campus at Redtail Ridge would help meet these needs and significantly address the life-critical missions served by bioscience companies and health care organizations.

As a Louisville resident with years of experience in Boulder County community economic development, I also value the local economic benefits of Redtail Ridge which include an estimated $1M annually in *net* new city revenue averaged over the first 20 years of the project. This additional revenue couldn't be more timely as we work to recover and rebuild from the Marshall Fire. And the jobs associated with redevelopment of Redtail Ridge would help revitalize our struggling retail centers.

Thank you for your dedication to the orderly and deliberate evolution of Louisville's built environment. I encourage the Planning Commission to look favorably upon the life-critical and local economic benefits of Redtail Ridge and to approve the project's preliminary and final plat.

Clif Harald
First Flatiron Consulting, LLC
LinkedIn
Mobile: 303-908-2333

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge

From: Beth McQuie <bmcquie@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 9:50 AM
To: Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

Dear Louisville Planning Commission,

I am writing about the latest version of Redtail Ridge.

I am not opposed to having a life and bioscience campus in Louisville. However, there are some factors that I hope you will consider.

The traffic plan seems problematic to me. Having Campus Drive come out on 96th, near the fire station, could create traffic jams, in my opinion. There is already a traffic light at 96th and the tollway. Campus Drive would join 96th just a few hundred feet from that. In addition, if Avista Hospital builds along 96th, they might want their own traffic light, too, for easy of entry of emergency vehicles. This hasn't been taken into account, from what I can tell.

Please do not widen 88th Street. That is just behind my home and the additional traffic would add to noise and pollution. Our neighborhood was destroyed in the Marshall Fire. Please don't add to our misery.

I would prefer that the plan have a smaller footprint. It could cover just the area that the StorageTek facility did. That way, open space could be maintained north of the former Disc Drive and our small-town feeling could continue. We could have a buffer of open space between Redtail Ridge and the main part of town.

This area is designed as a RURAL District in the 2013 Comprehensive Plan. Does the current Redtail Ridge plan seem rural? Not to me. It appears that it will cover the majority of the land with buildings and concrete parking lots. Although the limit is 3 stories, per the Comp Plan, in the past, the developer has pushed for higher buildings. Please do not allow that.

The Louisville Vision Statement, as stated in the 2013 Comprehensive Plan, includes a core value of maintaining Our Livable Small Town Feel. Redtail Ridge should demonstrate this.

Thank you for considering these points.

Beth McQuie

972 Saint Andrews Lane, Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Drainage Plans
Attachments: 2n_Redtail Ridge Filing No. 1 - Existing Onsite Easement Exhibit.pdf

Importance: High

From: sherry sommer <hellosherry2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 8:51 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Drainage Plans

Planning Commissioners,

I needed clarification on grading in the public land dedication at RTR and got these maps.

Maybe they will be of use to you as well.

Sherry Sommer

Hi Sherry,

Per our discussion this afternoon, here are the best grading plans we have that cove the public land dedication tracts that are slated for open space.

Thanks,
Rob

Rob Zuccaro, AICP
Planning and Building Safety Director
303-335-4590 (D)
303-335-4592 (O)

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

City of Louisville
COLORADO • SINCE 1878

Rob Zuccaro

From: sherry sommer <hellosherry2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 28, 2023 2:47 PM
To: City Council
Cc: Jeff Durbin; Rob Zuccaro
Subject: Incomplete Redtail Ridge preliminary application/Council agenda December 5.

Mayor Leh and members of council,

Please remove Redtail Ridge from your December 5, 2023 agenda. The application is not complete. Only complete applications can be reviewed by council.

—Northwest Parkway has not approved this application. According to Joel Meggers, managing administrator for the parkway, the parkway will not support the preliminary plat until negotiations are finalized. This should happen within the next few weeks.

—Brue Baukol has not updated their application submitted in April 2021. That application incomplete. When submitted and it remains incomplete.

—The City posted notice for this agenda item November 19, 2022. However, information on the current developments on city website has not been updated since April 2021. While the city may have followed the letter of the law in providing public notice, this certainly has not been a transparent process.

This is a very serious matter. Voters rejected the sprawling development proposed by Brue Baukol in our special election. This item must not appear on the council agenda before it is complete.

Sherry Sommer

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Please deny the proposal by Brue Baukol for Redtail Ridge at your meeting on November 10th

Importance: High

-----Original Message-----
From: Norma Anderson <norma22@icloud.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 6, 2022 10:47 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Please deny the proposal by Brue Baukol for Redtail Ridge at your meeting on November 10th

Dear Planning Commission,

I've written any number of letters, expressing my concern about the kind of planning Brue Baukol has made for the Redtail Ridge property.

Rather than reiterating what I've written so many times before, I'm going to implore you to please reject, once and for all, the plans Brue Baukol has continued to submit — each time without enough variation to reflect what the residents and citizens in Louisville have shown is necessary to have this area be developed.

Brue Baukol has been turned down by the City Council, put up for a general vote of Louisville residents and been soundly rejected, yet still Brue Baukol keeps bringing in all "the big guns" they can to get the project approved as they want it to be developed.

Please deny approval of Brue Baukol's plans for Redtail Ridge, for once and for all.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Norma Jean Anderson
1904 Steel Street
Louisville, Colorado 80027
norma22@me.com
(Landline) 303-954-9373
(Cell) 720-537-5901

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Deny Current Redtail Ridge Proposal

Importance: High

From: Laura Pederson <lppederson@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, November 6, 2022 11:11 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Deny Current Redtail Ridge Proposal

Hello,

I am writing once again to implore you to deny the current Redtail Ridge proposal.

The Redtail Ridge proposal doesn't address the concerns that led to the referendum. The updated plan is sprawling and needlessly destructive. The traffic and air quality impacts are even worse, and the previous sustainability measures have been removed.

The residents of Louisville are counting on the Planning Commission to rigorously enforce the City Code, and to ensure that the Redtail Ridge plan that moves forward is in full compliance with it.

Thanks and Regards,

Laura Pederson

2297 Cliffrose Lane

Louisville, Co.80027

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Louisville Municipal Code and RTR

From: sherry sommer <hellosherry2@yahoo.com>
Date: October 27, 2023 at 8:19:13 AM MDT
To: City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Louisville Municipal Code and RTR

Candidates discussed the pending Redtail Ridge application at Wednesday's panel discussion. There was confusion about the status of the application.

Our Planning Commission has recommended denial of the application because it does not meet the requirements of our municipal code. Read the commission's decision here:

https://www.louisvilleco.gov/home/showdocument?id=36760...](https://www.louisvilleco.gov/home/showdocument?id=36760&t=638031701898065640&fbclid=IwAR2tfvUC1fafqFckllX43e-TZClK_Q6LJa5VvpaQZQZAjw6IlmOlk3d3tRw)

Thanks to the League of Women Voters, the Chamber of Commerce, the DBA, and sponsors for supporting civic engagement.

Sherry Sommer

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Bev Snyder
To: City Council
Subject: RED TAIL RIDGE AGAIN
Date: Friday, February 2, 2024 10:51:34 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from bev@wisegator.com. Learn why this is important

Good morning to all,

Once again we are heading into a hearing about this property.

As far as I can tell the developer is presenting the same proposal we, THE VOTERS, turned down.

Here is what we think of this existing idea -

How long will this project take to complete - 10-20 years - unacceptable

The trees that are on the property now will be destroyed, where will the wild creatures go, what happens to the water supply?

The site will be completely graded - WHY? this is a very unnecessary practice

This idea will allow over 20,000 MORE cars/trucks a day on our current roads. This will create SO many more traffic problems and add pollution and the road upkeep will multiply. Has anyone actually factored this in what it is going to cost the city and county in the next several decades?

How much earlier will the city have to fix/replace the INTERLOCKEN exchange? Is there money to do this?

We DO NOT feel the developer has changed his intention for this area.

REMEMBER, we voters, voted against his intended development.

We would love to see a smaller development not reaching past Disc Drive - leaving the north side NOT GRADED or DEVELOPED to allow a natural area to continue on.

He, the developer, needs to comply with ALL city municipal codes and we definately want to keep our small town feel. That is what we want for our town - please refer back to the vote information of two (2) years ago.

This developer seems to feel that by pushing the same agenda over and over he can bully its way into existence. Please do not allow this.

And again, more of us want a SMALLER build there then those who do not.

Please honor our voting process and accept the outcome.

We are unable to attend the meeting tomorrow but we appreciate the time it took you to read this.

Bev Snyder and Rolland Fearn
304 Diamond Cir

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Carla Bigum
To: City Council
Subject: RedTail Ridge proposal
Date: Friday, February 2, 2024 10:26:44 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from bigumc@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear City Council Members of Louisville,

I write again to voice my objections to hearing from the developer for the City of Louisville land/property. I thought the citizen referendum vote two years ago indicated to council the wishes of the community. These were some of those concerns.

- Preservation of the ecologically rich portion of the site north of Disc Drive: no development, no grading
- Preservation of Louisville's small-town character
- Compliance with the city's municipal code

Is it true the developers would grade the entire or nearly the entire area? This is only one idea in the proposal which goes against the views of the community. I am still concerned about traffic issues. There is already a great deal of traffic on the roads in the same area. City of Broomfield across the street has continually added more traffic with the ongoing development across the street. This traffic will mix with the added traffic from the development.

At the February 6 meeting, PLEASE hear all the voices and weigh those concerns from the community against the resubmitted proposal. With new members on the council, the developer is seeking a favorable vote. Listen to the people of Louisville. While the land is highly attractive to a developer, the same area is attractive to the citizens as well as others who live in Boulder County.

Sincerely,
Carla Bigum
273 S Lincoln Ave.
Louisville, Colorado

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Sherry Bitler
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge Development
Date: Friday, February 2, 2024 10:12:45 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from sherbit50@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

This is a reminder that I was against the developer's plans for this parcel of land two years ago and, after seeing the "new" plans, have not changed my mind.

Take care,

Sherry Duncan Bitler
730 West St, Louisville, CO 80027
303 443 3277

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Cecilia Wilson
To: City Council
Subject: Again???
Date: Friday, February 2, 2024 10:08:51 AM

> Some people who received this message don't often get email from ceciliaawilson@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

How many times do we have to fight Red Tail Ridge??? I'm old and tired, but still very much opposed to the development as presented.

Best,
Cecilia Wilson
2311 CLiffrose Lane

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Lawrence Crowley
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge Development Proposal
Date: Friday, February 2, 2024 9:37:48 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from magic@ecentral.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

Dear Council Members,

I served on Louisville's Open Space Advisory Council for three years, so I have some experience and knowledge of our problems.

Please reject the latest proposal for developing Redtail Ridge. The developers do not have Louisville's best interests in mind. This proposal clearly in intended to maximize their benefits and profits at our expense.We need to keep Louisvilles small town character, preserve open space and the wildlife and natural areas that currently remain. Development should conform to Louisville's municipal code. We need to plan for the long run.

Please send these developers back to their lair to seriously make a plan that include the needs of Louisville as well as their own.

Thank you,

Lawrence Crowley
441 Pheasant Run
303-666-60640

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Paul T. Little
To: City Council
Subject: Please reject Redtail Ridge plan
Date: Friday, February 2, 2024 9:37:45 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from plittle@ptlittle.com. Learn why this is important

Hi, and thanks for your time. Please reject the Redtail Ridge plan.

Please honor the results of the special election to reject the sprawling Redtail Ridge development.

Redtail Ridge is a BAD DEAL for Louisville because of its:

- Massive, sprawling footprint requiring extensive grading
- Near-total decimation of trees, water sources, and wildlife habitat, especially in the area north of Disc Drive
- Road-clogging traffic (21,285 additional daily vehicle trips, according to the developer's own estimates) and new 4-lane roads
- Impact on the US 36 interchange at Interlocken, which is expected to fail prematurely
- 20 years of dusty, noisy construction
- Diversion effect on the McCaslin corridor and CTC commercial centers

Sincerely,

Paul T Little

545 Jefferson Ave, Lsvl.

--
Regards,
Paul

Paul T. Little
he / him
plittle@ptlittle.com
720-317-7014

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Geri DeLand
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge Development
Date: Friday, February 2, 2024 9:35:20 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from gerilyn359@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

I am not sure how many times the people of Louisville have told you that we do NOT want this development and yet you are still trying to push this through! Only leads me to believe that someone is getting their pockets lined. Why else would you push something like this through and against what the people of Louisville are telling you they want!

Over 30 years ago my family and I settled here in Louisville over every other town because of its small town feel, open spaces, schools etc. You are destroying it! Hasn't Louisville been through enough?? You need to spend more time working on keeping our businesses and restaurants instead of losing everything to Lafayette! Not everything should be about money!!!!

We do NOT want this development! It is time you started listening to us!

Signed,
Fed up!!!

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Michiko Christiansen
To: City Council
Subject: Thoughts on RTR
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:13:25 AM
Attachments: Dear council members 1 (11).docx

> Some people who received this message don't often get email from chikochrist@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear members,
Thank you for your time reading this letter.
M. Christiansen

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Dear Council members:

After reading about 970 something pages of Preliminary plat on Redtail Ridge and cross checking the previous monthly minutes, what I have found there are no new updates, and changes. I recommend denying the Preliminary Plat on Redtail Ridge and have them redraw and focus the development on the south of Disk Drive only and their plans to meet the city codes.

These are the questions needs to be fact checked. Here are the areas that needs to be clarified.

- The land dedication on the Paradise Lane is not in the City of Louisville, it is in the Boulder County.
  -Question: Does Boulder County know about this and what are their goals with this part of the property, Paradise Lane section? Is this location is currently already limited to 6 residential units by an Intergovernmental Agreement?
- Do you have the current letter from Broomfield regarding the Northwest Parkway traffic issue?
  - Question: Can we have both the DRCOG and the LSAB to be an oversight team regarding the traffic?
  The ratings in that area are graded big letter "F". Notice, Broomfield have their new buildings being built next door to us. More traffic and needs to upgrade the traffic studies to current date as of January 2024.
- Grading the land.
  -Question: Does this violated the LMC? Why there is a need for grading?
- Knowing Advent/Avista hospital will stay in their current location to continue to provide services such as ER, baby birthing, lab/radiology testing, recovery rooms and list goes on. This set up is the most convenient location because it is a stone throw to Monarch High school where the future students can be easily transported there with in a moment notice.
  - Question: What kind of expansion? A new Cancer centers? A new Kidney dialysis center? Would King Soopers, Whole Foods or Sprouts make a positive surrounding the Advent/Avista expansion?
  These two key words are important to understand Moving **and expansion has different meanings.**

-In the article and it rings true, and it is happening all over the U.S.A: “So much empty Office, so few easy options”.

-Question: What are the options?

Option #1: Look at the location by the new 7-11 on 96th St. the buildings are still empty. It is vital to focus the McCaslin area first. There will be a chance seeing a petition drawing up to change the empty buildings into affordable housing which it is happening right now across the nation.

Option #2: Creating local markets like grocery stores around the Advent/Avista expansion instead of office buildings.

- In the City of Louisville, the community itself are the local experts.

- Question: Is there a community involvement by gathering input, ideas, dreams, and conduct data research performed by the City of Louisville? Is the nonresident developer’s team to provide their expertise’s allowed?

I am wondering and asking these questions and would love to know the answers.

Why there is a reluctance to ask for a compact development on south of Disc Drive?

Why ignoring the Planning commission recommendation of denial?

Why ignoring the voice of the voters?

These questions are one of the ways to be well informed and get the real clarifications.

Thank you.

M. Christiansen

Louisville Resident

From:	cindy Bedell
To:	City Council; Meredyth Muth
Subject:	Feb 6 City Council Meeting: Resolution 80, Agenda Item approving Redtail Ridge Preliminary Subdivision Plat
Date:	Monday, February 5, 2024 12:36:41 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from cyndilarson@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important

Dear City Council:

There are many problems with this proposed resolution approving the Redtail Ridge Preliminary Subdivision plat. You should not approve it.

1.) Why is the Redtail Ridge Preliminary subdivision plat
being considered at this point without Northwest Parkway Authority approval?

"...the Authority and LLC believe that the City's consideration of the Preliminary Plat at this juncture is premature and object to its consideration in advance of agreements being reached and made part of the approval." Nov 30th, 2023 Electronic Communication to City Council

2.) Why is staff recommending approval when the Planning Commission recommended denial?

3.) Why is this development being considered when it is basically the same sprawling footprint that voters rejected first through a referendum, then a special election vote
overturning Ordinance 1811, Series 2021? Residents want less traffic, contiguous open space north of disc drive that preserves natural features, wildlife habitat, and viewsheds.
This proposed development still predicts over 21,000 additional vehicle trips per day, reduced LOS on adjacent roadways, and failure of the Northwest Parkway/96thStreet/Via Varra
intersection. Somehow with less square footage it is still going to have similar devastating impact on land use and road LOS. The development should be
clustered south of Disc Drive and overlay the previous Storage Tech footprint as much as possible.

4.) Where is the drainage report in this packet? Isn't it required in the packet for a preliminary subdivision plat?

5.) This plan calls for grading nearly the entire site, which will destroy the natural features and wildlife. This is unacceptable.

6.) **A new 2024 burrowing owl study is needed.** ERO Redtail Ridge Baseline Burrowing Owl Survey 1/19/21
""Based on the results of the 2020 surveys, burrowing owls do not currently occupy
the project area. ERO also determined that no burrowing owls or active burrowing owl nests are within the previously recommended 150 foot buffer (CDOW 2008) of the project area. In June 2020, changes in CPW guidance provided a new recommended buffer of 1,320 feet from active burrowing owl burrows for large industrial disturbances such as drilling rigs and residential developments, and a 660 foot buffer from active burrowing owl burrows for other activities (CPW 2020). ERO recommends that any future burrowing owl surveys be conducted to include an expanded survey area in accordance with the new CPW buffer guideliness. The results of the 2020 surveys are only valid for the 2020 breeding season and provide a baseline for burrowing owl activity at the Redtail Ridge development site".

7.) Including the Paradise Lane section in the total Open Space dedication is completely misleading. That parcel is not within the city of Louisville nor within the boundaries of the Redtail Ridge subdivision plat. In addition, it is already restricted through an IGA that limits development to a handful of large acreage residential units.

The actual open space dedication is only **69.41** acres once
Paradise Lane is deducted.

Figure 3: Public Land Dedication Summary

	Purpose	Acres
Tract B	Park	16.55
Tract C	Open Space	17.07
Tract D	Open Space	16.5
Tract E	Trail	3.64
Tract F	Trail	1.85
Tract H	Public Safety	0.7
Tract I	Open Space	35.84
Paradise Ln	Open Space	46.86
Total		139.01

In a development this large, representing 8% of the City of Louisville land, more open space is needed. Other big Louisville developments required more. Centennial Valley development dedicated over 35% of the land area to open space and Coal Creek Ranch dedicated over 46%.

You have the ability to require more as the Planning Commission recommended. Here are the municipal codes:

Municipal Codes Regarding Ability To Recommend More Open Space:
Code of Ordinances City of Louisville, Colorado
Sec. 16.16.010. - General design and construction standards.
D. Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible.
E. Schools, parks, churches and other community facilities should be planned for as an integral part of the area to the extent possible. Open space, park, and recreation areas must be located in such a manner as to create an area that is usable and accessible to the residents of the subdivision and shall otherwise conform to all applicable city standards and requirements. The need for additional open space, park, and recreation areas shall be based on the following factors: the city's comprehensive plan; topography, drainage, vegetation and other physical conditions; the type and density of the proposed development; the availability of other open space, park and recreation areas; and the overall need within the proposed development for such areas.
Sec. 17.28.080. - Open space.
A. Open space, in addition to the public use dedications specified in title 16, may be required by the city council upon recommendation by the planning commission. The requirement for additional open space will be based on the following factors:
1. Comprehensive development plan (including matters of state interest);
2. Topography, drainage, vegetation and other such physical conditions;
3. Anticipated socio-economic conditions;
4. Type and density of development and employment;
5. Overall need for open space and recreational facilities.
Such open space shall be owned and maintained as common open space by the developer or by an organization established for the ownership and maintenance of common open space, unless the city accepts dedication of the open space through mutual agreement between the developer or organization and the city council.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Best Regards,
Cindy Bedell
Louisville Ward II resident

From:	Jennifer Singer-Rupp
To:	City Council; Judi Kern; Caleb Dickinson; Christopher Leh; Deb Fahey; Barbara Hamlington; Dietrich Hoefner
Subject:	No to the current "RedTail Ridge" plan
Date:	Sunday, February 4, 2024 10:06:23 PM

Dear Mayor, Dear Louisville City Councilmembers,

Almost four years... How much we have all been through as a community these last four years. Once again, we are revisiting plans for the development of the former STK property (please see my previous email below regarding this development).....

We had a referendum that passed where a direction was chosen by the residents of Louisville for development plans of the former STK site. After the Marshall Fire, while residents who had lost their homes or were recovering from smoke damage were displaced, residents still cast their ballots in this referendum. Please follow the input of the majority of residents from this referendum and follow the democratic process. The direction the residents chose must be respected by our council representatives and I hope it will be reflected in your votes on Tuesday.

Virtually the same development plan was submitted to City Council by Brue Baukol post referendum. Please reject the current plans submitted by Brue Baukol for the former STK site and require them to reduce the footprint and preserve more of the natural habitat as was outlined in the referendum.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Singer Rupp
466 Muirfield Circle
Louisville, 80027

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Jennifer Singer-Rupp** <jsingerrupp@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 14, 2020 at 10:35 AM
Subject: No on "RedTail Ridge"
To: Ashley Stolzmann <AshleyS@louisvilleco.gov>, <CDickinson@louisvilleco.gov>, <Leh@louisvilleco.gov>, <DFahey@louisvilleco.gov>, <Lipton@louisvilleco.gov>, <KBrown@louisvilleco.gov>, <DennisM@louisvilleco.gov>

Dear Mayor, Dear Louisville City Councilmembers,

I am writing to renew my opposition to how the Red Tail Ridge development has evolved and urge you to vote against it in its current form. I urge you to vote NO on (i.e., reject) this development plan and PUD re-zoning from commercial/rural to suburban.

The expansion of size of the development is much too large. The proposal of 5 story buildings is absurd in the City of Louisville (I don't think we have any 5 story buildings) and the re-zoning to include residential

units goes against the original intent of this property. There are many other serious concerns about this project including short and long term impacts on traffic, infrastructure, wildlife, pollution, environmental, schools, property taxes, and water availability and rates. It was even mentioned in the June 11 meeting that the proposed development would increase our population by 25% - straining our current water sources and forcing us to expand our water works (which costs taxpayer money). We have no idea what this development will "cost" Louisville.

I grew up in Louisville and was the first first grade class to attend Coal Creek Elementary School. My father's first job out of college was at StorageTek. I have seen growth in Louisville. But this project as it is currently being proposed will forever change our town character and push our public works capacities to their limit. One listener on June 11 spoke to the view when one drives in from Denver to Louisville. After back to back developments, when we drive past Louisville, we are greeted with fields and open space. It was mentioned that StorageTek was required to construct their buildings such that they did not take away from this view. The buildings blended into the grasses and were constructed so they were more out of view. I have seen no discussions, considerations, or adjustments made on the part of the developers to take this into consideration. This piece of land is Louisville's flagship. It is our advertisement of who we are as a community to all people driving past on 36th.

I ask that the Louisville City Council please vote NO on (i.e., reject) this development plan and PUD.

Thank you for listening to and representing the position of the residents of Louisville.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Singer Rupp
466 Muirfield Circle
Louisville, 80027

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From:	Stephanie Schlageter
To:	City Council
Subject:	Please approve the Redtail Ridge Plat
Date:	Sunday, February 4, 2024 9:40:59 PM
Attachments:	image001.png Redtail Ridge Plat Letter of Support.docx

---

> Some people who received this message don't often get email from stephanie@radiancemedspa.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council,

Please see attached letter expressing my support of the Redtail Ridge Plat.

Thank you for your consideration,

Stephanie Schlageter

Stephanie Schlageter
Founder and CEO
www.radiancemedspa.com

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Stephanie Schlageter
916 Main Street
Louisville, CO 80027
stephanie@radiancemedspa.com

February 5, 2023

Dear Louisville City Council,

As an active participant in our business community, I wholeheartedly endorse the Redtail Ridge plat. Greenlighting this development paves the way for a cutting-edge life science campus, poised to attract top-tier companies, and also to bring an increase in customers for our businesses and new families for our communities.

Redtail Ridge represents an exciting opportunity to breathe new life into Louisville, especially in our downtown core. It will unlock the potential for a vibrant economic landscape, positioning Louisville as a key hub for growth and innovation.

The all-encompassing design of Redtail Ridge, with its emphasis on sustainability and accessibility, aligns with contemporary business values. It lays the foundation for a dynamic community where businesses can thrive alongside public amenities as well as open space, creating an environment where people can work, live, and engage in recreational activities.

Furthermore, the economic impact of this endeavor is considerable. It won't just generate employment opportunities but will also catalyze local commerce, benefiting businesses across many sectors. The presence of Avista Hospital within the development is particularly noteworthy, promising a steady stream of visitors and staff, keeping and growing jobs in our town as well as attracting new patrons for our downtown businesses.

Thank you for giving due consideration to this pivotal decision. I am confident that the Redtail Ridge development will mark the beginning of a new and prosperous chapter for Louisville.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Schlageter

CEO - Radiance Medspa, 916 Main Street, Louisville, CO 80027

Property Owner - 916 Main Street, Louisville, CO 80027

Board Member - Louisville Chamber of Commerce

Board Member - Louisville Downtown Business Association

From: Heather North
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge
Date: Sunday, February 4, 2024 8:26:32 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from heather.k.north@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council,

Two years ago, we held a special election the results of which were clear:

The people of Louisville said NO to a massive development.
The people of Louisville said NO to 21,000 additional vehicle trips on 96th Street.
The people of Louisville said NO to grading the entire site which would destroy the natural open space and animal habitats.
The people of Louisville made it clear that we would like a compact development south of Disk Drive and a building plan that meets city code.

As our city council, not only do you have a duty to the will of the people you represent, you have an opportunity to leave a lasting legacy of meaningful development that incorporates open space for future generations. In 100 years, no one will remark on the buildings that you promoted. Rather, they will be impressed by the views and the wild animals that inhabit the open space you preserved. Please send the current plan back to the drawing board as it does not meet city code, it does not preserve natural open space, and it does not fit in with the small town character of Louisville.

Many thanks for listening!
Ewen and Heather North

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Qian Wu
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge project
Date: Sunday, February 4, 2024 7:54:55 PM

> Some people who received this message don't often get email from qwu_us@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Mayor and city councils,

I am writing to you to opposite the RTR project. People of Louisville have voted against the RTR before. As elected leader of Louisville, you should respect the wishes of the people in this town. People of Louisville do not want large development at RTR. We Louisville can do better than Boulder, where too many constructions and developments have greatly degraded the quality of life.

Please vote down the project.

Best,
Qian Wu
146 Cherrywood Ln.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Kevin Delaney
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge
Date: Sunday, February 4, 2024 6:52:42 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from grayhorseelectric@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear City Council,
After the special election in 2022 defeated this unnecessary sprawl, I was disheartened to hear the same package is back before the Council. Please respect the results of the 2022 election! Invest in revitalizing the underutilized commercial buildings in Louisville before moving forward with this community suck and massive drain on our small town character. Please do what's right for the community and advocate for smart development and growth.
Thanks for listening!
Kind regards,
Kevin Delaney

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Lori Scheiffler
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge Plat Support
Date: Sunday, February 4, 2024 4:20:10 PM
Attachments: image002.png

> Some people who received this message don't often get email from loris@tamconsulting.com. Learn why this is important

Dear City Council Members,

I have lived in Louisville for 33 years. When my husband and I first moved to Louisville, he worked at StorageTek, formerly located on what is now referred to as Redtail Ridge Plat. Avista Hospital was a brand new hospital at the time. I've witnessed the positive growth of Louisville, experienced its many charms and community benefits and more recently become concerned as I've seen businesses exit, vacant storefronts and new businesses pop up in neighboring towns instead of Louisville. As a long time community member, I have grown increasingly concerned which is why I'm writing today.

As I understand it, our community has an opportunity to retain the quality healthcare services that have been provided for 30+ years through Avista Hospital by approving the current proposal for Redtail Ridge. I have been an outpatient of Avista Hospital many times and have used the Emergency Room services for myself, my kids and my husband more times than I would like! It is a comfort having their expert medical care so close by and accessible. Avista provides not only healthcare, but also jobs to our community. Avista is Louisville's largest employer, and I believe it is imperative to keep them in our town – not just close by!

Redtail Ridge also provides more open space for our town. My family has been frequent users of the existing open space in the community. As the population has grown, the need for more open space has increased. Not only that, but under the city's management, this open space can allow habitats to prosper and be preserved.

As I have mentioned, I'm extremely concerned about the number of businesses that have left Louisville, relocating to nearby communities (e.g., Lowe's, Alfalfa's, Kohl's). A walk down Main Street displays a few vacant restaurants (former Empire, former location of Waterloo that is simply a façade for the last several years.) There are also new restaurants, stores and other businesses that have chosen these same neighboring towns. In order to have a thriving city, we need to continually attract and provide opportunities for new businesses. Redtail Ridge helps add these opportunities, while also helping to bring new people to the community to patronize existing businesses.

Please consider this email a statement of resounding support for Redtail Ridge. In my mind, the community needs to continue to develop in accordance with Louisville's Comprehensive Plan and code. We need to have a thriving city again! Thank you for your consideration.

Cheers!

Lori Scheiffler
Co-Founder and President (she, her, hers)

TAMARRON CONSULTING
1900 Grant St, Suite 1170 | Denver, CO 80203
O 303.985.1126 | **M** 720.560.1846
Email | **Website**



==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Weiyan Chen
To: City Council
Subject: No massive development in RTR
Date: Sunday, February 4, 2024 4:01:45 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from weiyanch@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

Mr. Mayor and city council members,

I am writing to you to ask you vote No on the RTR (Redtail Ridge) proposal. In 2022, Louisville residents voted No on the proposal. This proposal is as bad as the last one. No means No.

I moved from Superior to Louisville because I do not like Superior's aggressive development, building on every inch of the land. I don't want that happening in Louisville. Since I moved to here, I have been proudly showing off the open spaces and historic downtown. My guests from out of state to out the country are so impressed and envying my living environment. Please keep Louisville as the sweet small town.

No massive development.
No 21000 additional cars to our road.

I want to remind all of you that you represent the best interests of residents of Louisville, not the best interest of the RTR developers.

Thank you

Weiyan Chen

146 Cherrywood Lane

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Ashley Zimmerer
To: City Council
Subject: Comments regarding Resolution No. 80 for the 2/6 meeting
Date: Sunday, February 4, 2024 3:34:07 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from zimmerer.ashley@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Hello City Council,

My name is Ashley Zimmerer and I live in Louisville. My drive to work takes me past Redtail Ridge multiple times a week; it's a beautiful area.

There are plenty of commercial areas in Louisville and the surrounding cities already. There is a brand new expansion to the Colorado Tech Center development practically right across the street from Redtail Ridge.

The proposed development in Resolution 80 would destroy wildlife habitat and add needless sprawl to the city.

Louisville residents, myself included, voted "No" on the Redtail Ridge development in 2022. Nothing has changed in the past year; the development was a bad fit for Louisville then, and remains a bad fit for Louisville now. Please respect the results of the special election and reject this proposed development.

The developers should come back with a new plan that meets city code, protects valuable wildlife habitat, and respects Louisville's small town character.

All the best,

Ashley Zimmerer

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: A R
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge
Date: Sunday, February 4, 2024 3:00:15 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from ar@metrocomp.com. Learn why this is important

Members of City Council,

Once again, I am writing to voice my opposition to the latest Redtail Ridge proposal. As best I can tell, this is the idenical proposal which was rejected by the Planning Commission over a year ago. Once again, the applicant has chosen to ignore the Commission and is attempting to do an end-around by taking the proposal directly to City Council. The applicant has a (long) history of bringing essentially identical proposals up for approval, and again and again, the answer has been NO. When City Council wanted to hear citizen feedback, a special election was held, and again the answer was NO.

While a landowner has a right to build on their property, this is only true if the plan meets code, and there are few negative impacts. In this case, the plan does not meet code, and there are sufficient negative impacts (most obviously, traffic impacts) for a NO vote. This been the issue all along.

At some point, Council must send a message to the applicant. There has been an enormous waste of time and money expended by the City, the Council, the Commission, and the Citizens dealing with this issue repeatedly, with no particular heed paid by the applicant to the many suggestions and ideas presented by everyone which could make the proposal more likely to be accepted.

Please either table this application until more new details are provided, or send it back to square one. How much longer are we to see the same proposal submitted?

Respectfully,
Andrew Rogowski
260 S Lincoln Ave
Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: stephanierowe00@gmail.com
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge
Date: Sunday, February 4, 2024 2:18:53 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from stephanierowe00@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council and Mayor Leh,

As you are all well aware, there are many reasons the current Redtail Ridge plan is not right for Louisville: the negative economic impact of diluting the tenant pool for the McCaslin corridor and the CTC, the impossible traffic jams that will come with 20k+ cars on the road, the environmental impact of such a sprawling footprint and so much asphalt, and the proposal's failure to meet the criteria of the city's municipal code, to name a few.

Should you all decide to approve the proposal anyway, over the manifest and overwhelming objections of the people you represent, you can perhaps mitigate some of the worst of the damage of this terribly conceived plan, a little, by requiring the developer to set **aside the northern portion of the land — that is, everything north of Disc and Tape Drives — and leave it as it is today**.

This would leave the developer the southern 2/3 of the site to sprawl all over as wantonly as they like, taking over the footprint of the old StorageTek facilities and beyond, in a southerly and westerly direction. Surely that is more than enough, even for this organization's rapacious vision.

Letting the northern portion of the site remain as it is, ungraded, would preserve its most ecologically rich area. This section, with its trees, vegetation, and ponds, is home to songbirds, raptors, snakes, bobcats, coyotes, foxes, prairie dogs, and likely even the occasional deer, moose, or bear. Rather than displacing these animals (and putting their lives at risk in doing so) or killing them outright, as in the case of more than 5,000 estimated prairie dogs now slated for extermination, setting aside this portion of the land would align with Louisville's stated goal of promoting biodiversity.

It would also, per a report by the Lynker Corporation + the Ember Alliance commissioned and paid for by the city of Louisville in the fall of 2023, be a significant step in our efforts to reduce our vulnerability to another devastating wildfire.

In Table 4-2 in the report, "Potential wildfire mitigation approaches on different property types owned and managed by the City of Louisville," the consultants recommend the following:

> **Conservation of existing prairie dog colonies and natural expansion of colonies (where feasible) to preserve natural fuel breaks created by animal activity.**

Dr. Meg Matonis, Senior Wildfire Analyst with Ember Alliance, presented a list of wildfire risk mitigation strategies before city council on October 17, 2023. These include — in fact, start with — **"stewardship of prairie dog colonies, which actually create really high-quality fuel breaks"** (at minute 27:3 in the video recording of that meeting).

The city of Louisville paid for this study. If we're not going to listen to the experts we trusted to undertake this inquiry, I as a taxpayer would certainly like the city to get my money back.

Finally, I would be remiss if I didn't remind you, for the 1000th time, that LMC 16.16.010 exists and, by

the law laid down in the municipal code, must be applied to the Redtail Ridge application: "**Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible**."

Are you able to look the people of Louisville in the eye and provide answers to these questions:

1. Does the application demonstrate that every effort has been made to "preserve and enhance to the extent reasonably possible" the natural features, including trees, of this property?

2. What are these efforts, exactly?

3. Does the developer make a convincing case, supported by credible documentation, that the destruction of the trees, vegetation, a pond, and wild animals is justified?

I appreciate that serving on city council is an enormous commitment of time and effort. And the pressures of resisting such a deep-pocketed developer must be a strain. Still, you've all sworn an oath to protect and advance the interests of the people you represent. Ignoring the municipal code and the scientists you're paying to advise you does not protect our interests or promote our well-being. Please approach the Redtail Ridge application with an open mind, look for facts, apply the LMC, and listen to what the people who've asked you to represent have to say.

Thank you,

Stephanie Rowe
631 West Street, Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Maryan Jaross
To: City Council
Subject: Retail Ridge
Date: Sunday, February 4, 2024 1:44:52 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from mjaross@comcast.net. Learn why this is important

Council members,

While I understand the need to develop this property and the importance of having an appropriate space for the hospital, I would still prefer to see underground parking or garages to minimize miles of parking lots, a grocery store near the fire station to capture tax revenue from all the housing on the Broomfield side of the street, and a commitment to provide some kind of jitney service to downtown Louisville to maximize business but not negatively impact the parking situation for residents.

I am pleased to see that there will be a new egress from Monarch and that reworking the Hwy 36 interchange is being taken into account.

In addition, I would like to see what is being forecast for the current hospital property, since that is closer to Coal Creek Ranch and we are concerned about the impact of traffic on a two-lane road.

Thank you,

Maryan Jaross
846 St. Andrews Lane
Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Susannah Pels
To: City Council; BHalington@louisvilleco.gov; Dietrich Hoefner
Subject: Redtail Ridge Proposal
Date: Sunday, February 4, 2024 12:56:21 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from suzie@dennistenney.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

Dear Council,
Please vote No on Feb 6, 2024 on current Redtail Ridge proposal. Currently it does not correct the concerns that resulted in the special election of 2022. Empty stores are not a source of revenue. As a Louisville resident since 1985, I have valued the small town environment admist the Front Range sprawl.
Yours ,
Susannah H. Pels
556 Grant Ave
Louisville Co. 80027
Sent from my iPad

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Dennis Tenney
To: City Council; BHalington@LouisvilleCO.gov; Dietrich Hoefner
Subject: NO on the Redtail Ridge proposal
Date: Sunday, February 4, 2024 12:08:03 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from yogafun@dennistenney.com. Learn why this is important

I urge you to vote NO on the Redtail Ridge proposal before city council on February 6, 2024.

As a resident of Louisville since 1985 and Boulder County since 1967 I strongly feel this proposal is inconsistent with many of the things I love about Louisville.

- it is simply too much development in too small an area.Too much of a burden on our existing culture and infrastructure.
- does this proposal even meet existing city codes? Please do not make an exception or change the codes.

- approval would not respect the special election vote, please respect the citizens of Louisville. This proposal still embodies many of the primary reasons we voted against it.
- Everything you've already heard against this money grab by an outside developer.
- Revenue will always be needed for the City of Louisville but please not this.

Peace and Love
Dennis Tenney
556 Grant Ave

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Melissa DuBois
To: City Council
Subject: No On Redtail Ridge Proposal
Date: Sunday, February 4, 2024 10:57:30 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from meldubois@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council,

My name is Melissa DuBois I am a long-time resident of Louisville currently living at 657 Owl Drive.

I would like to urge you to please reject the current proposal for the Redtail Ridge development. The developers have not respected the municipal code or the wishes of Louisville residents in their proposal.

I would like to urge the Council to continue to honor the wishes of Louisville voters, as well as the city municipal code, by requiring the following:

- **A compact development that remains south of Disc Drive**
- **Preservation of the ecologically rich portion of the site north of Disc Drive: no development, no grading**
- **Preservation of Louisville's small-town character**
- **Compliance with the city's municipal code**

Thank you for your service to the people of Louisville, and for standing up to big developers who wish to take advantage of our town.

Melissa DuBois

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Chris Wheeler
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge
Date: Sunday, February 4, 2024 10:55:00 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from chris@greatdividepictures.com. Learn why this is important

I have actively opposed this from the start. The developers of Redtail Ridge are relentlessly pursuing a project that is great for their corporate investors and bad for the people of Louisville. We want open space to protect the environment and to maintain a buffer that cushions us from the metro area. Our quality of life is a stake. Concrete is permanent. The people have already spoken. The revised proposal is nothing more than lipstick on a pig. I hope you have the courage to say no to corporate greed, and yes to the environment- and yes for the will of the people of Louisville.

Chris Wheeler
Great Divide Pictures
Sent from my iPhone

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From:	sherry sommer
To:	City Council; Barbara Hamlington; Judi Kern; Deb Fahey; Caleb Dickinson; Christopher Leh
Cc:	Jeff Durbin; Rob Zuccaro
Subject:	Fw: NO Redtail Ridge Preliminary
Date:	Sunday, February 4, 2024 10:44:50 AM

Members of council:

On February 6th, you will be acting as judges under the **quasi judicial process** on this agenda item:

RESOLUTION NO. 80, SERIES 2023 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE REDTAIL RIDGE FILING NO. 1PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT – continued from 12/5/2

You are also obligated to recognize the democratic process. Voters said NO to sprawl and YES to preserving all land north of Disc Drive in our special election. Council has a mandate from voters, under the democratic process, and authority given to you from our municipal code, to preserve natural features and require more open space.

This resolution, just like Ordinance 1811, which you sent to a vote on December 21, 2021, is for development that is way too big and needlessly destructive. Our Planning Commission has recommended denial because it does not meet our municipal code.

Council spoke about **the importance of the democratic process** when you sent the referendum petition to a vote. Council members Fahey and Dickinson and then council member Leh talked about their respect for the **democratic process** and their desire to give the power to the people to decide. Although sending this vote cost the city 90,000, you said it would be worth it to hear from the entire electorate. **You said you would respect the outcome of the vote and are obligated by Colorado State law and Louisville Municipal Code to do so.**

This application varies from previous versions on technicalities. It is still too big.

Residents campaigned against seemingly insurmountable odds. The ordinance was sent to the ballot only 9 days before the Marshall fire. We were outspent 32:1. We had 3,000 and and Brue Baukol donated 93,000.00 to the Yes campaign. Without the fire and Brue Baukol's outsized campaign contribution, we would have won by much more.

The current application is still sprawling and needlessly destructive of habitat, natural features, trees, and soil. It is not significantly different than the application we first saw as far back as 2020 when over 750 residents wrote to you with their concerns. The applicant has submitted the same grading and drainage plans each time they came to council. . They intend to grade 350 acres of the site. Planning Commission ruled in November 2022 that this application does not meet Louisville Municipal code.

Since 2020, the majority of residents have consistently spoken out against a too-big development. Your constituents voted NO to sprawl and needless destruction.

Recognize the results of the special election. You have the mandate and the authority under Louisville Municipal Code.

Preserve all land north of Disc Drive.

Sherry Sommer

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From:	sherry sommer
To:	City Council; Barbara Hamlington; Deb Fahey; Caleb Dickinson; Christopher Leh; Judi Kern
Subject:	NO Redtail Ridge Preliminary Approval
Date:	Sunday, February 4, 2024 10:34:11 AM

Members of Council:

On February 6th, you will be acting as judges under the **quasi judicial process** on this agenda item:

RESOLUTION NO. 80, SERIES 2023 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE REDTAIL RIDGE FILING NO. 1PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT – continued from 12/5/2

You are also obligated to recognize the democratic process. Voters said NO to sprawl and YES to preserving all land north of Disc Drive in our special election. Council has a mandate from voters, under the democratic process, and authority given to you from our municipal code, to preserve natural features and require more open space.

This resolution, just like Ordinance 1811, which you sent to a vote on December 21, 2021, is for development that is way too big and needlessly destructive.

Council spoke about **the importance of the democratic process** when you sent the referendum petition to a vote. Council members Fahey and Dickinson and then council member Leh talked about their respect for the **democratic process** and their desire to give the power to the people to decide. Although sending this vote cost the city 90,000, you said it would be worth it to hear from the entire electorate. **You said you would respect the outcome of the vote and are obligated by Colorado State law and Louisville Municipal Code to do so.**

Residents campaigned against seemingly insurmountable odds. The ordinance was sent to the ballot only 9 days before the Marshall fire. We were outspent 32:1. We had 3,000 and and Brue Baukol donated 93,000.00 to the Yes campaign. Without the fire and Brue Baukol's outsized campaign contribution, we would have won by much more.

The current application is still sprawling and needlessly destructive of habitat, natural features, trees, and soil. It is not significantly different than the application we first saw as far back as 2020 when over 750 residents wrote to you with their concerns. The applicant has submitted the same grading and drainage plans each time they came to council. . They intend to grade 350 acres of the site. Planning Commission ruled in November 2022 that this application does not meet Louisville Municipal code.

Since 2020, the majority of residents have consistently spoken out against a too-big development. Your constituents voted NO to sprawl and needless destruction.

Recognize the results of the special election. You have the mandate and the authority under Louisville Municipal Code.

Preserve all land north of Disc Drive.

Sherry Sommer

From: Lorena Soares
To: City Council
Subject: Retail Ridge
Date: Sunday, February 4, 2024 10:22:06 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from lorena44@msn.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

Cannot be at the meeting but want to express my and husband’s vote to create business development at the site. Stop sending taxable income to “Lafayette”.
L and D
Sent from my iPad

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Todd Rowan
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge Support - Approve the Plat
Date: Sunday, February 4, 2024 9:42:57 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from todd.e.rowan@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Hello City Council,

I am a Louisville Ward 1 resident and have watched the city council be unduly influenced by a small number of vocal residents in the city opposed to real estate development within our borders. Medtronic went elsewhere. Conoco (for various reasons...including our own ineptitude) went elsewhere. Avista may leave.

At what point do we, collectively, realize these are all "own goals?" (unflattering soccer reference) Do the anti-growth residents hold so much sway that reasonable city leaders cannot see that our economic vitality is at risk. Louisville already has a well-deserved reputation for being business unfriendly. It is also becoming homeowner unfriendly (reference the unnecessary difficulty Marshal fire victims had with the rebuilding process). Own goals.

You have a chance to bring some sanity back to the city and re-establish Louisville as a place that hangs the "open for business" sign once again. Fear mongering opponents to the Redtail Ridge development talk about changing the very fabric of Louisville. They screech about traffic and environmental blah blah blah. They discuss tax giveaways as if those where a bad thing and weren't used every day by cities all across our country to stimulate development and economic growth. They do this while Erie, Superior and Lafayette continue to thrive at our expense and reap the benefits of an enlightened citizenry and a group of city leaders with a long term vision.

I support the Redtail Ridge development and the benefits it brings to our city. Let's please not hold out, yet again, for some phantom improvements to the development plan that will supposedly benefit the environment, mitigate traffic issues and keep our cost of living low. Please...no more own goals. Let's develop a long-forgotten and forsaken corner of our city and help local businesses compete with surrounding municipalities.

I urge you to approve the Redtail Ridge development.

Todd Rowan
Ward 1

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Sarah Gibson
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge
Date: Sunday, February 4, 2024 8:38:48 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from semeg@me.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council,

Two years ago, we held a special election the results of which were clear:

The people of Louisville said NO to a massive development.
The people of Louisville said NO to 21,000 additional vehicle trips on 96th Street.
The people of Louisville said NO to grading the entire site which would destroy the natural open space and animal habitats.
The people of Louisville made it clear that we would like a compact development south of Disk Drive and a building plan that meets city code.

As our city council, not only do you have a duty to the will of the people you represent, you have an opportunity to leave a lasting legacy of meaningful development that incorporates open space for future generations. In 100 years, no one will remark on the buildings that you promoted. Rather, they will be impressed by the views and the wild animals that inhabit the open space you preserved. Please send the current plan back to the drawing board as it does not meet city code, it does not preserve natural open space, and it does not fit in with the small town character of Louisville.

Sincerely,
Sarah Gibson
748 Cleveland Ave
Louisville CO
80027

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Laura Pederson
To: City Council
Subject: Reject Redtail Ridge Development Plan
Date: Sunday, February 4, 2024 8:23:43 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from lppederson@comcast.net. Learn why this is important

Once again, I am imploring you to reject the current Redtail Ridge development plan. The citizens of Louisville have repeatedly demonstrated their steadfast objection to the proposal. Please listen to the community that you were elected to serve, and respect their wishes.

Thanks and Regards,

Laura Parks-Pederson

2297 Cliffrose Lane

Louisville, Co. 80027

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: heather gardner
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge
Date: Saturday, February 3, 2024 3:54:24 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from hg.indigoink@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council,

Two years ago, we held a special election the results of which were clear:

The people of Louisville said NO to a massive development.
The people of Louisville said NO to 21,000 additional vehicle trips on 96th Street.
The people of Louisville said NO to grading the entire site which would destroy the natural open space and animal habitats.
The people of Louisville made it clear that we would like a compact development south of Disk Drive and a building plan that meets city code.

As our city council, not only do you have a duty to the will of the people you represent, you have an opportunity to leave a lasting legacy of meaningful development that incorporates open space for future generations. In 100 years, no one will remark on the buildings that you promoted. Rather, they will be impressed by the views and the wild animals that inhabit the open space you preserved. Please send the current plan back to the drawing board as it does not meet city code, it does not preserve natural open space, and it does not fit in with the small town character of Louisville.

Sincerely,
Heather Gardner and Alan Muir
1158 La Farge Ave.
Louisville, CO 80027

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Jill Kenney
To: City Council
Subject: We Could Use a New Hospital
Date: Saturday, February 3, 2024 3:11:36 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jill_kenney@msn.com. Learn why this is important

Dear City Council,

I have lived in this area for 23 years. One of the staples of this community has always been Avista Adventist Hospital. My son, my mother-in-law, and I have all had surgery at Avista. Our entire family, including my husband, have all been to the ER or been treated at Avista. What stands out about Avista is the short wait times for the ER, the excellent care provided by the doctors and staff, and the kindness that only a community hospital can offer. It would be great to have a new Avista Hospital on the area currently referred to as Redtail Ridge. It would allow expansion for the hospital and give Avista a chance to get a new, state-of-the-art facility. It's not just about a new building. It is also about enhancing the hospital's ability to serve Louisville and the surrounding area with advanced medical care. A new location near mass transit also allows the hospital to attract more talent and makes healthcare more accessible to those without private transportation.

This move is an opportunity for growth, not just for Avista, but for Louisville as a whole. Keeping the hospital in Louisville, as opposed to Broomfield or other locations which will be the possible fall-back, helps Louisville economically and technologically.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jill Kenney

Jill F. Kenney
Attorney

303-249-8733 (mobile)
Jill_Kenney@msn.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail transmission, and any documents, files, or previous e-mail messages attached to it, may contain confidential information, some or all of which may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, please be advised that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of any of the information contained in or attached to this e-mail transmission is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail transmission in error, please immediately notify us by reply e-mail or via telephone or facsimile, and destroy the original e-mail transmission and its attachments. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

From: Hilary Talocco
To: City Council
Subject: Support Redtail Ridge
Date: Saturday, February 3, 2024 12:52:27 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from hilarytalocco@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

I'm writing to encourage the city council to support the redtail ridge proposal.

Thank you.

Hilary Talocco
Ward 2

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Bustos, Scott A - (DEN)
To: City Council
Subject: Support for Avista's Move to Redtail Ridge
Date: Saturday, February 3, 2024 11:53:03 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from sbustos@tcco.com. Learn why this is important

Re: **Support for Avista Hospital Move to Redtail Ridge**

Members of Louisville City Council-

As a member of the Board of Trustees for Avista Hospital, I provide this as my emphatic support of the Redtail Ridge development.

As a Trustee, I have long admired the mission driven purpose of the staff and leadership at Avista to fulfill their commitment of whole health care for body, mind and spirit. While this is their purpose and commitment for the community this Council serves to represent, the age and physical constraints of the existing hospital and campus are not aligned with level of care provided… there is a "gap" between the mission, hearts and care provided in the building and the buildings themselves.

The Redtail Ridge development and your approval are the critically essential "bridge" that provides alignment of mission and purpose with much needed state-of-the art facilities. I am guessing, like me, that you may not be a doctor, nurse or healthcare worker, but your support and approval enhance the ability for these great people to do what they do everyday for patients, visitors and the community of Louisville.

With hope and gratitude for your support!

Scott Bustos | Vice President & General Manager
Turner Construction Company | 1401 Zuni St, Ste 301 | Denver, CO 80204
Office 303.753.9600 | Mobile 720.388.0848 | sbustos@tcco.com
website | linkedin | facebook | twitter | youtube | pinterest | instagram

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Andy Meseck
To: City Council
Subject: Please Support the Redtail Ridge Plan
Date: Saturday, February 3, 2024 11:25:54 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from ameseck@comcast.net. Learn why this is important

My wife and I have been Louisville residents since 1995. We have watched this city grow and improve in so many ways - I've volunteered for boards and my youngest son and I have both worked for the city in various capacities . Our sons were both born at Avista and graduated from Monarch High, and we felt that the plan proposed a few years back was ideal for that location, with nothing but upside in terms of business/revenue for old town and the McCaslin corridor, which is sorely needed. We both volunteered to support the YES for Redtail Ridge Campaign during the special election, knocking on doors and hanging flyers. I feel that the only reason that it was voted down was due to a well-organized misinformation campaign, which even shamelessly claimed that the city was incapable of managing the fire recovery and this development simultaneously. Our town's progress and its reputation have been damaged by this vocal minority, and our citizens are finally seeing the light. I firmly believe that if that election was held today that the outcome would be different.

That plot of land has sat vacant and unutilized for long enough. This is a solid plan and provides the additional access that Monarch High desperately needs along with a future home for Avista Hospital. Let's get this done so that we can move forward and send a message to our current businesses and prospective businesses that Louisville has their support. Please vote YES on this Redtail Ridge plan.

Andy Meseck
879 Cleveland Ct.
303.886.2472

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From:	sherry sommer
To:	City Council; Caleb Dickinson; Deb Fahey; Barbara Hamlington; Christopher Leh; Judi Kern
Subject:	Redtail Ridge at City Council on Tuesday
Date:	Saturday, February 3, 2024 9:24:41 AM

Show Up, Speak Up on February 6

Calling all Louisvillians!

Two years ago, we voted in a special election to reject the sprawling Redtail Ridge development proposed for the old StorageTek property at the southeast corner of town. Now, the developers are back with a proposal for the same spread-out development.

What's worse: They plan to grade nearly the entire site, including areas they won't be building on, destroying wildlife habitat, a pond, and natural drainage channels.

Next Tuesday, February 6, at 6:00 pm, City Council again takes up the Redtail Ridge question. (This is the hearing originally scheduled for December 5 but postponed.)

Ready to finally put this matter to rest?

Please **SPEAK UP** in person at the Council meeting on Tuesday, and please **WRITE** to Council before Tuesday morning. Tell them **Redtail Ridge is a BAD DEAL for Louisville** because of its:

- Massive, sprawling footprint requiring extensive grading
- Near-total decimation of trees, water sources, and wildlife habitat, especially in the area north of Disc Drive
- Road-clogging traffic (21,285 additional daily vehicle trips, according to the developer's own estimates) and new 4-lane roads
- Impact on the US 36 interchange at Interlocken, which is expected to fail prematurely
- 20 years of dusty, noisy construction

- Diversion effect on the McCaslin corridor and CTC commercial centers

What City Council *can* do is **send the developer back to the drawing board.** The *only* plan Council should seriously consider is one that **respects Louisville residents' priorities**, expressed over and over since 2020 and made clear in the referendum:

- A compact development that remains south of Disc Drive

- Preservation of the ecologically rich portion of the site north of Disc Drive: no development, no grading

- Preservation of Louisville's small-town character

- Compliance with the city's municipal code

Our mayor and representatives on Council have one responsibility above all: To **respect and uphold the democratic process.** This means:

- Listening to residents and authentically engaging with their concerns and ideas

- Honoring Louisville's democratically-created municipal code

- Rejecting false rumors like the one saying Avista will leave Louisville without Redtail Ridge: *the Avista CEO affirms the hospital is staying, no matter what*

What you can do:

- Send an email by noon on Feb. 6 to Council@LouisvilleCO.gov

- Attend the hearing **on Tuesday, February 6 at 6 pm at City Hall, 749 Main Street**

- Speak up on **Zoom** (if you can't attend in person; find the link under Regular & Special meetings here)

- Visit PreserveLouisville.org

- Join our email list, below

Let's do this, Louisville!

Visit our Website

Join our E-mail List



==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: 18
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail ridge
Date: Saturday, February 3, 2024 9:03:41 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from aghart18@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important

I am sending these comments to the Louisville City Council because I am opposed to the Brue Baukol Redtail Ridge development.

I believe Redtail Ridge is a very bad idea for Louisville because of its massive, sprawling footprint which requires extensive grading. This will result in near-total decimation of trees, water sources, and wildlife habitat, especially in the area north of Disc Drive - something our area cannot afford.

It will also cause road-clogging traffic (21,285 additional daily vehicle trips, according to the developer's own estimates) and new 4-lane roads. We already experience traffic delays, we cannot bear more.

There will be a negative impact on the US 36 interchange at Interlocken, which is expected to fail prematurely.

This project has the capacity to cause twenty years of dusty, noisy construction. This is not the ideal we want in Louisville.

Also, it will have a diversion effect on the McCaslin corridor and CTC commercial centers - this will have a negative impact on the economy.

The City Council must send the developer back to square one. The only plan the City Council should seriously consider is one that respects Louisville residents' priorities, expressed over and over since 2020 - and made clear in the referendum.

Our priorities consist of listening to residents and authentically engaging with their concerns and ideas. It's also important to honor Louisville's democratically-created municipal code. And finally, you must reject the false rumor saying Avista will leave Louisville without Redtail Ridge. The Avista CEO has affirmed that the hospital is staying regardless.

Thank you for considering my comments regarding this critically important issue. And thank you for the work you do on behalf of the City of Louisville.

Sincerely,
Andrew Hartman
2514 Evans Ave
Louisville CO 80027
Sent from my iPhone

From: Janette Kotichas
To: City Council
Subject: Tedtail Ridge
Date: Saturday, February 3, 2024 8:37:08 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from janettekotichas@mac.com. Learn why this is important

Redtail Ridge is a BAD DEAL for Louisvillebecause of its:

- Massive, sprawling footprint requiring extensive grading
- Near-total decimation of trees, water sources, and wildlife habitat, especially in the area north of Disc Drive
- Road-clogging traffic (21,285 additional daily vehicle trips, according to the developer's own estimates) and new 4-lane roads
- Impact on the US 36 interchange at Interlocken, which is expected to fail prematurely
- 20 years of dusty, noisy construction
- Diversion effect on the McCaslin corridor and CTC commercial centers

Send the developer back to the drawing board. The *only* plan Council should seriously consider is one that **respects Louisville residents' priorities**, expressed **over and over** since 2020 and made clear in the referendum:

- A compact development that remains south of Disc Drive
- Preservation of the ecologically rich portion of the site north of Disc Drive: no development, no grading
- Preservation of Louisville's small-town character
- Compliance with the city's municipal code

As elected representatives, you have one responsibility above all: To **respect and uphold the democratic process**. This means:

- Listening to residents and authentically engaging with their concerns and ideas
- Honoring Louisville's democratically-created municipal code
- Rejecting false rumors like the one saying Avista will leave Louisville without Redtail Ridge: *the Avista CEO affirms the hospital is staying, no matter what*

Janette Kotichas
278 Juniper Street
Louisville, CO 80027

Sent from my iPhone

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Aaron Grider
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge
Date: Saturday, February 3, 2024 6:00:40 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from aaronapg@icloud.com. Learn why this is important

Louisville City Council,

Good morning. My family and I are residents of Louisville on Nighthawk Circle. I am writing to request that you please reject the current development proposal for Redtail Ridge. The only development plan for Redtail Ridge that Council should consider is one that incorporates the following values, which are held by my family and I, as well as our neighbors and friends in Louisville:

A compact development that remains south of Disc Drive

Preservation of the ecologically rich portion of the site north of Disc Drive: no development, no grading

Preservation of Louisville's small-town character

Compliance with the city's municipal code

Thank you for your service and for considering my request.

Aaron Grider
Colorado, USA
303-552-1083

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: SCOTT HALLGREN
To: City Council
Subject: Avista hospital at Redtail Ridge
Date: Friday, February 2, 2024 7:16:35 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from ercpman@aol.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

Dear Louisville Council Members

It is with great pleasure that I forward this letter of support for the new Avista Hospital in the Redtail Ridge development. Avista has been a medical main stay of the Louisville community for decades, but the current facility has clearly run through its lifespan. A new modern state of the art hospital is ready to be built by the Advent healthcare system. The location in Redtail Ridge would provide easy access to medical care for the Louisville area and the surrounding cities. A high-tech hospital with excellent RTD access will decrease carbon emissions dramatically.

I joined the Avista staff in 2011 and am a major supporter of the new facility. It will provide high-quality medical care while employing many local residents, and contributing significantly to the Louisville community economy.

Thanks much for your consideration.

Scott

Scott E Hallgren DO FACP FASGE

Sent from my iPhone

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Phil/Dawn
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge
Date: Friday, February 2, 2024 5:16:17 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from albanesium@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

As 37 year residents of Louisville my wife and I say **NO to Redtail ridge!**
Thank you
Sincerely, Phil & Dawn Albanese
540 Ridgeview Dr.
Louisville, CO 80027

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: mary kosenski
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge
Date: Friday, February 2, 2024 4:00:09 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from mkosenski@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

We have lived in Louisville for over 36 years, and have seen what over development has done to our small town. We need you to respect the special election vote we voted for. We don't need more over development! Traffic is horrible because of the development! Please rethink this over development, and try to retain some semblance of small town Louisville!
Thank you
Sent from my iPhone

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Charlene Bandurian
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge Development
Date: Friday, February 2, 2024 3:30:20 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from clbandurian@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important

City Council:

I am a longtime resident of Louisville. We purchased our home here in 1984.

The proposed plan for Redtail Ridge is not reflecting the desires of thousands of Louisville residents who voted in the referendum. The present plan of grading the site is the exact opposite of what the townspeople of Louisville have expressed they want. The damage of grading to wildlife and the environment of the site, including trees and a pond is a slap in the face to all of those who have expressed concern.

I want the council to consider what environmental damage will occur with grading. The wildlife will be destroyed in addition to years of tree growth. This would be an insensitive and destructive act done in the spirit of financial gain. Haven't we learned yet how to live with respect for the environment instead of wiping out what was there before us and what is greater than us?

With the development as it is presently outlined, the small-town character of Louisville will be destroyed. The council needs to listen to the desires of residents and honor Louisville's democratically-created municipal code. A referendum in a special election was rejected two years ago by Louisville citizens.

It is clear that what the citizens of Louisville want is a compact development that stays south of Disc Drive. The developer has to go back to the drawing board and come up with a plan that respects Louisville residents priorities that were expressed many times since 2020 and were made clear in the referendum.

Because of all these things, I reject the proposed plan that is even worse than the original one. I call for the City Council to reject this plan in the name of all the residents that elected them in good faith - in good faith that their decisions would only improve life in Louisville, not destroy it.

Charlene Bandurian
139 Lincoln Circle
Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Mike Deborski
To: City Council
Subject: Fwd: FW: Red Tail Ridge
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:24:00 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from mikedeborski@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Respected city council,

I'm writing to you in support of the newly proposed Red Tail development. Over my lifetime, this property has been know as a mine dump, baren pasture, the home of an excavation company, Varra Enterprises and most recently Storage Tek Corporation. Thus, it has a long history of industrial use.

Storage Tek was by far-our single largest employer in Louisville for decades. I'm told In its peak, this site had multiple buildings and over 7,000 employees on site. The positive economic impact it made upon Louisville was immense. It brought property tax revenue and more importantly helped drive the economy of our small retailers, restaurants supporting our Old Town and McCaslin Blvd business.

Since the exit of STK, Louisville has lost multiple businesses throughout town and especially along the McCaslin corridor. To have major employers is critical to the economic balance of a municipality.

We now have an opportunity to replace that revenue stream and at the same time secure the long term future of Avista Hospital, our current largest single employer. In addition, it will bring long over due access to Monarch High School that will allow for safer access for students, teachers, parents, and most important, emergency response. This should help alleviate the stacking on south 88th and Dillon.

It's my understanding The hundreds of thousands square feet of Storage Tek buildings were scraped to mitigate the heavy metal clean-up and tax burden of these expired structures. Thus, I can understand why the Johnny come lately, open space mongers perceive it as open space.

However, this site has had industrial zoning entitlements since the 1970's. It runs adjacent to highway 36 with its 24 hour a day noise and has a Xcel energy substation on site. The redemptive value as open space is marginal at best. Our open space advisory board should have much higher targets on its list to capture bang for our open space buck. The Marshall fire demonstrates that we and Boulder County currently have more acres of open space than we can properly manage.

I'm a huge proponent of property rights and believe once zoned within the city. Land should be utilized to its highest and best use at the owners discretion. This proposed application not only hits the mark but exceeded the expectation with a well planned energy efficient progressive development that will retain our city's greatest employer, bring new tech industry and benefit the safe access of Monarch High School. To ice the cake, they are making the largest public dedication of land in Louisville's history.

I respectfully request that Louisville City Council embraces and approves this project.

Michael Deborski

601 Pine Street

Louisville, CO 80027

Get Outlook for iOS

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Jeff Regier
To: City Council
Subject: No on Redtail Ridge
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:56:18 AM

> Some people who received this message don't often get email from regierjeff@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

I've been against this development from the beginning. Sent numerous emails. Voted in a special been. All of the talking points are on the table.
Please do not let this go forward.

Jeff Regier
Matchless St.
Louisville, CO

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Laura Shaffer
To: City Council
Subject: Please approve the Redtail Ridge Preliminary Plat
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 11:17:41 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from lalshaffer@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council Members,

I am writing in support of the Redtail Ridge preliminary plat. I believe the developer has the right to develop their privately owned land within the permitted zoning uses and in accordance with the specifications outlined in the 2010 GDP.

The comprehensive benefits of moving forward on Redtail Ridge are clear and very important for our town. Of utmost importance is keeping Avista Hospital, our largest employer, in Louisville. It is where I delivered my three babies. We need to retain the jobs and healthcare services Avista provides to our residents. Approving this plat ensures Avista's continued contribution to our community.

As a parent of a Monarch High School student, we urgently need your approval of the Redtail Ridge preliminary plat because it will provide a much-needed extension of Campus Dr making for a safer and better connected route to Monarch.

Red Tail Ridge has the potential to be a vibrant hub where businesses thrive alongside publicly accessible green spaces and miles of trails. This balance is crucial for creating an environment where people want to work, live, and play. Despite the dissent within the opposition regarding the development of this open space, I contend that this is a nuanced aspect worth deliberating. I remain in favor of this development but advocate for collaborative efforts with the developer to fine-tune their plan for the open spaces.

Approving this plat will enable a new life science campus, drawing world-class companies, new customers for our businesses, and new families into our communities. It provides a unique opportunity to revitalize Louisville and opens the door to a vibrant economic landscape, attracting new businesses and visitors, which are essential for our town to thrive. The economic ripple effects of this project are substantial. The increased tax revenue could lead to more tax incentives offered to businesses to attract and retain them.

Thank you for considering this pivotal decision. I am confident that the Redtail Ridge development will mark the beginning of a new chapter for Louisville. It's time to move forward on Redtail Ridge.

Sincerely,
Laura Shaffer
247 Hoover Ct

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: beth armbruster
To: City Council
Subject: Red tail Ridge (RTR)
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 10:38:34 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from brusterbeth@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear City Council members,

AS a citizen of Louisville I am writing to share my thoughts on the proposed RTR development. It is imperative that new developments have climate change and sustainability in mind. From the excessive size of homes rebuilt after the fire there appears to be a large lack of concern for energy conservation and the future of the environment. Therefore it is my hope city leaders have the foresight to insist RTR have the following criteria...

!. Mix of energy efficient homes, apartments and smaller dwellings that allow for a diverse population, suitable for singles, retirees, families,
2. Business and stores within RTR that support the community, to make it walkable and draw broomfield residents across from RTR to shop in Louisville.
3. Homes and businesses built with electric appliances, roofs designed to access solar energy and electrical hook up.
4. Lighting that is compatible with dark skies.
5. Wildlife corridors, developer to fund safe access for animals to cross 36.
6. Leave the north end undeveloped and designate it as open space to prevent future development.
7. Trees Planted for shade in neighborhoods, parking lots, parks, etc.
8. Park with small playground, basketball and tennis court with no mow areas,
9. Water wise xeriscape that support insects and birds instead of mono planting of grass.
10. Community garden plot close to neighborhood
11. Bus access

I look forward to hearing your ideas for making RTR a vibrant, sustainable community. Thank you,

Beth Armbruster

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Kelly Majure
To: City Council
Subject: Please Approve Redtail Ridge
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:10:47 PM

> Some people who received this message don't often get email from majurefam@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council Members,

I am writing to you to express my strong support for the approval of the preliminary plat for the Redtail Ridge development. It is imperative for the economic vitality of our city to approve this project. it is my understanding that this project aligns completely with Louisville's Comprehensive Plan and 2010 code. It embodies our community's goals for sustainable development, open space and public lands, and economic revitalization.

It is exciting that Avista is committed to building a state of the art hospital for our residents to benefit from if this plan is approved. It would be devastating if the hospital went elsewhere. As our largest employer, Avista's presence is integral to the economic and social fabric of our community. More than 60,000 babies have been born at Avista, and we all know someone who has received care there. It never occurred to me that it's current location is prohibitive to providing emergency care for area residents.

As a Monarch High School parent, the improvement and safety that a through street will provide is paramount alone. To think that kids could have been in school when the Marshall Fire occurred is frightening, not to mention having driven there for over six years for events, the traffic is horrible and it forces kids to make bad driving decisions.

I am most excited as a a resident to be able to have another gorgeous, sustainable open space to enjoy. Who doesn't love another dog park and additional sporting fields for the community. Right now it looks like a waste land filled with noxious weeds. Boulder County is becoming a hot bed for life science businesses and it is exciting to think that Louisville could be apart of that industry. The community park that will be on the corner of 88th and Campus Drive will be beautiful to look at as kids go to school, and parents commute to work.

It's time to move forward on Redtail Ridge. This plat meets the Comp Plan and our code, and does so in a way that respects our community's values, contributes to our economic vitality, and enhances our living environment. I strongly urge the Council to approve the preliminary plat for Redtail Ridge, setting Louisville on a path to sustainable growth and prosperity.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Kelly Majure
Ward 2 resident

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Alexis Adler
To: City Council
Subject: Support Redtail Ridge Plat
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:09:47 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from alexispadler@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council Members,

As a Ward 1 resident, I am writing to express my support for the approval of the Redtail Ridge Preliminary Subdivision Plat. I believe this project is pivotal to the future vitality of our city.

As the largest employer in Louisville, AdventHealth Avista has been a pillar in our town for decades. And as Avista's leadership has expressed, approval of this plat is critical for Avista to relocate to a more accessible location that allows for the expansion of healthcare services in our community.

Additionally, the public land dedication of over 139 acres, improved access for Monarch High School with the extension of Campus Drive, and the economic impacts of a cutting edge life sciences campus are just a few more of the compelling reasons to approve this plat.

Redtail Ridge will create jobs, drive more business to our downtown and the McCaslin corridor, and bring our community together through the intersection of work, innovation and outdoor recreation.

I believe that a thriving Redtail Ridge can co-exist with the charming Louisville that we all love and want to preserve. I hope you will approve the Redtail Ridge preliminary plat.

All my best,
Lexi Adler

Lexi Adler, MPA
215.668.3970
lexi.adler@epromos.com

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: MARY J HALL
To: City Council
Subject: What about NO do you not understand??!
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:02:57 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from mjsaddress@comcast.net. Learn why this is important

Members of Council:
On February 6th, you will consider this agenda item under the quasi judicial process:
RESOLUTION NO. 80, SERIES 2023 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE REDTAIL RIDGE FILING NO. 1PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT – continued from 12/5/2
Voters said NO to sprawl and YES to preserving all land north of Disc Drive in our special election. Council has a mandate from voters, under the democratic process, and authority given to you from our municipal code, to preserve natural features and require more open space.
This resolution, like Ordinance 1811, which you sent to a vote on December 21, 2021, is for development that is way too big and needlessly destructive.
Council spoke about **the importance of the democratic process** when you sent the referendum petition to a vote. Council members Fahey and Dickinson and then council member Leh talked about their respect for the **democratic process** and their desire to give the power to the people to decide. Although sending this vote cost the city 90,000, you said it would be worth it to hear from the entire electorate. **You said you would respect the outcome of the vote.**
Residents campaigned against seemingly insurmountable odds. The ordinance was sent to the ballot only 9 days before the Marshall fire. We were outspent 32:1. We had 3,000 and and Brue Baukol donated 93,000.00 to the Yes campaign. Without the fire and Brue Baukol's outsized campaign contribution, we would have won by much more.
The current application is still sprawling and needlessly destructive of habitat, natural features, trees, and soil. It is not significantly different than the application we first saw as far back as 2020 when over 750 residents wrote to you with their concerns. The applicant has submitted the same grading and drainage plans each time they came to council. . They intend to grade 350 acres of the site. Planning Commission ruled in November 2022 that this application does not meet Louisville Municipal code.
Since 2020, the majority of residents have consistently spoken out against a too-big development. Your constituents voted NO to sprawl and needless destruction.
You said you would respect the results of the special election. You have the mandate and the authority under Louisville Municipal Code to preserve all land north of Disc Drive.
We expect you to honor our vote, our city's municipal code and respect the democratic process.
Seriously,
Mj Hall, resident & registered voter since 1999

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click

From: Elyse Blazevich
To: City Council
Subject: Resubmission: Letter of Support: Redtail Ridge
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:04:55 PM
Attachments: image001.png
image002.png
COBioScience Letter for RedTail Ridge 12.21.2023.pdf

Some people who received this message don't often get email from eblazevich@cobioscience.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council Members,

In light of the delayed hearing, I am respectfully re-submitting these comments in support of the Redtail Ridge proposal to build a premier life and bioscience campus in Louisville. Sterling Bay's proposed Redtail Ridge campus makes an important investment in Louisville to benefit from the economic growth fueled by Colorado's life sciences ecosystem. Their new plan reflects thoughtful and responsible design modifications that address considerations previously raised by stakeholders.

I also respectfully ask that you grant Sterling Bay the approval it is seeking for this important and calculated life sciences development project to support the people and the companies in Colorado developing groundbreaking and life-saving health technologies.

Please review the attached letter of support and feel free to contact me with any questions.

Elyse Blazevich
President & CEO | Colorado BioScience Association
President | Colorado BioScience Institute
303.592.4072 direct | 303.594.6895 cell
eblazevich@cobioscience.com
www.cobioscience.com | www.cobioinstitute.org
600 Grant St #306 | Denver, CO 80203

Get Involved! Visit CBSA's **online calendar** to learn about our upcoming events. **Subscribe** to CBSA emails and follow us on **LinkedIn**, **Twitter**, and **Facebook**.

From: Elyse Blazevich
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2023 9:11 PM
To: council@LouisvilleCO.gov
Subject: Letter of Support: Redtail Ridge

Dear Louisville City Council Members,

I respectfully submit these comments in support of the Redtail Ridge proposal to build a premier life and bioscience campus in Louisville. Sterling Bay's proposed Redtail Ridge campus makes an important investment in Louisville to benefit from the economic growth fueled by Colorado's life sciences ecosystem. Their new plan reflects thoughtful and responsible design modifications that

address considerations previously raised by stakeholders.

I also respectfully ask that you grant Sterling Bay the approval it is seeking for this important and calculated life sciences development project to support the people and the companies in Colorado developing groundbreaking and life-saving health technologies.

Please review the attached letter of support and feel free to contact me with any questions.

Elyse Blazevich
President & CEO | Colorado BioScience Association
President | Colorado BioScience Institute
303.592.4072 direct | 303.594.6895 cell
eblazevich@cobioscience.com
www.cobioscience.com | www.cobioinstitute.org
600 Grant St #306 | Denver, CO 80203

Get Involved! Visit CBSA's **online calendar** to learn about our upcoming events. **Subscribe** to CBSA emails and follow us on **LinkedIn**, **Twitter**, and **Facebook**.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

COLORADO BIOSCIENCE ASSOCIATION

303.592.4073
info@cobioscience.com
cobioscience.com
600 Grant Street, Suite 306
Denver, CO 80203

December 21, 2023

Louisville City Council
749 Main St
Louisville, CO 80027

Re: the Redtail Ridge proposal for premier life- and bio-science campus in Louisville

Dear Louisville City Council Members,

I respectfully submit these comments in support of the Redtail Ridge proposal to build a premier life and bioscience campus in Louisville. Sterling Bay's proposed Redtail Ridge campus makes an important investment in Louisville to benefit from the economic growth fueled by Colorado's life sciences ecosystem. Their new plan reflects thoughtful and responsible design modifications that address considerations previously raised by stakeholders.

Colorado is home to a vibrant and growing cluster of life sciences companies that are developing life-saving breakthroughs in biotechnology, pharmaceuticals, medical devices, diagnostics, agricultural biotechnology, animal health and digital health. Some of our greatest strengths are in medical devices for orthopedics, in vitro diagnostics, surgical, dental, health IT, and cardiovascular and in research and development of early-stage therapeutics (72.8% discovery and preclinical) for oncology, immunology, central nervous system, and metabolic disorders. The Northwest Corridor, running along US Highway 36, connecting Denver and Boulder, including Superior and neighboring cities of Westminster, Thornton, Broomfield, Louisville, and Lafayette is home to 14.5% of the Colorado's life sciences ecosystem.

Colorado continues to rise in the rankings as a leading national and international hub for life sciences, with Boulder and the Northwest Corridor recently ranking the 8th leading life sciences hub in the U.S. by Jones Lang LaSalle. Colorado life sciences companies employ more than 38,000 people, representing more than $4.4 billion in annual payroll with an average salary of nearly $120,000. Between 2017 and 2022, the Denver/Boulder market has experienced a remarkable increase in the number of life sciences researchers with a growth rate the second highest among the 25 leading U.S. markets, highlighting the region's growing prominence in the life sciences sector. Our ecosystem has also seen a growing infusion of capital into Colorado life sciences companies with financings in excess of $1B for six consecutive years and a steady increase in federal funding reaching more than $550M in 2022.

The proposed Redtail Ridge project brings an important community on line to support the purpose-driven work of innovative life sciences professionals at a key inflection point. The real estate market for life sciences in Colorado remains strong and stable as a spike in new spec deliveries meets unprecedented demand for lab space over the past two years. According to CBRE in their Q3 2023 Denver/Boulder Life Sciences Market Overview, lab space vacancy rates in the Denver/Boulder market remain low at 8.5%. Approximately 70% of the conversion space expected to deliver over the next three to six months is already preleased.

Access to safe and effective technologies and treatments is essential for patients throughout the country and globe, which is why all life sciences research, development and manufacturing must be done in buildings that clear regulations by multiple federal agencies, including the Food and Drug Administration, Environmental Protection Agency and Occupational Safety and Health Administration. These regulations are designed to keep products, patients, workers and the public safe.

At Colorado BioScience Association, we champion life sciences on behalf of our members and the Colorado's life sciences community and at Colorado BioScience Institute, we cultivate and diversify the state's life sciences workforce from classroom, to campus, to career. Therefore, I respectfully ask that you grant Sterling Bay the approval it is seeking for this important and calculated life sciences development project to support the people and the companies in Colorado developing groundbreaking and life-saving health technologies.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Elyse Blazevich
President & CEO, Colorado BioScience Association
President, Colorado BioScience Institute

From: Terre Lantzy
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge plan
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:26:11 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from 2terrel@comcast.net. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

Dear Council Members,

In 2022, Louisville residents voted to reject the sprawling plan for Redtail Ridge. Please respect and honor that by having the Redtail Ridge development plan sent back to the drawing board.

I wish for you to inform the developers of Redtail Ridge to:

1) redesign their plan so that it focuses on compact development and not more urban sprawl
2) a complete application that meets our city code
3) plans that include access for mass transit, bike paths and the additional access needed to US 36 for so many more vehicles
4) thoughtful design that showcases Louisville's character, since this is what most people will see as they drive US36

I support thoughtful, affordable housing that includes senior, semi attached dwellings.

I will be watching..

Sincerely,

Terre Lantzy
595 St Andrews Ln
Louisville, CO 80027
cell: 303-887-5822

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Bill Boulet
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge Development - Be Respectful/Smart/Wise
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:42:33 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from wboulet1@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Mayor Leh & Council,

This email is to request that you deny the Redtail Ridge Preliminary Subdivision Plat (Resolution No. 80, Series 2023) as it is currently proposed. Here is a brief summary of my thoughts concerning the proposal:

Respect what the voters are telling you. The referendum denying the proposal was mostly about the intense impact a development of that size would have on Louisville's quality of life. An additional 21,000 vehicle trips per day, as identified in the developer's traffic study, would outweigh any perceived benefits this development would have on our community. This far exceeds the 12,400 historical average daily trips during the Storage Tech era. Even if the developer were to be required to pay for essential improvements to infrastructure in attempting to accommodate the additional traffic, the resulting decrease in the quality of life in our community would forever impair our small-town atmosphere and way of life. The developer must also satisfactorily address the concerns reflected in the Planning Commission's denial of its application, including ecological issues.

Be Smart. There are ways to address the impacts of any proposal on the Redtail Ridge property. One approach is to cap the projected maximum daily trips of any overall site plan to the maximum historical average (12,400). Enforcement of a cap would be a key component of any agreement reached with the developer. The "soft" statements of good intention included in the Transportation Demand Management Plan (pp. 629 et. seq. of the City Council meeting packet) are wholly insufficient to ensure such a limitation. Other reasonable approaches (e.g. square footage limits or tenant mix) might also be considered. The point is to find a way to ensure Louisville's quality of life by reducing the negative effects of the proposed development.

Be Wise. Remember that this is a negotiation. The developer has certainly recognized this fact (see its response to the Planning Commission's denial of their proposal, page 659 of the City Council meeting packet). The ConocoPhillips Campus General Development Plan (GDP), into which the developer has "shoe-horned" its current proposal, merely reflects broad parameters for a very different type of development. Accordingly, the means to protect the interests of the citizens of Louisville can best be achieved with specificity and patient persistence.

In summary, the community as a whole realizes that re-development of this parcel will occur,

while at the same time the important details of how that is to be done will impact all of us for decades or more into the future.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments and for making the effort to accomplish something positive for Louisville.

Sincerely,

Bill Boulet
427 Orchard Way, Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==
This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Susan Bauer
To: City Council; Susan Bauer
Subject: No on Redtail Ridge
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:34:47 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from susanmbauer@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council,

Please take the time to balance the proposed development for Redtail Ridge property against the impact. It can be done if the City Council and City Staff work together as a team and is willing to hold the developer accountable and request a plan that addresses issues, stakeholder concerns and adheres to city code.

As evidenced by a special election held **two years ago, the resounding message from the people of Louisville was a resolute NO to a massive development.**

- **In terms of scale, the proposed project covers 8% of the entire land area of Louisville**, equivalent to about 2.5 million sq ft of buildings – **approximately 17 times the size of the Superior Costco**. This calculation excludes expansive parking lots with extensive lighting.
- Additionally, **the people of Louisville emphatically rejected the prospect of accommodating 21,000 additional vehicle trips on 96th Street.** The developers' own packet, presented to the Town Council, estimates that the full build-out of the project site would generate around 21,285 daily vehicle trips, with no less than 1,908 during the AM peak hour and 2,149 during the PM peak hour. Despite these alarming figures, one of the primary entrances/exits is slated for 88th St. The **traffic studies indicate a foreseeable failure of the US 36 interchange at Interlocken, with no current plans or funding for improvement.** This matter alone should cause the City Council consternation. An ill-conceived plan, without stakeholder engagement and proper funding to mitigate impact is **not fiduciary responsible.**
- In addition to the vehicular concerns, the people of Louisville expressed a strong aversion to the extensive grading of the entire site, which would obliterate natural open spaces and disrupt animal

habitats. The proposed project involves grading 390 acres, including approximately 140 acres of crucial wildlife habitat. The site currently hosts a diverse array of species, including multiple raptors, prairie dogs, foxes, coyotes, deer, and more – a richness of wildlife that the citizens of Louisville have said is important to them, and aligns with the vision of Boulder County Open Space.

Again, please take the time to balance the proposed development for Redtail Ridge property against the impact. It can be done if the City Council and City Staff work together as a team and is willing to hold the developer accountable and request a plan that addresses stakeholder concerns and adheres to city code.

Sincerely,

Susan Bauer
1770 Morrison Court
Superior, CO 80027

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: A G
To: City Council
Subject: Vote NO to Redtail Ridge Preliminary Plat
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:10:55 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from agreves13@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Mayor and Council Members,

I understand that you will be considering the Redtail Ridge Filing No. 1 Preliminary Subdivision Plat this week; as continued from 12/5/2023. As a resident of Superior who accesses the proposed area for life, parenting, and work on a daily basis, and as a local volunteer in the realm of open space preservation, I am highly invested in the use of this land. I urge you to vote NO on this preliminary plat, in accordance with the referendum vote of your citizens. In its current form, which differs little from prior iterations, the application does not meet Louisville Municipal Code and would cause a huge amount of destruction.

One of the greatest concerns that requires your full attention and diligence is the grading plan for this proposal. It is unconscionable that ~360 of 400 acres would be graded, including open space. This is completely counterintuitive to open space and would decimate habitat, wildlife, biodiversity, vegetation & the associated carbon sink, trees, soil, and natural drainage. It preserves nothing.

Along with that, what is the plan, if any, for all the prairie dogs throughout this site? Your own adopted Wildfire Hazard and Risk Assessment of Louisville Public Lands, published on 10/9/2023, lists 'Conservation of Prairie Dog Colonies' as a wildfire mitigation strategy. Surely you did not fund that assessment just to have a pretty document or something to point to. I would hope that by now, Louisville leadership would recognize the value that wildlife plays in a healthy ecosystem- and healthy ecosystems are integral to wildfire mitigation. To abuse and destroy so much, as per this application, would run entirely counter to environmental efforts Louisville purports to undertake. If that rings hollow, at least consider what you are doing in the context of fire mitigation. Have a plan in place for these vital creatures. Stewardship is the lesson we hope to pass along to our kids and students. What a shame it would be to deliver the opposite action and example just right across the street from schools. I urge you to uphold the LMC (16.04.020 (N), 16.16.010 (D)) through the legitimate preservation that is called for.

Though the grading and drainage plan alone necessitates a full stop on this proposal, there are other aspects of great concern. Though many simply view this proposal as a means to extend Campus Drive, the predictions call for over 20,000 new, daily car trips at full buildout. Neither Louisville's nor Superior's roads and intersections can currently handle this capacity. The Northwest Parkway/US 36 interchange also does not have a plan in place. A 2.56 million square foot development demands a comprehensive plan for traffic considerations; one that has engaged stakeholders and been approved by all necessary parties. What good will an expanded Campus Drive be without this? Magical thinking, and no safer in an emergency. As the proposal currently stands, the traffic impacts and adjunct roadways are failure-bound.

Please listen to your residents and affected locals, and do not approve this proposal. It does not meet Louisville Municipal Code, would ravage natural assets and cause major traffic problems, and is geared toward greed and profit. Please send a clear message that a substantially different application is needed. Please respect how your residents have previously voted, and the

planning commission's previous ruling that this application is not in line with Louisville Municipal Code.

Thank you.

Amber Greves
Superior, CO

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Rindert Wesseling
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge development - AGAINST
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 3:59:57 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from r.wesseling@att.net. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

To: council@louisville.gov
To: Louisville, Colorado City Council
From: Rindert Wesseling, 327 Matchless St. Louisville, CO 80027
I wish to speak against the development of Redtail Ridge property.
Rindert Wesseling
LL (303)666-2117

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From:	Meghan Mosher
To:	City Council; bvs.board@bvsd.org
Cc:	Eric Gordon
Subject:	Letter in Support of Campus Drive Extension and Completion
Date:	Monday, February 5, 2024 3:53:58 PM
Attachments:	Campus Drive Letter Feb 2024 Final.pdf

Some people who received this message don't often get email from mosher.meghan@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Members of the Louisville City Council,

Please find attached a letter from members of the Monarch High School staff in support of approval of the Redtail Ridge preliminary plat, as it appears to be the only feasible and permanent solution to the accessibility of the Monarch K-8 and Monarch High School campuses, and the safety of our staff, students, and families. Although we recognize the political nature of this decision, we urge you to look beyond politics and recognize the longstanding safety issues facing our students and our school communities and approve the preliminary plat. As we've been told numerous times in the past by City Council members, there is no alternative beyond approval of the Redtail Ridge plat for the improvement of Campus Drive.

Thank you,
/s

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

To: Louisville City Council
CC: Boulder Valley School District Board of Education

February 5, 2024

We, the undersigned, represent members of the Monarch High School staff who are writing to urge that you approve the plat for the Redtail Ridge development in order to facilitate much-needed safety and congestion improvements along Campus Drive.

We first wrote to you on this topic in February of 2022, shortly after the devastation of the Marshall Fire. That incident made it clear that Campus Drive is not sufficient to provide prompt egress in the event of a similar incident, which endangers the more than 2,000 children and hundreds of staff who use our combined campuses on a daily basis. These concerns were not addressed.

After the April 2022 special election rejected the 2021 Redtail Ridge Plan, and reverted back to the 2010 City Council-approved plan, we wrote to the Planning Commission that fall asking that the plat be approved so that Campus Drive could be upgraded. Again, our concerns were ignored. Instead, we learned in October of 2022 that the school district was going to use $250,000 of its money to create an emergency egress connection via Paradise Lane due to the lack of action by the City of Louisville. This egress has been completed but never tested and very little information is available about it. This means that the city's intransigence on the development question has cost money that should be devoted to the needs of our students.

We now write for this third time to be clear that we are not just concerned about emergency evacuation but also the general safety and utility of the campus that serves both of our schools. There is no sidewalk on Campus Drive past Monarch K-8, so numerous students and staff walk on the edge of a deteriorating road that has no shoulder as heavy traffic passes nearby. When the high school ends the school day at 3:55pm there is roughly 30 minutes of traffic to leave campus. Traffic entering the campus can back up well down 88th and Dillon Road, blocking access to Avista Hospital, even worse when there is an incident like the recent traffic light outages that resulted in huge numbers of students being late to school, or trapped on campus.

We are aware of the political issues surrounding this development, but we are also extremely frustrated that concerns around the safety of thousands of children have been ignored for so long. Approval of this plat would enable prompt construction of the long-needed improvements to Campus Drive, including sidewalks, bike lanes, and a connection to 96th Street. There will be ample opportunity to critique the layout and buildings proposed for Redtail Ridge at a later date, but improvements to Campus Drive can move forward now, and are urgent and overdue. Please do not let politics trump our safety yet again.

We look forward to your response to this letter. You may contact us via ericsgordon@gmail.com and mosher.meghan@gmail.com.

Sincerely,

Meghan Mosher
Teacher
Monarch High School

Eric Gordon
Teacher
Monarch High School

Kelsey Hoover
Orchestra Teacher
Monarch High School

Carolyn Cunningham
Teacher
Monarch High School

Autumn Francis
Teacher
Monarch High School

Glen Einrem
Paraeducator
Monarch High School

Arica Rae Avila
Mental Health Advocate
Monarch High School

Miranda Lee
Teacher
Monarch High School

David Evans
Teacher
Monarch High School

Katy Wood
Affective Needs
Teacher
Monarch High School

Gwendolyn
Lukas-Doctor
Educator
Monarch High School

Jenifer Farrell
Teacher
Monarch High School

Jill Benisch
Counselor
Monarch High School

Kathleen Anne Packard
Teacher
Monarch High School

Bonnie Katzive
Teacher
Monarch High School

Alice Davidoff
Teacher
Monarch High School

Hillary Varas
Teacher
Monarch High School

Melissa Vass
Teacher/Parent
Monarch High School

Erin Gee
Teacher
Monarch High School

David Thomas
Teacher
Monarch High School

Katherine Croasdale
Teacher Librarian
Monarch High School

Ali Martini
Teacher
Monarch High School

James Kelpy
Teacher
Monarch High School

Andrea Brady
Paraeducator
Monarch High School

Troy Tewalt
Teacher
Monarch High School

Ben Holloway
Counselor
Monarch High School

Sean Duncan
Teacher
Monarch High School

Amanda Sharrow
Math Teacher
Monarch High School

Allyson Hall
Teacher
Monarch High School

Connie Williams
Teacher
Monarch High School

Geoff Findley
Educator
Monarch High School

Taryn Cawlfield
Teacher
Monarch High School

Mike Davidoff
School Social Worker
Monarch High School

Melissa Duplechin
Teacher
Monarch High School

Megan Navarro
Counseling Assistant
Monarch High School

Katharine Guiles Ellis
Teacher
Monarch High School

Stephanie Gregory
Behavior Analyst
Monarch High School

Dana Loew
Educator
Monarch High School

Javier Tovar
Head Custodian
Monarch High School

Alisha Watkins
Head Custodian
Monarch High School

Laszlo Vass
Teacher
Monarch High School

Kevin Lowe
Teacher
Monarch High School

Riley Nussbaum
Paraeducator
Monarch High School

From: Justin Solomon
To: City Council
Subject: Red Tail Ridge
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 3:15:27 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jsolly90@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear City Council,

The City of Louisville went to considerable expense and effort to conduct a special election in April of 2021. Some current members of Council indicated they wanted to hear directly from the citizens of Louisville when voting for the referendum. After all the time and expense of that vote it would be a shame and frankly undemocratic not to apply the clearly stated preferences of a majority of residents when considering the current plan under the CP GDP.

It is within your discretion and your authority to bring this application in line with our City's values and municipal code. The applicant has not shown a willingness to voluntarily bring their plan in line with either, so it is now incumbent upon you to act on our behalf.

It is within your authority to improve the application and the resulting development in the following ways:

1) Require written, binding commitments to the proposed sustainability measures.

2) Require the applicant to fund the off-site road improvements that will be necessary because of this development and will result in failing traffic grades (F) at two major intersections without the necessary upgrades. Do not burden the City's tax base.

3) The grading plan has not changed for this site over the various iterations and will result in nearly the entire site being graded despite the building square footage going from 6 million sf to the current 2.5 million sf. As such, the grading plan violates City Code which requires the natural features of the site be preserved to the extent possible, including natural drainage, water features, and trees. The unchanged grading plan is excessive and would do unnecessary ecological harm in violation of code.

4) Improve the quality of the open space dedication. The City should not accept land for public open space that the applicant will first bulldoze before dedicating it as open space. Vacant land that has been flattened is not the same as open space in a more natural state and with varied topography. The City should also not consider the Paradise Lanes lots as part of the open space calculation for this site. Those lots are neither part of the property or located within City limits.

5) Lastly, City Council should encourage the applicant to limit their building envelope to south of Disc Drive where the former Storage Tek campus was located. The current applicant is allowed 2.5 million sf and I believe Storage Tek had 1.8 million sf. City Council should offer variances for building height, density, and possibly even uses in exchange for the applicant making the development more compact and leaving the area north of Disc Drive intact through a combination of private and public open space. This would be consistent with City Code and the Comp Plan, which seek to limit the impact of development on both nature and the human population.

We only get one chance to get this right and eight percent of the City's land area is too important to decide without a full and clear picture. City Council should consider all aspects of the development, get firm and binding commitments from the applicant, and represent the reasonable and achievable desires of the electorate as stated through the April 2021 referendum vote.

Respectfully,

Justin and Susan Solomon
477 Lincoln Ct

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Karen Brown
To: City Council
Subject: Support and Approve Redtail Ridge Plat
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 3:13:49 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from karen.brown31@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Mayor and Council Members -

I write to you today as an almost 30 year resident of Louisville. In my time here I have seen the town go from barely hanging on, to thriving, to suffering but still hanging in there. Over the last 30 years there have been many opportunities to keep Louisville the thriving, energetic community we all want - some taken and some missed.

On February 5 you have the opportunity to help Louisville become the thriving place that it was just a few years ago, by supporting and approving the preliminary plat for the Redtail Ridge development. This project represents a pivotal opportunity for our community and aligns completely with Louisville's Comprehensive Plan and code. It embodies our community's goals for sustainable development, open space and public lands, and economic revitalization.

One of the great benefits of supporting this plan is keeping Avista Hospital in Louisville. Having Avista here is integral to the economic and social fabric of our community. Over 60,000 babies have been born there - my daughter included - and we all know someone who relies on having Avista close to receive quality health care. It is also the largest employer in Louisville, supporting individuals and families who spend their dollars in town.

In addition to the economic benefits that Redtail Ridge will provide, this development will convert over 150 acres of currently privately held land into open space and public lands that the entire community will be able to access. If you don't count the golf course, this is the largest single dedication of public lands in our town's history. For generations, Louisville residents have never had the opportunity to legally visit and enjoy the site. Approval will open up new avenues for recreation, nature conservation, and habitat preservation.

This development has been on hold long enough. It is time to move forward on Redtail Ridge. This project respects our community's values, contributes to our economic vitality, and enhances our living environment. I strongly urge the Council to approve the preliminary plat for Redtail Ridge, setting Louisville on a path to sustainable growth and prosperity.

Sincerely,

Karen Brown
505 Grant Avenue
Louisville, CO 80027

From: tonyheatherton@juno.com
To: City Council
Subject: Red Tail Ridge Development Proposal
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 3:07:07 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from tonyheatherton@juno.com. Learn why this is important

Hello Councilpersons,

We want to see the old Storage Tek property (now called Redtail Ridge) be left as open space and NOT be redeveloped. We like the semi-rural feel to that southerly entry to our City. That's the ideal from our point of view. However, we realize that the property is now owned by a private developer, not the City or County. We understand there may be a legal requirement to allow some sort of redevelopment because of decisions made back in 2010. However, much has changed since 2010. If some redevelopment must be allowed, we'd like that redevelopment be minimized as much as possible with as much open space and wildlife habitat preserved as possible.

One of our concerns about a redevelopment that is heavy on building large footprint office spaces is that the City already has so many areas with large, partly empty office spaces in the Centennial Parkway area. We don't see the need for more office buildings, more roads, and more traffic.

We understand there is a vote tomorrow to approve or disapprove the same, or very similar redevelopment plan voters rejected in 2022. We think such a plan should be rejected and the developer required to submit a smaller redevelopment footprint with preservation of wildlife habitat and open space areas for a large portion of the property.

Thanks for considering our opinions. All the best to you and your families.

Tony R. Heatherton
Theresa Heatherton
115 Hoover Avenue
Louisville, CO 80027

303-319-4589
tonyheatherton@juno.com

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Cathern H Smith
To: City Council
Subject: Louisville"s Municipal Code and Comprehensive Plan Require More
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 2:04:40 PM
Attachments: image.png

Some people who received this message don't often get email from cathernsmith@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear City Council and Mayor Leh,

Land use decisions relating to the Conoco Phillips property, comprising 8% of the land within Louisville's city limits, are before you again. As a threshold matter, I am asking you to determine:

- Whether the developer's application is substantially complete; and
- Whether the application and packet contain enough information to fully evaluate the impacts of the proposed development upon our town and the degree of compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and Louisville's Municipal Code.

Because of substantive negotiations relating to the special right-turn lane for Avista, design specifications for numerous roadway improvements, funding agreements and unaddressed comments of the Public Works staff relating to traffic, City Staff recommend approval with conditions. I agree with the Staff's conclusion that information is missing. But rather than conditionally approve - I like the Planning Commission - recommend denial of the application. My recommendation is consistent with the Code and the Comprehensive Plan.

As you may know, the purposes of Section 16 of the Louisville Municipal Code include providing for the safe and efficient circulation of traffic throughout the city and the avoidance of congestion. See Section 16.04.020(K). And, "A goal of the comprehensive plan is to maintain vehicle LOS C [level of service C] ..." See page 40 of the Comprehensive Plan.

It puzzles me how the Council can make the required determinations re (1) whether the plat conforms to the requirements of Title 16; (2) whether the plat is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; and (3) whether the proposed subdivision promotes the purposes of Section 16.04.020 until the developer completes negotiations with the Parkway and a plan to deal with the US 36 interchange's failure is in place. Right now, all we have is a recommendation to study --not improve -- the US36 interchange. The fact that several intersections will have levels of service well below C highlights the importance of traffic planning. These are not minor issues to be swept under the rug.

Additionally, from a policy perspective and as a matter of equity, I am asking you to apply the same standard to the developer, Sterling Bay, that was applied to residents rebuilding after the Marshall Fire. It is my understanding that residents were required to dot their i's and cross their t's before their applications were considered and could not submit incomplete applications. Instead of rushing through an incomplete application, let's take our time and find a way to thread the needle that upholds the value of our community as well as the letter and spirit of the municipal code and the comprehensive plan.

Finally, please note that, as discussed below, important information -- 100% required by the City Code -- is completely missing.

When assessing the degree of completeness and the potential benefits to the City, please consider the following:

1. **Missing Cost-Benefit Analysis**: There is no information about the financial impact of the development upon the City. For example, what infrastructure and other costs will the City incur? What are the anticipated gross and net tax revenues? How much of the costs of upgrading the US 36 interchange and 96th St/Parkway interchange will the City incur? Will the City give businesses which will occupy the new buildings tax breaks? Without this information how do you know that this development is good for the City?

2. **Missing Permit, Intergovernmental Agreement, and Financial Agreements with Northwest Parkway Authority**: The Parkway owns a right of way going almost all the way down to US 36. It is my understanding that before the developer can begin construction they will need at least: (1) a permit from the Parkway to connect to the Parkway's right of way; (2) a new or revised intergovernmental agreement relating to the operation of the signal at 96th Street; (3) an agreement covering design standards for the agreed upon road construction; (4) an agreement covering who pays for this road construction; and, (5) most likely, escrowed money to cover the costs.

On November 30, 2023, Managing Administrator the Northwest Parkway Highway Authority, Joel Meggers, wrote to City Council stating that consideration of the preliminary plat is "premature" and objecting to "consideration [of the developer's application] in advance of agreements being reached and made part of the approval." Mr. Meggers' correspondence (very worth reading and also asking the applicant questions about) is available at pages 860-65 of your February 6, 2024 packet. Among other things, Mr. Meggers letter asks for the "(e)limination of the proposed right-in/right-out access to the proposed Avista Hospital facility opposite Via Lata Drive" and additional traffic lanes at both Campus Drive/96 and the 96th Street/NW Parkway intersections as well as from the end of the Parkway to US 36. Clearly, a lot remains to be negotiated. And, if the location of the roads change, any approval given now is moot.

3. **Missing Analysis of Cost, Timing, and CDOT's Priority for Upgrading US 36 Interchange:** The Planning Commission found that the application does not comply with Section 16.04.020(K)'s requirement to avoid traffic congestion in part because the applicant's traffic study shows the US 36 and NW Parkway interchange reaching a F level of service requiring modification in 2027-2028 -- a scant 3-4 years from now. The Planning Commission also noted the application does not include proposals for mitigation, road capacity work, or contribution to the costs of such work. And, future improvements are not planned at this time.

Since the Planning Commission considered the application, the developer commissioned a new traffic study which --without explanation -- skirts the issue entirely. The new traffic study simply says "A coordinated study among agencies should occur to begin [sic] to look at interchange concepts." See the October 16, 2023 Traffic and Mobility Study found at page 56 of your packet. It looks to me like the process would be led by CDOT and involve several local governments and possibly the owners of toll lane. As traffic from the proposed development will accelerate the failure of this intersection, a plan and financial commitments are needed.

As a member of the Planning Commission noted, proceeding with this application without addressing the failing level of service is the opposite of planning. Should City Council move forward before an actual plan to address the US 36 interchange is in place, we will suffer from gridlock and dysfunction.

4. **Missing Analysis of Impact on Construction Traffic on Marshall Fire Communities and Mitigation Plan:** Oddly, neither of the developer's traffic studies address the impact of the traffic associated with the development on nearby communities, including those rebuilding from the Marshall Fire with high levels of their own construction traffic. Why not require the developer to mitigate the impact of their construction traffic upon affected communities?

5. **Missing At Least 4 Mandatory Preliminary Plat Requirements of Section 16.12.050, LMC:** Section 16.12.050 of the Municipal Code specifies 27 items that "shall be" included in the preliminary plat. The Code also specifies that "The word 'shall' is always mandatory ...". See Section 16.08.010(B) of the Code.

At least the following mandatory information is missing:

i. Per Section 16.12.050 (G), the "Location and dimensions of all existing streets, alleys, easements, drainage areas, irrigation ditches and

laterals, and other significant features within or adjacent to the tract to be subdivided" shall be provided. The plat documents fail to show many existing features.

ii. Per Section 16.12.050 (S), the" Location of significant natural features such as trees, woodlands, lakes, hills, streams, wetlands, and floodplains, and historical and archaeological sites." This important ecological information is completely missing. Its omission makes the approval by the Open Space Advisory Board pretty meaningless -- as they did not have enough information before them.

iii. Per Section 16.12.050 (W), the "Development phases or stages proposed in order to assure the availability of public services and the orderly development of the subdivision." Due to the omission of an appendix of the Subdivision Improvement Agreement, this information is incomplete.

iv. Per Section 16.12.050 (Y), "The maximum height proposed for all buildings and structures." Although the developer may seek exemption from existing height restrictions at a later stage, the Code mandates that this information is provided now. This critical information is completely missing. It's absence interferes with the ability of the community to assess the impact of the developement.

Additionally, the following mandatory information may be missing. Your confirmation that the following mandatory information is included is appreciated.

i. Per Section 16.12.050(N), "The location and size of existing utilities within or adjacent to the tract including water, sewer, electricity, and gas (may be placed on a separate plat)" are mandatory. This may or may not be complete. For example, if there is existing gas infrastructure it's omitted.

6. Missing Evidence Demonstrating Compliance with General Design Standards found in Section 16.16.010(D) and 16.16.020(B) of LMC: Under the Municipal Code, the developer bears the burden of demonstrating that its preliminary plat conforms to the General Design Standards. There is no evidence in the record related to the grading of the site and the requirements to (1) "preserve to the extent possible" "the natural features, historical, and archeological sites and vegetation of the area, including trees"; and that (2) "Drainage areas, wherever possible, are left in a natural state." See Sections Section 16.16.010(D) and 16.16.020(B) of LMC. Without presenting evidence, the developer cannot carry its burden.

7. Missing BVSD Approval/ Reliance on Expired Agreement: The agreement with BVSD was conditioned as follows:

A. That a land use application filed by the Developer or its successor that includes the new alignment of Campus Drive as shown on Attachment A is approved by the City within one year from the date of this Resolution; and

and has expired. See page 606 of your packet.

Please pump the brakes on this application and proceed in a manner that conforms to the letter and spirit of the City Code, the Comprehensive Plan, and the interests of the residents.

Best regards,

Cathern Smith
Ward III

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

From: Amy Deborski
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge Development
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 1:58:30 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from adeborski@msn.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council Members,

I am writing as a resident of Louisville to express my strong support for the approval of the preliminary plat for the Redtail Ridge development. This project represents a pivotal opportunity for our community and aligns completely with Louisville's Comprehensive Plan and code. It embodies our community's goals for sustainable development, open space and public lands, and economic revitalization.

One of the most compelling reasons to support the plat is that it will secure Avista's presence in Louisville. As our largest employer, Avista's presence is integral to the economic and social fabric of our community. More than 60,000 babies have been born at Avista, and we all know someone who has received care there. Approving the Redtail Ridge plat ensures that Avista remains in Louisville, and that should be a top priority.

I believe Redtail Ridge can become an important lever in revitalizing Louisville's economy, and the new workers drawn to Redtail will have a positive impact on downtown businesses and beyond. In fact, the current Redtail site pays just $10,000 a year in commercial property tax revenue. Think of what we could do with the more than $40 million in taxes and fees that Redtail would pay to the City of Louisville, and the $24 million in annual commercial property tax revenue that would go to Boulder Valley School District, the Fire District, Boulder County, and the City of Louisville, among others.

It's time to move forward on Redtail Ridge. This plat meets the Comp Plan and municipal code and our new energy code, and does so in a way that respects our community's values, contributes to our economic vitality, and enhances our living environment. I strongly urge the Council to approve the preliminary plat for Redtail Ridge, setting Louisville on a path to sustainable growth and prosperity.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Amy Deborski
565 Lafarge Avenue, Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==
This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Rebecca Killingsworth
To: City Council
Subject: Input regarding RTR subdivision plat
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 1:55:23 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from rebeccakillingsworth@outlook.com. Learn why this is important

Hello,
I am writing to request that the city council disapproves the proposed Redtail Ridge Subdivision plat.
The plan needs to meet all city codes and be a compact development south of Disk Drive that includes designated open space. The citizens already voted to disapprove a similar sprawling development and that decision needs to be respected.
I believe that the small town character of Louisville should be preserved and not have a large development that existing roads and infrastructure cannot support.

Thank you for your consideration,
Rebecca Killingsworth
498 Orchard Way
Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: John Sullivan
To: City Council
Subject: reject new redtail ridge proposal
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 1:30:53 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from sullivanjal39@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear City Council Member

My wife and I are disappointed that you are ignoring the voters desires as expressed in the special election less than 2 years ago that rejected the proposed project. Do you have a report that explains in detail what has changed that would compel you to override the voters you serve.

John and Anna Sullivan
245 W Sycamore Lane
Louisville, 80027

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Irene Shaffer
To: City Council
Subject: Please approve Redtail Ridge Plat
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 12:47:19 PM

> Some people who received this message don't often get email from ireneshaffer@boulderco.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council Members,

I am fortunate enough to have 4 grandchildren. All 4 attend either Monarch PK-8 or Monarch High. I am writing to urge your approval of the Redtail Ridge Plat. Campus Drive's current configuration of one way in-one way out, has never been safe for students (some of whom are beginner drivers), faculty, staff, parents or grandparents. I can only imagine the possible outcome if the wildfire would have happened on a school day!!! For the safety of my grandchildren and all the other people affected----- the APPROVAL of the Redtail Ridge Plat is ESSENTIAL!

Thank you for your time.

Irene Shaffer

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==
This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From:	Tam Dalle Molle
To:	City Council
Subject:	Please approve Redtail Ridge and keep our hospital in Louisville
Date:	Monday, February 5, 2024 12:16:14 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from tamdallemolle@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council:

My husband and I moved to Louisville 26 years ago. We were a newlywed couple in our 20's, anxious to start our family. Over the last 26 years, our three boys were born at Avista hospital, and we have been both regular recipients of excellent ongoing preventative care, as well as "frequent flyers" of emergency services (did I mention I have three boys??)

We are writing today to ask you to vote to approve the Redtail Ridge plat because it will enable Avista to move into a brand new, much-needed updated facility.

I look forward to my children having the same healthcare options in Louisville as they begin to start their own families. Additionally, as my generation continues to age, we will need access to more health care options.

We do not want to be left behind (again).

We all know that Avista is currently under contract for a 40-acre campus, and its strategic location along Northwest Parkway will enable an additional 100,000 residents within Boulder County to live within 15 minutes of the hospital. The modern infrastructure and advanced medical services it could offer will undoubtedly elevate the quality of healthcare available to our region.

The Redtail Ridge development provides an opportunity to alleviate this issue by offering multiple access points to our hospital. This new access point would enhance the safety and convenience of reaching our facility, a development that we believe patients and their families will greatly appreciate.

This improved accessibility will benefit our patients and their families during emergencies, and enhance overall healthcare outcomes. By relocating Avista, we can help promote improved RTD ridership while reducing overall single occupancy vehicle (SOV) traffic – both of which are critical elements in the Transportation Master Plans in Broomfield, Lafayette, and Louisville.

Please support the vote for RedTail Ridge - let’s be the City of YES to smart progress!

Tamra & Ken Dalle Molle
872 W. Mulberry Street
Louisville, CO 80027
(303) 870-7330
tamdallemolle@gmail.com

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: royalbooks@aol.com
To: City Council
Subject: RTR Project
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 12:12:37 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from royalbooks@aol.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council members,

I've lived in Louisville for over 24 years and have become increasingly frustrated by tunnel vision anti-business policies that have played a role in multiple closures of retail stores, restaurants and companies in our town ultimately leading to a decline in services and our quality of life here in Louisville.

Some of these shuttered companies have moved their offices or locations to other towns in the area for financial assistance via benefits offered by business boosting governments in Lafayette, Erie, etc. All while Louisville sent a clear message of acceptance to losing consumer spending, revenues, and investment to these towns as evidenced by the "NO" vote on the previous iteration of RTR. However, I am hopeful that our mayor and city council can send a different message this time to the community that Louisville is now "Open for Business".

I believe the RTR project embodies our community's goals for sustainable development, open space and public lands, and economic revitalization. It is critical that we keep Avista in Louisville, which is an essential resource for the health and safety of our community as well as the city's largest employer. Finding a permanent solution for Campus drive for the students, parents, and faculty at Monarch is also vital. Having a world class life science campus that adds open space, tax revenue, and workers/companies that support or local businesses is a huge plus.

Many of you were elected under the mandate of swinging the pendulum of declining economic vitality in our town back in the right direction - and you were the recipient of my vote for this reason. I can't think of a better way to send a message to your constituents that you will grow our economy by supporting the business community and this project.

Thank you!

Roger Willbanks
594 Manorwood Ln.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: ma heaney
To: City Council
Subject: Retail Ridge - NO!
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 11:54:47 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from ohsm@earthlink.net. Learn why this is important

Members of Council:

I understand that you have scheduled the approval of the Redtail Ridge Preliminary Plat on Tuesday's agenda.

This is confusing, as well as alarming, because that project has been rejected multiple times. And the plan currently submitted is the plan that was rejected by the Planning Commission as not meeting Louisville's regulations, correct? And criticized by County and State regulators.

It is appalling that our Council members (elected to represent citizen's needs and preferences) do not honor our city's democratic process. Or the Louisville Municipal Code.

This development is still planned with a backward, 1970's mentality, without a vision, and design, for the future. A future where climate change related issues and environmental impacts will be even more severe than what we are just beginning to experience.

Louisville MUST demand better development - development that:

- Demonstrates that the project will be a financial positive for Louisville - past plans did not demonstrate this conclusively
- Minimizes the projected massive traffic impacts - not hugely exacerbate current traffic with the predicted load increase created by the project
- Minimizes, hopefully eliminates, air pollution - again, predicted traffic loads will increase our area's already unacceptable, and unsafe, air pollution
- Reduces heat producing design aspects - eliminates huge "seas" of asphalt parking (construct small footprint garages), and unneeded pavement
- Retains current habitat, vegetation, heat-absorbing soil, addition of shade producing trees, installation of solar panel parking areas
- Complements Louisville's commercial property balance - not exacerbates the glut of empty commercial buildings
- Provides documentation that Louisville's water supply will withstand the additional load created by the development
- Follows climate adaption best practices developed and followed by municipalities worldwide

We can, and must, develop for the future - not the past.

Thank you.
mary ann heaney

1117 La Farge Ave

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Kim Contini
To: City Council
Subject: Red Tail Ridge
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 11:44:01 AM

> Some people who received this message don't often get email from kimcontini@hotmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear City Council,

Please REJECT the current Red Tail Ridge proposal. The people of Louisville have already spoken against this, and I hope you will respect your constituents wishes.

Respectfully,

Kim Contini
30-year Louisville resident

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==
This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Sheree Burcar
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge hearing 2/6/24
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 11:19:59 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from sburcar@comcast.net. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

Dear City Council,
I am writing to urge you reject the current subdivision plat application for Redtail Ridge. This is the exact same proposal that the Planning Commission rejected in September 2022, the exact same proposal that does NOT comply with the Louisville Municipal Code or with the 2010 ConocoPhillips Campus GDP. Brue Baukol has not incorporated any of the Planning Commission's recommendations made in their rejection.

In case you have forgotten, Louisville voters overturned City Council's approval of the Redtail Ridge GDP in April 2022. The citizens have spoken - we do not want this sprawling development and its associated negative impacts to local traffic, infrastructure, the environment, and quality of life, and its economic burden to taxpayers.

As officials ELECTED by the citizens of Louisville, why are you even considering
- overriding the will of the voters?
- ignoring the recommendation of the Planning Committee?

In closing, I request that you respect the results of the special election and reject the RTR subdivision plat application.

Respectfully,
Sheree Burcar
Ward 2

Sent from my iPad

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Patti Micklin
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail plat - please approve!
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 11:14:48 AM

> Some people who received this message don't often get email from patti.micklin@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Mayor Leh and all Louisville City Council Members,

My family and I have lived in Louisville for almost 18 years. I'm writing to ask you to approve the preliminary plat for the Redtail Ridge development at tonight's meeting. It's aligned with Louisville's Comprehensive Plan and code, it includes open space, and willl offer some much-needed economic revitalization.

Keeping Avista in Louisville is vital for our local economy. Monarch K-8 and High School need the expansion of Campus Drive to improve safety. There are many other reasons I support this, but these two are at the top of my list.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Patti Micklin

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Mary OBrien
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge Proposal
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 10:58:48 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from maryjjobrien@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

To Mayor Leh and City Council Members:

I support the Redtail Ridge proposal for the following reasons.

A. We need to keep Avista Hospital in town. The hospital needs a site with better access to communities in the area.

B. Monarch needs to have a second entrance and exit. This is a safety and security issue that became apparent in the Marshall Fire.

C. A large park could be the site of outdoor recreational amenities that are desired by the community, such as pickleball courts, a multipurpose field, and tennis courts.

Thank you for your attention.

Mary O'Brien
538 W Spruce way
Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Chandi Beck
To: City Council
Subject: Retail Ridge
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 10:58:12 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from chandibeck@hotmail.com. Learn why this is important

As a resident of Superior/Louisville, please forego the development of Redtail Ridge or demand energy efficient, high sustainability and keeping the environment as is as much as possible instead of leveling it to the ground as it is currently set to do.

The amount of traffic this will create in our neighborhoods is overwhelming and unnecessary. We do not need more concrete when hundreds of thousands of retail/commercial/industrial space sits empty around this area and the surrounding towns.

Why can they not build on/reconstruct an existing piece of commercial instead of destroying so much natural habitat and beauty that is great for our ecosystem and enjoyment of the area?

Thank you,

Chandi Beck
3061 Gardenia Way
Superior, CO 80028

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From:	Cory Nickerson
To:	City Council
Subject:	Approve the Redtail plat to keep Avista in Louisville
Date:	Monday, February 5, 2024 10:56:13 AM
Importance:	High

Some people who received this message don't often get email from corynick@hotmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council:

My family has been both patients and supporters of Avista since 2010 and I am writing to ask for your support for the Redtail Ridge plat because it will enable Avista to move into a new, much needed modern facility. A few years ago, I was invited to and was part of the fundraising committee to raise money in the community for a new Breast Cancer Treatment Center, which maybe now can finally be improved upon.

Additionally, and very importantly as Baby Boomers age, Coloradans will age and need access to health care options. According to an interview from November 2023 with our Colorado State Demographer, Elizabeth Garner:

" So for the last decade, this decade, and probably next, the following decade, between 2040 and 2050, the fastest growing age group is our 65 plus. And actually, it's even a little bit older. Our 75- to 84-year-olds, if we look at just one 10-year age group, are by far the fastest growing and most growth in the state." (view full interview at https://www.cpr.org/2023/11/10/colorado-population-growth-housing-shortage/)

We do not want to be left behind (again).

We all know that Avista is currently under contract for a 40-acre campus, and its strategic location along Northwest Parkway will enable an additional 100,000 residents within Boulder County to live within 15 minutes of the hospital. The modern infrastructure and advanced medical services it could offer will undoubtedly elevate the quality of healthcare available to our region.

The Redtail Ridge development provides an opportunity to alleviate this issue by offering multiple access points to our hospital. This new access point would enhance the safety and convenience of reaching our facility, a development that we believe our patients and their families will greatly appreciate.

This improved accessibility will benefit our patients and their families during emergencies, and enhance overall healthcare outcomes. By relocating Avista, we can help promote improved RTD ridership while reducing overall single occupancy vehicle (SOV) traffic – both of which are critical elements in the Transportation Master Plans in Broomfield, Lafayette, and Louisville.

Please support the vote for RedTail Ridge - let's be the City of YES to smart progress!

Best,

Cory Nickerson & Mike Williams
Residents in Louisville (since 2010 & 1998)

From: Kathy Warling-Smith
To: City Council
Subject: Support Redtail Redevelopment - yes!
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 10:04:24 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from kathy.warlingsmith@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

As a 24+ year resident of Louisville, I 110% support the Redtail Redevelopment beings discussed 2/6/24.

Kathy Warling-Smith
905 McKinley Ave
Old Town

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Chris Gabriel
To: City Council
Subject: red rail ridge
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 10:02:47 AM

> Some people who received this message don't often get email from chrisgabriel101@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Hello
I'm writing in support of the RedTail Ridge development. I think it would be good for the community and the faster it gets started the better.

I'm also writing to say that the city council should do what's best for Louisville and not let people who have the time and money to attend council meetings have a heckler's veto over what and what does not get built in our town.

Thanks
Chris Gabriel
217 Short Pl, Louisville, CO 80027

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: David Bauer
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Plat is good for the Business Community
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:44:40 AM
Attachments: image001.png
image002.png

> Some people who received this message don't often get email from david.bauer@fib.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council:

As a member of our business community, I write in strong support of the Redtail Ridge preliminary plat. Approving this plat enables a new life science campus, which will draw world-class companies and, more importantly, new customers for our businesses and new families for our communities.

The Redtail Ridge development presents a unique opportunity to revitalize Louisville, especially our downtown area. By approving this project, we open doors to a vibrant economic landscape, attracting new businesses and visitors, which is essential for a thriving downtown. The proposed development will serve as a magnet for both families and businesses, reinstating Louisville as a prime destination for growth and innovation.

The inclusive design of Redtail Ridge, with its focus on sustainability and accessibility, aligns perfectly with modern business values. It sets the stage for a dynamic community where businesses can flourish alongside public amenities and green spaces. This balance is crucial for creating an environment where people want to work, live, and play.

Moreover, the economic ripple effects of this project are substantial. It will not only create new jobs but also stimulate local commerce, benefiting businesses across various sectors. The presence of Avista Hospital within this development is particularly significant, as it will draw a steady flow of visitors and staff, all potential patrons of our downtown businesses.

Thank you for considering this pivotal decision. I am confident that the Redtail Ridge development will mark the beginning of a new, flourishing chapter for Louisville.

Sincerely,

David Bauer
RETAIL MANAGER II
NMLS# 940480
O: 303-225-7566 | **C:** 785-213-2129
david.bauer@fib.com
1020 Century Dr
Louisville, CO 80027

First Interstate Bank

firstinterstate.com

Ask me how to put a **Business Line of Credit** to work for you.

This email message (including any attachments) is only for use by the intended recipient(s) and is presumed confidential. It may also be subject to privacy laws or other confidentiality protections and may constitute inside information. If you are not an intended recipient, you may not review, copy, distribute, or otherwise use this message or its contents. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete this message (including any attachments) from your system immediately. Any unauthorized reading, copying, distribution, or other use of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Yuehua Ji
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:41:19 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from yuehuaji@hotmail.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

Dear Louisville City Council,
Two years ago, We got clear election the results of redtail ridge
Development is not preserve natural open space and not fit in with the small population town.
Sincerely,
Yuehua Ji
923 Cypress Lane
Louisville,CO 80027

Sent from my iPad

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Nelson MD, Ewell
To: City Council
Subject: Supporting Avista"s future in Louisville
Date: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:35:53 AM

> Some people who received this message don't often get email from ewell.nelson.md@adventhealth.com. Learn why this is important

To Whom it may concern:

I support the move of the Avista hospital campus to Redtail Ridge. The hospital sees this as the best way to serve the community of Louisville and I support their efforts in this regard.

-Ewell Lee Nelson, MD
Neurosurgeon
Avista Hospital

This message (including any attachments) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is non-public, proprietary, privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law or may constitute as attorney work product. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, notify us immediately by telephone and (i) destroy this message if a facsimile or (ii) delete this message immediately if this is an electronic communication. Thank you.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Moeller MD, Loralie
To: City Council
Subject: Supporting Avista"s future in Louisville
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:34:28 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from loralie.moeller.md@adventhealth.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Council Members,

I'm reaching out as a member of the Advent Health Avista medical staff to express my support for our hospital's relocation to Redtail Ridge. I have been on staff at Avista for 25 years providing care for patients in this community. Avista is a wonderful place to work and patients can feel the amazing team work approach we have for taking excellent care of patients. It serves the community well but I believe it is time to upgrade to a state-of-the-art facility that is crucial for meeting the evolving changes in healthcare and the needs of our community.

Our move to Redtail Ridge is a significant stride towards better serving Louisville. The location of Redtail Ridge will enhance accessibility and a newer facility will allow top tier healthcare for the community of Louisville.

I believe that Avista's future relies on this relocation to a new, state-of-the-art facility so that we can continue to provide the best care in the most sustainable and accessible way. The only way Avista can move into this new location is with your approval of the preliminary plat for Redtail ridge.
Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Warm regards,

Loralie Moeller, MD

This message (including any attachments) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is non-public, proprietary, privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law or may constitute as attorney work product. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, notify us immediately by telephone and (i) destroy this message if a facsimile or (ii) delete this message immediately if this is an electronic communication. Thank you.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==
This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From:	sherry sommer
To:	Meredyth Muth; City Council; Barbara Hamlington; Deb Fahey; Judi Kern; Caleb Dickinson; Christopher Leh
Cc:	Jeff Durbin; Rob Zuccaro
Subject:	Missing letters/RTR
Date:	Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:42:46 PM

I just reviewed letters in the packet for tonight's quasi judicial review of Redtail Ridge.

It's very important that all letters regarding this application be included in the record. Residents wrote dozens of letters, overwhelming concerned about this still enormous development. None of the letters received by PPLAB or OSAB are in the packet.

The last letter in that packet came in January 30. I have no doubt there are many in the queue. The meeting is tonight at 6:00–and now it's 2:40. Council needs to keep up with public comments.

Given the time sensitive nature and importance of this application, I hope an addendum will be published as soon as possible.

Sherry Sommer

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Meredyth Muth
To: Sherry Sommer; City Council; Barbara Hamlington; Deb Fahey; Judi Kern; Caleb Dickinson; Christopher Leh
Cc: Jeff Durbin; Rob Zuccaro
Subject: RE: Missing letters/RTR
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:49:08 PM

Hi Sherry,

The packet contains comments through Friday, February 2 at 9:22 am. They are not in exact chronological order as attach them to the pdf in batches.

I am just now posting the packet addendum that includes all emails that have come in since Friday at 9 am through this afternoon. It will be send to =Council and added to the website here shortly. Anything that comes in after that will be added to a later packet addendum.

MEREDYTH MUTH (she/her/hers)
CITY CLERK
CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO
303.335.4536 (OFFICE)
720.762.2491 (CELL)

Please note: all incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, § 24-72-100.1, et seq.

-----Original Message-----
From: sherry sommer <hellosherry2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:42 PM
To: Meredyth Muth <muthm@louisvilleco.gov>; City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>; Barbara Hamlington <BHamlington@louisvilleco.gov>; Deb Fahey <dfahey@louisvilleco.gov>; Judi Kern <jkern@louisvilleco.gov>; Caleb Dickinson <calebdickinson@gmail.com>; Christopher Leh <leh@louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: Jeff Durbin <jdurbin@louisvilleco.gov>; Rob Zuccaro <rzuccaro@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Missing letters/RTR

I just reviewed letters in the packet for tonight's quasi judicial review of Redtail Ridge.

It's very important that all letters regarding this application be included in the record. Residents wrote dozens of letters, overwhelming concerned about this still enormous development. None of the letters received by PPLAB or OSAB are in the packet.

The last letter in that packet came in January 30. I have no doubt there are many in the queue. The meeting is tonight at 6:00–and now it's 2:40. Council needs to keep up with public comments.

Given the time sensitive nature and importance of this application, I hope an addendum will be published as soon as possible.

Sherry Sommer

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From:	sherry sommer
To:	Meredyth Muth; City Council; Barbara Hamlington; Deb Fahey; Judi Kern; Caleb Dickinson; Christopher Leh
Cc:	Jeff Durbin; Rob Zuccaro
Subject:	Missing letters/RTR
Date:	Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:42:46 PM

I just reviewed letters in the packet for tonight's quasi judicial review of Redtail Ridge.

It's very important that all letters regarding this application be included in the record. Residents wrote dozens of letters, overwhelming concerned about this still enormous development. None of the letters received by PPLAB or OSAB are in the packet.

The last letter in that packet came in January 30. I have no doubt there are many in the queue. The meeting is tonight at 6:00–and now it's 2:40. Council needs to keep up with public comments.

Given the time sensitive nature and importance of this application, I hope an addendum will be published as soon as possible.

Sherry Sommer

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From:	Eric Lund
To:	City Council
Cc:	Iona Kearney
Subject:	City Council Meeting Feb 6th, Redtail Ridge Request to Mayor and Council - Letter of Support of approval
Date:	Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:33:35 PM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png image006.png image007.png image008.png Redtail Ridge Plat Approval.pdf

---

Please find attached a letter of support from the Louisville Chamber of Commerce regarding Redtail Ridge Plat approval.

Thank you,

Eric J Lund

Executive Director

Louisville Chamber of Commerce

970-619-1587

eric@louisvillechamber.com

www.louisvillechamber.com

901 Main St Ste. A

LOUISVILLE CHAMBER

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Date: Feb 6th, 2024

To: Honorable Mayor and City Council of Louisville

From: Louisville Chamber of Commerce

RE: Redtail Ridge Approval of Preliminary Plat – Agenda Item 8-D

On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Louisville Chamber of Commerce and the 350-plus businesses that we represent, we are asking the council to support the preliminary plat for the proposed Redtail Ridge project. The project includes many innovative measures to promote mobility and mass transit ridership and includes more than 19 miles of new trails, multi-use paths, and bike lanes. The site is located less than a half-mile from an RTD location and is well-placed to become a model of both transit-oriented development (TOD) and implement sensible first- and last-mile transit solutions.

Additionally, the relocation of Advent Health Hospital is critical to the future success of our city and would have a substantial positive impact on the future of Louisville, being that the hospital is one of the largest employers in our region. This will have a significant impact on our city businesses and residents.

Regarding transportation, opponents of this project will undoubtedly repeat the debunked claim that the project will mean 20,000 more cars on our streets. This is both factually inaccurate and deliberately misleading on several levels. To begin with, opponents confuse the number of cars with the number of "vehicle trips," and none of the traffic studies support the contention that 20,000 cars will be added to our streets. Second, the claims forget to point out that the vehicle trip numbers represent 2040 figures when the project is fully built out.

We believe it is a missed opportunity for Louisville not to have a seat on the Northwest Parkway. I encourage the Council to work with the Northwest Parkway to protect Louisville's interests and support the life sciences campus at Redtail.

Regarding sustainability, the project will pursue both LEED and Fitwell certification and has made several dozen commitments for energy efficiency, onsite renewable energy, EV chargers, native plant palettes, water-wise landscaping, and fixtures, and so much more. Habitat management and preservation are also key elements of this next-generation life sciences campus and collectively represent an enormous improvement on the current conditions there.

And of course, the Redtail plan creates more than 139 acres of new public lands for our community to use, with 19 miles of new trails and bike paths, and will include numerous multi-mobility features. We should hold all future developments to the high bar that Redtail will set.

In summary, we request that you approve the preliminary plat for Redtail Ridge as presented,

Eric J Lund, Executive Director
Louisville Chamber of Commerce
CC: Louisville Board of Directors

From: Cathern H Smith
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge: Open Space and Other Ecological Considerations
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:18:27 PM
Attachments: LMC re Ability To Recommend More Open Space.docx

Some people who received this message don't often get email from cathernsmith@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Members of City Council and Mayor Leh,

Open Space is woven into the fiber of Louisville. The Comprehensive Plan is replete with references to the importance of Open Space to the high quality of life in our City. As you know, open spaces provide valued ecosystem services, including habitats that support biodiversity, recreational opportunities, improved water quality through filtration, and carbon sequestration. And, as we saw during the early stages of the CoVID 19 pandemic, Open Space provides refuges that support our mental health.

When making land use decisions for other large tracts of land, past City Council's have used the authority provided by the City Code to get significantly more Open Space. The norms established by Centennial Valley (**35%)** and Coal Creek (**46%)** suggest that **at least 40% is appropriate here**. And, as Centennial Valley and Coal Creek demonstrate, the municipal code provides ample authority. Two key provisions of the City Code are attached. Please ask City Staff to prepare an analysis applying these factors. (FN1) If useful to you, I am happy to take a deeper dive and give you my analysis.

The approximately 160 ecologically rich acres north of Disc Drive is among the land that should be preserved. Larger open spaces provide more robust and varied ecosystem services than small spaces. According to the 2013 Comprehensive Plan just 26% of Louisville's land is Open Space. I have heard several members of City Council say that 40% of Louisville's land is Open Space and that more Open Space is not needed. While some acquisitions have been made since 2013, 40% sounds way too high. The 40% number must include parks, ball fields, and other publicly used lands.

Just a few months ago, in November 2023, the citizens of Louisville expressed overwhelming support for Open Space by renewing the existing tax and increasing the Open Space tax. Similarly, at the special election, the citizens of Louisville rejected the developer's sprawling plan - identical for the most part to the plan before you now. With clustering of the development, significant Open Space is possible.

As you know, we sit on the cusp of a second great extinction event, the critters most affected by the development of Redtail Ridge cannot appear before you. The environmental degradation caused by grading cannot be overstated. It will take the soil decades to recover. And, all surface and sub-surface habitat is destroyed. The critters living on the property are pretty much being given a death sentence --when there are other options, like clustering.

We are environmental stewards of the lands and its critters. As part of our stewardship, the developer should be required to provide the mandatory information required by Section 16.12.050(S). Subsection S requires the

developer to provide the "Location of significant natural features such as trees, woodlands, lakes, hills, streams, wetlands, and floodplains, and historical and archaeological sites." Without this information, the approval of the Open Space Advisory Board and City Council are from an ecological standpoint meaningless – because they are made in a vacuum. Given what is at stake, it is perfectly reasonable to hold the develop to the City Code's requirements.

Your decision will deeply impact your children and grandchildren. As in-fill continues, the creation of Open Space now will provide future generations of humans as well as wildlife with a high quality of life.

I would like to see City Council take on the challenge of maximizing Open Space while allowing for reasonable economic growth.

Best regards,

Cathern Smith
Ward III

FN 1: Please direct the staff not to include property outside of Louisville when making calculations about compliance with City Code.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

Municipal Codes Regarding Ability To Recommend More Open Space:

Code of Ordinances City of Louisville, Colorado

Sec. 16.16.010. - General design and construction standards.

D. Natural features, historical and archaeological sites, and vegetation of the area, including trees, must be preserved to the extent possible.

E. Schools, parks, churches and other community facilities should be planned for as an integral part of the area to the extent possible. Open space, park, and recreation areas must be located in such a manner as to create an area that is usable and accessible to the residents of the subdivision and shall otherwise conform to all applicable city standards and requirements. The need for additional open space, park, and recreation areas shall be based on the following factors: the city's comprehensive plan; topography, drainage, vegetation and other physical conditions; the type and density of the proposed development; the availability of other open space, park and recreation areas; and the overall need within the proposed development for such areas.

Sec. 17.28.080. - Open space.

A. Open space, in addition to the public use dedications specified in title 16, may be required by the city council upon recommendation by the planning commission. The requirement for additional open space will be based on the following factors:

1. Comprehensive development plan (including matters of state interest);

2. Topography, drainage, vegetation and other such physical conditions;

3. Anticipated socio-economic conditions;

4. Type and density of development and employment;

5. Overall need for open space and recreational facilities.

Such open space shall be owned and maintained as common open space by the developer or by an organization established for the ownership and maintenance of common open space, unless the city accepts dedication of the open space through mutual agreement between the developer or organization and the city council.

The four classifications of Open Space:

https://library.municode.com/co/louisville/codes/code_of_ordinances

Sec. 4.03.010. - Classification and management.

Open space shall be managed in a manner consistent with good stewardship and sound ecological principles that benefits citizens of Louisville by promoting native plants, wildlife, wildlife and plant habitat, cultural resources, agriculture and scenic vistas and appropriate passive recreation. It is intended that the differing classifications of open space will require different management policies to provide reasonable levels of protection consistent with the intended uses of the land. The city shall manage its open space according to the following classifications:

A.Open space—Preserve.

1. Land under this classification is characterized by a moderate to high level of relative ecological importance with lower levels of habitat fragmentation. Where open space—preserve land is adjacent to other open space or other city-owned land, the adjacent land shall include, where possible, a sufficient buffer area to permit the successful management of the open space—preserve land.

2. This land shall be managed in a manner that preserves and promotes the long-term viability of native plants and native wildlife, restoration, restoration potential and ecologically sound agricultural use. Management of city-owned lands surrounding open space—preserve lands shall, to the extent possible under and consistent with the management criteria for the classification of such surrounding land, not be in conflict with the management required under this section.

3. Visitation for research purposes and formal supervised educational visitation may be permitted in this classification. No or very low levels of passive recreational activities shall be permitted.

4. When there is a real conflict between human use and any area or item of ecological importance in this classification, preference shall be given to sustaining the area or item of ecological importance.

B. Open space—Protected land.

1.Land under this classification shall be characterized by a moderate to high level of relative ecological importance with higher levels of habitat fragmentation.

2. This land shall be managed in the same manner as open space—preserve land, except that management may permit passive recreational activities so long as:

> a. The passive recreation activities are designed to encourage resource protection, long-term ecological viability of native plants and native wildlife, restoration, ecologically sensitive agricultural use, research, and education; and

b. The recreational impacts are contained in order to prevent any adverse effect on open space—preserve land.

3. Moderate to moderately high visitation levels may be permitted in this classification.

4. When there is a real conflict between human use and any area or item of ecological importance in this classification, preference shall be given to sustaining the area or item of ecological importance.

C. Open space—Visitor land.

1. Land under this classification shall be characterized by a lower level of relative ecological importance with higher levels of habitat fragmentation.

2. Open space—visitor land shall be managed so that recreational opportunities are designed to encourage resource protection with minimal landscaping using native plants and limited irrigation.

3. Moderate to high levels of visitation may be permitted in this classification.

D. Open space—Other lands.

1. Open space—other lands shall be managed to include construction of entryway features and trail rests, planting of trees, and other buffer plantings. Reasonable attempts shall be made to minimize the impact of entryway features and trail rests on the land, and to use native trees and plants.

2. High levels of visitation and passive recreation activities consistent with existing patterns may be permitted in this classification.

E. Notwithstanding the foregoing, all current uses and all uses contemplated in any intergovernmental agreement or other contractual obligation of the city in existence before the enactment of this chapter will be allowed unless and until the city council recommends a change and takes all necessary legal steps to implement such a change. The board may recommend such a change to council at anytime.

F. City decisions regarding open space identification, classification and management shall consider the best information available.

From: Brian Moran
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge - Voice of Community
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:16:57 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from bmoran@ghx.com. Learn why this is important

Hello Louisville Council –

I hear that once again folks are trying to push through an agenda and development plan that's been in front of us residents and pushed back on multiple times before.

I have been a homeowner here for 20 years (and a renter before then). I have worked in the community for the last 17 years. I have raised 2 kids here and both have attended local public schools. I attend church here in town. I support small businesses in my town.

I do not want to live in another Broomfield or whatever you wanna call the atrocious sprawl that's Superior. I don't want Generic America – I want to live in Louisville.

If I had my way, we'd pass a tax measure to help procure as much of Redtail Ridge property as possible for green space and trails/park… but I understand economics.

If Louisville feels that it much keep "growing" (in lieu of replacing all our lost businesses and empty buildings throughout the town), I'm not incredibly aligned. However, I'd ask that a new and condensed plan be created. I'd support Avista expansion for instance. But we do NOT NEED to build that area out. We should prioritize being one of the last bastion of green belts off of 36. We should prioritize sustainability and low infrastructure – and less congestion and pollution in our town.

Just don't try to sneak the garbage through. A developer will benefit. You'll all be disliked. And the town will suffer.

Thank you,
Brian & the Moran family

Brian Moran
Sr. Product Manager, Global Exchange Services - Automation
Product Owner – My Exchange, Intelligent Business Rules
Pronouns: He/Him/His

GHX
1315 W. Century Drive
Louisville, CO 80027
720.887.7661 direct
720.887.7000 main
720.887.7200 fax
bmoran@ghx.com
Subscribe to The Healthcare Hub blog
Global perspectives and insights on running the new business of healthcare

From: Joel Hayes
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:09:08 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from hayesjoel@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Mayor and Council Members:

I write to oppose the proposed preliminary subdivision plat set on tonights' agenda regarding the Redtail Ridge proposal, for the same reasons that the Louisville Planning Commission recommended denial of the same proposal. Namely:

1. The Applicant has not demonstrated that the proposed subdivision adequately preserves natural features, wildlife habitat and vegetation of the property. Previously undeveloped areas on the northern portion of the property include natural vegetation that could be further preserved as public or private open space with clustering of the development lots to the south.

2. The Application does not include proposals for mitigation, road capacity work, or contribution to future road capacity work for the interchange, nor are future improvements planned at this time.

3. The Application does not include a commitment from Northwest Parkway Authority for the acquisition of right of way needed to construct road capacity improvements included in the traffic study as needed to mitigate traffic congestion.

4. The Application does not comply with LMC Sec. 16.16.040 concerning block length, as some blocks proposed in the Application exceed the maximum length of 1,320 feet. Maintaining prescribed block lengths is necessary to ensure an adequate and convenient transportation system to serve the proposed subdivision.

5. The Application does not comply with LMC Sec. 16.16.020.B., which states that drainage areas should be left in a natural state to the greatest extent possible. The Applicant has not demonstrated that grading of drainage areas within public open spaces has been limited to the greatest extent possible.

6. The Application does not comply with the 2010 ConocPhillips Campus General Development Plan (GDP). The type and character of the development proposed with the Application is not consistent with the GDP and the street network does not comply with the street network shown on the GDP because it is proposed as publicly dedicated roads rather than private roads.

I hope the Council will again deny this proposal. If and when this area is developed I hope it will be done in a way that adds to our quality of life and complies with the letter and spirit of our zoning and development plans. Thank you for your consideration of my letter and for your service to our fair city.

Sincerely

Joel Hayes

187 Harper St.
Louisville CO

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: John Ohannessian
To: City Council
Subject: No on Redtail Ridge Vote
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:49:08 PM

> Some people who received this message don't often get email from johnohan@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Council,
As a Louisville City resident I ask you to please vote NO on the upcoming Redtail Ridge vote.

Thank you

John Ohannessian
569 Augusta Drive
Louisville, CO 80027
303-817-3535 (Cell)

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Tonya Johnson
To: City Council
Subject: RedTail Ridge
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:54:29 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from tonyaj@ecentral.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

Hello Members of City Council

I realize that I may be too late to submit my comments; however, I would like to weigh in on the RedTail Ridge project. I believe that for a city that is limiting new gas connections and new gas stations, it seems extravagant to approve a large plan that will have a significantly greater environmental impact.

The owner of the land knew how it was zoned when they bought the property. I would be being more in favor of considering options that preserve open space and wildlife - I wonder if there are organizations that can provide funding to remove a significant portion of this land from development?

I oppose the scale of this project.

Thank you for your time. I do not need a response.

Respectfully,
Tonya Johnson
509 La Farge Ave
Louisville, CO 80027

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Betty Solek
To: City Council
Subject: Fwd: Voting on Redtail Ridge
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:53:24 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from betzgirls@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

I wrote this comment in December and it is still current for this evening's meeting. The proposed subdivision on the Redtail proposal is not consistent with Louisville policies. Large corporate campus approaches to design also do not support use of of the regional public transit system. Please ask the applicant to prepare a conceptual plan that will address the citizen input and Louisville policies.
Betty Solek

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Betty Solek** <betzgirls@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Dec 4, 2023 at 1:19 PM
Subject: Voting on Redtail Ridge
To: <Council@louisvilleco.gov>

Dear current council members:
I understand there could be a vote on the resubmitted application for the RedTail Ridge proposal tomorrow. In light of the current vacant seat on the council, It doesn't seem the consideration of this proposal is appropriate. Louisville voters said no to this proposal and it's disturbing to see a new council immediately reconsider the application. And not even a complete council!
Louisville residents have made clear their opposition to the vision for the last big undeveloped opportunity for this community. The city was supportive of the original vision when ConocoPhillips proposed a sustainable energy research center. It seems the council continues to be presented with the vision of a large corporate entity, with out the sustainable energy research center. Now the plan is presenting more of the same corporate buildings that Broomfield Interlocken Business park provides. I heard all of the city council candidates voice their support for the small town character of Louisville. I am not convinced that "more of the same" corporate office park will support a small town character.
This is the year that Louisville begins its Comprehensive Plan update. It seems to me that this council needs to find a way to allow that process to proceed and give Louisville citizens the opportunity to voice their vision for this property, while also considering Louisville as a whole.
Thank you for considering my input.
Betty Solek
1101 N Franklin Ave
Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Trudi Moran
To: City Council
Subject: No on RedTail Ridge / Southeast Gateway
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:47:11 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from trudirmoran@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

Councilpersons,

With respect to the agenda item pertaining to RedTail Ridge, I urge you to vote no. This proposal is not a good fit for our community. Our community spoke in the special election and this is the fourth year I have written on the issue. The proposal continues to be sprawling and unnecessarily impact native land features and wildlife. The current plan has too many impacts to sensitive ecosystems. It is sprawling rather than condensed development. It removes far too many trees. Please send the development back to the drawing board so they can present a plan that fits with the town's comprehensive plan. I am opposed to such a development when we already have transportation and traffic issues and this would result in many more trips (most likely single drivers) on our roads. Please send the developer back to revise the plan and please respect the democratic process and your constituents.

Thanks for your time,
Trudi Redd Moran
Louisville resident

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Chris Torrence
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge proposal - vote for approval
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:39:36 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from chris_torrence@comcast.net. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

Hi City Council,

As a longtime resident of Louisville, I am writing to urge you to approve the preliminary subdivision plat for Redtail Ridge.

There have been many proposals over the years, some better than others. Although the current proposal isn't perfect, it appears that the developers have acted in good faith to provide a plan that meets the desired needs, both for the original 2010 GDP as well as add-ons such as additional open space, trails, LEEDs building standards, and solar electric generation.

This is just for approval of the preliminary proposal, and there is plenty of time for compromise and course correction in future proposals.

Rather than "design by community", I would suggest that we trust you, the elected officials, to do the right thing in the coming months and years as final proposals are developed and brought forward.

Thank you for your consideration.

-Chris Torrence
Louisville, Colorado

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Natasha Flyer
To: City Council
Subject: Premature Public Hearing for Preliminary Plat - Incomplete Packet as Mandatory by City Code
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:34:51 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from natasha.flyer@colorado.edu. Learn why this is important

JUST A FEW COMPLETELY MISSING EXAMPLES:

1. **Missing 16.12.050 (Y), "The maximum height proposed for ALL buildings and structures."**
2. **Missing 16.12.050 (W)**, "**Development phases or stages proposed in order to assure the availability of public services and the orderly development of the subdivision.**
3. **No compliance 16.16.020(B)** Burden on developer to demonstrate need for grading site
4. **Missing 16.04.020(K), "To provide for the safe and efficient circulation of traffic throughout the city, the avoidance of congestion in the streets and highways" - Addressing cost burden of US 36 and NWPY interchange**
5. **Expired Agreement with BSVD on Alignment of Campus Drive**
6. **Missing** Intergovernmental Agreement with NWPY
7. **Missing** full drainage report in Preliminary Plat packet, only uninterpretable image.

Natasha Flyer

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Garrett Clark
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:33:08 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from clark.garrett3@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear City Council,
Appreciate your service to the community, as a busy father of three young children and owning my own small business I felt the need to speak up about Redtail Ridge.

In the special election shortly after the fire, with minimal research, myself and my wife voted against the development. In retrospect that was the wrong decision for Louisville.

After researching the issue in depth our community should have moved forward with the initial 2019-2020 proposal for a 5+ million sqft live/work development. This would:

- Provide housing for the Marshall Fire victims that didn't have enough insurance or deep enough pockets.
- Allow for the younger families that can't afford 1M+ houses to grow in Louisville rather than neighboring towns.
- Keep our downtown restaurants from closing with the additional customers.
- Provide the first large scale retail since the Sams Club and Kohls have closed.
- Provide local walking/biking jobs for our citizens rather than those same jobs being in a neighboring town requiring a commute.

Louisville as a community was built off of the former jobs provided by StorageTek, we need to remember that and grow forward as a community.

Thank you!

Garrett Clark
594 Spruce Circle

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Amy Conway
To: City Council
Subject: Concerns about developing RedTail Ridge
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:20:44 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from amyconway@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

Dear Louisville City Council,
I am writing to express my desire for the city council to respect the results of our 2022 special election which rejected the big development on Redtail Ridge. We can do better than this! Please help protect our small town feeling by countering with a proposal for a much smaller development south of Disc Drive that won't change the traffic and ruin natural habitat.

Thank you,
Amy Conway
2402 McKinley Ave
Louisville, CO

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Tim Stalker
To: City Council
Subject: Letter to the City Council for this evening"s meeting
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:10:44 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from tstalker28@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

To the Council

Thank you for the opportunity to provide my comments regarding the RedTailridge preliminary plat.

The plat before you tonight, unfortunately, has proceeded to this step in the planning process without an amendment to the CononoPhillips GDP. It's a decision the developer made and expressed in the Spring of 2022 that the city staff must legally let proceed. While your consideration of this plat provides no avenue for the public to contest this maneuver, the public opinon about the plans in the plat are still a matter of outstanding relevant public opinion expressed in the referendum vote that voted down the developer's attempt to amend the GDP with what are essentially the same plans.

Rather than honoring the city's vote to deny the developer's amendment to the GDP, and working towards a better amendment, this developer has proceeded in ignoring the city's referendum and ceased working with the city on another amendment. Why? Because by pitching the plans as a proposal for a subdivision they're able to make prevent the public's right to protest it as an ordinance.

The developer is performing an unprecedented avoidance of our home rule charter for **prohibited action by council - section 7-5 b**, which states:

No referred ordinance repealed by the registered electors of the City may be readopted by the Council during a period of four (4) years after the date of the election on the referred ordinance, unless the readoption is approved by the registered electors.

In name only, the developer is proposing a subdivision rather than an ordinance of a GDP amendment with the same plans used for the amendment the city denied in April 2022. Quoting Jay Hardy from Brue Baukol, ***"We are not going back to the drawing board, period. What we will do is take that ConocoPhillips GDP and submit a plat off of that. There will not be another review of trying to redo the general development plan."*** Such bravado and chest pounding provides you or the city no help.

As a city council, you do have the responsibility of paying attention to our home rule

charter for what you're prohibited from doing because the plans for the plat haven't changed. It's still a 389 acre site the developer intends to grade almost in its entirety. That has never changed. While you're not legally obligated to adhere to section 7.5b in our home rule charter, please understand that you and the city are being taken advantage of. This developer has no interest in Louisville, other than for the 389 acre site they own. Otherwise they would have proposed a better amendment and plans to the GDP. The fact of the matter is, you're being asked to approve a plat with an unprecedented and un-amended GDP. No other landowner that I can determine as proceeded in such a way as this.

Please vote to deny this proposal with modifications.

Thank you,
Tim Stalker
806 W Dahlia Ct

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: jdmcnary@gmail.com
To: City Council
Subject: Letter Recommending Approval of Redtail Ridge
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:07:12 AM
Attachments: McNaryAvistaRedtailRidge Letter v1.0.pdf

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jdmcnary@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

February 6, 2024

Members of the Louisville City Council:

As a resident of Louisville and a Director on the AdventHealth Avista Hospital Board of Trustees, I am writing in support of the Redtail Ridge plan for development.

I have been a resident of Boulder County for over 40 years and have witnessed tremendous change throughout the county during that time. While I certainly miss the smaller scale and population density of that time, I believe it is important to acknowledge the many changes for good that the area's growth has brought about. One of these changes was the construction of Avista Hospital, a facility that has benefited thousands of fellow Louisville residents and their families each year.

A critical component of the Redtail Ridge plan is the opportunity for Avista Hospital to build a new, larger facility with better access. We are fortunate to have such a high-quality medical facility in our community but there are shortcomings that the new facility can address. The first is access. Raising an active family has involved numerous trips to the emergency room and the long, winding route to the hospital always felt even longer when we were rushing to get there. The planned location for the new facility has greatly improved access which will allow many people to receive medical care more quickly. Another shortcoming the new facility will rectify is its size. Throughout 2022 I had medical issues that required numerous hospital stays. Avista was the first choice for my care team but was unavailable and I was directed to receive care at other area hospitals. The new facility will have more room to serve a greater number of patients and offer more comprehensive services that will benefit the members of our community.

Please consider the value Avista Hospital brings to our community and recognize how much more it can offer us all with a new, updated and expanded facility by voting to approve the Redtail Ridge development plan.

Sincerely,

Judy McNary
1574 White Violet Way

Louisville CO 80027
Director, AdventHealth Avista Hospital Board of Trustees

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: farenz@comcast.net
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:49:39 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from farenz@comcast.net. Learn why this is important

Dear members of the Louisville City Council-
As a 38 year resident of Louisville, I have seen many changes to the city and the development of all parts of the city. I was in favor of the Redtail Ridge development plan that was rejected in 2022 and remain in favor of that development or something substantially the same. I think the expansion of the Avista Hospital and related development creates new, clean jobs in the area and should result in expanded medical services available in our city. As I recall that plan also included some public access to park-like areas within the development and we can always use more areas for public use. I do not think we should leave that tract of land vacant any longer – I remember Storage Tech and the jobs and income it provided to Louisville businesses. I believe we should encourage revenue producing businesses on that land not leave it empty and unused.

As I recall, much of the opposition to the plan in 2022 was that it would impact rebuilding after the fire. I do not believe that was true at the time – commercial builders are not in the business of home building. Most of the rebuilding in well under way and this development would likely have little effect on remaining rebuilding, if any.

While there will no doubt be some increase in traffic, it seems like most of the traffic will not have any effect on the local Louisville streets. Other developments, including Steel Ranch, North End and all the housing along Hwy 42 added traffic but also provided benefits to the local economy and they were approved.

Felicia Renz
696 Owl Dr.
Louisville, CO 80027

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Jeff Meier
To: City Council
Subject: Red Tail Ridge
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:27:53 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from jmeier0207@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

Please vote yes on this development
Thanks!

Jeff Meier
970 948-6666
470 County Rd
Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From:	tamar krantz
To:	City Council; Christopher Leh; Caleb Dickinson; Deb Fahey; Judi Kern; Barbara Hamlington; Dietrich Hoefner
Subject:	Please Carefully Consider the Planning Commission Decision on RTR plat
Date:	Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:24:48 AM

Dear City Council members,

Thankyou in advance for carefully considering the application for a preliminary subdivision plat at Redtail Ridge and for carefully considering the resolution of the planning commission.

Planning commission deliberated for three meetings and arrived at a recommendation of denial for the subdivision plat. ***The response from Evan Pesonen of Sterling Bay to the planning commission recommendation of denial includes some reasonable responses and some misinterpretations of our code*** (Attachment #20 page Page 659 of 1770 in the meeting packet). I've taken the time to analyze their response. Please see my in-line comments in red, below.

Thanks for considering this very carefully.

Tamar
Former Planning Commissioner

Attachment #20 f

On Sterling Bay Letterhead

March 24, 2023
Mr. Rob Zuccaro
Planning and Building Safety Director
City of Louisville 749 Main St Louisville, CO 80027
Sent via email: RZuccaro@LouisvilleCo.gov

RE: Response to Plan Commission Resolution No. 13, Series 2022

Dear Mr. Zuccaro,

Below please find detailed responses to five reasons the City of Louisville Planning Commission cited as their basis of denial of the preliminary plat on December 8, 2022. For ease of review, the Plan Commissions' concerns are repeated followed by our response.

Section 2. Based on the testimony of the witnesses and the documents and other evidence made a part of the record of the hearing before the Planning Commission, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed subdivision does not promote the following purposes set forth in Section 16.04.020 of the Louisville Municipal Code

("LMC"), or comply with the following standards set forth in LMC Chapter 16.16 and this title:

A. The Planning Commission finds that the application from Sterling Bay (the "Applicant") for approval of the Redtail Ridge Filing No. 1 Preliminary and Final Subdivision Plat (the "Application") does not comply with LMC Sec. 16.16.010.D. and E., which states that natural features and vegetation must be preserved to the extent possible and a need for additional open space may be based on vegetation and the type and density of the proposed development. The Applicant has *not demonstrated that the proposed subdivision adequately preserves natural features, wildlife habitat and vegetation of the property. Previously undeveloped areas on the northern portion of the property include natural vegetation that could be further preserved as public or private open space with clustering of the development lots to the south*.

Response: ***Code Section 16.16.010.D requires natural features and vegetation to "be preserved to the extent possible." Code Section 16.16.010.E generally governs the location of community facilities, parks, and open spaces, and also provides, "The need for additional open space, park, and recreation areas shall be based on the following factors: the city's comprehensive plan; topography, drainage, vegetation and other physical conditions; the type and density of the proposed development; the availability of other open space, park and recreation areas; and the overall need within the proposed development for such areas."***

This part of the response simply repeats the words of the code sections referenced above. ***Note that the city council can require more open space. The need can be justified under 16.16.10. E under "overall need within the development for such areas".***

The proposed grading of the site is necessary to meet the development's drainage requirements, so the proposal satisfies Code Section 16.16.010.D's direction to preserve vegetation and natural features "to the extent possible." We will have one of our consultants present on these issues specifically, which should help defuse concerns in this area. Staff was in support of our wildlife programs and indicated that they met the Code's requirements.

Simply stating that the natural features are preserved to the extent possible because the drainage requirements must be met is not satisfactory. In order to verify that vegetation and natural features are preserved to the extent possible, the ***burden of proof is on the applicant to show that alternatives were considered.***

The planning commission memo states that more natural features could be preserved with clustering. Clustering the development to the south is feasible. This needs to be addressed by the applicant.

Additionally, Code Section 16.16.010.E merely states that open space, like other public use amenities, should be designed to complement the proposed development. The provision does not allow the City to deny an application simply because the proposal could be redesigned to provide more open space. The required public use dedication of 12% is provided by Code Section 16.16.060, and the actual open space we propose dedicating greatly exceeds this threshold.

While it is true that open space dedication exceeds the minimum requirement. 12% is a minimum. ***The above statement is false. The city CAN deny the application simply because it could be redesigned to provide more open space under 16.16.010.E***. The applicant has shown no willingness to work with the city and the public to cluster development to protect natural areas. Please refer to Sec. 16.04.020, which references the Local Government Control Enabling Act and describes the city's broad authority over land use decisions.

B. The Planning Commission finds that the Application does not comply with LMC Sec. 16.04.020.K, which states the purpose of a subdivision is to avoid traffic congestion, based on the following:

1. According to the traffic study submitted with the Application, the US 36 and Northwest Parkway interchange reaches a Level of Service F and would need to be modified by the year 2027-2028 to provide additional vehicular capacity to accommodate the proposed subdivision. The Application does not include proposals for mitigation, road capacity work, or contribution to future road capacity work for the interchange, nor are future improvements planned at this time.

Response: Code Section 16.04.020.K does not state that an applicant must demonstrate avoidance of traffic congestion; instead, the provision merely states that traffic circulation is one of the many purposes for which the City has the authority to grant a subdivision. Thus, the Resolution's statement that the application "does not comply" with Section 16.04.020.K is not technically correct. The subdivision plat results in much needed and high priority reduction in congestion and dangerous traffic patterns for Monarch High School by extending Campus Drive. The current situation is known to be a safety hazard by the School District, the City and the citizens, and there is strong
community support and school district support for the extension of Campus Drive to the east, which extension creates the issues with the NW Parkway.

The applicant claims that the resolution's statement that the application "does not comply" with section 16.04.020K is not technically correct.

However, ***it IS technically correct***. "Does not comply" in the context of the LMC 16.04.020

(copied below in its entirety for context) means that it does not "...provide for the safe and efficient circulation of traffic throughout the city, the avoidance of congestion…" Please read the entire purpose section below. Note that in this context, ***local governments have the authority under state law to deny a subdivision for the purposes listed in this section***, including purpose
"K." Here is the section including the introductory paragraph.

Sec. 16.04.020. - Purpose.

The regulations in this title are designed and enacted in accordance with the authority granted to the city including, but not limited to, subdivision authority granted in C.R.S. § 31-23-201 et seq. and the land use authority granted in C.R.S. § 29-20-101 et seq., the "Local Government Land Use Control Enabling Act of 1974," for the following purposes:

A. To promote the health, safety, convenience, order, prosperity and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the city;

B. To provide for the proper arrangement of streets in relation to existing or planned streets and to the comprehensive plan;

C. To provide for adequate and convenient open spaces for motor vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle traffic, utilities, access of firefighting apparatus, civil defense, recreation, and sites for schools, educational facilities, and related structures;

D. To promote orderly growth and to provide for the harmonious development of the city in accordance with its comprehensive plan;

E. To provide for adequate light, air and privacy and to secure safety from fire, flood and other danger;

F. To avoid congestion of population and to provide for the proper distribution of population and supportive land uses;

G. To ensure that public facilities and services are available and will have sufficient capacity to serve the development;

H.

To protect the character and the social and economic stability of all parts of the city;

I.

To conserve and enhance the value of land throughout the city and the value of buildings and improvements upon the land;

J.

To minimize the conflicts among the uses of land and buildings placed on the land;

K.

To provide for the safe and efficient circulation of traffic throughout the city, the avoidance of congestion in the streets and highways and along pedestrian and bikeways;

L.

To provide reasonable standards in order to further the orderly layout of land and to ensure proper legal descriptions and monumenting of subdivided land;

M.

To mitigate the pollution of air, streams and ponds, assure the adequacy of drainage facilities, safeguard the water table, and encourage the wise use and management of the natural environment;

N.

To preserve and enhance to the extent reasonably possible the natural beauty and topography of the city and areas of historical or archeological importance and to ensure appropriate development with regard to such natural, historical and archaeological sites and features;

O.

To regulate the use of land within the city on the basis of the impact thereof on the community or surrounding areas;

P.

To regulate the location of activities and developments which may result in significant changes in population density;

Q.

To provide for phased development of services and facilities;

R.

To help assure that growth bears a reasonable share of the costs thereof; and

S.

To otherwise plan for and regulate the use of land so as to provide planned and orderly use of land and protection of the environment in a manner consistent with constitutional rights.

.

The statement that “The subdivision plat results in much needed and high priority reduction in congestion and dangerous traffic patterns for Monarch High School by extending Campus Drive is not particularly relevant in this context because ***the resolution refers to traffic predictions for the early failure of US36 and NWP interchange, not Campus Drive.*** Furthermore, the claim is that this will reduce congestion and improve safety is hypothetical. Egress concerns are ameliorated by the recent construction of an emergency exit via Paradise lane. With the project, traffic volume will increase 7X on the Campus drive extension as the site is built out, from initially only 1,700 vehicles per day to 12,200 vehicles per day (Source: Fox Tuttle Traffic Study, 2021) making school egress potentially more difficult.

2. The Application does not include a commitment from Northwest Parkway Authority for the acquisition of right of way needed to construct road capacity improvements included in the traffic study as needed to mitigate traffic congestion.

Response: We continue to work with the NWPA regarding the improvements proposed within their right-of-way as well as the limited easements that are needed to accommodate sidewalks along sections of 96th Street.

The applicant should continue to work with the NWPA and submit a complete application once this is obtained. ***City council best practice is to avoid conditional approvals.***

C. The Planning Commission finds that the Application does not comply with LMC Sec. 16.16.040 concerning block length, as some blocks proposed in the Application exceed the maximum length of 1,320 feet. Although the Applicant requested a modification pursuant to LMC Chapter 16.24 to allow longer block lengths, the Commission does not find that there are unique physical or topographical circumstances or conditions to justify the modification. Maintaining prescribed block lengths is necessary to ensure an adequate and convenient transportation system to serve the proposed subdivision.

Response: The preliminary and final plats have been modified to decrease the parcel sizes therefore eliminating the block length maximum being exceeded.
This is now acceptable.

D. The Planning Commission finds that the Application does not comply with LMC Sec. 16.16.020.B., which states that drainage areas should be left in a natural state to the greatest extent possible. The Applicant has not demonstrated that grading of drainage areas within public open spaces has been limited to the greatest extent possible.

Response: The redevelopment of the project incorporates numerous criteria that were not in place when the original Storagetek campus was designed and built. Stormwater

detention, water quality and drainage criteria have all become more stringent, and expansive soil conditions on the property now require over-excavation resulting in additional disturbance that we are mitigating to the greatest extent possible. We have asked our design team to scrutinize the grading limits, and they have been reduced in certain areas. While the criteria outlined in LMC Sec. 16.16.020.B is subjective in our opinion, our professional engineer and design professionals have done everything they feel possible to minimize impacts through their design of the redevelopment and feel we have satisfied the requirements of the City's municipal code and existing entitlement documents.

Please note that, there appears to be a mistake in the wording of the resolution. LMC Sec. 16.16.020.B states that "Drainage areas, wherever possible, should be left in a natural state and no encroachments shall be made on the natural channel area." the resolution mistakenly says "greatest extent possible."

I agree that the words, "greatest extent possible" (as well as "whenever possible") are subjective. ***However, the city has authority under Sec. 16.04.020 S (in above response) to "…regulate the use of land so as to provide planned and orderly use of land and protection of the environment in a manner consistent with constitutional rights***." As stated under Resolution point A, "The planning commission memo states that more natural features could be preserved with clustering. Clustering the development to the south is feasible. This needs to be addressed by the applicant." The same is true for drainage areas.

This applicant response explains the difficulty of leaving drainage areas in a natural state and the efforts of the applicant are appreciated.

This response mentions entitlement documents. I cannot respond to this without the name of the documents.

The Planning Commission finds that the Application does not comply with the 2010 ConocoPhillips Campus General Development Plan (GDP). The type and character of the development proposed with the Application is not consistent with the GDP and the street network does not comply with the street network shown on the GDP because it is proposed as publicly dedicated roads rather than private roads.

Response: For (1), the "permitted uses" allowed by the GDP are very broad and include commercial uses, offices, "facilities for the research, development, manufacturing, fabrication, processing, or assembly of scientific and technical products, or other products," and "other uses as established by the City Council." Thus, while our proposed uses may not be precisely the same as what Conoco Phillips was contemplating, the proposed development fits within the general character of development described in the GDP, which is not tied to the specific uses Conoco Phillips might have contemplated.

I split this to begin with the type and character of development then address the roads.

Regarding Type and Character:

One of the four main purposes of a GDP is to establish the “type and character of development” The applicant is interpreting the GDP so broadly that this purpose becomes absent from the GDP. The use of the word “campus” throughout the document shows this and the council record from 2010 verifies intent as a single user corporate campus.

Furthermore, the type and character is established in part by the zoning, which is “PCZD commercial with PUD-C overlay.” ***The plat does not comply with the PUD-C overlay.*** The allowed uses in PUDC commercial include manufacturing however, the type of manufacturing differs from the type allowed in industrial zoning. Sec. 17.72.090. - Commercial and office states that “such facilities shall be completely enclosed and any noise, smoke, dust, odor, or other environmental contamination produced by such facilities, confined to the lot upon which such facilities are located..”

The letter from sterling bay to Rob Zuccaro dated November 28, 2023 RE: Redtail Ridge Preliminary Master Plat and Subdivision Filing No.1 states the intent to use the site for R&D Life Sciences labs & cGMP facilities as well as flex industrial. In verbal Testimony the applicant explained that this includes manufacturing of pharmaceuticals and pharmaceutical products. These uses are inconsistent with the PUD-C overlay because they emit pollutants beyond the lots upon which they are located. These types of facilities are heavy polluters of air and water and create hazardous and toxic waste. Some pharmaceutical manufacturing may not even be allowed in our industrial zoned areas.

It is possible that the proposed uses have been further explained elsewhere in the 1170 pages and that I have overlooked this. They were not clear when this was presented to the planning commission. City Council should clarify the proposed uses before determining compliance.One of the requirements for a subdivision plat in Sec. 16.12.050 (M) is the description of the “proposed uses.”

Regarding Roads:

The same applies to (2), to which we will respond by quoting the GDP’s statement regarding the street network: “Traffic circulation patterns depicted within and across Lot A represent internal private drives and are conceptual only and subject to modification.” While the GDP mentions private drives, the statement is intended to clarify that the streets depicted in the GDP are merely conceptual and should in no way limit future development. Thus, a site plan including dedicated public streets is not inconsistent with the GDP.

First, the statement above that the "streets depicted in the GDP are conceptual and should in "no way limit future development" is illogical. If this were true, then the GDP sets no limits and provides not direction on the streets. We cannot interpret that the GDP says nothing when our code says that a GDP "shall set forth...D. the proposed location of all streets shall be coordinated with the adopted general street plan for the city." (LMC 17.17.030). It seems to me that the logical interpretation is that the GDP says ***something*** about the streets.

Second, the planning commission resolution is correct in noting that ***public roads do not comply with the GDP, which describes internal private drives***. The words "internal private" represent a restrictive clause for the word "drives". According to grammarly.com, "restrictive element defines or limits the meaning of the word it modifies and is therefore essential to the meaning of the sentence. Because it contains essential information, a restrictive element is not set off with commas."

Third, this interpretation should be made in the larger context of the GDP and its purpose. ***A GDP serves as a restrictive document***. Here is the city code language that states that the ConocoPhillips GDP remains in effect: "All final plans registered and recorded or filed hereunder shall be binding upon the applicants therefor, their successors and assigns, shall limit and control the issuance and validity of all building permits and shall restrict and limit the construction, location, use and operation of all land and structures included within such plans to all conditions and limitations set forth in such plans (LMC17.72.160) The words, "binding, limit, control, and restrict" do not imply entitlement to the most broad interpretation possible.

Finally, the city council need not interpret this in the applicant's favor. As you know, the 2010 GDP is legally tied to the PCZD agreement that is on page 664/969 of the December 5, 2023 city council meeting packet. This is clarified under section 4.3, "Remedies and Vested Rights", which states:

> "The Owner acknowledges that certain actions, such as the review of subdivision plats and site specific development plans are matters of quasi-judicial discretion, and no promises or assurances of favorable exercise of such discretion have been made to or relied upon by the Owner. The Owner further acknowledges that this Agreement ***does not constitute a vested rights agreement.***

Thank you and your team for your continued efforts towards finalizing the Preliminary Plat and Filing 1 Final Plat for Redtail Ridge. We are available at your convenience to review and discuss any of your comments and our responses. Respectfully, STERLING BAY Evan Pesonen Vice President – Asset Management and Acquisitions

From: Mike Kranzdorf
To: City Council; Rob Zuccaro
Subject: Retail Ridge
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:22:11 AM

Hello Council and staff,

The Retail Ridge Preliminary Subdivision Plat should be approved to allow for productive discussions with the new developer of the project. It's the beginning of a process, not an end. Sterling Bay has committed to generous public and private land dedications, concentrated building placement, onsite solar, LEED design, improved access for Monarch High and a new home for Avista Hospital. It will not be everything to everyone, but given the prior GDP and metro district approvals, this project will move forward in some form. Staff has determined the plat to be in accordance with city policy. It's time to work collaboratively and not put up more impediments. Losing the Medtronic campus because of roadblocks was bad enough, please don't let it happen to Avista as well.

Thank you,

Michael Kranzdorf
Amterre Property Group LLC

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Christopher Leh
To: Meredyth Muth
Subject: Fwd: Redtail Ridge
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:45:10 AM

Best Regards,

Chris Leh
Mayor
City of Louisville (CO)
(c) 303.668.3916
Leh@louisvilleco.gov

Begin forwarded message:

From: barmstrob@gmail.com
Date: February 2, 2024 at 4:42:22 PM MST
To: Christopher Leh <leh@louisvilleco.gov>, Caleb Dickinson <cdickinson@louisvilleco.gov>, Deb Fahey <dfahey@louisvilleco.gov>, Dietrich Hoefner <DHoefner@louisvilleco.gov>, Barbara Hamlington <BHamlington@louisvilleco.gov>, Judi Kern <jkern@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

Some people who received this message don't often get email from barmstrob@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

City Council Members,

I am writing to encourage you, as a council, to definitively resolve the Redtail Ridge issue in our town for once and for all. This property is privately owned, and as such, the city needs to work in good faith with the owners to get to a compromise where no one gets everything they want, but all parties get most of what they want. The position of the No Campaign is a zero sum game as it has become clear that members of this campaign will settle for nothing less than zero development. This approach is the epitome of not acting in good faith. Our town has suffered long enough from the undue and disproportionate influence the No Campaign has had on our city governance and progress, to the point that an average citizen of Louisville would be excused from wondering who's really making the decisions for our city, a duly elected set of Council members in whom we invest the responsibility of these very difficult and complex decisions, or a small but vocal group of residents who are propagating misinformation and are appealing to residents who simply do not have the same context and information, nor the time, to inform and instruct a wise decision in the way that elected City Council members have.

Please prioritize what's right for our city over the long-term rather than what feels good to a small subset of residents in the immediate term. This would be good governance in practice.

Brian & Elizabeth Armstrong
1201 La Farge Ave

From: Christopher Leh
To: Meredyth Muth
Subject: Fwd: Vote yes on Redtail Ridge development
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:36:50 AM

Meredith – I am going to forward to you emails that were addressed solely to me to ensure that they are part of the public record.

Best Regards,

Chris Leh
Mayor
City of Louisville (CO)
(c) 303.668.3916
Leh@louisvilleco.gov

Begin forwarded message:

From: Bob Anastasi <bob.anastasi@outlook.com>
Date: February 6, 2024 at 1:04:49 PM MST
To: Christopher Leh <leh@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Vote yes on Redtail Ridge development

> You don't often get email from bob.anastasi@outlook.com. Learn why this is important

Mr. Leh, I have lived in Louisville since 1983. I have raised a family here, and even started a business here back in 2001. I am emailing you to let you know how important I think it is that you vote in favor of the Redtail Ridge development. There are some people who will never be happy unless the whole area is turned into Open Space, but I feel like the development group has made a number of reasonable concessions over the years. There are a number of reasons why I am asking you to vote in favor of the Redtail Ridge development plan.

1) It is not the right of people to just keep a property from that is zoned for development, from being developed, just because they wish the space was zoned something else.
2) We need the residential units to provide for more living options within the city (more residents also means more people to support Louisville businesses)
3) This is prime real estate for business (the location is both convenient, and high-profile)… Louisville needs to take advantage of that, like Broomfield did with Interlocken years ago.
4) We need to keep Avista hospital in Louisville (we can't have them pull a Medtronic and leave)
5) We need the additional access roads to Monarch K-12, Monarch High School and Avista in the case of any one of a number of emergency that might occur (not just another wildfire)
6) The city needs the revenue from the taxes that will be generated once Redtail Ridge is completed and people, companies & businesses move in

Bob Anastasi
839 Trail Ridge Drive

From: Edward Duell
To: City Council
Subject: Red Tail Ridge.
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:42:52 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from edduell@hotmail.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

Hello city council,

I am just another concerned Louisville resident voicing my opinion to vote against the RTR proposal that the developers are trying to force on the city.

While I understand the need to grow the city, we have one chance to get this development right. The proposed plan is not focused on the long term good of the city residents nor on sustainable growth and I recommend that the current plan be rejected.

Thank you
Ed Duell
Louisville Resident. (794 West Pinyon Way)

Sent from my iPhone

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: sherry sommer
To: City Council
Cc: Jeff Durbin; Rob Zuccaro
Subject: Red Tail Ridge Referendum Council Clips
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:00:30 PM

---

https://youtu.be/c1BUkJONPt8?feature=shared

Sherry

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Elizabeth Stahr
To: City Council
Subject: Please save Redtail Ridge
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:14:28 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from mestahr@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear City Council Members,
I hope this letter is not too late to be considered regarding developing another new area in Louisville.
This should be open space for the community to enjoy and keep as a reminder of what a beautiful area this is. Louisville remains within the top 10 towns to live in, in Colorado and the United States. People are drawn to this area for the open space, lifestyle and beauty that that provides, and the small town feel that is quickly being lost in development and overcrowding. The focus should be on building out areas to shop and spend within this community, in areas set up for this very reason. The former Lowes, the empty scrapbooking building, Alfalfas and so on should be the focus and the "new" draw. Instead of adding more humans, please consider adding more businesses so that we don't all need to shop in Boulder, Broomfield, Lafayette and Denver. We need a buffer from Superior, Broomfield, Lafayette and Boulder so we are not lost and will remain (in a very small way) Louisville.
Please don't continue to overcrowd and cause animosity, instead add a sense of community where we spend where we live and support a healthy lifestyle. Please save this beautiful area!
Elizabeth Stahr

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Adrianne Middleton
To: City Council
Subject: Red Tail Ridge
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:58:46 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from adriannemiddleton@mac.com. Learn why this is important

In 2022 voters turned down this development, and I can't believe that the city council is entertaining it. Again.

I understand that the developer is proposing fewer square feet of built out space, but it will still turn the entire Storage Tek site into an asphalt and concrete desert. It will still bring 20,000 cars/day to Louisville, necessitating a costly upgrade to the Interlocken interchange. Who is going to pay for that upgrade? The taxpayers? We're struggling to find funds for essential services. Why should we pay a big corporation's bills? Has the developer gone through the process of requesting a building permit and getting the Northwest Parkway's approval? If it hasn't, why is this even being considered?

As I understand the situation, the city council asked for open space as part of the development project. What they got were a few acres divided by a parkway. There will not be any red tailed hawks there if we don't protect the land north of Disc Drive. There won't be nice places for people to walk. We will lose a valuable ecological property.

Do we want our city to look like an industrial park, or do we want it to be a place where our grandchildren will be happy growing up? Louisville voters have already chosen. Will you support the democratic process?

Thank you for your consideration.
Adrianne

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Don Brown
To: City Council
Subject: RedTail Ridge
Date: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:05:53 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from donpbrown2@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Esteemed Councilmember,

The Redtail Ridge decision before you tonight is an opportunity for Louisville to take the first step in waking up from our long slumber. A slumber where our community has avoided making land use decisions that are appropriate for our modern circumstances.

Our current Comprehensive Plan and, more importantly, our existing zoning scheme have their roots in the circumstances that faced Louisville in the 1960's through the 1990's. We were a community where the mines were closing, residents were demanding local shopping, and Boulder was beginning to burst. We created a plan that was driven by sales tax maximization, big box retail, separate suburban housing, and automobile accessibility.

Most would agree that it was these plans that led to our many years of prosperity where we led the region in sales tax collection, used proceed from this dominance to build several enduring municipal assets, and fostered an old-town feel downtown as it converted from primarily utilitarian business to the browsing and dining uses that occupy downtown Louisville today.

However, times have changed. With the onset of online sales, our sales tax revenue is no longer dependent on land use. The radical escalation of housing costs that many of us have (or will) benefit from have left us with a complete lack of housing that is attainable for our teachers, firefighters, police officers and other workers who are the lifeblood of our community. In fact, many of us who are empty nesters have come to the realization that it is difficult, if not impossible, for our kids to locate in Louisville. Finally, we have under utilized access to significant transit infrastructure that has evolved around us.

The proposal before you tonight presents an opportunity for us to move forward. Not only is it in compliance with our current requirements, it will bring jobs and customers for our business. Further, approval of this project will send a signal that Louisville is no longer to be considered closed for business. And it ensures that Avista Hospital -- our biggest employer and a place where many of our citizens began their journey in life -- will stay in our community for the foreseeable future.

It is my hope that as this development moves forward, we can enhance its current features to meet some of the current needs of our community. Better recreational opportunities for our citizens. Better connectedness through trails. Housing that takes advantage of the existing transit infrastructure and fills the gaps in our current stock. Businesses with housing that is walkable to reduce the traffic impact of this development.

Redtail Ridge is not all those things today. But it could be. And our City, through your leadership, could again become a regional leader in innovative thinking that enables us to modernize our land use plans, preserve our old-town character feel of downtown, and move us forward as a healthier, more sustainable community into the 21st century.

Thank you for your service and your dedication to our community.

With Greatest Regards!

Don Brown

505 Grant Ave.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Ian Leech
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:03:27 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from ianleech51@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

Please no development at Redtail Ridge.

Sent from my iPad

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Tim Stalker
To: kathleen@kellypc.com; Jeff Durbin; City Council
Subject: Fwd: Letter to the City Council for this evening"s meeting
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:40:40 PM

Hello, all

I'm forwarding you three e-mails in regard to a response I received yesterday from councilmember Caleb Dickinson about an e-mail I sent to council so that it could be included in the addendum to the packet for last night's city council meeting. I wished to have my comments put into the record. I of course wasn't expecting an e-mail back, given the quasi-judicial rules governing official actions per the Redtail Ridge preliminary plat.

Mayor Leh made it a point to cover the importance of quasi-judicial rules and why they must be followed at the meeting last night and I thought I should report this. Below is my letter to council.

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Tim Stalker** <tstalker28@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Feb 6, 2024 at 11:10 AM
Subject: Letter to the City Council for this evening's meeting
To: <council@louisvilleco.gov>

To the Council

Thank you for the opportunity to provide my comments regarding the RedTailridge preliminary plat.

The plat before you tonight, unfortunately, has proceeded to this step in the planning process without an amendment to the CononoPhillips GDP. It's a decision the developer made and expressed in the Spring of 2022 that the city staff must legally let proceed. While your consideration of this plat provides no avenue for the public to contest this maneuver, the public opinon about the plans in the plat are still a matter of outstanding relevant public opinion expressed in the referendum vote that voted down the developer's attempt to amend the GDP with what are essentially the same plans.

Rather than honoring the city's vote to deny the developer's amendment to the GDP, and working towards a better amendment, this developer has proceeded in ignoring the city's referendum and ceased working with the city on another amendment. Why? Because by pitching the plans as a proposal for a subdivision they're able to

make prevent the public's right to protest it as an ordinance.

The developer is performing an unprecedented avoidance of our home rule charter for **prohibited action by council - section 7-5 b**, which states:

No referred ordinance repealed by the registered electors of the City may be readopted by the Council during a period of four (4) years after the date of the election on the referred ordinance, unless the readoption is approved by the registered electors.

In name only, the developer is proposing a subdivision rather than an ordinance of a GDP amendment with the same plans used for the amendment the city denied in April 2022. Quoting Jay Hardy from Brue Baukol, ***"We are not going back to the drawing board, period. What we will do is take that ConocoPhillips GDP and submit a plat off of that. There will not be another review of trying to redo the general development plan."*** Such bravado and chest pounding provides you or the city no help.

As a city council, you do have the responsibility of paying attention to our home rule charter for what you're prohibited from doing because the plans for the plat haven't changed. It's still a 389 acre site the developer intends to grade almost in its entirety. That has never changed. While you're not legally obligated to adhere to section 7.5b in our home rule charter, please understand that you and the city are being taken advantage of. This developer has no interest in Louisville, other than for the 389 acre site they own. Otherwise they would have proposed a better amendment and plans to the GDP. The fact of the matter is, you're being asked to approve a plat with an unprecedented and un-amended GDP. No other landowner that I can determine as proceeded in such a way as this.

Please vote to deny this proposal with modifications.

Thank you,
Tim Stalker
806 W Dahlia Ct

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Tim Stalker
To: kathleen@kellypc.com; Jeff Durbin; City Council
Subject: Fwd: Letter to the City Council for this evening"s meeting
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:53:50 PM

Below is Councilmember Dickinson's response to my letter. Not only does this break the quasi-judicial rules but it also discloses his interest in the development as "a win here" prior to hearing all the evidence he mentions in the following sentence. This breaks the Home Rule Charter section 5-10 for disclosure of interest. I don't know what the punishment is for breaking quasi-judicial rules and the home charter but according to the charter Dickinson should recuse himself as he's on the record for showing his interest in the preliminary plat in support prior to making an informed and unbiased decision on the action he's considering.

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Caleb Dickinson** <cdickinson@louisvilleco.gov>
Date: Tue, Feb 6, 2024 at 3:18 PM
Subject: Re: Letter to the City Council for this evening's meeting
To: Tim Stalker <tstalker28@gmail.com>

Thanks for writing in, Tim.

I read your email and hear your frustration.

I hope that you can take some comfort in the fact that the developer is back with all the same environmental aspects (tons of Open Space, 2.6MW of solar, LEED Silver buildings, bike paths, trail connections, Campus Dr, etc) but with a smaller footprint of 2.5m, down from the 3.0m in the 2021 GDP.

They are operating under the approved 2010 GDP. There is no requirement to have ever amended that GDP. They are allowed to come to council under that guiding document, and must, since their amended GDP was reversed by the voters.

I realize that the no campaign does not see the "win" here, but they got the developer to come back with the same plan, only smaller. I thought that was kind of the stated hope of that group.

I'm interested to hear all of the evidence tonight from staff, the applicant, and the public.

Thank you for engaging,
Caleb

Caleb Dickinson
City Council, Ward I
303-495-8219

From: Tim Stalker <tstalker28@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:10 AM
To: City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Letter to the City Council for this evening's meeting

To the Council

Thank you for the opportunity to provide my comments regarding the RedTailridge preliminary plat.

The plat before you tonight, unfortunately, has proceeded to this step in the planning process without an amendment to the CononoPhillips GDP. It's a decision the developer made and expressed in the Spring of 2022 that the city staff must legally let proceed. While your consideration of this plat provides no avenue for the public to contest this maneuver, the public opinon about the plans in the plat are still a matter of outstanding relevant public opinion expressed in the referendum vote that voted down the developer's attempt to amend the GDP with what are essentially the same plans.

Rather than honoring the city's vote to deny the developer's amendment to the GDP, and working towards a better amendment, this developer has proceeded in ignoring the city's referendum and ceased working with the city on another amendment. Why? Because by pitching the plans as a proposal for a subdivision they're able to make prevent the public's right to protest it as an ordinance.

The developer is performing an unprecedented avoidance of our home rule charter for **prohibited action by council - section 7-5 b**, which states:

No referred ordinance repealed by the registered electors of the City may be readopted by the Council during a period of four (4) years after the date of the election on the referred ordinance, unless the readoption is approved by the registered electors.

In name only, the developer is proposing a subdivision rather than an ordinance of a GDP amendment with the same plans used for the amendment the city denied in April 2022. Quoting Jay Hardy from Brue Baukol, ***"We are not going back to the drawing board, period. What we will do is take that ConocoPhillips GDP and***

submit a plat off of that. There will not be another review of trying to redo the general development plan." Such bravado and chest pounding provides you or the city no help.

As a city council, you do have the responsibility of paying attention to our home rule charter for what you're prohibited from doing because the plans for the plat haven't changed. It's still a 389 acre site the developer intends to grade almost in its entirety. That has never changed. While you're not legally obligated to adhere to section 7.5b in our home rule charter, please understand that you and the city are being taken advantage of. This developer has no interest in Louisville, other than for the 389 acre site they own. Otherwise they would have proposed a better amendment and plans to the GDP. The fact of the matter is, you're being asked to approve a plat with an unprecedented and un-amended GDP. No other landowner that I can determine as proceeded in such a way as this.

Please vote to deny this proposal with modifications.

Thank you,
Tim Stalker
806 W Dahlia Ct

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Tim Stalker
To: kathleen@kellypc.com; Jeff Durbin; City Council
Subject: Fwd: Letter to the City Council for this evening"s meeting
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:57:55 PM

This is my response to Caleb, though I don't mention how he broke the rules. Can you get back to me with what sort of consequences there are for breaking quasi-judicial rules and the home rule charter for disclosure of interest. While Mayor Leh went on at length last night about quasi-judicial circumstances and ethics, he made no mention of what sanctions/punishment are in place for when councilmembers break the rules.

Thank you so much,

Tim Stalker

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Tim Stalker** <tstalker28@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Feb 6, 2024 at 3:35 PM
Subject: Re: Letter to the City Council for this evening's meeting
To: Caleb Dickinson <cdickinson@louisvilleco.gov>

"They are operating under the approved 2010 GDP. There is no requirement to have ever amended that GDP. They are allowed to come to council under that guiding document, and must, since their amended GDP was reversed by the voters."

No, they could have worked and put forward another amendment, but by not doing that they're preventing the public's right to protest it by bringing it to council as a plat. That's not something they must do. It's something they prefer to do:

Jay Hardy: ***"We are not going back to the drawing board, period. What we will do is take that ConocoPhillips GDP and submit a plat off of that. There will not be another review of trying to redo the general development plan."***

The plan isn't smaller. The footprint they will develop is the same as it always has been.

On Tue, Feb 6, 2024 at 3:18 PM Caleb Dickinson <cdickinson@louisvilleco.gov> wrote:

> Thanks for writing in, Tim.
>
> I read your email and hear your frustration.

I hope that you can take some comfort in the fact that the developer is back with all the same environmental aspects (tons of Open Space, 2.6MW of solar, LEED Silver buildings, bike paths, trail connections, Campus Dr, etc) but with a smaller footprint of 2.5m, down from the 3.0m in the 2021 GDP.

They are operating under the approved 2010 GDP. There is no requirement to have ever amended that GDP. They are allowed to come to council under that guiding document, and must, since their amended GDP was reversed by the voters.

I realize that the no campaign does not see the "win" here, but they got the developer to come back with the same plan, only smaller. I thought that was kind of the stated hope of that group.

I'm interested to hear all of the evidence tonight from staff, the applicant, and the public.

Thank you for engaging,
Caleb

Caleb Dickinson
City Council, Ward I
303-495-8219

From: Tim Stalker <tstalker28@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:10 AM
To: City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Letter to the City Council for this evening's meeting

To the Council

Thank you for the opportunity to provide my comments regarding the RedTailridge preliminary plat.

The plat before you tonight, unfortunately, has proceeded to this step in the planning process without an amendment to the CononoPhillips GDP. It's a decision the developer made and expressed in the Spring of 2022 that the city staff must legally let proceed. While your consideration of this plat provides no avenue for the public to contest this maneuver, the public opinon about the plans in the plat are still a matter of outstanding relevant public opinion expressed in the referendum vote that voted down the developer's attempt to amend the GDP with what are essentially the same plans.

Rather than honoring the city's vote to deny the developer's amendment to the GDP, and working towards a better amendment, this developer has proceeded in ignoring the city's referendum and ceased working with the city on another amendment. Why? Because by pitching the plans as a proposal for a subdivision they're able to make prevent the public's right to protest it as an ordinance.

The developer is performing an unprecedented avoidance of our home rule charter for **prohibited action by council - section 7-5 b**, which states:

No referred ordinance repealed by the registered electors of the City may be readopted by the Council during a period of four (4) years after the date of the election on the referred ordinance, unless the readoption is approved by the registered electors.

In name only, the developer is proposing a subdivision rather than an ordinance of a GDP amendment with the same plans used for the amendment the city denied in April 2022. Quoting Jay Hardy from Brue Baukol, ***"We are not going back to the drawing board, period. What we will do is take that ConocoPhillips GDP and submit a plat off of that. There will not be another review of trying to redo the general development plan."*** Such bravado and chest pounding provides you or the city no help.

As a city council, you do have the responsibility of paying attention to our home rule charter for what you're prohibited from doing because the plans for the plat haven't changed. It's still a 389 acre site the developer intends to grade almost in its entirety. That has never changed. While you're not legally obligated to adhere to section 7.5b in our home rule charter, please understand that you and the city are being taken advantage of. This developer has no interest in Louisville, other than for the 389 acre site they own. Otherwise they would have proposed a better amendment and plans to the GDP. The fact of the matter is, you're being asked to approve a plat with an unprecedented and un-amended GDP. No other landowner that I can determine as proceeded in such a way as this.

Please vote to deny this proposal with modifications.

Thank you,
Tim Stalker
806 W Dahlia Ct

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Jeffrey Gass
To: Caleb Dickinson; Christopher Leh
Cc: City Council
Subject: Red Tail Ridge
Date: Thursday, February 8, 2024 6:59:59 AM

Vote yes on Red Tail Ridge
The presentation made by Sterling Bey and city planning department answered most if not all of the non sensical concerns for this property. How does a development over a mile away ruin the downtown charm of our city. I would say McCaslin Parkway does the city a bigger disservice to our old town charm.
Remember these same people complain that our taxes are to high. What better way to generate revenue for the city, school district and county, with this substantial revenue boast, with property taxes and increase sales tax revenue, with more spending done downtown and along the McCaslin Parkway corridor
Last but not least, how would this people feel if Avista leaves Louisville. Superior or Broomfield would in my opinion, would welcome them with open arms. Avista Hospital saved my life, so losing them to another community would only add more time to reach and save lives.

Jeffrey Gass
784 Meadowlark Lane
Louisville, CO 80027
Ward 1

Sent from my I-phone

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From:	sherry sommer
To:	Rob Zuccaro
Cc:	City Council; Erik Swiatek
Subject:	Clarification on Redtail presentation
Date:	Thursday, February 8, 2024 8:55:04 AM

Director Zuccaro,

I appreciate the work you and your staff does for our city.

According to staff presentation on 2/6/2024, there will be a park in the northwest corner of the Redtail Ridge.

The public and council need to know:

21 The city must pay for construction of a park, soccer fields, pickleball, dog park, etc. on this site.

3) Several years ago, it would have cost an estimated 3,000,000 to build public amenities on the site. The current cost would be much more.

3) The parks budget is currently underfunded.

We need to have at least a ball park estimate on construction cost and transparency on the parks and open space budget. The city is currently looking at the parks and open space budgets. I don't believe the city will have funding for these amenities.

The city should not set expectations that it can't foreseeably meet. We just passed a tax increase and need to work within this limited budget.

Thank you so much,

Sherry Sommer

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From:	sherry sommer
To:	City Council
Cc:	Meredyth Muth
Subject:	Quasi judicial disclosures
Date:	Friday, February 9, 2024 11:48:21 AM

Members of Council,

During your 2/6/2024 meeting, public comment requested disclosure of council ex parte communications on the Redtail Ridge application.

Mayor Leh explained the requirements of due process:
(2/6/2024 council meeting, 3:33:20-3:38:20).

Council members

1) Must not reply to emails regarding the application.
2) Must not access information outside the public process.
3) Discuss the application outside of the public process.
4) Must not appear biased against the applicant.

I would add:

5) Must not appear biased against planning commission recommendation and resident comments based on Louisville Municipal Code and State Law.

In the interest of transparency, I would like to be assured that all Council members deliberating on the application have disclosed their ex parte communications since May 5, 2022. (including communications with representatives of BVSD, Avista Hospital and Advent Health, Brue Baukol, and Sterling Bay)

Ward 3 representatives Hamlington and Hoeffner, could you ask City Attorney Kelly about disclosure requirements of council members elected or appointed after the public review process starting April 5, 2022?
(Thank you, as always, for your diligent and excellent representation of Ward 3.)

Sincerely,

Sherry Sommer

Sherry Sommer

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Viki Kirk
To: City Council
Subject: approve Redtail Ridge
Date: Saturday, February 10, 2024 2:11:58 PM

Dear Louisville City Council Members,

I am writing to you as a longtime resident of Louisville, to express my strong support for the approval of the preliminary plat for the Redtail Ridge development. This project represents a pivotal opportunity for our community and aligns completely with Louisville's Comprehensive Plan and code. It embodies our community's goals for sustainable development, open space and public lands, and economic revitalization.
One of the most compelling reasons to support the plat is that it will secure Avista's presence in Louisville. As our largest employer, Avista's presence is integral to the economic and social fabric of our community. More than 60,000 babies have been born at Avista, and we all know someone who has received care there. Approving the Redtail Ridge plat ensures that Avista remains in Louisville, and that should be a top priority. Approving this plat also creates the opportunity to turn this privately owned land into more than 155 acres of new public open space. This dedication will be the second-largest public land
dedication in our city's history–and the single largest if you don't include land used for golf courses. For generations, Louisville residents have never had the opportunity to legally visit and enjoy the site. Approving the plat opens up new avenues for recreation and nature conservation, habitat preservation, and so much more. It's time to move forward on Redtail Ridge. This plat meets the Comp Plan and our code, and does so in a way that respects our community's values, contributes to our economic vitality, and enhances our living environment. I strongly urge the Council to approve the preliminary plat for Redtail Ridge, setting Louisville on a path to sustainable growth and prosperity.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Viki Kirk

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From:	sherry sommer
To:	City Council
Cc:	Jeff Durbin; Samma Fox; Meredyth Muth
Subject:	Council meeting 2/20/2024
Date:	Tuesday, February 13, 2024 10:05:00 AM

Members of Council:

The Redtail Ridge application was on your agenda December 5, 2023 and February 6, 2024. On both dates, the public has come to speak but were not allowed to do so.

I **am requesting that all members of the public be allowed to make their voices heard on February 20, 2024. If f necessary, the meeting should be continued.**

---The **December 5** agenda item was not heard because quorum was not met. Members of the public requested that the mayor state names of those who wanted to speak. As chair, **the mayor chose not to names or even the number of of residents who wanted to speak.**

-- Redtail was placed at the end of a full agenda on **February 6.** This very important meeting continued very late. **Presentations of such an important topic at such a late hour is not appropriate. It limits the ability of many in the public to speak and is a needless burden on staff, resident, and council time. The agenda needs to be structured in a more thoughtful way by the chair.**

--Mayor Leh has mused aloud on more than one occasion that i**t may not be possible to take all public comments on this topic**. In the February 6 meeting he thought out loud, saying that he had an idea for public comments at the February 20th meeting. **He has questioned out loud the potential value of hearing all comments.**

On behalf of all Louisville residents, I would like to ask that resident time be respected and that all members of the public be allowed to speak.

--The topic of development on this site has been a considerable time commitment for residents, not only in the past 4 months, but since since 2020. **You owe it to the public to consider every attendee**.

--The **applicant** contributed 93,000.00 to the special election campaign. This gave them power to broadcast their views. The Yes campaign outspent the resident led campaign 32:1, and they had a **megaphone** to reach the public. **Individual residents should not be deprived of the opportunity to be heard.**

—It is **customary and fair** to ask members of the public **not to reiterate points** that have already been made. Everyone should have the opportunity to come to the microphone and state that they agree or disagree with previous speakers.

Allowing all residents to speak is supported by city rules, ordinances, and policy.

You represent the residents of Louisville. It is important to remember that, according

to our charter, **residents hold ultimate authority through direct democracy: the right to referendum, initiative, and recall.**

Sincerely,

Sherry Sommer
Preserve Louisville

For ease of reference:

Louisville City Charter
Section 5-6. Code of Ethics

- (a) Sections 5-6 through 5-17 shall be known as the Code of Ethics.
- (b) Those entrusted with positions in the City government **must commit** to

Adhering to the **letter and spirit** of the Code of Ethics. Only when the people are confident that those in positions of public responsibility are committed to high levels of ethical and moral conduct, will they have faith that their government is acting for the good of the public. **This faith in the motives of officers, public body members, and employees is critical for a harmonious and trusting relationship between the City government and the people it serves.**

(c) While it is critical that persons holding positions in the City government follow both the letter and spirit of the Code of Ethics, it is equally important that they **strive to avoid situations** that may create public perceptions of violations of the Code of Ethics. **Perceptions of such violations can have the same negative impacts on public trust as actual violations.**

(d) The Code of Ethics is intended to **foster public trust** by defining the parameters of honest government and by prohibiting the use of public office for private gain.

City of Louisville Rules of Procedure

he Home Rule Charter of the City of Louisville provides that the Council may determine its own rules of procedure for meetings. The following Rules shall be in effect upon their adoption by the Council until such time as they are amended or new Rules adopted. (p. 1)

In order to efficiently and effectively complete City business facing the Council, all meetings must be conducted in an **orderly and respectful manner.** These Rules are intended to provide guidelines for the procedures to be followed for the conduct of Council meetings and study sessions.(p. 1)

1. A **bedrock principle** of a representative democracy is notice of impending governmental action and an **opportunity for members of the public and their**

representatives to be heard. Principles of good government include deep r**espect for citizens**; **prudent stewardship** of public resources, including t**he time of its citizens, staff members and elected officials;** direction that is clear and decisive; and decision making that is reasonably consistent, equitable, flexible, and transparent. (p. 7)

Rules of Procedure

1. Through the application of these Rules, Council intends to ensure that it balances the principles described in the previous section in a way that ensures robust debate and **accountability of City government** to its residents. To that end, these procedures are not meant to be employed for the purpose of **unreasonable rigidity, surprise, suppression of competing views, or needless prolonging of action.**

- PUBLIC COMMENTS: The following provisions apply to any section of the agenda where public comments are allowed.
    1. All regular and special meetings of the Council shall be open to the public. **Members of the public shall have a reasonable opportunity to be heard at each meeting.** The Chair may permit public comment on any item at the time such item is being considered by the Council.

1. Louisville City Council Rules of Procedure, page 8 . Updated May 16, 2023

Public involvement policy

During its review and decision-making process, **Council has an obligation to recognize the efforts and activities that have preceded its deliberations. Council should have regard for the public involvement processes that have been completed in support or opposition of projects.**

Preamble, Louisville City Charter

- **The government is formed by the citizens, and the citizens have the right to control the government through their elected representatives or, when appropriate, by direct democracy.**

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Holly VAN DORE
To: City Council
Subject: Please approve Redtail Ridge
Date: Tuesday, February 13, 2024 4:55:39 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from thevandores@comcast.net. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council Members,
I am writing to you as a longtime resident of Louisville (36 years), to express my strong support for the approval of the preliminary plat for the Redtail Ridge development. This project represents an opportunity for our community and it embodies our community's goals for sustainable development, open space
and public lands, and economic revitalization.
One of the biggest reasons to support the plat is that it will secure Avista Hospital's presence in Louisville. As our largest employer, Avista's presence is integral to the economic and social fabric of our community. More than 60,000 babies have been born at Avista, and we all know someone who has received care there. I love having a hospital so close to us especially as I get older! Approving the Redtail Ridge plat ensures that Avista remains in Louisville, and that should be a top priority for council!
Approving this plat also creates the opportunity to turn this privately owned land into more than 155 acres of new public open space. This dedication will be the second-largest public land dedication in our city's history–and the single largest if you don't include land used for the golf course. For generations, Louisville residents have never had the opportunity to legally visit and enjoy the site. Approving the plat opens up new avenues for recreation and nature conservation, habitat preservation, and so much more.
I worked at StorageTek in Louisville for 12 years and it didn't cause traffic issues or problems for the community. And at that time we had a couple thousand employees. We would go to Louisville restaurants for lunch all the time and Happy Hour after work. If anything STK helped our local businesses and economic growth. And I think Redtail Ridge would do the same thing.
It's time to move forward on Redtail Ridge. This plat meets the Comp Plan and our code, and does so in a way that respects our community's values, contributes to our economic vitality, and enhances our living environment. I strongly urge the Council to approve the preliminary plat for Redtail Ridge, setting Louisville on a path to sustainable growth and prosperity.
Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,
Holly Van Dore

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Cameron Schaefer
To: City Council
Subject: As a Monarch Parent Please Approve the Redtail Plat
Date: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 6:54:33 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from cameron.schaefer@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council Members,

As parents of a student at Monarch, we urge your approval of the Redtail Ridge preliminary plat because it will finally extend Campus Drive.

Since sending our daughter there last year we've been pretty shocked to be honest at what a horrible system it is trying to drop off and pick up kids - have to leave 45 min before school at times...from Louisville :(This feels completely unnecessary and something that the "no growth no matter what" crowd in Louisville likely misses as a true cost of inaction.

The Redtail Ridge development promises a much-needed extension of Campus Drive, offering us a safer, more connected route to school. We believe this development is essential for our safety and convenience and respectfully urge the Council to approve it.

Sincerely,

Cameron & Marelize Schaefer
Monarch Parents

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Jodi Blanchard
To: City Council
Subject: Fwd: YEH For RedTail Ridge
Date: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 6:34:42 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jodiblanchard31@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jodi Blanchard <jodiblanchard31@gmail.com>
Date: February 14, 2024 at 7:30:44 AM CST
To: council@louisvilleco.org
Subject: YEH For RedTail Ridge

Dear Louisville City Council Members,

My name is Jodi Blanchard. I have been a resident of Louisville for over 40 years, I raised my three children here, I was on the ground floor of opening and working for Avista Hospital and I have worked for a business in downtown Louisville. I've seen a lot of changes to Louisville in this time. I lived here while Storage Tech was in full swing. The company brought a vibrancy to our small town that I have not seen for a very long time.

I am writing this letter in strong support of the Redtail Ridge preliminary plat. I have watched the presentation given by the city planning department and feel stronger than ever that this development plat should be approved and is for the betterment of our city and our people.

The Developer is doing everything and more than what is required under our codes.
The city has done a wonderful job obtaining open space over the years and it will be a benefit to everyone to have 139 more acres of open space that are included in this plan. Good for us and better for the habitat.

This project aligns perfectly with our Comp Plan and our city's goals for compatible development, sustainability, transportation, and economic vitality. By approving this plat, we take a significant step towards a more connected and environmentally responsible Louisville.

It is essential that Avista Hospital stay in Louisville. It is our largest employer, in Louisville
Its presence is not just about jobs; it's about maintaining a sense of community and providing essential healthcare services to our residents. Avista was built when we had less than half the population we have now. We have to take care of our own not be forced to seek healthcare outside our community. Approving this plat ensures Avista's continued contribution to our community's well-being.

According to Biz Wes, interview with a representative from Avista Hospital:
"We can't wait any longer," Dan Enderson, a regional executive with AdventHealth, told members of the Louisville City Council.

"Our goal is to stay in the Louisville community. However, we need the opportunity to expand and have better access than we have today," Enderson said.

"Redtail representatives, including Avista officials, stressed the importance of a swift resolution to the Redtail approval process, which has dragged on for the better part of a half-decade."

Don't be fooled, Avista will leave as did Medtronic, if this city continues to drag its feet on the approval of this preliminary plat.

We also need a much stronger tax base that will come from this approval for our community to support our open spaces, our recreation center, our roads and our downtown. We have been nickeled and dimed long enough and our downtown is suffering. We used to be a destination city and now our surrounding cities have become destinations.

Approving the plat will eventually give Louisville the network of roads, trails, and infrastructure that can create a safe and healthy campus. It is what allows Campus Drive to finally be extended. And yes, it keeps Avista Hospital in Louisville. This is so important for the safety of our residents.

Approving the Redtail Ridge plat is a must for many reasons; We have always been a city that is forward-thinking, family-friendly, and open to new opportunities. Let's move on and be the vibrant city we once were and better!

Please, please, please make the decision that benefits all of Louisville and vote “YEH” for RedTail Ridge

Best Regards,
Jodi Blanchard
640 W Sagebrush Dr, Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Thomas Dinges
To: City Council
Subject: Preliminary Subdivision Plat Approval for Redtail Ridge - Please approve
Date: Tuesday, February 13, 2024 9:49:04 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from dingesfamily@mac.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

Louisville City Council,

I am a proud resident of Louisville since 2017. Absolutely love living in this town as it has so much to offer for our residents and visitors.

I am also a Marshall Fire Victim and I've seen firsthand what this city can do when it is most needed.

As we continue the rebuild process, we also need to keep an eye on the future.

In my view the Preliminary Subdivision Plat Approval for Redtail Ridge is one that should move forward. I'm a big believer in you "can't stay the same". You either get better or you get worse. This isn't in a relative sense, but in an absolute sense.

We need to invest in our City. Provide incentives for businesses to locate here to create good, well-paying jobs. I'm all for open space. We need it, but we also need to be able to re-develop space that is not so much open as it is more unusable into something that is usable to provide for generations to come. We need to keep Avista hospital in Louisville. We meed tp provide for more open space that we call can enjoy. We need to create the opportunity to bring more jobs to Louisville.

Approving the Preliminary Subdivision Plat Approval for Redtail Ridge will go a long way in my view in accomplishing many of these things.

Sincerely,

Thomas Dinges
1002 Honeysuckle Lane
Louisville, CO 80027

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Peter Grady
To: City Council
Subject: Re: Redtail Ridge Plat
Date: Tuesday, February 13, 2024 5:01:13 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from pgrady3434@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Thank you City Council for your time and dedication to the community. It is greatly appreciated by our family and thank you again!

There are many reasons to approve the Redtail Ridge Plat project, improving the actual land with the Landscape vision, the direct revenue that is needed and the indirect revenue by supporting our local businesses. Our local businesses need help and hopefully this can demonstrate to the business community that the city is not run by a vocal minority and the city can attract more stores and restaurants.

I was impressed by the amount of open space and connecting of trails, I thought this would be a huge win for the city and its residents. The trails in the city are amazing but this will help further improve the area and the reputation of the city.

Avista Hospital needs this project and a new state of the art hospital would be a win for the city and its residence. The current facility is old and does not have easy access.

A Premiere Life Science campus will help support CU and researchers across our region and provide many high paying jobs. If it does not happen here these jobs and revenue will find another home that is wanting a modern facility and the improvements to the land and roads and revenue that comes with it.

The improvement of the roads and I understand that this project may force CDOT to improve to move up the timeline for the needed improvements of 36 and 470 but this is going to happen soon, regardless of the Redtail Ridge Plat. But the improvements of Campus drive will be very helpful for the families and students that are currently experiencing long delays.

Thank you and best regards,

Peter and Eveline Grady
302 W Spruce St

From: John Ohannessian
To: City Council
Subject: VOTE NO ON REDTAIL RIDGE
Date: Tuesday, February 13, 2024 4:59:23 PM

> Some people who received this message don't often get email from johnohan@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council,
Please **VOTE NO** on REDTAIL RIDGE and/or RTR subdivision plat.

As a citizen of Louisville since 1986 we want to preserve our beautiful Louisville.
Thank you.

John Ohannessian
569 Augusta Drive
Louisville, CO 80027
303-817-3535 (Cell)

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From:	Christopher Leh
To:	Meredyth Muth
Subject:	Fwd: Redtail Ridge
Date:	Wednesday, February 14, 2024 8:57:00 AM

Sent only to me.

Best Regards,

Chris Leh
Mayor
City of Louisville (CO)
(c) 303.668.3916
Leh@louisvilleco.gov

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** tom husted <husted33@msn.com>
> **Date:** December 4, 2023 at 2:27:07 PM MST
> **To:** Christopher Leh <leh@louisvilleco.gov>
> **Subject: Redtail Ridge**
>
> [You don't often get email from husted33@msn.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]
>
> Mayor Leh,
> As a long time resident I have always appreciated the openness of our city government to matters that can have an impact on our beautiful community. The proposal & facts on the Redtail Ridge subdivision certainly have not been communicated to the public in the manner I believe can be called transparency. In that regard, I respectfully request the council to postpone any decision until the citizens of Louisville view the facts and details of the Redtail Ridge subdivision. Thank you for your consideration. I do believe it is the right thing to do at this time. Thank you for your consideration.
> Respectfully,
> Harold T. Husted
> 309 Centennial Dr.
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> ==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==
>
> This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Christopher Leh
To: Meredyth Muth
Subject: Fwd: Vote yes on Redtail Ridge development
Date: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 8:56:08 AM

Sent to me only.

Best Regards,

Chris Leh
Mayor
City of Louisville (CO)
(c) 303.668.3916
Leh@louisvilleco.gov

Begin forwarded message:

From: Bob Anastasi <bob.anastasi@outlook.com>
Date: February 6, 2024 at 1:04:49 PM MST
To: Christopher Leh <leh@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Vote yes on Redtail Ridge development

> You don't often get email from bob.anastasi@outlook.com. Learn why this is important

Mr. Leh, I have lived in Louisville since 1983. I have raised a family here, and even started a business here back in 2001. I am emailing you to let you know how important I think it is that you vote in favor of the Redtail Ridge development. There are some people who will never be happy unless the whole area is turned into Open Space, but I feel like the development group has made a number of reasonable concessions over the years. There are a number of reasons why I am asking you to vote in favor of the Redtail Ridge development plan.

1) It is not the right of people to just keep a property from that is zoned for development, from being developed, just because they wish the space was zoned something else.
2) We need the residential units to provide for more living options within the city (more residents also means more people to support Louisville businesses)
3) This is prime real estate for business (the location is both convenient, and high-profile)… Louisville needs to take advantage of that, like Broomfield did with Interlocken years ago.
4) We need to keep Avista hospital in Louisville (we can't have them pull a Medtronic and leave)
5) We need the additional access roads to Monarch K-12, Monarch High School and Avista in the case of any one of a number of emergency that might occur (not just another wildfire)
6) The city needs the revenue from the taxes that will be generated once Redtail Ridge is completed and people, companies & businesses move in

Bob Anastasi
839 Trail Ridge Drive

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

From: Robin Salcido
To: City Council
Subject: Support Redtail sustainability
Date: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 9:27:46 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from robin@resphotography.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Louisville City Council:
I am writing to ask for your support of the preliminary plat at Redtail Ridge. Your affirmative vote will help create one of the most environmentally sustainable life sciences campuses in Colorado.

In all honesty, I don't understand the opposition to this plan as I've seen it. All growth is not bad, and from what I've seen, this plan addresses my concerns as to the development (keeping Avista in Louisville, and taking care of limited access to Avista and Monarch).

The project will pursue both LEED and Fitwell certification, and has made several dozen commitments for energy efficiency, onsite renewable energy, EV chargers, native plant palettes, water-wise landscaping and fixtures, and so much more. Habitat management and preservation are also key elements of this next-generation life sciences campus, and collectively represent an enormous improvement on the current conditions there.

And of course, the Redtail plan creates more than 139 acres of new public lands for our community to use, with 19 miles of new trails and bike paths, and will include numerous multi-mobility features.

Thank you for listening.
Robin
908 Garfield Avenue
Louisville, CO 80027

--
~ Robin Enright Salcido
Artist

"Tell me, what is it you plan to do
with your one wild and precious life?"
— Mary Oliver

www.resphotography.com
Wise Women Project
Magnificent Men Project
Our Stories Today
Follow me on Facebook
Instagram: @WomenWordsWisdom

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Stephanie Hempen
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge support
Date: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 8:42:03 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from stephaniehempen@icloud.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

As a Louisville resident for over 20 years I wanted you to know that I am in full support of the Redtail Ridge preliminary plat approval. I believe it falls in line with our community environmental, open space and overall continued growth goals.

Thank you,
STEPHANIE HEMPEN

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Eric & Elizabeth Ryterski
To: City Council
Subject: Support Redtail Ridge
Date: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 8:25:29 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from elizabeth.ryterski@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Louisville City Council Members,

As a long-time Louisville resident, I express strong support for the Redtail Ridge development's preliminary plat approval. This project aligns seamlessly with Louisville's Comprehensive Plan and code, reflecting our community's commitment to sustainable development, open space, public lands, and economic revitalization.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Ryterski
941 Garfield Ave
Louisville

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.

From: Jessie Bliss
To: City Council
Subject: Redtail Ridge
Date: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 1:54:26 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jessiebliss@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Hello,

I am emailing to express my support of the plat approval for Redtail Ridge. I urge the council to move forward with the approval on February 20. I believe that the responsible development of Redtail Ridge is very important for the health and vitality of Louisville.

Specifically, as a 12-year resident of Louisville, the issues of expanding our tax base, developing more high-density housing as a countermeasure to housing unaffordability, improving safety and access to Monarch High School by expanding Monarch Dr. and allowing Avista Hospital to stay and expand in Louisville are very important issues to me. Additionally, making this parcel of land available for use and enjoyment through the expansion of open space and responsible land management, I believe is a benefit for most Louisville residents.

I know the negative outcry against Redtail Ridge is organized, loud and demanding. It would be tempting to elevate these voices above the quieter, supportive majority. I ask that the council put what is best for the long term sustainability of Louisville of first in their decision to support the plat approval for Redtail Ridge.

Sincerely,
Jessie Bliss
1100 Lincoln Ave
Louisville, CO 80027

--

JESSIE BLISS

303.885.8334 | jessiebliss@gmail.com

Website |Facebook | Global Luxury

City of Louisville
COLORADO • SINCE 1878

CITY COUNCIL COMMUNICATION
AGENDA ITEM 8B

SUBJECT: **ORDINANCE NO. 1869, SERIES 2024 – AN ORDINANCE APPROVING THE VACATION OF THREE EASEMENTS ON LOT 1 DEDICATED BY THE EMPIRE ROAD SUBDIVISION – 1ST READING – SET PUBLIC HEARING FOR MARCH 5, 2024**

DATE: **FEBRUARY 20, 2024**

PRESENTED BY: **AMELIA BRACKETT HOGSTAD, SENIOR PLANNER**

VICINITY MAP:



SUMMARY:
Attached for consideration on first reading, and to set the public hearing for March 5, 2024, is a draft ordinance to vacate 3 easements on Lot 1 dedicated by the Empire Road Subdivision.

REQUEST:
The applicant, Andy Johnson of DAJ Design, on behalf of Basecamp Louisville LLC (Ironton Distillery), requests approval of an ordinance to vacate 3 easements. The vacation request is part of a Planned Unit Development (PUD), Special Review Use (SRU), Plat, and Annexation Agreement Amendment application to allow the development of a distillery, tasting room and event space and associated site improvements at 1303 Empire Road.

A full staff report on the application will be provided to City Council ahead of the March 5, 2024 hearing.



Figure 1. Exhibits showing easements to be vacated.

ANALYSIS:
The easements to be vacated were dedicated in 2005 as part of the Empire Road Subdivision Plat. Louisville Public Works, Louisville Open Space, Boulder County Open Space, the City of Lafayette Open Space, and utility providers have reviewed the proposed easement vacations and have no objections as part of the development application.

FISCAL IMPACT:
There is no anticipated fiscal impact to the City resulting from the requested easement vacation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval of Ordinance No. 1869, Series 2024 on first reading, and setting second reading and the public hearing for March 5, 2024.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Ordinance No. 1869, Series 2024

ORDINANCE NO. 1869
SERIES 2024

AN ORDINANCE APPROVING THE VACATION OF THREE EASEMENTS LOCATED ON LOT 1 DEDICATED BY THE EMPIRE ROAD SUBDIVISION

WHEREAS, by the Empire Road Subdivision, recorded in the Office of the Boulder County Clerk and Recorder on September 6th, 2005 at Reception No. 2719793, there were dedicated three easements – one utility and irrigation, one drainage, and one utility – on Lot 1 of such Subdivision in the location described in Exhibits A, B, and C attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference ("the easements"); and

WHEREAS, a replat application has been approved by the City dedicating new easements under the name Empire Road Subdivision Replat A; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds and determines that the easements for which vacation is requested are not and will not be needed for any public, governmental, or utility purposes; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to approve the application and vacate the City's interests in the easements for which vacation is requested;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO:

Section 1. The City hereby approves the vacation of the easements located on Lot 1 of the Empire Road Subdivision which easements herein vacated are in the location further described in Exhibits A, B, and C attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference ("the easements").

Section 2. All other ordinances or portions thereof inconsistent or in conflict with this ordinance or any portion hereof are repealed to the extent of such inconsistency or conflict.

Section 3. The Mayor and City Manager, or either of them, is authorized to execute such additional documents as may be necessary to evidence the vacation of the easements herein vacated, including but not execution of quit claim deeds.

INTRODUCED, READ, PASSED ON FIRST READING, AND ORDERED PUBLISHED this 20TH day of February, 2024.

_____
Christopher M. Leh, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
Kelly, P.C.
City Attorney

PASSED AND ADOPTED ON SECOND AND FINAL READING, this ____ day of _____, 2024.

_____
Christopher M. Leh, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

EXHIBIT "A"

LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 9, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH,
RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN,
CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO

SHEET 1 OF 2

A PARCEL OF LAND LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 9, TOWNSHIP A SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO, BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

CONSIDERING THE SOUTH LINE OF LOT 1, EMPIRE ROAD SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT, TO BEAR SOUTH 75°59'25" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 614.41 FEET BETWEEN FOUND #5 REBARS WITH 1 1/2" ALUMINUM CAPS STAMPED "FLATIRONS SURV 29038, WITH ALL BEARINGS CONTAINED HEREIN RELATIVE THERETO.

COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 1, THENCE ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 1, NORTH 00°11'47" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 72.48 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING;
THENCE CONTINUING ALONG SAID WEST LINE, NORTH 00°11'47" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 12.90 FEET;
THENCE DEPARTING SAID WEST LINE, NORTH 51°02'40" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 509.02 FEET TO THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 1;
THENCE ALONG SAID EAST LINE, SOUTH 37°55'38" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 10.00 FEET;
THENCE DEPARTING SAID EAST LINE, SOUTH 51°02'40" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 516.98 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINING 5,130 SQUARE FEET OR 0.12 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

I, JAMES Z. GOWAN, A LAND SURVEYOR LICENSED IN THE STATE OF COLORADO, DO HEREBY STATE FOR AND ON BEHALF OF FLATIRONS, INC., THAT THIS PARCEL DESCRIPTION AND ATTACHED EXHIBIT, BEING MADE A PART THEREOF, WERE PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY RESPONSIBLE CHARGE, ARE ACCURATE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, INFORMATION AND BELIEF, ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPLICABLE STANDARDS OF PRACTICE AND ARE NOT A GUARANTY OR WARRANTY, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED. SAID PARCEL DESCRIPTION AND EXHIBIT WERE PREPARED AT THE REQUEST OF THE CLIENT AND ARE NOT INTENDED TO REPRESENT A MONUMENTED LAND SURVEY OR SUBDIVIDE LAND IN VIOLATION OF STATE STATUTE.



JAMES Z. GOWAN
COLORADO P.L.S. #29038
VICE PRESIDENT, FLATIRONS, INC.

JOB NUMBER: 21-77,713
DRAWN BY: T. HENDERSON
DATE: DECEMBER 5, 2023

THIS IS NOT A "LAND SURVEY PLAT" OR "IMPROVEMENT SURVEY PLAT" AND THIS EXHIBIT IS NOT INTENDED FOR PURPOSES OF TRANSFER OF TITLE OR SUBDIVISIONS OF LAND. RECORD INFORMATION SHOWN HEREON IS BASED ON INFORMATION PROVIDED BY CLIENT.

Flatirons, Inc.
Land Surveying Services
655 FOURTH AVE
LONGMONT, CO 80501
(303) 776-1733
www.FlatironsInc.com

EXHIBIT "A"

LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 9, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH,
RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN,
CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO

SHEET 2 OF 2



GRAPHIC SCALE

100 0 50 100

(IN FEET)
1 inch = 100 ft.

JOB NUMBER: 21-77,713
DRAWN BY: T. HENDERSON
DATE: DECEMBER 5, 2023

COLORADO LICENSED
JAMES L. HENDERSON
29038
12/5/23
PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR

THIS IS NOT A "LAND SURVEY PLAT" OR "IMPROVEMENT SURVEY PLAT" AND THIS EXHIBIT IS NOT INTENDED FOR PURPOSES OF TRANSFER OF TITLE OR SUBDIVISIONS OF LAND. RECORD INFORMATION SHOWN HEREON IS BASED ON INFORMATION PROVIDED BY CLIENT.

Flatirons, Inc.
Land Surveying Services
655 FOURTH AVE
LONGMONT, CO 80501
(303) 776-1733
www.FlatironsInc.com

EXHIBIT "B"

LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 9, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH,
RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN,
CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO

SHEET 1 OF 2

A PARCEL OF LAND LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 9, TOWNSHIP A SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO, BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

CONSIDERING THE SOUTH LINE OF LOT 1, EMPIRE ROAD SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT, TO BEAR SOUTH 75°59'25" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 614.41 FEET BETWEEN FOUND #5 REBARS WITH 1 1/2" ALUMINUM CAPS STAMPED "FLATIRONS SURV 29038, WITH ALL BEARINGS CONTAINED HEREIN RELATIVE THERETO.

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 1, THENCE ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 1, NORTH 00°11'47" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 25.79 FEET;
THENCE DEPARTING SAID WEST LINE, NORTH 75°59'25" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 596.99 FEET TO THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 1;
THENCE ALONG SAID EAST LINE, SOUTH 37°55'38" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 27.35 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 1;
THENCE ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF LOT 1, SOUTH 75°59'25" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 614.41 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINING 15,142 SQUARE FEET OR 0.35 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

I, JAMES Z. GOWAN, A LAND SURVEYOR LICENSED IN THE STATE OF COLORADO, DO HEREBY STATE FOR AND ON BEHALF OF FLATIRONS, INC., THAT THIS PARCEL DESCRIPTION AND ATTACHED EXHIBIT, BEING MADE A PART THEREOF, WERE PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY RESPONSIBLE CHARGE, ARE ACCURATE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, INFORMATION AND BELIEF, ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPLICABLE STANDARDS OF PRACTICE AND ARE NOT A GUARANTY OR WARRANTY, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED. SAID PARCEL DESCRIPTION AND EXHIBIT WERE PREPARED AT THE REQUEST OF THE CLIENT AND ARE NOT INTENDED TO REPRESENT A MONUMENTED LAND SURVEY OR SUBDIVIDE LAND IN VIOLATION OF STATE STATUTE.



JAMES Z. GOWAN
COLORADO P.L.S. #29038
VICE PRESIDENT, FLATIRONS, INC.

JOB NUMBER: 21-77,713
DRAWN BY: T. HENDERSON
DATE: DECEMBER 5, 2023

THIS IS NOT A "LAND SURVEY PLAT" OR "IMPROVEMENT SURVEY PLAT" AND THIS EXHIBIT IS NOT INTENDED FOR PURPOSES OF TRANSFER OF TITLE OR SUBDIVISIONS OF LAND. RECORD INFORMATION SHOWN HEREON IS BASED ON INFORMATION PROVIDED BY CLIENT.

Flatirons, Inc.
Land Surveying Services
655 FOURTH AVE
LONGMONT, CO 80501
(303) 776-1733
www.FlatironsInc.com

EXHIBIT "B"

LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 9, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH,
RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN,
CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO

SHEET 2 OF 2



GRAPHIC SCALE

100 0 50 100

(IN FEET)
1 inch = 100 ft.

JOB NUMBER: 21-77,713
DRAWN BY: T. HENDERSON
DATE: DECEMBER 5, 2023

COLORADO LICENSED
JAMES L. CHAMAN
29038
12/5/23
PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR

THIS IS NOT A "LAND SURVEY PLAT" OR "IMPROVEMENT SURVEY PLAT" AND THIS EXHIBIT IS NOT INTENDED FOR PURPOSES OF TRANSFER OF TITLE OR SUBDIVISIONS OF LAND. RECORD INFORMATION SHOWN HEREON IS BASED ON INFORMATION PROVIDED BY CLIENT.

Flatirons, Inc.
Land Surveying Services
655 FOURTH AVE
LONGMONT, CO 80501
(303) 776-1733
www.FlatironsInc.com

EXHIBIT "C"

LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 9, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH,
RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN,
CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO

SHEET 1 OF 2

A PARCEL OF LAND LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 9, TOWNSHIP A SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO, BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

CONSIDERING THE SOUTH LINE OF LOT 1, EMPIRE ROAD SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT, TO BEAR SOUTH 75°59'25" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 614.41 FEET BETWEEN FOUND #5 REBARS WITH 1 1/2" ALUMINUM CAPS STAMPED "FLATIRONS SURV 29038, WITH ALL BEARINGS CONTAINED HEREIN RELATIVE THERETO.

COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 1, THENCE ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 1, NORTH 00°11'47" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 17.54 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING;
THENCE CONTINUING ALONG SAID WEST LINE, NORTH 00°11'47" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 8.25 FEET;
THENCE DEPARTING SAID WEST LINE, NORTH 75°59'25" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 596.99 FEET TO THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 1;
THENCE ALONG SAID EAST LINE, SOUTH 37°55'38" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 8.75 FEET;
THENCE DEPARTING SAID EAST LINE, SOUTH 75°59'25" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 602.56 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINING 4,798 SQUARE FEET OR 0.11 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

I, JAMES Z. GOWAN, A LAND SURVEYOR LICENSED IN THE STATE OF COLORADO, DO HEREBY STATE FOR AND ON BEHALF OF FLATIRONS, INC., THAT THIS PARCEL DESCRIPTION AND ATTACHED EXHIBIT, BEING MADE A PART THEREOF, WERE PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY RESPONSIBLE CHARGE, ARE ACCURATE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, INFORMATION AND BELIEF, ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPLICABLE STANDARDS OF PRACTICE AND ARE NOT A GUARANTY OR WARRANTY, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED. SAID PARCEL DESCRIPTION AND EXHIBIT WERE PREPARED AT THE REQUEST OF THE CLIENT AND ARE NOT INTENDED TO REPRESENT A MONUMENTED LAND SURVEY OR SUBDIVIDE LAND IN VIOLATION OF STATE STATUTE.



JAMES Z. GOWAN
COLORADO P.L.S. #29038
VICE PRESIDENT, FLATIRONS, INC.

JOB NUMBER: 21-77,713
DRAWN BY: T. HENDERSON
DATE: DECEMBER 5, 2023

THIS IS NOT A "LAND SURVEY PLAT" OR "IMPROVEMENT SURVEY PLAT" AND THIS EXHIBIT IS NOT INTENDED FOR PURPOSES OF TRANSFER OF TITLE OR SUBDIVISIONS OF LAND. RECORD INFORMATION SHOWN HEREON IS BASED ON INFORMATION PROVIDED BY CLIENT.

Flatirons, Inc.
Land Surveying Services
655 FOURTH AVE
LONGMONT, CO 80501
(303) 776-1733
www.FlatironsInc.com

EXHIBIT "C"

LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 9, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH,
RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN,
CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO

SHEET 2 OF 2



GRAPHIC SCALE

100 0 50 100

(IN FEET)
1 inch = 100 ft.

COLORADO LICENSED
JAMES L. HENDERSON
29038
12/5/25
PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR

JOB NUMBER: 21-77,713
DRAWN BY: T. HENDERSON
DATE: DECEMBER 5, 2023

THIS IS NOT A "LAND SURVEY PLAT" OR "IMPROVEMENT SURVEY PLAT" AND THIS EXHIBIT IS NOT INTENDED FOR PURPOSES OF TRANSFER OF TITLE OR SUBDIVISIONS OF LAND. RECORD INFORMATION SHOWN HEREON IS BASED ON INFORMATION PROVIDED BY CLIENT.

Flatirons, Inc.
Land Surveying Services
655 FOURTH AVE
LONGMONT, CO 80501
(303) 776-1733
www.FlatironsInc.com