

## Comments on Draft 1 of the North Mountains Area Plan as of September 6, 2013

Source of Comment	Comment	Staff Response
<b>General</b>		
Comment at 7/25/13 Meeting	Have same type of acreage breakdown on proposed land use map for current zoning map.	This is a good idea. The Plan will be updated to show this.
Comment at 7/25/13 Meeting	Have both the existing land use maps and the proposed land use map side by side, so that individuals can see the differences.	The current Plan does not have an existing land use map to the same level of detail that the proposed Plan has. The existing land use map shows only the location of commercial centers and visual resource areas, so it may be a difficult comparison.
Comment at 7/31/13 Meeting	Zoning Plan – Make clear what changes to existing regulations the proposed policies are making.	This Plan does not make changes to existing regulations. However, it does make changes to proposed recommendations. There is a document on our website that shows all of the changes to the existing policies.
Comment at 7/31/13 Meeting	Given that the canyon includes 3 counties, showing and trying for logical consistency with land uses, connections, etc would be helpful. People usually know which county they live in, but to keep track of what is different is not easy for “regular” people and leads to frustration with government.	This process has included Boulder and Gilpin County. Both Counties have commented. We do try to be consistent with land uses and connections in their Plans. However, this Plan does not change existing zoning. Therefore, some inconsistencies will continue to exist between Counties in regard to what is allowed or not allowed on properties.

<b>Introduction and History</b>		
Public Health	Page 2. Introduction, last sentence "Is this supposed to be the "Indian Hills" Area or should it say North Mountain Plan Area?"	This has been modified to read the North Mountains Area Plan.
Public Health	Page 4, Last sentence before Golden Gate Canyon paragraph, "Should this be Area Plan instead of "Community Plan"?"	This has been modified to read Area Plan.
DW, Citizen	<p>INTRODUCTION;</p> <p><i>This would be a good place to show the goal of the plan.</i></p> <p>"This Draft) Plan is shorter than the 1997 plan because any goals or policies that were duplicated in the Comprehensive Master Plan have been removed."</p> <p><i>It would make review of the DRAFT much more understandable if the paragraphs in the Master Plan were shown with the changes in italics or colored Ink.</i></p> <p><i>I suggest putting the History at the end, not the beginning of The Draft.</i></p>	<p>A goal statement has been added to this chapter.</p> <p>Thank you for the comment. We will consider that for future plan updates.</p> <p>Thank you for the comment. To maintain consistency with the Comprehensive Master Plan and other Area Plans that have already been adopted, we will keep the history at the beginning.</p>
DW, Citizen	There are numerous historical statements that are out of date. There is a more recent book "Coal Creek Canyon - Tales from Times Past" by Vicki Moran - Editor	We have updated the last paragraph of the Coal Creek Canyon section to reflect the current situation.
JW, Citizen	Hogan's ranch is now under a conservation easement (Boulder County paid ~10 million) and the same Hogans as mentioned in the History may not still be living there.)	This has been noted in the History.
JW, Citizen	Levitt Booth is deceased. His son George Booth still lives in the canyon. His daughter Murva Ann Rodgers lives in Blue Mt. Estates. References to Levitt need to be changed to past tense.	This has been updated in the History.

JW, Citizen	I do not know if Lois Ranson still lives in Plainview.	There are Ransons that live in Plainview, it is unclear if one of them is Lois, so the language has been modified to talk in general about the Ransons.
JW, Citizen	The one-room school house was moved (with much effort) to the grounds of the Coal Creek K-8 school on June 20, 2002	This has been updated in the History.
JW, Citizen	The building that was Cummings Realty is now vacant. Byer's and Sellars was the last realty business at that location.	This has been updated in the History.
JW, Citizen	Population - 2,400, 2010 census (I think this even this figure is too low)	This estimate has been updated.
JW, Citizen	(Paragraph starting "Today") There is no beauty shop, no auto parts store. There are 2 restaurants and one coffee shop.... There are two local monthly newsletters, the Coal Creek Mountain Messenger, LLC, and the Highlander - editor Anita Wilks. Wee Creekers is the local day care center. There are two gas stations, an auto repair shop, a liquor store, a Kwik Mart, and a US Post Office. CCCIA no longer prints a newsletter but submits articles to the local monthly newsletters. (This is an incomplete list but yes we still enjoy "a place of spectacular beauty and the spirit of community."  Yes, we still have many fund raisers, book clubs, churches, and many other groups.	This paragraph has been modified.
<b>Residential Uses</b>		
JW, Citizen	Re: Staff response – 1 du/35 acres... conservation easements. Perhaps add “Other restrictions may apply”. i.e. Seavers 547 acres allows only two 35 acre building sites. 547 divided by 35 would be 15.6 building sites – roads, clearings all over the north slope of West Blue Mountain	This is a good idea. Use Area 5 has been modified to say: “1 du/35 acres. Note: Some of these areas have additional density restrictions imposed by conservation easements.”

<p>DW, Citizen</p>	<p>Residential uses General policies</p> <p><i>In policy number 3 or 4, suggest adding, " Any new residential development shall include spacing for a sewage disposal tile field and a distance of at least 200 feet from the residential well, any neighbors well, or a stream."</i></p>	<p>The Public Health regulations regarding septic systems require septic systems to be located at least 200 feet from any well. We tried not to reiterate regulations in this Plan. Distance between streams and septic systems is not specifically designated, though the Comprehensive Master Plan does state that surface water quality should be protected through appropriate buffers. Topography may change the distance of that buffer.</p>
<p>DW, Citizen</p>	<p>Specific Land Use Recommendations</p> <p><i>Use areas 3, 4, and 5 do not appear anywhere in the following documentation. Do we need a map to show their application?</i></p>	<p>A sentence has been added under "Specific Land Use Recommendations" that references the maps associated with the descriptions.</p>
<p><b>Coal Creek Canyon Center</b></p>		
<p>Comment at 7/31/13 Meeting</p>	<p>Need recommendations for improvements to the center. All the propane area needs is a big storage tank and a portable tank; it doesn't need all of that storage.</p> <p>Daily support needs should be served by this center. There is no mention of the impact of the CCCIA Hall on this area – how can something like this be in this center also?</p>	<p>The Plan does discuss a specific area plan for the Coal Creek Canyon Center. This would be a future planning process and could address the propane storage facility in more detail.</p> <p>The intent is for the center is to support daily needs and it is stated in the plan that it is a center "...where the services and good available are needed daily by residents within the community." P.11, Area 6, policy 1. Another community hall could be located in this center. Community</p>

		Halls would be considered Community Uses and would be evaluated against the Community Use criteria in the Comprehensive Master Plan.
Comment at 7/31/13 Meeting	Proposed retail Canyon Center – good – would be nice to have more coherent development/connections/parking.	Staff agrees, and there is also a policy that talks about creating a specific area plan for this Center, which would more specifically address connections, access and parking.
DW, Citizen	Land use recommendations <i>I liked these words from your April Question Sheet and think they would be appropriate here.</i> "The current plan designates the area as a Mountain Community Center. Use recommendations say this should be a neighborhood Center where these services and goods available are needed daily by the residents , with 25% open space"	These items are noted in policies 1 and 2 under Area 6: Coal Creek Canyon Center.
DW, Citizen	I suggest delete words "Area 6" from Coal Creek Canyon Center and delete the words "use area 7" from Golden Gate Canyon Center. Let Coal Creek Canyon Center (page 11 of draft), stand on its own.	To maintain consistency with how other Area Plan use recommendations were labeled we will continue to reference Area 6 and Area 7.
DW, Citizen	1. Delete " beauty salons and cleaners" and somewhere get in the words "contingent on water and sewage disposal availability"	This Area Plan will be incorporated into the Comprehensive Master Plan, which states, "Applications for New Development should demonstrate that water is adequate and available for the use proposed, including any watering for outside uses such as landscaping or livestock."
DW, Citizen	6. c, Where do we need Pedestrian access? Delete it.	Pedestrian access may be applicable between commercial uses within the

		center.
DW, Citizen	6. g. incorporate the "existing commercial uses" consistent with daily needs of the residents	This is implied through the first policy in this section that discuss how the center is for goods and services needed daily by residents.
<b>Golden Gate Canyon Center</b>		
Comment at 7/25/13 Meeting	Several concerns about having the Grange Hall included in the Center, that this designation will eliminate the Grange's ability to be a community center due to insurance rates increasing.	Staff does not want to push the Grange Hall out of the Community, but the type of use is considered appropriate and compatible with other uses within a commercial center. After talking with the State Grange Master, we do not anticipate the insurance rates increasing due to a recommendation in an advisory document.
Comment at 7/25/13 Meeting	Concern about the site distance at the Grange. Is it adequate for commercial uses?	The County recently made road improvements to this intersection.
Comment at 7/25/13 Meeting	How does the Federal Antiquities Act impact any future sale of the Grange Hall for commercial uses?	The Federal Antiquities Act addresses archaeological and historic sites on federal lands.
At least 29 Citizens of the Golden Gate Canyon Area	There is some question in our community as to whether the Planning Department is listening to or understanding the input from the community on the revised North County Plan.  At the initial meeting at the Grange the community strongly said they did not want commercial in the Golden Gate Canyon area. The survey on line was very clear that the community does not want commercial anywhere in the Golden Gate Canyon. That is documented on your website. We know that	Planning staff has received many comments regarding eliminating the proposed Golden Gate Canyon center from the North Mountains Plan. Staff still finds a small center appropriate for this area. Due to the A-35 zoning, physical constraints, and community comments, two of the three commercial centers previously located in

	<p>Plan Jeffco also advised against commercial at the corner of Golden Gate Canyon Road and Crawford Gulch Road.</p> <p>At the last meeting at the Grange you said that the Planning Department staff feels that a commercial center is appropriate at Golden Gate Canyon Road and Crawford Gulch Road.</p> <p>Early in the process we asked if you knew how A-35 came about. You were good to meet with several community members to better understand how the community brought that about. However, at the last meeting at the Grange two of your staff members were asked if they knew how it came about. One said she thought it was a state mandate and the other professed no knowledge of it at all because this was not the part of the county where he normally works. Both were polite and listened to our explanations but the concern remains that others on the Planning Department staff are making judgments on something without knowing the background. It is our hope that they can become more informed.</p> <p>To that end a group of us have drafted a letter of explanation as well as some background materials that we are delivering to some Planning Department staff as well as to the Planning Commission, Historical Commission and the County Commissioners. We have attached the same documents here. Please know that we care deeply about this community and the direction it is taking. Included also are copies of an additional petition in opposition to commercial development on Golden Gate Canyon Road. The originals are given to Alan Tiefenbach. There will be more of those coming and they too, will be copied to you.</p>	<p>this area are proposed for elimination.</p> <p>All of Planning Staff has received and reviewed the information you generously provided. This information is also contained in the Planning Commission packet for the North Mountains Area Plan hearing on 9-25-13.</p>
FL, Citizen	I have been keeping up with the proposed changes to the	Planning staff has received many comments

	<p>proposed commercial zoning in the Golden Gate Canyon area. Our family has been a landowner in Golden Gate Canyon for over 70 years. We have a ranch on Robinson Hill Road and would pasture cattle there during the summer months. We now lease the land for pasture.</p> <p>Over the years we have seen many changes in the canyon. There are many more homes in the area. Traffic has increased tremendously. There are not as many ranchers as there used to be, and a lot more people.</p> <p>I would like to go on record as firmly opposing the zoning change which would include the Golden Gate Grange in the commercial development triangle. What a lovely institution the Grange has been in the canyon for so many years. It has provided a place for people to meet and has many worthwhile activities which support not only the Grange but also the much needed volunteer fire department in the canyon. What a shame it would be if the Grange would not be a part of the community and commercial development would take over! Many classes and activities are held at the Grange for people of all ages. It has also been a place for weddings/funerals/celebrations to take place. The Grange brings together the community by sponsoring major fundraisers held for the benefit of the community. People love coming to the wonderful activities sponsored by the Grange.</p> <p>Please do not ruin the beautiful canyon by bringing in commercial development which is unnecessary. Traffic is already increasing because of the many people who now live in the canyon which places an extra burden on the volunteer fire department. They need to be ready to fight fires---not serve as an ambulance crew for the many accidents which happen there due to increased traffic. Commercial development would</p>	<p>regarding eliminating the proposed Golden Gate Canyon center from the North Mountains Plan. Staff still finds a small center appropriate for this area. Due to the A-35 zoning, physical constraints, and community comments, two of the three commercial centers previously located in this area are proposed for elimination.</p> <p>The Plan states that “While the County Shops and Golden Gate Grange are in operation, these areas should be supported as Community Uses. If these uses cease, the property may be appropriate for Limited Commercial or Community Uses. “This policy is to emphasize that the Grange uses should be allowed to continue.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>jeopardize the beauty of this unique canyon.</p> <p>Thank you for holding the meetings which keep everyone informed and I hope you will continue doing this.</p>	
TN, Citizen	<p>I am a current resident and land owner in Golden Gate Canyon, residing on Mica Mountain Road.</p> <p>I understand that a private application has been made for <u>Commercial Rezoning</u> of the old Nare trailer site, located at the junction of Golden Gate Canyon Road and Crawford Gulch Road. <u>I oppose Commercial Rezoning</u> in Golden Gate Canyon because I believe strongly that commercial rezoning is inconsistent with the lifestyle objectives of most residents of the Canyon, the multi-generational residents as well as the new-comers who value the wild and pristine nature of our Canyon.</p> <p>Commercial operations belong in town, in Golden. Please keep Golden Gate Canyon wild and beautiful.</p>	<p>Planning staff has received many comments regarding eliminating the proposed Golden Gate Canyon center from the North Mountains Plan. Staff still finds a small center appropriate for this area. Due to the A-35 zoning, physical constraints, and community comments, two of the three commercial centers previously located in this area are proposed for elimination.</p>
BD, Citizen	<p>I strongly oppose Case 12-117556RZ to re-zone the area around the Golden Gate Canyon Grange. People move to the foothills to be able to relax and enjoy the wildlife and quiet. Having a commercial operation of any type in this area would greatly degrade the quality of living.</p>	<p>Planning staff has received many comments regarding eliminating the proposed Golden Gate Canyon center from the North Mountains Plan. Staff still finds a small center appropriate for this area. Due to the A-35 zoning, physical constraints, and community comments, two of the three commercial centers previously located in this area are proposed for elimination.</p>
DW, Citizen	<p>Mountain Scale Neighborhood Commercial Use area 6 is applicable.</p>	<p>This center is much smaller than the Coal Creek Canyon Center and the commercial category is the more restrictive Limited</p>

		Commercial designation.
RL, Citizen	<p>Thank you for requesting input regarding the area near Crawford Gulch and Golden Gate Canyon. My family owns property in the canyon. I am not in favor of a commercial area in the proposed area. Commercial enterprises belong in Golden, Arvada, Lakewood and Wheat Ridge. The canyon road is already congested with traffic and does not need any additional bottle neck areas that contribute more to the problem. This site is too small to have a commercial development and the required services such as parking. The fire department and Grange need access to their buildings and activities.</p> <p>The Grange provides a meeting place for the community and classes are held there for yoga, small acreage property management, and techniques for fire control around homesteads in the area. The Grange and Fire station provide service to the community and should not be considered commercial.</p> <p>Keep the canyon scenic and commercial ventures in areas where there is enough population to support the business and have room and infrastructure to adequately meet the needs of the business.</p>	<p>Planning staff has received many comments regarding eliminating the proposed Golden Gate Canyon center from the North Mountains Plan. Staff still finds a small center appropriate for this area. Due to the A-35 zoning, physical constraints, and community comments, two of the three commercial centers previously located in this area are proposed for elimination.</p> <p>The Plan states that “While the County Shops and Golden Gate Grange are in operation, these areas should be supported as Community Uses. If these uses cease, the property may be appropriate for Limited Commercial or Community Uses. “This policy is to emphasize that the Grange uses should be allowed to continue.</p> <p>The size of the center is very limited by topography, but could still support some commercial uses.</p>
NH, Citizen	<p>I am extremely upset about the proposed North Mountain Community Plan in the Golden Gate Canyon/Guy Hill/Crawford Gulch/White Ranch Park areas. There are many reasons that I am opposed to this. I am a Grange member and also have property interests in the canyon, and I am against the planned zoning to Commercial zoning. This Grange is a landmark in the canyon that supports many community functions that serve not</p>	<p>Planning staff has received many comments regarding eliminating the proposed Golden Gate Canyon center from the North Mountains Plan. Staff still finds a small center appropriate for this area. Due to the A-35 zoning, physical constraints, and community comments, two of the three</p>

	<p>only Grange members but many community activities and classes for our residents in the canyon. It would be detrimental to our non-profit organization to make such a change and our Grange cannot support this. The Golden Gate Fire Department uses our Grange for their fundraiser needs as well which helps the community support new fire equipment and take preventive measures in the event of fire which is extremely important. We all know the dangers involved of fire in our canyon. Changing the zoning would impair the functioning of the Grange organization as it is now and would also increase our insurance rates. This is not what our Grange would want. We do not want be zoned commercial as we are a nonprofit organization and our Grange is not set up for our parking lot to be used as a public lot and never has been. In the event of a zoning change, the concern would be increased traffic, more trash and more fire danger and more accidents within the canyon.</p> <p>There is no reason to support any business for commercial development in our canyon when we are only 5 miles away from Golden. Businesses belong in town and certainly not in a scenic canyon area that residents who live in the canyon do not support a Commercial zoning change. We drive into Golden and get supplies needed with no problems. The residents who live here would not support this. I urge you to keep the canyon as it is for our future generations to treasure. It is priceless to hold on to our natural beauty as it exists now from any further development including a change to Commercial zoning that is not needed nor is it necessary to change the zoning. I don't understand why the county continues to make changes when the community does not want the change.</p>	<p>commercial centers previously located in this area are proposed for elimination.</p> <p>Staff does not want to push the Grange Hall out of the Community, but the type of use is considered appropriate and compatible with other uses within a commercial center. After talking with the State Grange Master, we do not anticipate the insurance rates increasing due to a recommendation in an advisory document.</p>
--	---	--

<p>LR, Citizen</p>	<p>My interest in the Golden Gate Canyon stems from my grandparents and Dad buying property in early 1940s west on Robinson Hill Rd.</p> <p>My four siblings concur that we oppose the planned commercial development in Golden Gate Canyon. We are not members of Golden Gate Grange, but several of us support its fundraising efforts that help protect against fires in the canyon. And one of the 4 of us attends some of the events held there.</p> <p>Commercial designation in that area would likely cause the Grange to fold up, due to increased insurance rates. The members there struggle to support activities being held at their Grange. Without that gathering place, there would be no "community" for residents; the physical building is an asset to the Canyon residents.</p> <p>Commercial businesses in that narrow canyon would not only be an eyesore, but would be hazardous to access and leave. Additionally, it wouldn't enhance the peaceful nature of the canyon.</p> <p>Don't even consider designating the Grange land as a conservation zone or open space to avoid including it in a commercial zone! Keep all commercialization OUT of narrow, winding Golden Gate Canyon. We don't want an interstate highway atmosphere there!</p> <p>Golden and all the services it provides is not so distant from the location of Golden Gate Grange. The canyon residents certainly aren't eager to have commercial businesses fill in their narrow canyon. They are satisfied obtaining services in Golden, which isn't a hardship.</p> <p>THANK YOU for logging and heeding my input.</p>	<p>Planning staff has received many comments regarding eliminating the proposed Golden Gate Canyon center from the North Mountains Plan. Staff still finds a small center appropriate for this area. Due to the A-35 zoning, physical constraints, and community comments, two of the three commercial centers previously located in this area are proposed for elimination.</p> <p>Staff does not want to push the Grange Hall out of the Community, but the type of use is considered appropriate and compatible with other uses within a commercial center. After talking with the State Grange Master, we do not anticipate the insurance rates increasing due to a recommendation in an advisory document.</p>
--------------------	--	---

	Commercialization of Golden Gate Canyon is the wrong stance for this community of narrow, winding roads.	
IL, Citizen	<p>Thank you for keeping us informed on the proposed North Mountain Community Plan.</p> <p>I am opposed to commercial development in the Golden Gate Canyon/Guy Hill/Crawford Gulch/White Ranch Park areas. It is unnecessary to bring in commercial establishments. Specifically, I request removal of the Golden Gate Grange #451 from the planned zoning of Commercial. Changing the zoning to commercial would create a burden for the Grange because of increased insurance rates which could seriously impair the functioning of the Grange as it is now. The Grange is a non-profit organization and does many positive things for the community in Golden Gate Canyon. Many community activities are held in the Grange Hall. It is affordable for groups to rent the Grange for a variety of activities. Classes are held in the Grange to improve the lives of members of the community. An example is the yoga classes which are held and are open to everyone.</p> <p>The Golden Gate Fire Department has a major fundraiser (pig roast) held at the Grange in September. Without the funds that are raised. The Golden Gate Fire Department would not be able to have up to date equipment to fight potential fires in the canyon. In these days of wildfires burning and ruining people's homes and lives, it is imperative to have a fire department in the community that has up to date equipment to work with. If the proposed commercial development would go through, it is questionable where there would be room to park. The Grange cannot have their parking lot used as a public lot. An increase in the trash that would be created is another potential</p>	<p>Planning staff has received many comments regarding eliminating the proposed Golden Gate Canyon center from the North Mountains Plan. Staff still finds a small center appropriate for this area. Due to the A-35 zoning, physical constraints, and community comments, two of the three commercial centers previously located in this area are proposed for elimination.</p> <p>Staff does not want to push the Grange Hall out of the Community, but the type of use is considered appropriate and compatible with other uses within a commercial center. After talking with the State Grange Master, we do not anticipate the insurance rates increasing due to a recommendation in an advisory document.</p> <p>Transportation studies and documents indicate that Golden Gate Canyon Road can accommodate additional traffic and is currently well below capacity.</p>

	<p>problem.</p> <p>Another concern is the possibility of increased traffic in the canyon. The road is narrow and winding. It is extremely dangerous now with the many bike riders who continue to ride in the narrow canyon road. The fire department is already being used for first aid for the many accidents which occur now, and would be overtaxed with an increase in traffic that commercial zoning could create.</p> <p>I would like to keep the canyon as a peaceful place, not having an increase in traffic and commercialization which is proposed. People who live in the canyon are here because of the natural beauty of the canyon, and not because they need to have commercial establishments. The Golden Gate Community is not far from facilities and commercial establishments in Golden and Arvada. People who work in town drive to their work each day and have an opportunity to purchase what they need to have then. I do not feel that there are enough people to support any type of commercial establishment. What a waste to build a facility, only to have it fail and be empty. This would be an eyesore in the canyon. Please do not ruin the natural beauty and peacefulness of Golden Gate Canyon by bringing in commercial establishments which are unnecessary.</p> <p>Thank you for giving everyone an opportunity to express their feelings at the town meetings you have held. I hope you seriously consider my thoughts on this matter. Please keep us informed about what is happening.</p>	
TH, Citizen	I would like to express my objection to any possible commercial development in the Golden Gate Canyon area. I don't believe the group that you'll be meeting with at the Grange give an accurate representation of the sentiment of the majority of the	Planning staff has received many comments regarding eliminating the proposed Golden Gate Canyon center from the North Mountains Plan. Staff still finds a small

	<p>residents of this community. Many of us chose Golden Gate, instead of other developed canyons, specifically because it is strictly a residential area. Please don't open the door for commercial development, we're one of the last hold outs and it's part of what makes it so nice to live up here.</p>	<p>center appropriate for this area. Due to the A-35 zoning, physical constraints, and community comments, two of the three commercial centers previously located in this area are proposed for elimination.</p>
DR, Citizen	<p>We support having a Plan, but have many concerns regarding the Golden Gate Canyon Center. Concerns are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Don't want to see this area as commercial in the future.</li> <li>- Concern about site distance at this location.</li> <li>- Will the size and configuration of the site allow for commercial uses with setbacks and parking standards that will need to be met?</li> <li>- This is not a responsible place for commercial development. There is other commercial close enough in Golden.</li> <li>- A-35 initiators wanted to reduce density, we have seen lots of benefits of that. This proposal is contrary to that rezoning, which the BCC supported.</li> <li>- Don't see an overwhelming need for a center. It is not a hardship to travel to Golden. Golden Gate Canyon Road is cleared well in the winter.</li> <li>- This center would not provide the appropriate services to keep people up in the Canyon and not driving into Golden anyway.</li> </ul>	<p>Staff still finds a small center appropriate for this area.</p> <p>The County recently made road improvements to this intersection.</p> <p>Setback and parking requirements will be evaluated with a specific proposal, but these items will also contribute to staff's intent of having small, limited uses at this center.</p>
<b>Hazards</b>		
Comment at 7/31/13 Meeting	<p>Wildfire and other hazards chapter should include the neighborhood staging areas on the map.</p>	<p>The Community Wildfire Protection Plans designated community safety zones, not</p>

		neighborhood staging areas.
Comment at 7/25/13 Meeting	Have the boundaries of public land outlined on the Wildfire Hazards map.	Wildfire does not follow parcel boundaries, so we are not sure how this would be helpful.
AG, Citizen	Policies regarding secondary and emergency access should allow for substandard road templates for emergency access roads.	To the policy regarding secondary and emergency access routes, we have added that "Substandard road templates should be considered when providing emergency access."
Boulder County	Of particular interest to Boulder County are those policies addressing wildfire and wildlife. The dangers associated with wildfire are well known to all of us; wildfires can start in either of our counties, and the danger of fire spreading to the other county is always a possibility. Recognition and mitigation of wildfire potential is critical to reducing wildfire impacts and to planning emergency service coordination between counties and fire districts.	We agree that wildfires do not acknowledge jurisdictional boundaries. The Wildfire Hazard policies came from the local Fire Protection District's Community Wildfire Protection Plans. The Coal Creek Canyon District encompasses three counties, Jefferson, Boulder and Gilpin.
Public Health	Page 16, Radiation Hazard Policies, last sentence before the numbers begin, change Colorado Health Department to Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.	This has been modified to the correct name.
DW, Citizen	Wildfire Hazard Policies 2. - define shaded fire breaks - Identify roads j,k,and l as being in Coal Creek Canyon  6. - Identify roads d, e, f, and g as being in Coal Creek Canyon - A 30,000 gallon tank is currently in place at the west end of Loomis	Shaded fuelbreaks will be added to the Glossary of the Comprehensive Master Plan.  Specific roads and areas have been removed to avoid future inconsistencies between this Plan and the CWPP's, since they will likely be updated prior to this Area Plan being updated.

	<p>7. - Secondary evacuation or emergency access routes should be considered for all new developments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Delete "new"</li> <li>-Identify roads h, i, j, and k as being in Coal Creek Canyon</li> <li>-k is probably Wondervu</li> <li>-Add intersection of Loomis and Spruce Canyon Drive east and south to highway 72 (This road was in existence in the 1960's and is still there but blocked at the south end)</li> </ul>	<p>This Plan is only applied to new developments. New development does include redevelopment of an existing area.</p>
<p>Golden Gate Canyon Fire Protection District</p>	<p>Responses to questions posed by staff:</p> <p><b>How often are the CWPPs updated?</b></p> <p>In the GGFPD the CWPPs are fairly recent documents. The first plan I am aware of was prepared by Anchor Point (a private company) and finalized in 2004. In 2011 it was revised by various county and state agencies. If the past is any indication of the future we updated the plan once in 7 years. Residential and Open Space development since 2004 has changed the situation on the ground, along well traveled roads and near new residences. However, I will note that the majority of land in GGFPD has remained in its natural state since it is not near residences or along frequented roads. Our district is large (50 sq miles) and much of it is remote, difficult to access wildlands.</p> <p><b>Our area plans are updated approximately every 10-15 years, will references to specific roads be helpful in such a long term document, or will they be outdated very quickly?</b></p> <p>I do think including references to specific roads and areas in the North Mtn Community Plan would be helpful. But I also think that you will be duplicating the CWPPs in this regard.</p> <p><b>What is the difference between vegetation thinning along</b></p>	<p>Thank you for your responses. We are removing the detailed policies in this Plan, but we are keeping the reference to the CWPP's and will add a definition of Shaded Fuelbreak to the Comprehensive Master Plan Glossary.</p>

	<p><b>access roads and a shaded fuel break?</b></p> <p>This term seems to have varying definitions. Here is one from <a href="http://www.wildlandfire.com/docs/fire-glossary.htm">http://www.wildlandfire.com/docs/fire-glossary.htm</a> I think is most applicable: "<i>Shaded Fuel break - Fuel breaks built in timbered areas where the trees on the break are thinned and pruned to reduce the fire potential yet retain enough crown canopy to make a less favorable microclimate for surface fires.</i>"</p>	
<b>Historic Resources</b>		
Comment at 7/25/13 Meeting	Should the airplane crash on Mt. Tom be shown on the Historic Resources map?	Staff has investigated this site and found that the crash is on private property. The property owner does not wish for this site to be publicized because it encourages trespassing and possibly destruction of any remaining artifacts at the site.
<b>Open Space and Trails</b>		
Comment at 7/31/13 Meeting	Why conceptual trail connections shown on public land?	The potential trails have not been thoroughly vetted at this time, even across public property. Negotiations have not been done with private property owners, which will impact where a trail enters and exits public lands.
<b>Transportation</b>		
Comment at 7/31/13 Meeting	<p>Transportation: Twin Spruce/72 intersection needs improved visibility for safety turning left from Twin Spruce</p> <p>Transit: Jeffco should give the same amount of financial and political support to mountain transit that Boulder County does.</p>	<p>This can be added to the list of potential road improvements.</p> <p>Transit is encouraged in this Plan. Political and financial support is determined by the</p>

	Need shoulder for bicyclists on 72.	Board of County Commissioners.  The County's Bicycle Plan does call for paved shoulders at least 4 feet in width along Hwy 72.
Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT)	CDOT appreciates the opportunity to offer our remarks to the 'Draft' version of the North Area Plan, on which we primarily focused to pages 24 & 25. Please see red-lines attached where we offer a few word substitutions for the opening paragraphs that we believe are more succinct, direct and less polarizing. Generally, local residents will be familiar with the common names given to our State Highways. However, for non-local Jefferson County residents or service agencies, it would be more helpful to clearly ID US 6, State Highway 72 as you have with SH 93. Not everyone will be familiar with which is "Golden Gate Canyon", "Coal Creek Canyon", or "Clear Creek Canyon" Roads.	We have reviewed the additional red-marks and incorporated most of them as appropriate.  We will change the names of the state highways to the official highway names. Golden Gate Canyon Road is commonly referred to as such in most, if not all, of the County's transportation documents, so we will not be changing those references.
CDOT	It is not clear if Highway 6 on the southern boundary is part of the North Area Plan. There is very little discussion of the history of this roadway as there is with the other primary highways. Is this particular highway corridor not associated with this North Area Plan? There are numerous stakeholders who have a strong interest in this particular highway corridor which continues to see increased traffic volumes.	US 6 is the dividing line between the North Mountains Area Plan and the Central Mountains Area Plan. Policies regarding US 6 may be contained in both or either plan. Since this is a land use plan, not a transportation plan specifically, and the majority of the land north of US 6 is owned by Jefferson County Open Space, there is not much potential for the land uses in this area to impact US 6, so it was not discussed in great detail.
CDOT	We suggest spelling out "Level of Service" the first time before using the acronym LOS	We agree and have changed the first reference to LOS to spell it out.

CDOT	4.e. What is “the first turn westbound on Golden Gate Canyon Road”? This is a county road until it reaches the Jefferson/Gilpin County Line where it turns into SH 46. It is not clear if this location is a segment of State Highway. (A mile marker would be more helpful to us to ID ownership & maintenance responsibilities). If this is CDOT property, we recommend a meeting to understand the issue, if it is not a maintenance placed barrier.	The Transportation and Engineering Division recommends this policy be removed and a more general policy be added.
CDOT	4.i. The feasibility for westbound passing lanes on SH 72 from SH 93 to Wondervu will be looked at with the Denver Water Board-Gross Reservoir permit. Are there other segments of concern?	That segment covers this Planning Area. The policy has been modified to say, “Passing lanes on SH 72 between SH 93 and Wondervu, as deemed necessary by the Denver Water Board-Gross Reservoir permit.”
CDOT	9. Noted. CDOT can only help sign State Highways, not county or local roads. CDOT is currently coordinating with both Jefferson & Clear Creek County’s Open Space Departments who have created a partnership for the Peaks-to-Plains Multi-Use Trail corridor along US 6. They have obtained funding for design & construction and are currently moving forward with a major segment from mm 262.5 on the east to mm 259.3 on the west (tunnel #6). Once again, it is not clear to CDOT if Clear Creek Canyon/US 6 is part of the North Area Plan area.	We understand that CDOT is not responsible for county or local roads and we are aware of the additional funding that has been procured to create a multi-use trail along US 6. US 6 is the dividing line between this Plan area and the Central Mountains Community Plan (also being updated). Any needed improvements to that road could be referenced in either or both plans. Policy 9 has been updated to say “...along state maintained canyon roads. An example of this coordination is the Peak-to-Plains trail currently funded as a joint Clear Creek and Jefferson County multi-use trail along US 6.”

CDOT	Noted. This aspect of cycling will be examined for the segment of SH 72 from SH 93 to Wondervu under the same Denver Water Board Permit mentioned in 4.g. above. Are there other CDOT highway segments in Jefferson County of concern? To decrease vehicular conflicts with cyclist as well as pedestrians, CDOT is supportive of accommodating within our ROW, safe multi-use parking areas and related facilities within these canyon corridors with appropriate agreements in-place for maintenance, etc. (similar to Mayhem Gulch) Parking along unimproved shoulders is discouraged such as locations where they exist, are primarily intended to be used as a recovery zone, or for disabled vehicles to move into, out of the travel lanes.	A reference to the Peak-to-Plains trail along US 6 has been added.  Other CDOT highways are out of this Plan area.
CDOT	For all highway enhancement and improvement requests, Jefferson County Commissioners may initiate a request that CDOT to look into each issue to determine if they qualify as a “Local Agency Project”. Other alternatives may involve further discussions between Jefferson County, Region 1, and possibly other stakeholders to identify which highway, the scope of design, review, construction, and maintenance responsibilities. These would need to be legitimized through either an MOU or other agreement.	Thank you for your review. We hope that our Transportation and Engineering Division works closely with you in future highway enhancement and improvement requests.
Transportation & Engineering	I would suggest that language specific to placement of guardrail or barriers related to the safety and operational aspects of managing a roadway do not belong in a planning document such as the North Mountains Plan. If there is a specific concern regarding guardrail or any other safety aspect we would be happy to check into it. Perhaps something more general that would encourage installation of paved shoulders, delineation of the roadway, and installation of roadside safety features might be appropriate.	This policy has been modified to have a general statement and then make it clear that the listed items are concerns of the residents, not necessarily County work program items. It now reads:  “Encourage the installation of paved shoulders, delineation of the roadway, and installation of roadside safety features with new development or road improvement

		projects. Specific concerns identified by the residents include:”
Public Health	What does the acronym LOS stand for? Lower Level of Service (LOS)? We would recommend that the acronym be spelled out at least once in the document with the acronym to follow.	We have modified this so that the first reference to LOS spells it out and then gives the acronym.
<b>Water and Sanitation</b>		
Public Health	Page 26, Water and Sanitation, Does the County have monetary and employee resources to conduct this study as mentioned in Policies 1 and 2? If not, I would suggest we remove this. Jefferson County Public Health does not currently have the capacity to conduct such a study at this time. What entity does “County” refer to?	We will delete these two policies. In addition to the concern about resources to complete this. A Ground Water study was conducted in the Turkey Creek basin. While it did not cover the entire county, it gave us enough information to create regulations to address availability of ground water in the mountain areas of the County.
<b>Wildlife</b>		
Boulder County	The wildlife policies which are included in the draft Plan are important in accommodating the needs of wildlife, and are an issue of concern in maintaining an important environmental resource in the area. As is the case with wildfire, county lines are artificial boundaries with no relationship to wildlife migration and habitat areas.	Thank you.