1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. CONSENT AGENDA

3.1. Approval of September, 2018 Accounts Payable Warrants 9.18

3.2. Approval of September 04, 2018 Regular Meeting Minutes

3.3. IGA for Boulder County Ballot Boxes

4. STAFF REPORTS

4.1. Karen Gerrity, Town Administrator

4.2. Jennifer Hogan, Town Treasurer

4.3. Hope Jordan, Town Clerk

4.4. Larry Johns, Town Marshal

4.5. Chris Pelletier, Public Works Manager: Verbal Report

4.6. Dawn Baumhover, Community Center Manager

5. BOARD OF TRUSTEE REPORTS

5.1. Mayor's Report

5.2. Trustees' Reports

   Mayor Pro Tem Wood

   Trustee Apt

   Trustee Donahue
6. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

7. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

8. ACTION ITEMS

8.1. Ordinance Approving Loan Agreement for BioSolids Project

AIM to approve Ordinance 788
Ordinance - Nederland 2018 CWRPDA Loan

9. DISCUSSION ITEMS

9.1. Status of GOCO Grant for Park Improvements

AIM Gateway Park
ARC_Pumptrack_Handout
GOCO Draft Narrative with CP comments
Chris P Nederland_MASTER_PLAN_3-13_FINALreduced4part_1
9-18-18 Barker Meadow

9.2. ADU and STR Use and Code

9-18-18 AIM Discussion of STRs and ADUs
9-18-18 STR BOT
9-18-18 Code Definitions and Possible Edits
9-18-18 City Ordinance No. 2121_201406261530179676
9-18-18 Ordinance 785 ADUs
9-18-18 DRAFT amending ADU ordinance 785

9.3. Status of IGA and Summary of Process

AIM IGA Discussion
Annexation Process Summary
NED DRAFT Nederland Comprehensive Development Plan IGA_BOT EDITS.docx
2009 Amendment to IGA

10. OTHER BUSINESS

11. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Trustees encourages citizen participation. Public hearings and the "unscheduled citizens" agenda item allow an opportunity to address the Board. Discussion is limited to 3 minutes and please address your comments to the Board. Thank you for your cooperation.

The Board of Trustees may take action on any item included on this agenda, regardless of the heading under which such item appears. Discussion items may become action items if the Board determines that deferring final action on an item to a subsequent meeting is unnecessary or unwarranted and that taking immediate action does not compromise any third-party's rights.

The Board of Trustees meeting packets are prepared by Friday before the Tuesday meetings and are available for inspection at Town Hall during normal business hours. The information is reviewed and studied by the Board of Trustee members, eliminating lengthy discussions to gain basic understanding. Short discussion on agenda items does not reflect lack of thought or analysis. The agendas are posted at Town Hall, the post office, and on the Town's website on the Friday prior to the meeting. Copies of the

agenda and meeting packet are available at no cost via email from the Town Clerk or from the Town website at www.nederlandco.org.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>InvoiceNumber</th>
<th>Vendor Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Invoice Amt</th>
<th>Approved Amt</th>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Account Description</th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>YTD Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-08 GS</td>
<td>Grapes &amp; Sons, PO Box 571, Black Hawk, CO, 80422</td>
<td>Return of ROW Dep - Grapes&amp;Sons 92 E 1st St</td>
<td>08/29/18</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>10-00-2200</td>
<td>Deposits held in Escrow</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($42,092.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4026820069</td>
<td>Canon Solutions America, Inc., 15004 Collections Centere Drive, Chicago, IL, 60693</td>
<td>copier maintenance base TH</td>
<td>09/02/18</td>
<td>$46.00</td>
<td>$46.00</td>
<td>10-12-5471</td>
<td>Office Equipment Mainten</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$124.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4026819320</td>
<td>14 Canon Solutions America, Inc., 15004 Collections Centere Drive, Chicago, IL, 60693</td>
<td>PD copier usage</td>
<td>09/02/18</td>
<td>$84.74</td>
<td>$84.74</td>
<td>10-18-5770</td>
<td>Printing/Copying</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
<td>$245.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72511</td>
<td>JVA, Inc., 1319 Spruce Street, Boulder, CO, 80302</td>
<td>1840.52c: 393 W Spring St, Review</td>
<td>09/02/18</td>
<td>$132.00</td>
<td>$132.00</td>
<td>10-00-2200</td>
<td>Deposits held in Escrow</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($42,092.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72512</td>
<td>JVA, Inc., 1319 Spruce Street, Boulder, CO, 80302</td>
<td>1840.53c: 163 Conger Street Review</td>
<td>09/02/18</td>
<td>$132.00</td>
<td>$132.00</td>
<td>10-00-2200</td>
<td>Deposits held in Escrow</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($42,092.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72513</td>
<td>JVA, Inc., 1319 Spruce Street, Boulder, CO, 80302</td>
<td>1840.54c: 76 Blue Spruce Review</td>
<td>09/02/18</td>
<td>$132.00</td>
<td>$132.00</td>
<td>10-00-2200</td>
<td>Deposits held in Escrow</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($42,092.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72592</td>
<td>JVA, Inc., 1319 Spruce Street, Boulder, CO, 80302</td>
<td>Knotted Root Brewery Pretreatment</td>
<td>09/02/18</td>
<td>$884.00</td>
<td>$884.00</td>
<td>10-00-2200</td>
<td>Deposits held in Escrow</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($42,092.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72848</td>
<td>JVA, Inc., 1319 Spruce Street, Boulder, CO, 80302</td>
<td>Knotted Root Brewery Pretreatment</td>
<td>09/02/18</td>
<td>$1,530.95</td>
<td>$1,530.95</td>
<td>10-00-2200</td>
<td>Deposits held in Escrow</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($42,092.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14702</td>
<td>Murray Dahl Kuechenmeister &amp; Renaud LLP, 710 Kipling Street, Suite 300, Lakewood, CO, 80215</td>
<td>103 E 1st Street</td>
<td>09/16/18</td>
<td>$105.00</td>
<td>$105.00</td>
<td>10-00-2200</td>
<td>Deposits held in Escrow</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($42,092.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14702</td>
<td>Murray Dahl Kuechenmeister &amp; Renaud LLP, 710 Kipling Street, Suite 300, Lakewood, CO, 80215</td>
<td>Wild Bear Nature Center</td>
<td>09/16/18</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>10-00-2200</td>
<td>Deposits held in Escrow</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($42,092.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14701</td>
<td>Murray Dahl Kuechenmeister &amp; Renaud LLP, 710 Kipling Street, Suite 300, Lakewood, CO, 80215</td>
<td>Legal services - August</td>
<td>09/13/18</td>
<td>$4,210.00</td>
<td>$4,210.00</td>
<td>10-12-5100</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$13,991.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-09</td>
<td>United States Postal Services, , ,</td>
<td>PO Box 340 - 12 Months</td>
<td>09/16/18</td>
<td>$156.00</td>
<td>$156.00</td>
<td>10-12-5710</td>
<td>Postage/Shipping</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$1,287.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3288</td>
<td>The Mountain Ear, PO BOX 99, Nederland, CO, 80466</td>
<td>public notice</td>
<td>09/13/18</td>
<td>$6.60</td>
<td>$6.60</td>
<td>10-14-5780</td>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$128.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218080626</td>
<td>Utility Notification Center of Colorado, 16361 Table Mountain Parkway, Golden, CO, 80403</td>
<td>locates</td>
<td>09/10/18</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
<td>10-20-5188</td>
<td>Excavation Services</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($69.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92863295-1</td>
<td>General Air Service &amp; Supply, 1105 Zuni Street, Denver, CO, 80204-3338</td>
<td>gas rental charge</td>
<td>09/10/18</td>
<td>$80.50</td>
<td>$80.50</td>
<td>10-20-5520</td>
<td>Minor Supplies (tools)</td>
<td>$8,500.00</td>
<td>$4,563.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Colorado Department of Revenue, , Denver, CO, 80261-0008</td>
<td>Mar 2018 VC Sales Tax</td>
<td>04/15/18</td>
<td>($450.91)</td>
<td>($450.91)</td>
<td>10-00-2030</td>
<td>Use Tax Payable</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($8,382.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Colorado Department of Revenue, , Denver, CO, 80261-0008</td>
<td>July 2018 VC Sales Tax</td>
<td>08/15/18</td>
<td>$305.58</td>
<td>$305.58</td>
<td>10-00-2030</td>
<td>Use Tax Payable</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($8,382.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InvoiceNumber</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td>Invoice Amt</td>
<td>Approved Amt</td>
<td>Account Number</td>
<td>Account Description</td>
<td>Budgeted $</td>
<td>YTD Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-08</td>
<td>08/31/18</td>
<td>Aug 2018 VC Sales Tax 30661151</td>
<td>09/15/18</td>
<td>$198.26</td>
<td>$198.26</td>
<td>10-00-2030</td>
<td>Use Tax Payable</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($8,382.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>08/29/18</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain Blueprint &amp; Supply Co., 2460 30th Street, Boulder, CO, 80301</td>
<td>09/09/18</td>
<td>$20.88</td>
<td>$20.88</td>
<td>10-14-5770</td>
<td>Printing/Copying</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$129.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>08/13/18</td>
<td>E-470 Public Hwy Authority, PO Box 5470, Denver, CO, 80217-5470</td>
<td>09/01/18</td>
<td>$18.55</td>
<td>$18.55</td>
<td>10-18-5190</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$181.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>08/16/18</td>
<td>Air-O-Pure Portables, PO BOX 1828, Nederland, CO, 80466</td>
<td>08/27/18</td>
<td>$105.00</td>
<td>$105.00</td>
<td>10-20-5210</td>
<td>Parks Maintenance</td>
<td>$15,700.00</td>
<td>$12,215.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>06/15/18</td>
<td>Wear Parts &amp; Equip Co, Inc, PO Box 472617, Aurora, CO, 80047-2617</td>
<td>06/25/18</td>
<td>$881.60</td>
<td>$881.60</td>
<td>10-20-5510</td>
<td>Equipment Maintenance &amp;</td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
<td>$8,120.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>08/23/18</td>
<td>AAA Pest Pros, PO Box 20235, Boulder, CO, 80308</td>
<td>09/02/18</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
<td>10-12-5205</td>
<td>Building Maintenance</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,038.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>08/18/18</td>
<td>BATCO, 5735 Prospect rd, Longmont, CO, 80305</td>
<td>09/17/18</td>
<td>$54.00</td>
<td>$54.00</td>
<td>10-13-5670</td>
<td>Supplies for Resale</td>
<td>$26,000.00</td>
<td>$4,659.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>08/31/18</td>
<td>FDGD LLC., 3875 Arbol Ctd, Boulder, CO, 80301</td>
<td>09/15/18</td>
<td>$1,015.70</td>
<td>$1,015.70</td>
<td>10-13-5670</td>
<td>Supplies for Resale</td>
<td>$26,000.00</td>
<td>$4,659.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>08/31/18</td>
<td>Maris, LLC, 4920 Atlanta Highway, #330, Alpharetta, GA, 30004</td>
<td>09/30/18</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>10-20-5190</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>($1,296.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>07/31/18</td>
<td>Kay L Turnbaugh, PO Box 931, Nederland, CO, 80466</td>
<td>08/15/18</td>
<td>$167.50</td>
<td>$167.50</td>
<td>10-13-5670</td>
<td>Supplies for Resale</td>
<td>$26,000.00</td>
<td>$4,659.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>08/17/18</td>
<td>Hartco Inc., dba CAM Services, 2525 W. 64th Avenue, Denver, CO, 80221</td>
<td>09/16/18</td>
<td>$460.00</td>
<td>$460.00</td>
<td>10-20-5215</td>
<td>Streets Maintenance</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>$6,642.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $52.93 $20.88 $26.20 $1,205.72 $55.00 $54.00 $1,015.70 $40.00 $167.50 $460.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>InvoiceNumber</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Invoice Amt</th>
<th>Approved Amt</th>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Account Description</th>
<th>Budgeted $</th>
<th>YTD Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>08/31/18</td>
<td>Prosecution services - August</td>
<td>09/30/18</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>10-17-5105</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>$27,000.00</td>
<td>$12,958.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>08/16/18</td>
<td>codification</td>
<td>09/15/18</td>
<td>$2,968.50</td>
<td>$2,968.50</td>
<td>10-14-5180</td>
<td>Codification</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>($268.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>08/20/18</td>
<td>notecards &amp; poster prints</td>
<td>09/19/18</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
<td>10-13-5670</td>
<td>Supplies for Resale</td>
<td>$26,000.00</td>
<td>$4,659.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08/29/18</td>
<td>postcards &amp; notecards</td>
<td>09/28/18</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>10-13-5670</td>
<td>Supplies for Resale</td>
<td>$26,000.00</td>
<td>$4,659.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>08/30/18</td>
<td>August Municipal Judge Services</td>
<td>09/29/18</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>10-17-5105</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>$27,000.00</td>
<td>$12,958.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total General Fund**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Invoice Amt</th>
<th>Approved Amt</th>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Account Description</th>
<th>Budgeted $</th>
<th>YTD Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;M Roofing, 3768 Eureka Way, Frederick, CO, 80516</td>
<td>Roof repair</td>
<td>08/10/18</td>
<td>$344.67</td>
<td>$344.67</td>
<td>20-25-5205</td>
<td>Building Maintenance</td>
<td>$17,000.00</td>
<td>$9,973.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tundra Restaurant Supply, BIN 010198, Milwaukee, WI, 53288-0464</td>
<td>stove parts</td>
<td>06/13/18</td>
<td>$62.65</td>
<td>$62.65</td>
<td>20-25-5260</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>($324.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parts for stove - return</td>
<td>07/05/18</td>
<td>($47.09)</td>
<td>($47.09)</td>
<td>20-25-5260</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>($324.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodriver Energy LLC, PO Box 732686, Dallas, TX, 75373-2686</td>
<td>6437 - natural gas August</td>
<td>09/19/18</td>
<td>$169.40</td>
<td>$169.40</td>
<td>20-25-5231</td>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
<td>$4,622.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Fitness LLC, 606 SE 9th Avenue, Portland, OR, 97214</td>
<td>Treadmill</td>
<td>08/21/18</td>
<td>$4,095.00</td>
<td>$4,095.00</td>
<td>20-25-5450</td>
<td>Minor Equipment</td>
<td>$13,000.00</td>
<td>($5,565.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Community Center Fund**

**Sewer Fund**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Invoice Amt</th>
<th>Approved Amt</th>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Account Description</th>
<th>Budgeted $</th>
<th>YTD Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DPC Industries, PO BOX 301023, Dallas, TX, 75303-1023</td>
<td>treatment chems</td>
<td>08/07/18</td>
<td>$2,289.82</td>
<td>$2,289.82</td>
<td>40-45-5525</td>
<td>Minor Supplies (bugs/che)</td>
<td>$23,000.00</td>
<td>($8,077.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>08/17/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InvoiceNumber</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td>Invoice Amt</td>
<td>Approved Amt</td>
<td>Account Number</td>
<td>Account Description</td>
<td>Budgeted $</td>
<td>YTD Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>USABlueBoook, P.O. Box 9004, Gurnee, IL, 60031-9004</td>
<td>08/08/18</td>
<td>$186.35</td>
<td>$186.35</td>
<td>40-45-5665</td>
<td>Lab Supplies/Chemicals</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>$8,702.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Utility Notification Center of Colorado, 16361 Table Mountain Parkway, Golden, CO, 80403</td>
<td>08/31/18</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
<td>40-45-5183</td>
<td>Locate Services</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$85.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>United Systems Technology, Inc., PO Box 743722, Atlanta, GA, 30374-3722</td>
<td>08/09/18</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$6.40</td>
<td>40-45-5183</td>
<td>Locate Services</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$85.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Occupational Health Centers of the SouthWest, PO Box 9008, Broomfield, CO, 80021-9008</td>
<td>08/23/18</td>
<td>$42.50</td>
<td>$42.50</td>
<td>40-45-5190</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>$5,085.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>Veris Environmental, LLC, 53036 Hwy 71, Limon, CO, 80828</td>
<td>09/10/18</td>
<td>$974.80</td>
<td>$974.80</td>
<td>50-45-5121</td>
<td>SCADA</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$430.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ferguson Enterprises, PO Box 802817, Chicago, IL, 60680-2817</td>
<td>08/24/18</td>
<td>$252.63</td>
<td>$252.63</td>
<td>50-45-5530</td>
<td>Minor Supplies (infrastruct)</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>($1,380.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Grainger, Dept. 848534202, P.O. Box 419267, Kansas City, MO, 64141-6267</td>
<td>09/03/18</td>
<td>$96.26</td>
<td>$96.26</td>
<td>50-45-5650</td>
<td>Infrastructure Improvement</td>
<td>$69,000.00</td>
<td>$57,059.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Vranesh and Raisch, LLC, 1720 14th Street, Suite 200, Boulder, CO, 80302</td>
<td>09/04/18</td>
<td>$61.50</td>
<td>$61.50</td>
<td>50-45-5101</td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>($5,474.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>TZA Water Engineers, 12596 W. Bayaud Avenue, Suite 330, Lakewood, CO, 80228</td>
<td>05/23/18</td>
<td>$287.50</td>
<td>$287.50</td>
<td>50-45-5101</td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>($5,474.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Sewer Fund**

**Water Fund**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>InvoiceNumber</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Invoice Amt</th>
<th>Approved Amt</th>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Account Description</th>
<th>Budgeted $</th>
<th>YTD Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Automation Services, 9434 Cody Drive, Westminster, CO, 80021</td>
<td>08/08/18</td>
<td>$186.35</td>
<td>$186.35</td>
<td>40-45-5665</td>
<td>Lab Supplies/Chemicals</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>$8,702.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Utility Notification Center of Colorado, 16361 Table Mountain Parkway, Golden, CO, 80403</td>
<td>08/31/18</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
<td>40-45-5183</td>
<td>Locate Services</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$85.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>United Systems Technology, Inc., PO Box 743722, Atlanta, GA, 30374-3722</td>
<td>08/09/18</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$6.40</td>
<td>40-45-5183</td>
<td>Locate Services</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$85.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Occupational Health Centers of the SouthWest, PO Box 9008, Broomfield, CO, 80021-9008</td>
<td>08/23/18</td>
<td>$42.50</td>
<td>$42.50</td>
<td>40-45-5190</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>$5,085.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>Veris Environmental, LLC, 53036 Hwy 71, Limon, CO, 80828</td>
<td>09/10/18</td>
<td>$974.80</td>
<td>$974.80</td>
<td>50-45-5121</td>
<td>SCADA</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$430.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ferguson Enterprises, PO Box 802817, Chicago, IL, 60680-2817</td>
<td>08/24/18</td>
<td>$252.63</td>
<td>$252.63</td>
<td>50-45-5530</td>
<td>Minor Supplies (infrastruct)</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>($1,380.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Grainger, Dept. 848534202, P.O. Box 419267, Kansas City, MO, 64141-6267</td>
<td>09/03/18</td>
<td>$96.26</td>
<td>$96.26</td>
<td>50-45-5650</td>
<td>Infrastructure Improvement</td>
<td>$69,000.00</td>
<td>$57,059.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Vranesh and Raisch, LLC, 1720 14th Street, Suite 200, Boulder, CO, 80302</td>
<td>09/04/18</td>
<td>$61.50</td>
<td>$61.50</td>
<td>50-45-5101</td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>($5,474.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>TZA Water Engineers, 12596 W. Bayaud Avenue, Suite 330, Lakewood, CO, 80228</td>
<td>05/23/18</td>
<td>$287.50</td>
<td>$287.50</td>
<td>50-45-5101</td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>($5,474.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Water Fund**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invoice Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Invoice Amt</th>
<th>Approved Amt</th>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Account Description</th>
<th>Budgeted $</th>
<th>YTD Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0414459.01-000002</td>
<td>08/13/18</td>
<td>June water accounting</td>
<td>08/23/18</td>
<td>$345.00</td>
<td>$345.00</td>
<td>50-45-5101</td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>($5,474.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>08/08/18</td>
<td>USABlueBook, P.O. Box 9004, Gurnee, IL, 60031-9004</td>
<td>08/18/18</td>
<td>$457.27</td>
<td>$457.27</td>
<td>50-45-5665</td>
<td>Lab Supplies/Chemicals</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$2,266.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>08/31/18</td>
<td>Utility Notification Center of Colorado, 16361 Table Mountain Parkway, Golden, CO, 80403</td>
<td>09/10/18</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
<td>50-45-5183</td>
<td>Locate Services</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$142.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>09/07/18</td>
<td>Colorado Analytical Lab, PO BOX 507, Brighton, CO, 80601-0507</td>
<td>09/02/18</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td>50-45-5670</td>
<td>Supplies for Resale</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$41,927.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>08/24/18</td>
<td>Zenner Performance, 15280 Addison Road #100, Addison, TX, 75001</td>
<td>08/24/18</td>
<td>$401.84</td>
<td>$401.84</td>
<td>50-45-6550</td>
<td>Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>$69,000.00</td>
<td>$57,059.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>09/19/18</td>
<td>Occupational Health Centers of the SouthWest, PO Box 9008, Broomfield, CO, 80021-9008</td>
<td>09/19/18</td>
<td>$40.69</td>
<td>$40.69</td>
<td>50-45-5231</td>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$1,708.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>09/17/18</td>
<td>Nederland Downtown Development Authority, PO Box 396, Nederland, CO, 80466</td>
<td>09/17/18</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>50-00-1050</td>
<td>Loan Receivable</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($47,955.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution 2018-05 Loan for Round-About Improvements</td>
<td>09/17/18</td>
<td>$1,755.65</td>
<td>$1,755.65</td>
<td>50-00-1050</td>
<td>Loan Receivable</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($47,955.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution 2018-08 Loan for Business Flower Baskets</td>
<td>09/17/18</td>
<td>$1,800.00</td>
<td>$1,800.00</td>
<td>50-00-1050</td>
<td>Loan Receivable</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($47,955.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution 2018-09 Loan for Public Art Project</td>
<td>09/17/18</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>50-00-1050</td>
<td>Loan Receivable</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($47,955.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution 2018-06 Loan for Noxious Weed Control Project</td>
<td>09/17/18</td>
<td>$1,900.00</td>
<td>$1,900.00</td>
<td>50-00-1050</td>
<td>Loan Receivable</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($47,955.65)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Water Fund**

Total Bills To Pay: $40,298.56
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invoice Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Invoice Amt</th>
<th>Approved Amt</th>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Account Description</th>
<th>Budgeted $</th>
<th>Budget Remaining</th>
<th>Warrants presented at:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-34</td>
<td>8/31/2018</td>
<td>Cindy Downing</td>
<td>$144.00</td>
<td>$144.00</td>
<td>70-75-5129</td>
<td>DDA Secretary &amp; Personnel</td>
<td>12,600.00</td>
<td>$6,335.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-35</td>
<td>8/27/2018</td>
<td>Eileen Purdy</td>
<td>$10.32</td>
<td>$10.32</td>
<td>70-75-6000</td>
<td>2018/2019 TARP Grant Expenses</td>
<td>11,475.00</td>
<td>$11,288.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/31/2018</td>
<td>Town of Nederland</td>
<td>$1,617.94</td>
<td>$1,617.94</td>
<td>70-75-5129</td>
<td>DDA Secretary &amp; Personnel</td>
<td>12,600.00</td>
<td>$4,605.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2018</td>
<td>Town of Nederland</td>
<td>$48,105.65</td>
<td>$48,105.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80-7200 Loan Interest</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80-7200 Loan Proceeds</td>
<td>$47,955.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **CALL TO ORDER:**
   Mayor calls the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

2. **ROLL CALL**
   Present: Mayor Larson, Mayor Pro-Tem Gustafson, Trustee Baumhover, Trustee Conrad. Absent: Trustee Rawsthorne.
   Also Present: Town Administrator Karen Gerrity, Town Clerk Hope Jordan

3. **CONSENT AGENDA**
   Consent Agenda passes with unanimous vote.
   Mayor: Any questions or comments? Do I have a motion to move the Consent Agenda?
   A Unanimous Yes approved the consent agenda.

   - 3.1 Approval of Accounts Payable
     **Warrants 9-4-18**

   - 3.2 Approval of August 21st, 2018 Regular Meeting Minutes
     **Draft BOT 8-21-18 Minutes Review**

4. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**
   No one signed up to speak on non-agenda item. No one spoke on non-agenda item.

5. **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

   - 5.1 JVA Power Point Presentation about CMAR
     Mayor: Nicole Bratsos Ferdinandsen will introduce our first agenda item.
     **CMAR AIM 2018 (3)**

     Nicole Bratsos Ferdinandsen: The Town’s on call engineers are here to introduce the process of CMAR. Staff recommends the process for the BioSolids Project.

     **JVA Power Point Presentation**

     Andrew Sparn explains that Josh McGibbon the Vice President of Environmental Department is also in attendance. Andrew reminds the BOT of the history between JVA and the Town of Nederland. He begins with the Water Treatment Facility in 2013. The original budget did not have enough funds for
solid handling. The Town wastes to a pond which is not true Biosolids handling. In 2014 the town created a Master Infrastructure plan which included participation by JVA. Biosolid handling is part of the MIP for sustainability and cost saving. After a 2015 complaint about smell, Andrew reminded the town they have spent thousands of dollars hauling away liquid waste. The state conducted a requested seep study on the pond. Relining the pond is an option but it does not have a lot of benefit. Biosolid design commenced in 2016. During design development, funding was also sought through grants. Fall would be the time to begin the project because ground water is low, it’s before winter, and contractors are looking to fill time. Completion would be July 2019, with final completion in August of 2019. Odor challenges, seepage concerns and compliancy motivate the need for this project. This is an upgrade to your Biosolids handling capacity. Slide 6 of the Powerpoint is a look at the Project Budget. Two million is our project budget. The Division of Local Government (DOLA) Grant is $950,000.00. The Town applied for the whole loan with the State Revolving Fund in case DOLA did not come through. Because the town is focused on sustainability, they applied for The Green Project Reserve Fund that turned the two million dollar loan into a zero percent loan.

Josh McGibbon explained that the project budget was set in 2015. They plan to complete the project in the defined budget. In this construction climate the only way to do it is with an alternative delivery. We have used the CMAR process in over 10 projects in 2018. CMAR is defined in the Design Build Institute of America. Design Build is a well-known process and CMAR is a version in which you have an Engineer, and a contractor and both are contracted separately with the Town. That provides separation of responsibility. It gives two points of risk with two contracts. It puts everyone at the table together, the contractor, engineer, and owner, with one goal to deliver the best value for the Town within the budget of the project. CMAR brings contractors on early to sort through value building and value engineering options within the budget in an open book fashion. JVA has used the process in numerous other towns that are like Nederland. It meets the procurement requirements of the Town.

Mayor Larson opens the floor to the Board. Mayor Larson wants to know if any of the 10 projects JVA worked on matched the scale of the Town’s project. He asked if CMAR’s process was affected by the amount of money for the project.

Josh McGibbons explained that JVA has worked with a wide range of project costs in the CMAR process. The Berthoud Water treatment plant was used as an example. They had 4 million in wants and only 3 million to spend. Through CMAR they were able to complete the project for 2.9 million.

Mayor Larson confirms that the Town of Nederland’s project is the same scale as other projects that implemented the CMAR process.

Trustee Conrad has two questions. The CMAR process seems to allow us to accept the lowest bid, but also the ability to evaluate people’s success in the past.

Josh McGibbons said that JVA wants a long lasting sustainable project. If the cost exceeds the budget, then we will work together to get the most value for
the project and work within budget. We can make changes along the way and ask if the changes are in the best interest of the project. The price is the price. By having an open book process we can see what the true values are for each component of the project.

Trustee Conrad also asked about the hard bid process and how the BOT would be informed of changes? She asked if changes are reviewed and approved by staff. Josh McGibbon explained that generally a trusted Staff is allowed to make decisions as long as it is in the contingency budget. Only if the changes would fall outside the contingency budget, would the change be brought to the BOT.

Andrew Sparn commented that JVA will be back in front of the Board with the final budget, and that the project and contingency funds will be approved before the project moves forward.

Josh McGibbon added that the Board will see all the numbers involved through CMAR. The Board will need to decide how involved they will want to be in the process regarding changes.

Andrew reminded the Board that JVA and the Town are beholding to what was approved by the State and are also held to the Owner Project Requirement. Changes are typically not large.

Trustee Gustafson asks if the CMAR process is a result of the dearth of contractors available now.

Both Andrew and Josh affirm.

Trustee Gustafson asks if the conditions were different would JVA still be excited about CMAR?

Josh explained that they used the CMAR project in the past regardless of construction conditions. CMAR works best with existing projects when you don’t know all the conditions and cannot pinpoint things on paper. There is a risk in hard bid because there is no guarantee of the percent markup. This process allows for contractor security that they will receive the markup they want, but the project will remain in the budget.

Trustee Gustafson questioned if the project timeline is also part of contractor downtime.

Josh replied that yes, they could start excavation while they are looking for other contractors and working out final design issues. That is where design build comes in because you are building while you are designing. You can make changes and start construction as we are finalizing the minute details.

Trustee Gustafson wondered if we are at a risk of only getting one contractor bid.

Josh explained that they get 3 to 5 bids through CMAR. Contractors want to
work with JVA. JVA will push hard to get 5 contractors.

Trustee Gustafson also wondered if there will be preference for local contractors.

Josh replied that they give community incentives.

Trustee Gustafson asks if there is a commission agent role in the project.

Josh explained that as the Engineer on record that is their role. They perform the construction administration and training of the project.

Trustee Baumhover supports the process.

Trustee Apt wondered about a monetary example Josh gave in his discussion of CMAR of a project with a budget of 2 million that really costs 2.5 is a metaphor.

Josh McGibbons explained that it may. His point is that projects always have more parts to them then could be afforded. It is hard to control prices because of several variables.

Trustee Dallas asked how much the price of the project has risen between May of 2017 and September 4th.

Andrew explains that the price would have increased by approximately 5%.

Trustee Masters questioned that we were quoted $1.9 million last year in May and we have a $2 million dollar cap. He is concerned that we get into the process, budget $2 million, which includes all costs, but then as we get into the process the budget balloons to $2.5 million. Trustee Masters is concerned that the $2.5 million budget example Josh mentioned as an example is the Town's reality. How true do you think that statement is?

Josh McGibbons explained that the truth is we have a 2 million dollar budget and the goal is to work within the 2 million dollar budget. Prices are going up daily. Steel is going up in price. But, at the end of the day, 2 million is the project budget.

Andrew Sparn added that if we hard bid, he is not confident we would hit the $1.9 million budget.

Trustee Masters explained that the contract appears concrete regarding the needs for fulfillment. He asked where they see cost cutting without compromising the project. He does not see any wish list items, only functioning needs.

Andrew provides examples where cost cutting could take place, for example, the cobble or the concrete.

Trustee Masters noted that tonight they were supposed to present on CMAR process and later on there is a question of whether the Town will approve
JVA’s proposal for Construction Management Administration. He noted that in the proposal they have already found contractors. Does this assume the Town has already approved the proposal from JVA?

Andrew Sparn replied that when the funding came in the Town was ready to go. If not, the Town would have to wait till 2019 because you will not want to dig a hole during Spring runoff.

Josh McGibbons also claimed that in the proposal there is an estimate of their fee on an hourly basis to deliver construction administration for the project. At this point they are being paid to be the on call Engineer.

Trustee Masters questioned if JVA already received the bids that were due August 31st?

Andrew Sparn responded that they have advertised. They received bids from two companies.

Trustee Masters asked if they reflect the cost proposed last year.

Andrew Sparn replied that JVA estimated the project at $1.8 million in the RFP. The schedule begins the first week in October. We will present to you the final project and the tough decisions that need to be made. We will ask the Board to approve the actual construction contract.

Josh McGibbons furthers Andrew’s thoughts by explaining that the Board will see the movements in the creation of the contract before approving the contract.

Trustee Masters noted that some dates were off in the contract.

Andrew explained that there was a Staff level decision to negotiate with the contractor. There was a selection team that included Staff members, Andrew Sparn and another Engineer on the project. Opinions were ranked and the team selected the contractor.

Trustee Masters expressed that the order in which JVA presented the power point and then the proposal for Construction Administration seems convoluted and not clear in his mind.

Josh McGibbon expressed that JVA has been waiting on the project for a long time. As soon as the funding became clear and that the project would be delivered it was “all hands on deck.” Once the funding came in everything began to move forward quickly. Moving the project forward in relation to timing and project funding was important. Waiting until next year would not be beneficial. We are ready. Funding is on the shelf.

Trustee Dallas was concerned about the process regarding the presentation and funding during the same Board meeting. He trusts JVA and the CMAR proposal, and he was uncomfortable with the steps involved.

Mayor Larson said that he has been in conversation all week with Town Staff regarding the presentation and proposal. He feels that the proposal supports transparency.

Mayor Larson turns the meeting to the Action Items.
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6. ACTION ITEMS

6.1. Town Clerk Oath of Office
AIM and Resolution appointing town clerk
2018-11 Appointing Town Clerk
Karen Gerrity introduces Town Hall’s support of Hope Jordan taking the oath as Town Clerk. She reviews Hope Jordan’s experience and interest in the Town of Nederland.

Ms. Jordan expresses her reasons for wanting to be Town Clerk.

Mayor Larson motions to approve the Town Clerk. Trustee Gustafson seconds the motion.

The nomination for Town Clerk is unanimously approved.

Mayor Larson leads Hope Jordan in the Oath.

6.2. Appointment of Planning Commissioner
AIM PC Appt -Reis 9 4 2018
Jim Reis PC application
Pam Miley Application and resume

Mayor Larson moves to appoint Jim Reis to the Planning Commission. Trustee Gustafson motions to appoint Jim Reis to the Planning Commission.

The nomination for Town Clerk is unanimously approved.

Jim Reis thanks the Board and expresses his interest in helping with STRs. He promises to be prepared for every meeting.

6.3. Acceptance of Construction Administration Proposal with JVA
CA Biosolids Contract 2018
Nederland Biosolids CMAR Construction Administration Services

Mayor Larson moves to the JVA Proposal for Construction Administration. Nicole Brastos-Ferdinandson introduces the item.

Mayor Larson opens the Board for discussion. Trustee Gustafson thanks JVA for the work they do for the Town. She feels comfortable with the agenda. She sees the moving parts in the project. Trustee Gustafson is pleased with the efforts of the Town Staff and with JVA. She reminds the board to bring any issues with an agenda to Town Staff prior to the Board meeting.

Motion to approve the proposal.

A Unanimous Yes approves the motion.

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1. Food Pantry Funding in the Budget

CLERK FOLDER\BOT 2018\JVA Contract.pdf
AIM Food Pantry
Food Pantry Support

Mayor Larsen introduces the Food Pantry’s request to be a line item in the Town Budget.

Town Clerk introduces the Food Pantry.

Maggie May: Board Member for the Nederland Food Pantry
[CLERK FOLDER\BOT 2018\FOOD PANTRY’S MISSION.docx]

Dennis Whalen: President of the Nederland Food Pantry
[CLERK FOLDER\BOT 2018\Dennis Whalen Response.pdf]

Chris Current: Executive Director of the Nederland Food Pantry supports the request for budget funding. The Food Pantry intends to purchase food, expand outreach and resources, and continue as the center of emergency preparedness.

Mayor opens the floor to Board Member discussion.

Trustee Conrad is supportive of the Food Pantry and is amazed by their work. Trustee Conrad asked how far the Food Pantry services extend.

Maggie May lets the Board know that the Pantry now serves the Peak to Peak community since the flood.

Trustee Gustafson questions the amount of their request.

Chris Current responds that they felt like the amount requested would benefit the Pantry and their purchase of food for the community.

Trustee Gustafson remarks that she attended the Human Services conference in Longmont. What resonated with her was people were sharing what their town allocation was for social service support. None of the organizations she spoke with umbrellaed as many services as the Food Pantry provides Nederland. Nederland was the only community that did not fund social services. Trustee Gustafson feels that the Food Pantry could be offered a more meaningful contribution considering the impact the Pantry has on town.

Trustee Baumhover was not aware of all of the services the Food Pantry provides. He believes the Food Pantry makes a positive impact on the Nederland Community. Trustee Baumhover believes the Food Pantry is at the core of the town’s Envision 2020. He believes the funding request could be more. Trustee Baumhover hopes the Food Pantry’s conversation for funding continues.

Mayor Larson is interested in the total expenses of the Food Pantry.

Chris Current claims, $47,000 is their yearly expense.
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Trustee Apt is supportive of the Food Pantry.

Trustee Masters explained the Town Budget. He is supportive of the Pantry. He wondered if the Community Center take on the Food Pantry as a function of the Community Center. You may need to consider your non profit status.

Mayor Larson allows community members to speak.

Ressa Lively Smith – 11863 Magnolia Dr - supports the Food Pantry. She tells the Board that everyone who supports the board can stand up. The audience stands.

Mayor Larson opens up the floor for anyone who would like to speak.

Annette Frank 183 Thunderidge Rd. - supports the Food Pantry. She talks about the Clothing Closet. She reminds the Board that people who work for the Town use the Pantry and the Clothing Closet.

Janette Taylor reminds those present that the Food Pantry is a known by front range organizations as the beacon in the mountains.

Kayla Evans – 1250 Eldora Rd. - supports the Food Pantry’s request.

Ron Mitchell – 60 West Boulder St. supports the Food Pantry’s request.

Mayor Larson states that everyone who signed up to speak stood when Ressa Lively-Smith asked the audience members to stand if they supported the Food Pantry’s request. Those names are:

Susan Gerhart – 193 S. Skyview Dr.
Mary Lou May – 16 Skyview Drive.
Karen Siefert – 1898 C.R. 68
Lawrence Tasaday – 902 Klondike
Jeanie Lawson - 91 Sundown Trail
Tim Dillon – 145 east Second St.

Mayor explains that a nod to move the request forward is needed.

A nod to move forward is made with an interest in further discussion.

Trustee Gustafson wants to continue to discuss other ideas related to do this.

Mayor Larson would like to meet with the Town Administrator to discuss the legality of the Food Pantry being a line item. He would like to see how he can tie the Food Pantry to the town.

Trustee Gustafson can we have a discussion about the discretionary funds?

Trustee Apt can there be continued conversation with the Food Pantry about becoming an aspect of the Community Center? Can this become a community center line item. He is concerned that the conversation was not solicited. He
would like the staff to research more. Can we leverage with a matching grant?

Trustee Baumhover would like to discuss the topic more.

Kristen Conrad would like to see clarity with scenarios of funding.

Mayor Larson was thinking more of an IDA

Town Administrator discussed creating a contract between the Food Pantry and the Town for their services. This would not jeopardize their non-profit services.

Trustee Conrad agrees with the Town Administrator in wanting to keep the Food Pantry independent.

Mayor Larson likes the idea of a Health and Human Services line item in which the Pantry could be contracted.

Mayor Larson asks for a nod of four to continue the discussion of various structures for the budget. He receives the required nod.

Mayor Larson asks the Town Administrator to introduce the idea of legal services for our town.

7.2. RFP for Legal Services

Town Administrator introduces the item. Should the Town consider posting an RFP for a part time legal position or a firm.

AIM Legal Services
Attorney Engagement Agreement
TownATT

Trustee Masters would prefer a firm.
Trustee Apt prefers a firm.

Trustee Baumhover would prefer a firm.

Trustee Gustafson does not feel strongly about needing a firm.

Trustee Conrad questions how often legal counsel is called upon.

Town Administrator sees the potential need for legal services to grow. The Building and Planning processes often require legal services. The Town Administrator is tracking building fees to be sure they are covering related legal fees.

Mayor Larson feels the current firm the Town is working with is good.
Town Administrator says the Town is reigning in the legal services to meet the budget. She states that the Town has a Water attorney.
Trustee Gustafson would like the issue of coverage during an absence be addressed in the RFP if considering a single attorney.

Mayor Larson states putting out an RFP is a good idea.

Trustee Masters is happy with the current firm and Carmen. He is concerned about the experience of the current attorney assigned by the firm. He is concerned that Ordinances are being written based on direction from the Planning Commissioners.

Town Administrator assures Trustee Masters that is no longer done.

Trustee Conrad would like the current firm to know Trustee Masters concerns.

Town Administrator reminds the Board that they lead the hiring of an Attorney.

Mayor asks if the Board would like to put out an RFP. The current firm can put in a bid and receives a nod of four.

Town Administrator will put out an RFP for a few weeks to see what potential candidates are interested in the opportunity.

Mayor asks if there are any other discussions.

Trustee Gustafson reminds the Board about the Fishing Event. She invites everyone’s participation.

Trustee Apt is interested in hiring, or sharing with other towns, a part time Sustainability Coordinator focused on grants for energy efficiency.

Mayor Larson opens the floor for non-agenda items.

Ron Mitchel - 60 West Boulder St. - reads an piece from author Shupe regarding parking.

Kayla Evans – 1250 Eldora Rd. – would like to discuss the Backdoor Theatre’s use of the Community Center on Sunday afternoons.

Town Administrator suggests a meeting with Kayla, the Town Administrator, and Dawn Baumhover.

The Mayor motions to adjourn the meeting at 9:15.

8. OTHER BUSINESS

9. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Trustees encourages citizen participation. Public hearings and the "unscheduled citizens" agenda item allow an opportunity to address the Board. Discussion is limited to 3 minutes and please address your comments to the Board. Than you for your cooperation.
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The Board of Trustees may take action on any item included on this agenda, regardless of the heading under which such item appears. Discussion items may become action items if the Board determines that deferring final action on an item to a subsequent meeting is unnecessary or unwarranted and that taking immediate action does not compromise any third-party's rights.

The Board of Trustees meeting packets are prepared by Friday before the Tuesday meetings and are available for inspection at Town Hall during normal business hours. The information is reviewed and studied by the Board of Trustee members, eliminating lengthy discussions to gain basic understanding. Short discussion on agenda items does not reflect lack of thought or analysis. The agendas are posted at Town Hall, the post office, and on the Town's website on the Friday prior to the meeting. Copies of the agenda and meeting packet are available at no cost via email from the Town Clerk or from the Town website at www.nederlandco.org.
AGENDA ITEM:
Consideration of an Intergovernmental Agreement with Boulder County to Provide a Permanent Ballot Box

SUMMARY:
To better serve the residents of Nederland during elections, discussions between Boulder County Elections Office and Town Staff has resulted in a draft agreement which was reviewed and approved by the Town Attorney. The agreement allows for a permanent mail drop-off box and video security surveillance recording system at the Nederland Community Center to be used for all municipal elections. As stated in Colorado Secretary of State Election Rules (8 Colorado Code Regulations 1505-1), any drop off ballot boxes must be secured and monitored. The agreement between Boulder County and the Town of Nederland (attached) would provide a secure and monitored ballot box, as required by the Election Rule. If approved by the Town of Nederland, the ballot box is planned to be installed by October 2018. The Town will be allowed to use the ballot box for their local elections.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Staff recommends approval of the IGA.

ATTACHMENT:
DRAFT IGA

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:
There will be no financial impact to the Town.
INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT

THIS INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT (the “Agreement”) is entered into this _____ day of ____________, 2018, by and between the CLERK AND RECORDER FOR BOULDER COUNTY (the “Clerk”) and _______________ (the “Property Representative”) on behalf of the Town of Nederland (the “Town”). The Clerk and the Property Representative may be collectively referred to as the “Parties.”

WHEREAS, the Clerk conducts elections in Boulder County and provides election services to Boulder County voters; and

WHEREAS, to better serve its citizens, the Clerk desires to install stand-alone mail ballot drop-off boxes throughout Boulder County for receipt of mail ballots; and

WHEREAS, the Clerk and the Property Representative agreed that the Clerk may install a mail ballot drop-off box and video security surveillance recording system at the Nederland Community Center at 750 CO-72, Nederland, CO 80466 (the “Property”), which Property is owned by the Town of Nederland; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Colorado Election Code (COLO. REV. STAT. § 1-1-101, et seq.) and Colorado Secretary of State’s Election Rules (8 Colorado Code of Regulations 1505-1), mail ballot drop-off locations must meet certain requirements, including monitoring by an election official or video security surveillance recording system during all times when mail ballot drop-off boxes are open to receive ballots; and

WHEREAS, this Agreement is designed to serve the citizens of Boulder County during elections by providing convenient locations for voters to drop off their completed mail ballots; and

WHEREAS, intergovernmental agreements are authorized and encouraged by Article XIV, Section 18 of the Colorado Constitution and COLO. REV. STAT. § 29-1-203.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the recitals, promises, covenants and understandings set forth herein, the Parties agree as follows:

1. Site Location. The Property Representative shall permit the Clerk to install and maintain a mail ballot drop-off box and video security surveillance recording system at the Property. The mail ballot drop-off box shall be located near the entrance of the Nederland Community Center, as detailed in the photo of the Property included as Exhibit A. The mail ballot drop-off box and area immediately around and below the mail ballot drop-off box, approximately a 4.5-foot by 3.5-foot square, are referred to as the “Premises.”

2. Description of Improvements. The mail ballot drop-off box and the video security surveillance recording system are collectively referred to as “the Improvements.” The mail ballot drop-off box is a secure location for the deposit of mail ballots. The video security
surveillance recording system includes a video camera and recording system that allows for continuous recording of the mail ballot drop-off box when the mail ballot drop-off box is being used to receive ballots, which recording is required by Colorado law.

3. **Funding of Improvements.** The Clerk will fund the entire cost for obtaining, installing, and maintaining the Improvements.

4. **Use of and Access to Improvements.**

   a. **Mail Ballot Drop-Off Box.** The Clerk is authorized to install a mail ballot drop-off box at the Property on or by September 21, 2018. This may also include installing a cement pad to affix the mail ballot drop-off box to if necessary to secure the mail ballot drop-off box. The approximate location of the mail ballot drop-off box is shown in Exhibit A.

   b. **Duration of Use of Mail Ballot Drop-Off Box.** The mail ballot drop-off box will be permanently installed on the Premises. However, the mail ballot drop-off box will only be open to receive mail ballots from the time ballots are mailed by the Clerk until Election Day during a general election, a primary election, and any special election. During the period in which mail ballots may be dropped off, the mail ballot drop-off box will be available to voters 24 hours a day.

   c. **Video Security Surveillance Recording System.** The Clerk will install a video security surveillance recording system that includes a camera and a recording system on or by September 21, 2018. The approximate location of the video security surveillance recording system is shown on Exhibit A. The Clerk is responsible for obtaining and retaining the video data from the video security surveillance recording system. The Clerk is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with all applicable laws and regulations governing video surveillance of mail ballot drop-off boxes and any costs associated with making the video security surveillance recording system compliant with such laws and regulations.

   d. **Duration of Use of Video Security Surveillance Recording System.** The video security surveillance recording system will be permanently installed on the Property. However, the video security surveillance recording system will only be in active use from the time ballots are mailed by the Clerk until Election Day during a general election, a primary election, and any special election.

   e. **Access to Improvements.** The Clerk, as well as the Clerk’s agents and contractors, shall have the right of ingress and egress in, to, through, over, and across the Property for purposes of installing, replacing, repairing, and maintaining the Improvements; for collecting ballots from the mail ballot drop-off box during an election; and for retrieving recorded video from the video security surveillance recording system during an election.
f. **Schedule for Access.** The Parties may establish a schedule before each election setting forth the dates and times that the Clerk’s staff will access the mail ballot drop-off box to collect ballots and access the video security surveillance recording system to retrieve recorded data.

5. **Maintenance.**

   a. During all times that the mail ballot drop-off box is installed on the Premises, the Clerk shall maintain the Premises in good repair at the Clerk’s expense.

   b. During all times that the mail ballot drop-off box is installed on the Premises, the Property Representative shall ensure that the Premises are adequately lit.

   c. During all times at which the video security surveillance recording system is installed on the Property, the Clerk shall maintain the video security surveillance recording system in good repair.

6. **Use of Property Representative’s Internet Network.** The Property Representative shall permit the Clerk to utilize the Property Representative’s internet network for the sole purposes of accessing recorded surveillance footage and storing it on a Boulder County-maintained server.

7. **Damage to Premises.** The Clerk shall be responsible for repair/replacement of the Property Representative’s property damaged by the Clerk or his/her agents pursuant to this Agreement. The Clerk will be responsible for any damages to persons or property caused by the negligence of the Clerk, the Clerk’s employees, agents, representatives, or other persons acting under the direction or control of the Clerk while at the Property. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary, nothing in this Agreement will be construed in any way to be a waiver by the Clerk or Boulder County of the protection that is granted to the County and its employees under the Colorado Governmental Immunity Act, C.R.S. 24-10-101, et. seq.

8. **Electioneering.** No electioneering, including posting signs or communicating with voters related to an issue or candidate in the election, is permitted within 100 feet of the mail ballot drop-off location when it is open to receive ballots during an election. The Property Representative agrees that the Clerk and Clerk’s staff may take steps they deem reasonably necessary to stop or prevent such electioneering. The Property Representative will refrain from erecting or permitting any sign, display, or other demonstration that may, in the judgment of the Clerk, have the effect of influencing or intimidating voters during an election. The Clerk and the Clerk’s staff may take the steps they deem reasonably necessary to obscure or remove any such sign, display or other demonstration.

9. **Term and Termination.** This Agreement shall be for eleven (11) years or until the Clerk or Property Representative notifies the other in writing of their wish to terminate this Agreement. The Property Representative must notify the Clerk of his or her intent to terminate this Agreement at least 120 days prior to any election in order to provide the Clerk sufficient
time to establish a new mail ballot drop-box location. Upon termination, the Clerk shall remove
the mail ballot drop-box within 90 days and restore the Premises to the condition as near to
original condition prior to installation. The Clerk shall also remove the video security
surveillance recording system within 90 days.

10. Notices. Any notices to be provided under this Agreement shall be given in writing
and either delivered by hand or deposited in the United States mail with sufficient postage to the
addresses set forth below:

To the Clerk: Boulder County Clerk and Recorder
Division of Elections
1750 33rd Street
Boulder, CO 80020

To the Property Representative: Town of Nederland
Town Clerk’s Office
P.O. Box 396
Nederland, CO 80466

11. Assignment. No party may assign any of the obligations, benefits, or provisions of
this Agreement in whole or in part without the expressed written authorization of the other party,
which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld. Any purported assignment, transfer, pledge
or encumbrance made without such prior written authorization shall be void.

12. Counterparts. This agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which will be
deemed an original, and all of which shall constitute one and the same agreement.

13. Governing Law. The terms, covenants and provisions herein shall be governed by
and construed under the applicable laws of the State of Colorado. For the resolution of any
dispute arising hereunder, venue shall be in the courts of Boulder County, State of Colorado.

14. Headings. All section headings are for convenience or reference only and are not
intended to define or limit the scope of any provision of this Agreement.

15. Entire Agreement. This Agreement represents the entire and integrated agreement
between the Clerk and the Property Representative and supersedes all prior negotiations,
representations, or agreements, either written or verbal. Any amendments to this Agreement
must be in writing and be signed by both parties.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties have signed this Agreement.

CLERK AND RECORDER OF THE
COUNTY OF BOULDER

By: ________________________________
    Clerk and Recorder, Boulder County

TOWN OF NEDERLAND

By: ________________________________
    Mayor, Town of Nederland

ATTEST:

By: ________________________________
    Town Clerk, Town of Nederland
STAFF REPORT FROM TOWN ADMINISTRATOR

STAFF ACCOLADES

This month we recognize Jake Kaiser who has been working for the town in a variety of capacities for the Public Works Department for well over a year. In his short time working for the Town he has become the Department’s go to person for all maintenance of the Town’s roads. Jake and Emmett together have managed to grade and improve every road in town. Jake has taken the lead to improve and coordinate grading operations, and roadway improvements. Jake’s wealth of experience in machine operations makes him one of the Town’s most valuable assets. In addition to his skills as an operator, his commitment and dedication to the town, the community and his coworkers make him a clear candidate for recognition for his work. Jake has raised the bar for road improvements and the Town’s roads have dramatically improved in the short time that he has been guiding operations.

KIDS FISHING FUN

Thanks to Mayor Pro Tem Gustafson for hosting a fun evening of fishing and community fellowship last night.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PLANNING AND BUILDING MID AUGUST TO MID SEPTEMBER

Building Permit issuance picked up during this time. A total of 10 permits have been issued to include: 5 miscellaneous/one-stop permits, 2 residential deck permits, and 3 new single-family residence permits. Staff processed 3 excavation permits and one banner permit during this time and updated the Residential Building Plans checklist which has been uploaded to the website.

The Planning Commission had a joint work session with the Board of Trustees which preceded the regular Commission meeting in August. The Commission considered the Election of Officers with a unanimous vote for Roger Cornell to serve as the Chairman due to his longtime experience and expertise. They also considered two applicants for the new additional full-term member position with choice of Jim Reis. The Commission discussed several topics: the Public zone and allowed uses, and extending the timeline in code language pertaining to land use reviews in acknowledgement of feedback from residents about allowing more review time received at the Community Forum on May 10. They also expressed gratitude about the joint work session in terms of working on more controversial legislation jointly and indicated the need to do so more often.

A monthly report from SAFEBuilt is included as an attachment to this report.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN TOWN

Staff was asked to quantify the amount of affordable housing in Town and how that compares to the stated goal of 12%. There are currently 24 units managed by the Boulder County Housing Authority and an additional 26 units approved for future development which will result in 50 affordable units. The work staff did for the 2020 Census report indicates that there are 773 residences in the Town so the goal for 12% of the dwelling units to be affordable requires a total of 91 units. This means the town will have a goal shortfall of 41 units when the BCAH development is completed.

CDOT

The Town Administrator and Public Works Manager met with Daniel Marcucci of CDOT on August 23, 2018. The intersection of Lakeview and Highway 72 was discussed. If the town uses their own funding, including grant money, then CDOT would need to approve the design and construction documents. If the Town wants to collaborate with CDOT on the project, it could take a number of years since this project is not currently on the CDOT project list and funds have been allocated through 2020. Town Staff will attend the next quarterly CDOT Region 4/DRCOG Communities meeting and will learn more about the process for municipalities to get projects on the list.
NICHE has a new mission statement and is as follows: The Nederland Interagency Counsel for Homeless Encampments (NICHE) is a collaborative organization with shared responsibilities that foster public health and safety through care for the vulnerable, stewardship of natural resources, and respect for the needs of the mountain community. In a recent meeting the members agreed that they are hearing fewer complaints about shooting and illegal campfires. The campgrounds are cleaner and they are seeing more recreational campers. The fire ban has made a positive impact as well as an increased presence by law enforcement and community outreach staff.

TRAIL TO NEDERLAND MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL

The Town Administrator met with County staff, the school principal and the impacted property owner to discuss the trail location, right of way easements and the design. The decision was made to create a soft trail that will be located several feet above and away from the road once the pedestrians cross CR130. A safe crossing spot was also identified.

The status of the project is as follows:

- Evans Property Trail Assessment: County will hire a design consultant to examine conceptual alignments parallel to CR130. Identify Right Of Way needs, potential walls/structures and how the trail fits in with development plans. The assessment will also include a crossing location. This will probably occur this fall.
- Engineering Design Plans: County will complete the design plans based on the revised trail alignment and crossing location. Expected to begin in early 2019.
- Safe Routes to School Grant Application: Depending on the status of the design plans and right-of-way acquisition, partner on an infrastructure grant application with the local match covered by the County’s regional transportation sales tax funds for this trail. Typically have to have right-of-way secure before applying for these grant funds. Construction will be dependent on available funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range: 08/01/2018 - 08/31/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NED - New England</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jurisdiction Building Performance Report
MEMORANDUM

To: Nederland Board of Trustees
From: Jennifer Hagey, Treasurer
Date: September 18, 2018
Re: Treasurer’s Report

General Fund

As of August 31, 2018, revenue was less than YTD 2018 budget by $3,000. Tax revenue was $21,000 over budgeted revenue due to additional Motor Vehicle Tax revenue and Use Tax collected. Public Works was $9,000 over budgeted revenue for a facility use payment for future improvements, Permits and Licensing $6,000 over, Misc Revenue $1,000 over and Planning and Zoning is on budget. Law Enforcement/Courts was $8,000 under due to less fine revenue received and the Visitor Center was $7,000 under budgeted revenue. Grants Revenue was $25,000 under due to a timing difference of estimated budget date and actual receipt.

Expenditures were less than the YTD 2018 budget by $106,000. The Police Department was $69,000 under budgeted expenses primarily due to less personnel expenses. Public Works was $26,000 under budgeted expenditures, Admin and Finance $9,000, Planning and Zoning $8,000, the Board of Trustees $5,000, Permits and Licensing/Clerk $4,000, Visitor Center $3,000 and Capital Expenditures was on budget. Grant Expense was $18,000 over budgeted expenses due to a timing difference in expenses incurred compared to the budgeted date.

The overall change in fund balance, revenue less expenses, was $94,000 as compared to a budget of $-9,000.
Community Center Fund

As of August 31, 2018, revenue was $2,000 over the YTD 2018 budget. Fitness center revenue was $6,000 over budget. Sales tax receipts was $4,000 under budget.

Expenditures were $2,000 less than the budget.

The change in fund balance was $12,000 versus a budget of $8,000.

Water Fund

As of August 31, 2018, revenue was $82,000 over the YTD 2018 budgeted amount. This included $40,000 for User Fees over budgeted revenue, additional PIF Fees revenue of $36,000 and TAP Fees of $6,000.

Expenditures were $68,000 less than the budget. Equipment and Supplies was $38,000 under budget which includes $25,000 for budgeted PIF buybacks. Capital Improvements was $46,000 under for expenses not yet incurred. Personnel, Building and Utilities were slightly under budget adding to $12,000. Miscellaneous expense, falling in the “office” category was $28,000 overbudget due to the water main break at the traffic circle.

The change in fund balance was $78,000 versus a budget of $-71,000.

Sewer Fund

As of August 31, 2018, revenue was $16,000 over the YTD 2018 budgeted amount. User Fees were $16,000 over budgeted revenue. TAP Fees was $5,000 over budget and Interest Revenue was $2,000 over. PIF Fee sales were $7,000 under budget.

New PIF sales were $26,000 over budget while the intent to buy back unused PIF and resell them, which has not happened yet, accounts for $33,000 less than budgeted revenue.

Expenditures were $32,000 less than budget. Capital Improvements was over budget $36,000 due to spend for the BioSolids project we intend to include in the future loan. Operating expenditures were $64,000 less than budget for savings in all lines of the budget specifically $12,000 for sludge hauling not yet incurred and $33,000 for PIF buybacks not yet expended.

The change in fund balance, revenue less expenses, was $-61,000 compared to budget of $-109,000.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTD</th>
<th>Year To Date (YTD)</th>
<th>Full Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTUALS</td>
<td>ACTUALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL FUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALES TAX</td>
<td>80,890</td>
<td>353,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY TAX</td>
<td>7,355</td>
<td>423,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE TAX</td>
<td>6,626</td>
<td>38,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER TAXES AND FEES</td>
<td>20,901</td>
<td>21,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING &amp; ZONING</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>55,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURTS</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>3,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>5,736</td>
<td>21,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC WORKS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISITOR CENTER</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>28,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>3,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANTS REVENUE</td>
<td>(829)</td>
<td>40,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GENERAL FUND REVENUE</td>
<td>138,649</td>
<td>1,185,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOARD OF TRUSTEES</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>16,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION &amp; FINANCE</td>
<td>22,559</td>
<td>220,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISITOR CENTER</td>
<td>5,736</td>
<td>21,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLERK'S OFFICE</td>
<td>11,962</td>
<td>68,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING &amp; ZONING</td>
<td>10,908</td>
<td>66,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURTS</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>14,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>58,091</td>
<td>353,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC WORKS</td>
<td>44,058</td>
<td>280,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS-THROUGHS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>7,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GENERAL FUND EXPENSES</td>
<td>160,129</td>
<td>1,091,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>138,649</td>
<td>1,185,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>160,129</td>
<td>1,091,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET CHANGE</td>
<td>(21,479)</td>
<td>93,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE IN FUND BALANCE</td>
<td>(21,479)</td>
<td>93,543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### General Fund Expense by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>MTD ACTUALS</th>
<th>Year To Date (YTD) ACTUALS</th>
<th>Year to Date (YTD) BUDGET</th>
<th>Full Year BUDGET</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Expenses</td>
<td>107,880</td>
<td>672,109</td>
<td>780,329</td>
<td>1,088,220</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>27,572</td>
<td>210,851</td>
<td>170,303</td>
<td>231,450</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Expenses</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>28,993</td>
<td>43,873</td>
<td>65,800</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Expenses</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>16,804</td>
<td>15,840</td>
<td>23,750</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>24,655</td>
<td>28,223</td>
<td>38,320</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>22,361</td>
<td>58,435</td>
<td>74,563</td>
<td>115,900</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3,073</td>
<td>43,021</td>
<td>53,585</td>
<td>62,629</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance (workers comp/prop casualty)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75,583</td>
<td>74,904</td>
<td>99,927</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>17,092</td>
<td>24,175</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital &amp; Lease Payments</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>38,782</td>
<td>38,571</td>
<td>42,071</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-Through</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Expenses</td>
<td>2,848</td>
<td>26,101</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1,058,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Trustees (ex. Personnel Expenses)</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>6,690</td>
<td>10,872</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Allocation</td>
<td>(15,034)</td>
<td>(120,272)</td>
<td>(119,707)</td>
<td>(179,561)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>160,129</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,091,721</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,197,447</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,793,371</strong></td>
<td><strong>39%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**August 2018 Preliminary and Unaudited**
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## TOWN OF NEDERLAND
### 2018 FINANCIAL REPORT

**MTD August 2018**

### Preliminary and Unaudited

#### COMMUNITY CENTER

**Operating Revenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTUALS</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>Actuals vs. Budget</th>
<th>% Var</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Center</td>
<td>5,904</td>
<td>41,943</td>
<td>35,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income</td>
<td>4,008</td>
<td>35,324</td>
<td>35,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Insurance/FEMA Assistance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations/Grants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>9,914</td>
<td>77,472</td>
<td>70,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTUALS</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>Actuals vs. Budget</th>
<th>% Var</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>16,303</td>
<td>98,716</td>
<td>101,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>2,883</td>
<td>3,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1,819</td>
<td>13,834</td>
<td>20,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>16,184</td>
<td>18,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>10,242</td>
<td>8,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>13,931</td>
<td>26,311</td>
<td>17,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Allocation</td>
<td>2,198</td>
<td>17,584</td>
<td>17,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>37,198</td>
<td>186,067</td>
<td>188,104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTUALS</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>Actuals vs. Budget</th>
<th>% Var</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(27,284)</td>
<td>(108,594)</td>
<td>(117,184)</td>
<td>8,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Revenues and Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTUALS</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>Actuals vs. Budget</th>
<th>% Var</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Receipts</td>
<td>29,419</td>
<td>126,128</td>
<td>130,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,499</td>
<td>5,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>39,333</td>
<td>203,600</td>
<td>201,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures (Cash)</strong></td>
<td>37,198</td>
<td>191,566</td>
<td>193,603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change in Fund Balance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTUALS</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>Actuals vs. Budget</th>
<th>% Var</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>12,034</td>
<td>8,085</td>
<td>41,921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TOWN OF NEDERLAND
### 2018 FINANCIAL REPORT

**August 2018**

**Preliminary and Unaudited**

### WATER OPERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MTD ACTUALS</th>
<th>Year To Date (YTD)</th>
<th>Full Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTUALS</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>% var</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
<td>$ 21,289</td>
<td>$ 305,227</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>17,558</td>
<td>124,102</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>3,633</td>
<td>30,440</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>18,008</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>34,088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>6,066</td>
<td>39,881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>4,481</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Allocation</td>
<td>6,066</td>
<td>48,528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>36,345</td>
<td>291,798</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER SOURCES OF CASH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MTD ACTUALS</th>
<th>Year To Date (YTD)</th>
<th>Full Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTUALS</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>% var</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>19,564</td>
<td>86,961</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIF Fees</td>
<td>14,804</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>4,178</td>
<td>1244%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>(1,400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>34,977</td>
<td>103,697</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MTD ACTUALS</th>
<th>Year To Date (YTD)</th>
<th>Full Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTUALS</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>% var</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71,629</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Cash Items</td>
<td>205,051</td>
<td>111,155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>$ 56,266</td>
<td>385,833</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>36,901</td>
<td>457,571</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES (Full Accrual)</td>
<td>36,901</td>
<td>457,571</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE IN FUND BALANCE</td>
<td>19,365</td>
<td>71,738</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TOWN OF NEDERLAND
#### 2018 FINANCIAL REPORT

**August 2018**

**Preliminary and Unaudited**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEWER OPERATIONS</th>
<th>MTD</th>
<th>Year To Date (YTD)</th>
<th>Full Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
<td>$18,552</td>
<td>312,754</td>
<td>324,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>17,558</td>
<td>117,495</td>
<td>124,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>11,486</td>
<td>29,484</td>
<td>47,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>2,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>2,498</td>
<td>26,534</td>
<td>29,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>3,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>4,111</td>
<td>51,959</td>
<td>81,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>4,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Allocation</td>
<td>6,770</td>
<td>54,160</td>
<td>54,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$43,176</td>
<td>284,685</td>
<td>348,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROFIT/(LOSS) FROM OPERATIONS**

| | (24,625) | (28,069) | (28,069) | 20,863 | 55,321 |

**OTHER SOURCES OF CASH**

| | 19,564 | 83,875 | 86,961 | 78,683 | 5,192 | 7% | 189,323 | 44% |
| Sales Tax | - | 42,405 | 16,700 | 39,513 | 2,892 | 7% | 25,000 | 170% |
| PIF Fees | 282 | 2,085 | 536 | 145 | 1,539 | 133% | 800 | 261% |
| Interest Income | - | 20,394 | 17,300 | 18,667 | 1,727 | 9% | 17,300 | 118% |
| Other | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Grant Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Total** | 19,846 | 148,759 | 121,497 | 137,009 | 11,750 | 9% | 232,423 | 64% |

**OTHER EXPENDITURES**

| | 58,884 | 167,769 | 167,768 | 169,237 | 1,469 | 1% | 245,769 | 68% |
| Debt Service | 628 | 70,380 | 38,000 | 101,351 | 30,971 | 31% | 42,000 | 168% |
| Capital Improvements | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Non Cash Items | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Depreciation | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Capital Contra | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Amortization | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Debt Contra | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Total Revenues** | $38,397 | 461,513 | 445,863 | 413,156 | 48,357 | 12% | 814,368 | 64% |
| **Total Expenditures (Cash)** | 102,688 | 522,833 | 554,428 | 525,872 | 3,039 | 1% | 803,257 | 65% |
| **Total Expenditures (Full Accrual)** | 102,688 | 522,833 | 554,428 | 525,872 | 3,039 | 1% | 803,257 | 65% |

**CHANGE IN FUND BALANCE**

| | (64,291) | (61,321) | (108,565) | (112,717) | 11,086 |

---

NED 2018 Financials 08.xls/Summary
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STAFF REPORT FROM TOWN CLERK

Some items everyone may be interested in knowing are:

Business Licenses:
1. The Cigarette Store is applying for a 3.2% Liquor License. Their Public Hearing will be during the Oct. 2nd meeting.
2. The PI will have their Liquor License Public Hearing on Oct. 2nd.
3. The Flower Collective is renewing their Marijuana Retail License.
4. The Business License Data base is coming together quickly. Christy R. is excited to work on it.

Special Events in September:
1. Enchanted Forest Event
2. Italian Dinner at the Community Center
3. Buff Classic
4. Ned/Ned
5. Animals After Dark
6. Fishing Fun
7. Chipeta Park rentals have kept Nicki and Tim very busy, accolades to each of them for their tireless efforts.

Other:
MEMORANDUM

To: Nederland Board of Trustees
From: Marshal Larry Johns
Date: August 12th 2018
Re: Staff Report – Police Department 08/12/18 – 09/10/18

Details:

- NPD has started our annual mandatory driving training hosted by the Boulder County Sheriff’s Office. The four hour block is coupled with Stop Stick deployment and four hours of (RED) Rapid Emergency Deployment training. In addition, Officer Hendricks attended a ten hour active harmer / shooter training with Longmont Police. They used sim-u-nition guns and ammo for live force on force training. This is the first opportunity to use Longmont as an additional training resource.

- September 24, 25, 26 NedFest was held. We saw an increase in transient activity before and after the event. This is the first year with no alcohol or drug associated medical calls and only one reported noise complaint. A check of the decibel level showed it was under by 10. Two public alcohol consumption summons were issued. A total of 125 man hours were put in by the Colorado Rangers, and 25 extra duty hours by NPD Officers.

- The Colorado Rangers will be implementing an annual fee to every agency who they work for. They have yet to determine how they fee will be structured between all the agencies they work for. I hope to cover the majority if not all the fee by each event. The Town uses the Rangers on a few other non-special events as well.

- September 8 & 9 the Ned Ned walk/run event had 262 participants, and 54 volunteers. The Buff Classic brought approximately 1500 riders through town, with a food and rest stop at Salto. Both events went off without incident.

- NPD completed the required bi-annual report for asset forfeiture, no items have been seized.

- Boulder County Sheriff reports are attached from April-July, **Highlighted incidents occurred during contract hours. All others were outside of contract hours.**
Nederland Police Crime and Traffic Statistics June 11th – August 13th

General traffic and parking violations 37 summons issued
Other Municipal Ordinances 10 summons issued

Felony Warrant Arrest (Idaho Burglary)
Juvenile with a firearm (Unfounded)
Warrant Arrest x
Stolen Vehicle x 2. One returned, the other located in city of Boulder.
Theft x 3
Traffic accidents x 1
Civil assists 1
Welfare check x
Intoxicated x 2.
Disorderly Intoxicated x 1 transported to detox
Criminal Mischief 2
Graffiti x 2
Pedestrian transient contacts x 11
Transient associated complaints x 8
Transient camping x 2
Outside agency assists x 12
Medical x 5
Animal complaint x 5
False Alarm Response x 4
Noise Complaint x 3
Trespass x 1
Shooting complaint x 1

Boulder County Sheriff reports are attached from April-July. Highlighted incidents occurred during contract hours. All others were outside of contract hours.

BCSO April:

NDPD180403-00056 4/3/18 5:48 ALINTS-Intrusion alarm 2 In Progress 599
NDPD180405-000567 4/5/18 3:24 TRSTOS-Traffic Stop 2 In Progress 646
NDPD180408-000598 4/8/18 20:59 PECONS-Pedestrian Contact 4 Respond in Person 647
NDPD180408-000599 4/8/18 22:58 TRSTOS-Traffic Stop 2 In Progress 647
NDPD180408-000600 4/8/18 23:23 ASSISS-Assist 4 Respond in Person 643
NDPD180409-000601 4/9/18 5:31 SUSPIS-Suspicious 3 Just Occured 647
NDPD180410-000606 4/10/18 4:32 EXPATS-Extra Patrol 5 Phone Call 643
NDPD180410-000610 4/10/18 14:41 CISRVS-Civil Service 4 Respond in Person 635
NDPD180412-000619 4/12/18 2:43 SUSPIS-Suspicious 3 Just Occured 648
NDPD180414-000638 4/14/18 20:46 ASSISS-Assist 4 Respond in Person 593
NDPD180418-000651 4/18/18 1:12 TRSTOS-Traffic Stop 2 In Progress 647
NDPD180418-000654 4/18/18 23:23 ASSISS-Assist 4 Respond in Person 650
NDPD180420-000667 4/20/18 12:38 TRSTOS-Traffic Stop 2 In Progress 573
BCSO May:

NDPD180501-000751 5/1/18 2:19 SUSPIS-Suspicious 3 Just Occurred 654
NDPD180502-000755 5/2/18 9:15 CISRVS-Civil Service 4 Respond in Person 554
NDPD180503-000770 5/3/18 21:59 FOLLOS-Follow-Up 5 Phone Call 578
NDPD180504-000771 5/4/18 2:51 PATROLS-Field-Initiated Patrol 3 Just Occurred 650
NDPD180504-000778 5/4/18 20:38 CISRVS-Civil Service 4 Respond in Person 650
NDPD180505-000780 5/4/18 23:59 DRUNKS-Drunk Person 3 Just Occurred 650
NDPD180505-000785 5/5/18 10:34 TRSTOS-Traffic 3 Just Occurred 573
NDPD180505-000788 5/5/18 11:41 CISRVS-Civil Service 4 Respond in Person 573
NDPD180505-000789 5/5/18 12:03 CISRVS-Civil Service 4 Respond in Person 573
NDPD180505-000794 5/5/18 19:25 PARKIS-Abandoned/Parking 4 Respond in Person 650
NDPD180508-000806 5/8/18 0:45 TRSTOS-Traffic Stop 2 In Progress 643
NDPD180508-000810 5/8/18 22:44 HARASS-Harassment 5 Phone Call BCSO180508-0002603 654
NDPD180509-000815 5/9/18 12:14 TRSTOS-Traffic Stop 2 In Progress BCSO180509-00002610 648
NDPD180513-000854 5/13/18 21:31 MIPERS-Missing Person 5 Phone Call NDPD180513-0000216 643
NDPD180513-000854 5/13/18 21:31 MIPERS-Missing Person 5 Phone Call BCSO180513-0002698 643
NDPD180514-000855 5/14/18 0:19 FOLLOS-Follow-Up 5 Phone Call 643
NDPD180514-000856 5/14/18 1:29 TRSTOS-Traffic Stop 2 In Progress 643
NDPD180514-000860 5/14/18 21:12 ASSISS-Assist 4 Respond in Person 593
NDPD180515-000861 5/15/18 5:30 OAAS-Other Agency Assist 4 Respond in Person 654
NDPD180515-000862 5/15/18 5:49 OAAS-Other Agency Assist 4 Respond in Person 654
NDPD180516-000876 5/16/18 11:18 TRSTOS-Traffic Stop 2 In Progress 599
NDPD180519-000904 5/19/18 9:51 CISRVS-Civil Service 4 Respond in Person 568
NDPD180519-000907 5/19/18 23:18 ANCOMS-Animal Complaint 4 Respond in Person 646
NDPD180520-000909 5/20/18 11:26 DOMESS-Domestic Violence 2 In Progress NDPD180520-0000228 599
NDPD180521-000913 5/21/18 21:05 CISRVS-Civil Service 4 Respond in Person 643
NDPD180523-000919 5/23/18 0:06 ALINTS-Intrusion alarm 2 In Progress 633
NDPD180525-000941 5/25/18 19:09 WECHES-Welfare Check 4 Respond in Person 650
NDPD180526-000951 5/26/18 23:45 TRSTOS-Traffic Stop 2 In Progress 572
NDPD180527-000952 5/27/18 2:00 EMSS-Medical Calls 2 In Progress 643
NDPD180527-000960 5/27/18 22:51 ANCOMS-Animal Complaint 4 Respond in Person 643
NDPD180529-000962 5/29/18 0:21 TRSTOS-Traffic Stop 2 In Progress 654
NDPD180529-000964 5/29/18 9:59 CIEVIS-Civil Eviction 4 Respond in Person 599
NDPD180529-000971 5/29/18 21:32 DRUNKS-Drunk Person 3 Just Occurred 654

BCSO June:

NDPD180602-001004 6/2/18 23:39 ANCOMS-Animal Complaint 4 Respond in Person 645
NDPD180603-001007 6/3/18 10:33 PATROLS-Field-Initiated Patrol 3 Just Occurred 566
NDPD180713-001335 7/13/18 0:06 EMSS-Medical Calls 2 In Progress 650
NDPD180713-001346 7/13/18 21:49 FIREWS-Fireworks Complaints 4 Respond in Person 650
NDPD180717-001374 7/17/18 0:37 TRSTOS-Traffic Stop 2 In Progress 635
NDPD180717-001375 7/17/18 0:54 TRSTOS-Traffic Stop 2 In Progress 635
NDPD180717-001382 7/17/18 22:34 ANCOMS-Animal Complaint 4 Respond in Person BCSO180718-0004191 654
NDPD180718-001383 7/18/18 6:10 ALINTS-Intrusion alarm 2 In Progress 654
NDPD180718-001390 7/18/18 18:41 SUSPIS-Suspicious 3 Just Occurred 592
NDPD180719-001409 7/19/18 22:55 NOISES-Noise 4 Respond in Person 578
NDPD180721-001430 7/21/18 1:32 TRSTOS-Traffic Stop 2 In Progress 583
NDPD180721-001431 7/21/18 1:58 PATROLS-Field-Initiated Patrol 3 Just Occurred 583
NDPD180721-001432 7/21/18 5:21 EMSS-Medical Calls 2 In Progress 652
NDPD180722-001441 7/22/18 4:10 ALINTS-Intrusion alarm 2 In Progress 643
NDPD180722-001448 7/22/18 16:55 TRSTOS-Traffic Stop 2 In Progress 558
NDPD180722-001450 7/22/18 21:00 SUSPIS-Suspicious 3 Just Occurred 593
Community Center is seeing new faces from the community along with a steady rise in bookings and inquiries regarding space and class offering for both the present and future. Increasing usage has always been a goal of the CC, however the new growth is proving challenging for staff. We have recently experienced multi-event days and there are more coming in the near future. Staff is struggling to accommodate the usage within the hours currently allocated and finding we are at capacity.

Last Friday was Foothills United Way’s Day of Caring, an annual day of service in honor of 9/11. Community Center’s project of painting the trim on the west wing was accepted and we hosted a team of Vista volunteers through AmeriCorps. Additionally, the team washed windows, weeded, and spruced up the entrances just in time for the evening wedding reception that followed.

Throughout the afternoon teams arrived at the community room which had been set up the previous evening to do their part, deliver ice, set up the photo booth, bring the coffee, set up DJ music and lighting, stage the catering etc. The reception was the largest formal sit-down event the room has hosted, 144 guests at 16 tables. The reception ended at 10pm and the room had to be broken down and cleaned for the Peak Life Breakfast the following morning at 8am.

A similar scenario will take place for a wedding reception Saturday 9/29. Primary decoration of the room will occur on Thursday immediately following Pantry. These
decorations will be in place for the Friday night Peak Life Dinner. As soon as the
room is cleaned, the bridal party will come in and set their tables for the reception
which takes place on Saturday afternoon/evening. Both wedding receptions occur(eds)
simultaneously with movie showings stretching not only staff coverage but parking
to the max.

Additionally, art drop off and hanging for the fall show will be the same day,
Saturday 9/29. Art At The Center will celebrate the opening of the show with a
reception form 5-7pm on Thursday, 10/4.

When CC is not orchestrating a dance of events and meetings, we are focused
heavily on budget preparation and aligning our priorities for 2019.
AGENDA ITEM:

To approve Ordinance 788 approving a loan agreement with the Colorado Water Resources and Power Development for construction of the Biosolids Facility

SUMMARY:

The Town of Nederland has been pursuing this project for several years and has finally secured funding for the amount of $2 million. Additionally, through project innovations, Staff has secured a 0% interest loan. This ordinance is the next step in executing the loan.

HISTORY AND PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION:

- Waste Water Treatment Plant was constructed in 2013 in response to tightening water quality standards. The plant was not designed to address the plant’s byproduct: Sludge.
- Sludge hauling costs continue to increase. The current budget doesn’t allow for full removal of sludge. As a result, sludge is stored in the pond essentially storing debt.
- In 2014 the Master Infrastructure Plan (MIP) was approved. The MIP identified a Biosolids Study be performed to assess options for mitigating sludge.
- In 2014 Nederland received a violation from the State for odors produced from the sludge pond that can result in fines up to $15,000 per day. To resolve this, Staff added water to the pond to create a top layer of aerobic water that creates a “cap” to hold odors in. This raised the pond above design elevations. Additionally, Staff purchased chemicals to reduce odors at a $1000 a barrel. These practices are wasteful and unsustainable.
- In 2015 the waste water plant underwent a Sanitary Survey from the State in which the pond was identified as needing a seepage study. This would result in having to reline the pond. Relining the pond would require removing all the sludge and would likely cost the town upwards of $400,000 and still not resolve the unsustainable practice of sludge hauling and odors.
In September of 2015 the Biosolids Study was completed and presented to the BOT. The Biosolids Study explored all options for treating sludge and represents the first step in choosing to eliminate the pond for a more sustainable and economical option for treating sludge.

There were several presentations of the Biosolids Study to inform new BOT members not familiar with the project.

Upon thorough review from Staff an option was chosen and presented to the BOT.

In August 2016, a letter agreement was presented to the BOT outlining the costs for engineering presented in 4 phases with approval of the first phase being the site application for $23,000. The Site Application was submitted to CDPHE on January 23, 2017.

Approval for the second phase of design was given to JVA on February 18, 2017. This was the Process Design Report (PDR) or 30% design and submitted to the state for approval on May 24, 2017.

In April of 2017 the BOT approved funds for the Project Needs Assessment (PNA). This is a requirement for SRF funding. The PNA was submitted to CDPHE on

Staff met with State funding agencies for a prequalifying meeting for SRF funding. It was determined at this meeting that the Town is well positioned for full project funding of $2 million.

Meanwhile the first version for the Owner’s Project Requirements (OPR) was presented in March of 2017. The final version of the OPR was approved pending clarification in June 2017. These edits are in the July 18, 2017 BOT packet.

At the July 18, 2017 BOT meeting, Staff was given permission to continue to the third phase or 60% design. Permission was also granted to pursue DOLA (Department Of Local Affairs) funding for the amount of $950,000.

In December of 2017 the BOT was informed that a debt authorization vote would need to be added to the April 2018 ballot in order to pursue SRF funds.

In January 2018, final design or the forth phase was completed and approved by CDPHE.

Nederland’s debt authorization vote passes in April of this year, paving the way to borrow funds.

June of 2018, Nederland was approved to borrow SRF Funds from the Colorado Water Resources and Power Authority for the amount of $2 million at 2% interest for 20 years.

June of 2018 the Town of Nederland applies for Green Project Reserve Funds to reduce the Town’s interest rate to 0% through project efficiencies.

July of 2018, Nederland received funding from the Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) for the amount of $950,000.

August of 2018, the town was awarded a 0% interest loan on their SRF loan for efficiencies and innovative aspects of the project through a program called Green Project Reserves (GPR).
• BOT accepted a construction administration agreement with the Town’s on-call engineers, JVA Inc at their regular September 4th BOT Meeting.

QUESTION BEFORE THE BOARD:

Does the BOT approve Ordinance 788 to accept debt for the amount of $2 million dollars to fund the Biosolids project ultimately payable from the Town’s waste water revenue?

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approving Ordinance 788

ATTACHMENTS:

• Ordinance 788

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

Rates will need to be increased as the final step in executing this loan agreement. Staff will present these increases at the regular October 2nd 2018 BOT meeting. The market will ultimately decide the value of this project, however; Staff will work to keep costs within an approved budget of $2 million as identified in the Owner’s Project Requirements (OPR)
TOWN OF NEDERLAND

ORDINANCE NO. 788

AN ORDINANCE APPROVING A LOAN AGREEMENT WITH THE COLORADO WATER RESOURCES AND POWER DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY PAYABLE FROM THE TOWN’S NET WASTEWATER REVENUES TO FINANCE UPGRADES TO THE TOWN’S WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEM AND PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS RELATING THERETO; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

WHEREAS, the Town of Nederland, Boulder County, Colorado (the “Town”) is a municipal corporation duly organized and existing as a statutory town under the Constitution and the laws of the State of Colorado; and

WHEREAS, the members of the Board of Trustees of the Town (the “Board of Trustees”) have been duly elected and qualified; and

WHEREAS, Article X, Section 20 of the Colorado Constitution (“TABOR”) requires voter approval for any new tax, the creation of any debt and for spending certain moneys above limits established by TABOR; and

WHEREAS, TABOR requires the Town to submit ballot issues (as defined in TABOR) to the Town’s electors on limited election days before action can be taken on such ballot issues; and

WHEREAS, at the general Town election held on April 3, 2018, the following election question (the “Election Question”) was approved by a majority of the Town electors voting thereon:

SHALL TOWN OF NEDERLAND DEBT BE INCREASED $2,000,000 WITH A MAXIMUM REPAYMENT COST OF $5,000,000, WITHOUT IMPOSING ANY NEW TAXES OR TAX RATE INCREASES, FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSTRUCTING, INSTALLING AND EQUIPPING BIOSOLIDS IMPROVEMENTS AT THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT CENTER, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH ANY NECESSARY SITE IMPROVEMENTS, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:

• THE TOWN MAY PLEDGE TO THE PAYMENT OF THE DEBT THE RATES, FEES, PAYMENTS AND CHARGES OF THE WASTEWATER SYSTEM AND ANY PORTION OF THE TOWN’S SALES TAX AS
HEREAFTER DETERMINED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, OR ANY OTHER LEGALLY AVAILABLE REVENUES OF THE TOWN, AS DETERMINED BY THE TOWN BOARD;

- THE DEBT MAY CONSIST OF REVENUE BONDS, LOANS OR OTHER MULTIPLE FISCAL YEAR FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS OF THE TOWN, BE SOLD IN ONE SERIES OR MORE, FOR A PRICE ABOVE OR BELOW THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF SUCH SERIES, ON TERMS AND CONDITIONS, AND WITH SUCH MATURITIES AS PERMITTED BY LAW AND AS THE TOWN MAY DETERMINE, INCLUDING PROVISIONS FOR REDEMPTION PRIOR TO MATURITY WITH OR WITHOUT PAYMENT OF PREMIUM OF NOT TO EXCEED THREE PERCENT;


WHEREAS, the Town has not incurred any of the debt approved by the voters of the Town at the April 2018 election; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees has determined it is in the best interests of the Town and its inhabitants that the Town finance improvements to its wastewater system, as described in the Election Question (the “Project”); and

WHEREAS, the Town has made an application to the Colorado Water Resources and Power Development Authority (the “CWRPDA”), a body corporate and political subdivision of the State, for a loan from the CWRPDA’s Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund to finance all or a portion of the cost of the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees has determined that in order to finance all or a portion of the costs of the Project, it is necessary and advisable and in the best interests of the Town to enter into a loan agreement (the “Loan Agreement”) with the Colorado Water Resources and Power Development Authority (“CWRPDA”), a body corporate and political subdivision of
the State of Colorado, pursuant to which CWRPDA shall loan the Town an amount of not to exceed $2,000,000 (the “Loan”) from the Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund to pay for a portion of the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Town’s repayment obligations under the Loan Agreement shall be evidenced by a governmental agency bond (the “Bond”) to be issued by the Town to CWRPDA, and which Bond shall be payable only from revenue of the System; and

WHEREAS, the Town’s obligations under the Loan Agreement and the Bond (collectively referred to herein as the “Financing Documents”) shall constitute a revenue obligation of the Town payable from the net wastewater revenues of the Town (the “Net Revenue”) and the sales tax revenue (the “Sales Tax Revenues”, and, together with the Net Revenues, the “Pledged Property”) of the Town as set forth in the Loan Agreement; and

WHEREAS, the Town has previously entered into a Loan Agreement with the CWRPDA, dated November 3, 2011, pursuant to which the Town received a Green Loan in the aggregate principal amount of $2,000,000, and a second Loan Agreement with the CWRPDA, also dated November 3, 2011, pursuant to which the Town received a Leveraged Loan in the aggregate principal amount of $1,961,090 (the “2011 Loans”), which 2011 Loans are repayable from the Pledged Property; and

WHEREAS, except for the 2011 Loans, the Town has not pledged nor hypothecated the Pledged Property derived or to be derived from the operation of the System, or any part thereof, to the payment of any bonds or for any other purpose, with the result that the Net Revenue may now be pledged lawfully and irrevocably to the payment of the Financing Documents;

WHEREAS, the forms of the Financing Documents are on file with the Town Clerk; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees desires to approve the form of the Financing Documents and other documents referenced therein, authorize the execution of the Loan Agreement, and authorize the execution and delivery of the Bond;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE TOWN OF NEDERLAND, COLORADO, AS FOLLOWS:
Section 1. Approvals, Authorizations, and Amendments.

(a) The forms of the Financing Documents as are on file with the Town Clerk are hereby approved, and the Mayor, Town Administrator and Town Clerk are hereby authorized and directed to execute the Financing Documents in substantially the forms as are on file with the Town Clerk, with such changes as are not inconsistent herewith and as are hereafter approved by the Mayor or Town Administrator. The Town Clerk is hereby authorized to authenticate and affix the seal of the Town thereto. The Town shall enter into and perform its obligations under the Financing Documents, in the forms of such Financing Documents, with such changes as are not inconsistent herewith and as are hereafter approved by the Mayor or the Town Administrator.

(b) The Mayor, the Town Administrator and the Town Clerk are further hereby authorized and directed to execute and authenticate such other documents, instruments, or certificates as are deemed necessary or desirable in connection with the Town’s performance of its obligations under the Financing Documents.

Section 2. Election to Apply Supplemental Act. Section 11-57-204 of the Supplemental Public Securities Act, constituting Title 11, Article 57, Part 2, Colorado Revised Statutes (the “Supplemental Act”) provides that a public entity, including the Town, may elect in an act of issuance to apply all or any of the provisions of the Supplemental Act. The Town hereby elects to apply all sections of the Supplemental Act to the Financing Documents.

Section 3. Delegation.

(a) Pursuant to Section 11-57-205 of the Supplemental Act, the Board of Trustees hereby delegates to the Mayor and the Town Administrator the independent authority to make the following determinations relating to and contained in the Financing Documents, subject to the restrictions contained in paragraph (b) of this Section 3:

(i) The interest rate on the Loan;

(ii) The principal amount of the Loan;

(iii) The amount of principal of the Loan maturing in any given year and the final maturity of the Loan;

(iv) The dates on which the principal of and interest on the Loan are paid; and
(v) The existence and amount of capitalized interest or reserve funds for the Loan, if any.

(b) The delegation in paragraph (a) of this Section 3 shall be subject to the following parameters and restrictions:

(i) the net effective interest rate on the Loan shall not exceed 2.00%;

(ii) the principal amount of the Loan shall not exceed $2,000,000;

(iii) the maximum annual repayment cost of the Loan shall not exceed $5,000,000;

(iv) the total repayment cost of the Loan shall not exceed $5,000,000; and

(v) the maturity of the Loan shall not extend beyond December 31, 2048.

Section 4. Conclusive Recital. Pursuant to Section 11-57-210 of the Supplemental Act, both the Bond and the Loan Agreement shall contain a recital that the Bond is issued pursuant to the Supplemental Act. Such recitals shall be conclusive evidence of the validity and the regularity of the issuance of the Bond after its delivery for value.

Section 5. Pledge of Revenues. The creation, perfection, enforcement, and priority of the pledge of revenues to secure or pay the Bond and the Loan Agreement as provided therein shall be governed by Section 11-57-208 of the Supplemental Act and this Ordinance. The amounts pledged to the payment of the Bond and the Loan Agreement shall immediately be subject to the liens of such pledge without any physical delivery, filing, or further act. The lien of such pledge shall have the priority described in the Loan Agreement. The lien of such pledge shall be valid, binding, and enforceable as against all persons having claims of any kind in tort, contract, or otherwise against the Town irrespective of whether such persons have notice of such lien.

Section 6. Limitation of Actions. Pursuant to Section 11-57-212 of the Supplemental Act, no legal or equitable action brought with respect to any legislative acts or proceedings in
connection with the Financing Documents shall be commenced more than thirty days after the adoption of this Ordinance.

Section 7. **Limited Obligation.** The Financing Documents are payable solely from the revenues set forth in the Financing Documents and do not constitute a debt within the meaning of any constitutional or statutory limitation or provision.
Section 8. **No Recourse Against Officers and Agents.** Pursuant to Section 11-57-209 of the Supplemental Act, if a member of the Board of Trustees, or any officer or agent of the Town acts in good faith, no civil recourse shall be available against such member, officer, or agent for payment of the principal of or interest on the Bond. Such recourse shall not be available either directly or indirectly through the Board of Trustees or the Town, or otherwise, whether by virtue of any constitution, statute, rule of law, enforcement of penalty, or otherwise. By the acceptance of the Bond and as a part of the consideration for the sale or purchase of the Bond, CWRPDA specifically waives any such recourse.

Section 9. **Disposition and Investment of Loan Proceeds.** The proceeds of the Loan shall be applied only to pay the costs and expenses of the Project, including costs related thereto. Neither CWRPDA nor any subsequent owner(s) of the Loan Agreement shall be responsible for the application or disposal by the Town or any of its officers of the funds derived from the Loan. In the event that all of the proceeds of the Loan are not required to pay such costs and expenses, any remaining amount shall be used for the purpose of paying the principal amount of the Loan and the interest thereon.

Section 10. **Town Representatives.** Pursuant to the Loan Agreement, the Mayor, Town Administrator, and the Town Clerk are each designated as an Authorized Officer (as defined in the Loan Agreement) for the purpose of performing any act or executing any document relating to the Loan, the Town, the Bond or the Loan Agreement. A copy of this Ordinance shall be furnished to CWRPDA as evidence of such designation.

Section 11. **Estimated Life of the Project.** It is hereby determined that the estimated life of the Project to be financed with the proceeds of the Loan is not less than the maximum maturity of the Loan authorized hereby.

Section 12. **Direction to Take Authorizing Action.** The Mayor, the Town Administrator and the Town Clerk and other appropriate officers of the Town are hereby authorized and directed to take all other actions necessary or appropriate to effectuate the provisions of this Ordinance, including but not limited to the execution and delivery of such certificates and affidavits as may reasonably be required by CWRPDA. The execution of any documents, instruments, or certificates by said officials shall be conclusive evidence of the
approval by the Town of such documents, instruments, or certificates in accordance with the terms thereof and this Ordinance.

Section 13.  **Ratification and Approval of Prior Actions.** All actions heretofore taken by the Mayor, any member of the Board of Trustees, the Town Administrator and the Town Clerk and the other officers and employees of the Town, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Ordinance, relating to the Financing Documents, or actions to be taken in respect thereof, are hereby ratified, approved, and confirmed.

Section 14.  **Severability.** If any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this Ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstances shall for any reason be adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction invalid, such judgment shall not affect application to other persons or circumstances.

Section 15.  **Ordinance Irrepealable.** After the Bond is issued, this Ordinance shall constitute an irrevocable contract between the Town and CWRPDA, and shall be and remain irrepealable until the Bond shall have been fully paid, satisfied, and discharged. No provisions of any constitution, statute, charter, ordinance, resolution or other measure enacted after the issuance of the Bond shall in any manner be construed as impairing the obligations of the Town to keep and perform the covenants contained in this Ordinance.

Section 16.  **Emergency Declaration.** It is hereby found and determined by the Board of Trustees that: (i) the issuance of the Bond and the construction of the Project is necessary in the public interest; and (ii) it is necessary to take advantage of the current conditions in the municipal bond market and low interest rates, the continuation of which cannot be predicted. As a result of the foregoing, the Board of Trustees hereby declares that an emergency exists, and that this Ordinance is necessary to the immediate preservation of the public health and safety, all in accordance with §31-16-105, C.R.S. and Section 1-46 of the Nederland Municipal Code.
Section 17. **Effective Date.** This Ordinance, as adopted by the Board of Trustees, shall take effect immediately and shall be numbered and recorded by the Town Clerk in the official records of the Town. The adoption and publication shall be authenticated by the signatures of the Mayor and Town Clerk, and by the certificate of publication.

[Remainder of this page left intentionally blank]
INTRODUCED, READ AND APPROVED on first and final reading by a vote of ___ to ___ this 18th of September, 2018, and ordered published in full in the ____________, a newspaper of general circulation in the Town of Nederland, on September ___, 2018.

TOWN OF NEDERLAND, COLORADO

__________________________________

Mayor

(SEAL)

Attest:

__________________________________

Town Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________________

Town Attorney
I, Hope Jordan, Town Clerk of the Town of Nederland, Colorado (the “Town”), do hereby certify:

1. The foregoing pages are a true, perfect and complete copy of the Ordinance adopted by the Town Board of Trustees constituting the governing board of the Town of Nederland (the “Board of Trustees”), had and taken at an open regular meeting of the Board of Trustees held at the Nederland Community Center in Nederland, Colorado, on September 18, 2018, convening at the hour of 7:00 p.m. as recorded in the regular book of official records of the proceedings of said Town of Nederland kept in my office.

2. The Ordinance was adopted at a reading at an open, regular meeting of the Board of Trustees on September 18, 2018, by a ¾ of the members of the Board of Trustees as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>“Yes”</th>
<th>“No”</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kristopher Larsen, Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Baumhover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Gustafson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rawsthorne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Conrad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Apt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The Ordinance has been signed by the Mayor, sealed with the corporate seal of the Town, attested by me as Town Clerk, and duly recorded in the books of the Town; and that the same remains of record in the book of records of the Town.

4. That notice of the regular meeting of September 18, 2018, attached hereto as Exhibit A, was posted within the Town at least 24 hours before such meetings as required by law.
5. That the Ordinance was published by in full after adoption in the __________________, a newspaper of general circulation within the Town on __________ __, 2018. The affidavit of publication is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said Town this __ day of __________, 2018.

_______________________________________
(SEAL) Town Clerk
EXHIBIT A

(Notice of Regular Meeting)
EXHIBIT B

(Affidavit of Publication)
AGENDA INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
NEDERLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Meeting Date: 9/18/2018
Prepared By: Stefani Davidson
Dept: Admin
Consent ☐  Information ☐  Action ☐  Discussion ☒

AGENDA ITEM:
GOCO grant to implement Gateway Park

SUMMARY:
PROSAB is working on writing a GOCO grant to make the Gateway Park a reality.

The mission for the Gateway Park Area Master Plan is to integrate immediate recreational opportunities with the downtown core of Nederland to provide a holistic experience of cultural and recreational offerings to locals and visitors, and to do so in an environmentally conscious and sustainable manner. According to ESRI Business Information Solutions, which conducted surveys in 2011 for the Master Plan, 83% of respondents rated the importance of parks and recreational opportunities a “4” or “5”, where 5 indicated that it was “very important”. When asked which activities should be added, expanded or improved, the top rated category was “biking/hiking/running”, and this grant would enable the park to expand these activities in Nederland. When asked which facilities should be added, expanded, or improved, pedestrian/bike paths and the proposed Gateway Park were ranked as top priorities for residents of Nederland and the surrounding area.

TEENS, Inc. which is located adjacent to the proposed park, serves an average of 40 teens each day. The pump track and grassy fields will be great places for the youth of Nederland to recreate. Currently, the closest pump track is in Boulder, which is a half hour away. Having a pump track in town will enable youth to bike locally.

There will be restrooms and a pavilion on the edge of the park. The City of Boulder should be helping to pay for it. The restrooms will be helpful for residents, visitors and during events.

Nederland is a very dog friendly town and residents have been asking for a dog park for years. In fact, according to the 2011 survey, dog walking is the second most common outdoor activity that respondents took part in. Making a fenced in area for dogs to run will give owners a place to meet one another and socialize, which brings a community together. Additionally, the 2011 surveys indicated strong support for improving and protecting water quality and creating a dog park would help to keep dogs from defecating in Barker Reservoir and therefore improve water quality. This area would also serve as a multi-use area and could still be used for festivals and events.
Reclaiming the fisherman’s parking lot and making it a beautifully landscaped area will encourage more visitors to walk around the creek and the reservoir, which will be good for local businesses, as they rely on tourism to keep their businesses alive.

The Sustainability Advisory board is building a 10 ft by 10 ft greenhouse that will serve as an example that residents can use to build their own greenhouse.

There will also be trails through and around the park. Some will be ADA accessible and other will be multiuse.

All of these improvements to the area will encourage residents and visitors to engage in healthy outdoor activities.

**HISTORY AND PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION:**
Nederland’s 2020 Vision Statement
Parks and Trails Master plan

**QUESTION BEFORE THE BOARD:**
Will you support PROSAB in applying for the grant and implementing the building of Gateway Park?

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**
Support PROSAB in applying for the grant and implementing the building of Gateway Park

**ANY CONSEQUENCES OF INACTION? PROS/CONS OF EACH ALTERNATIVE?**
Gateway Park will not get built and the area will remain under-used and remain an eyesore to the town

**ATTACHMENTS:**
- GOCO grant draft
- Pump track design
- Conceptual layout
- Nederland Park Master Plan

**FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:**
Much of the match for this grant comes from renting out Guercio Field last winter and this upcoming winter.
**WHAT IS A PUMPTRACK?**

A Pumptrack is a progressive kind of structure that uses an up and down ‘pumping’ motion to propel the bicycle forward instead of pedaling.

Pumptracks are a perfect structure for practicing balance, learning skills and improving confidence on the bike. They are safe and fun to ride for all ages and skill levels. Pumptracks are suitable for bikes of all sizes, skateboards, rollerblades and scooters.

They create a community environment by bridging the generation gap between parents, small children and adolescents. Our structures are modular, flexible and movable to suit any type of terrain and land usage issues and can be made from various kinds of materials to suit the needs of the client and the surroundings.

**CHECK OUT OUR LINEUP!**

**Lumberjack Series**

The Lumberjack series has a substructure that is made from a marine grade lumber and is topped with our ultra-grip composite surface. This surface has a texture to it that means that you can ride no matter what Mother Nature throws at you. Because of the modular design it can easily be rearranged or added to at anytime. This line is ideal for indoor settings, mobile setups, resorts, and bike shops and is easily stored, setup, and transported.

**Blacksmith Series**

The Blacksmith Series consists of an ultra-strength reinforced composite framework with the same ultra-grip composite surface as the Lumberjack Series. It can be permanently installed or expanded and reconfigured as desired. This line is ideal for re-purposing a tennis court, parking lot, or any other hard surface. It can also be dropped into an open space, park area, or in conjunction with a skatepark. Because of the completely composite design, it can be installed with surrounding landscape to create a beautifully natural aesthetic. Perfect for municipalities, resorts, camps or bike shops.

**Mason Series**

The Mason Series is constructed with high strength precast concrete. We manufacture these structures using precision molds that give you a perfect shape and riding surface. Each piece is the exact same size and shape as the Lumberjack and Blacksmith Series; meaning you get the same amazing ride in a more permanent aesthetically pleasing manner. The Mason Series can be used for repurposing a tennis court, parking lot or any other pad, or it can be placed as a standalone feature with added landscaping. While it is more difficult the Mason Series can be added to or reconfigured at a later date. The Mason Series is perfect for any municipality or resort that is looking for a worry free progressive biking structure.
Speed Ring
The Speed Ring is the entry level smallest possible track to build with only one possible layout. It is a great “starter” track as it can be added to over the years to become a larger track. This is a perfect track to learn how to ride pumptrack, or fine-tune your skills. Track Length 125’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lumberjack</th>
<th>Blacksmith</th>
<th>Mason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Triple Threat
You will have a blast flying around the Triple Threat with its three 60 degree turns and equilateral triangle design. The speed you get from this configuration is where the real fun is at. Ride the Triple Threat clockwise or counter-clockwise to see which direction you are faster. Track Length 158’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lumberjack</th>
<th>Blacksmith</th>
<th>Mason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sidewinder
The Sidewinder delivers turning in both directions and offers multiple layout possibilities with over 200’ of track. The Sidewinder is a great track for improving your agility in the corners. Track Length 215’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lumberjack</th>
<th>Blacksmith</th>
<th>Mason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
<td>$86,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mach 6
The Mach 6 is a pumped up version of The Sidewinder containing 6 berms, over 100’ more of track and multiple configurations. Host a time trial and post the fastest times on our facebook page to see how your riders compare to others around the globe. Track Length 330’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lumberjack</th>
<th>Blacksmith</th>
<th>Mason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>$74,500</td>
<td>$94,500</td>
<td>$121,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Prix
The name really says it all, as the Grand Prix is the largest package we offer (of course if you want bigger we will be happy to oblige) being longer than a football field yet compact enough to fit in a 115’x88’ space. The Grand Prix has numerous layout possibilities and enough parts to create two of our smaller tracks for head-to-head racing. Track Length 440’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lumberjack</th>
<th>Blacksmith</th>
<th>Mason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
<td>$159,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOCO uses a 100-point system to evaluate projects based upon the following criteria, with projects ranked by total points. The maximum possible points for each section are shown in parentheses.

Please provide as much detail as possible for each of the questions. Do NOT leave any questions blank. Failure to respond to these questions may substantially reduce your score, due to the difficulty of evaluating the project without this information.

1. **YOUR COMMUNITY**: Introduce the community this project will serve. Highlight any underserved populations that this project is intended to serve. Discuss the recreational interests of your community, how does this project tie in to those? Who are the existing and/or expected users of the proposed project - individuals, organized sports leagues and teams, school and youth groups, etc. the project will benefit? Provide user numbers for each user group, noting how you arrived at that estimate. (10 pts.)

   **Response**: Nederland is an active outdoorsy community that values the environment and recognizes the importance of trails and parks in the community. This is identified in Nederland’s 2020 Vision Statement attached with this document. Additionally, Nederland completed a Parks and Trails Master plan also attached with this document. Through surveys, this Master Plan identified the Town’s needs and users. The project is expected to benefit a variety of users. Nederland has a significant cycling network and the addition of the proposed bike park is expected to benefit area youths and adults.

   **Commented [C1]**: I think it will be necessary to delegate members to gather input from individual groups that will be represented and that this facility will serve.

   **Commented [C2]**: I think we want a good site plan and explanation. This should be collaborative and the whole group should identify where and what is being constructed in more detail than we have currently done. Possibly delegating one person to the bike park, one person to the trails portion, one person to the nature path, and one to the dog park, etc. We will need a establish a deadline to gather this information. When we have created a draft then we could possibly hire someone to draw it for us. Annette will be a good contact for dog park support as she has been working on this with residents in old town.

2. **SCOPE**: Describe the state of the existing facilities. If this project is intended to enhance or replace existing facilities, discuss why are they no longer acceptable? Include site photos. Describe the scope of the project - what exactly will be built? What is the useful life of the project components and how was that useful life determined? Describe consultations you have had with outside experts, other communities, or knowledgeable individuals about building this sort of project. The budget attachment will also be evaluated as part of this response. (15 pts.)

   **Response**: Existing facilities are non-existent. There is a large open space area specifically set aside for the purpose of building a park. A portion of this area is currently being rented in order to support the necessary funds needed for a GOCO Grant match. Nederland proposes constructing a bike park, connecting trails to our existing facilities, natural habitat walking trail, and trail access to a presentation green house. Additionally, an open space lawn area will be created and a fenced in dog park area. ADA accessibility will be incorporated by creating specific parking and properly graded trails.
ACCESS: Describe access to the proposed project. How many people live within a 10-minute walk of the project site (within one mile or less)? Is it accessible by means other than automobile? How do/will users access the site? How is it situated in relation to where users live: is it near or linked to schools, other recreational amenities, or community gathering spots? Are there obstacles to getting to the project site; if so, how do you intend to overcome them? Will ADA accessibility be incorporated? (5 pts.)

Response: This park is centrally located in Nederland’s downtown area and within walking distance most areas within the town. The proposed park will link to our current park facilities as identified in the Town’s master plan. The new park will be situated next to the Town’s teen center and an existing skate park. There is City of Boulder parking also adjacent to the park for visitors accessing the reservoir. The proposed area has been a gathering spot for special events, farmer’s markets, dog walkers and recreational users for many years. Nederland hopes to develop this park with these specific uses in mind. ADA accessibility will be incorporated into this design with trails specifically constructed to accommodate ADA challenges.

NEED: What makes this project unique? Why is the project needed? How will the project enhance recreational offerings, including programming, and/or environmental education opportunities in the community? Do similar amenities exist in the community? How are potential users of the project compensating now for the lack of the project? (15 pts.)

Response: A need for a bike park was identified in Nederland’s Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan. We have also attached letters of support from potential area users and businesses. There are cycling organizations and youth groups willing to support youth programs geared for this facility. Current cycling occurs in the street and at the Town’s other park facilities which are not bike friendly. This project will help to separate bicycle users from vehicular traffic. This facility will also accommodate dog walkers and provide a large area for dog owners to allow their dogs off-leash to run. Nederland is a very dog friendly community and there are no facilities in Nederland that exist for this purpose. This is beneficial to City of Boulder from a water quality standpoint to help curb existing off-leash dog use of the drinking water.

Commented [C3]: Whoever is assigned the trail portion of the project will be responsible for identifying ADA accessibility. Maybe reaching out to the various users of the proposed facility and understanding how this will be more accessible that say going to Boulder for the same thing.

Commented [C4]: Someone with better writing skills than myself should represent the communities needs and why. Jonathon might be a good one for this since he is an elected official. I think it will be important to explain how the need was identified.
PLANNING/OUTREACH:
Describe the public planning process that identified this specific project as a priority. Discuss specific plans or targeted public outreach efforts that prioritized this project and the opportunities the public had to comment. Discuss your efforts to engage youth and underserved populations in the planning process. What priority is this project to the community? If this project is not a top priority discuss why it is being pursued at this time. If a survey was distributed, how many people and what groups were surveyed? Provide one copy of a blank survey. Summarize the feedback received from the public and how it was determined that your constituents want and will use the project? What did you learn from the processes discussed above? (15 pts.)

Response: The attached Master Plan used comprehensive data and surveys to identify the needs of the community. Additionally, we have attached a variety of letters of support from a number of different user groups. Nederland will be accommodating the majority of the current uses of the proposed area while also making it for accessible, attractive, and more user friendly for all user groups.

Commented [C5]: Outreach will need to be planned by PROSAB and delegate members to reach out to certain groups for any form of support whether written, physical, or financial.

Commented [C6]: This should happen naturally as the PROSAB reaches out to various support groups. And plans public outreach. I suggest an online survey. They are relatively easy to set up and you will get a variety of feedback. Someone should be tasked with crafting the right questions for the survey.

Commented [C7]: This will be my responsibility. As we get numbers and more input from I will be able to have a better idea of time and town involvement.

Commented [C8]: This will also be my responsibility. It will be necessary to add more staff time and possibly staff to maintain this park. I will make this my task to budget appropriately and request the necessary funding. I will create a draft maintenance plan that will help support the need for maintenance funds and staff.

OPPOSITION: Who is opposed to the project? Have neighbors, user groups, or other parties objected to the project? Include any letters, petitions, news articles, or other documents evidencing opposition. What has been done to address the concerns of those opposing and how has the opposition responded? (5 pts.)

Response: Need to creatively find opposition that we can help accommodate and ultimately support the project if their concern is able to be met.

Commented [C5]: This should happen naturally as the PROSAB reaches out to various support groups. And plans public outreach. I suggest an online survey. They are relatively easy to set up and you will get a variety of feedback. Someone should be tasked with crafting the right questions for the survey.

Commented [C7]: This will be my responsibility. As we get numbers and more input from I will be able to have a better idea of time and town involvement.

TIMELINE: When will the project be ready for construction and when will it be complete? Discuss any design, engineering and/or permitting that is outstanding. (5 pts.)


Commented [C7]: This will be my responsibility. As we get numbers and more input from I will be able to have a better idea of time and town involvement.

MAINTENANCE: Estimate the annual costs to maintain the project. How did you derive those numbers; how do you intend to fund maintenance; and who is responsible for maintenance? (5 pts.)

Response: Maintenance will be added to our current parks Staff responsibilities. A Draft Facilities Maintenance Plan is attached to that identifies the time needed to maintain this additional facility. Nederland will add one part time parks employee for upkeep of the proposed facilities.

Commented [C8]: This will also be my responsibility. It will be necessary to add more staff time and possibly staff to maintain this park. I will make this my task to budget appropriately and request the necessary funding. I will create a draft maintenance plan that will help support the need for maintenance funds and staff.
Bicycle organizations will volunteer time to help maintain the bike park.

9. **YOUTH INVOLVEMENT:** Will a Youth Corps or other local youth organization be used to implement the project? Keep in mind this could be anything from planning and fundraising to construction. If so, describe what the youth organization will be doing and discuss the collaboration you’ve had with them. Submit a letter of support from the organization that you will be collaborating with. If there will not be youth involvement in this project, provide an explanation of why. (5 pts.)

Response: Youth Corps will participation will be vital to the implementation of this project with an anticipated of at least 40 hours of youth group involvement.

10. **MATCH STATUS:** How much of your planned cash match is secured? How much of it is yet to be raised and what are your plans for raising those additional funds? What is your “Plan B” if you are unable to raise those funds? (“Plan B” only needed if matching funds are not secured.) Describe any partnerships established for this project. If cash or in-kind partnerships for this project were not possible, explain why. (10 pts.)

Response: Nederland has creatively funded the match by agreeing to rent out the existing space for part time parking in the winter months. This was an enormous sacrifice but recognized as a way to ultimately bring the Town’s plans to fruition. Nederland desires to return and dedicate this space to recreational user groups. Nederland does not have a “Plan B” and is confident that the needed match will be secured. The Town of Nederland plans to contribute the efforts of its Public Works Department and heavy machinery that is expected to far exceed the necessary in-kind match.

11. **NEED FOR FUNDS:** What is compelling about your community’s need for GOCO funds? What opportunities are lost if this project is not undertaken now? Will the project (or components of it) get done if GOCO funds are not awarded? Will applicant or partner funds dedicated to the project be lost if GOCO doesn’t award a grant now? (5 pts.)

Response: Nederland is a growing community, with an ever increasing demand on the Town’s facilities from visitors. Nederland is becoming a destination place for a variety of recreational purposes and is a gateway to recreational activities in the surrounding national forest. Nederland often serves as the stopping point for visitors before doing their outdoor activities. Nederland relies on outside funding and cooperation from...
a variety of volunteers to do large projects such as this. There is currently no other funding for this project.

**SUPPORT:** Provide up to seven community support letters/emails that are supporting the project in ways other than cash or in-kind contributions. Letters should come from users, user groups, community members, volunteers, schools, etc.

12. Support letters/emails must be included with the application and will not be accepted if mailed to the GOCO office. (There is no need to provide narrative in this question; scoring will be based on the quality of support letters submitted with the application) (5 pts.)

**Response:** No narrative, just letters and the group that each letter represents.

Commented [C12]: His should be delegated with a goal of getting more letters than needed and picking the best ones for final submission.
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Chapter 1. Executive Summary

Introduction

Nederland takes great pride in its heritage, surrounding natural beauty, and unique character. It is a community made up of engaged residents and committed volunteers and organizations that come together to voice their opinions and get things done. This community ownership and hands-on approach is reflected in this Nederland Area Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan, an update of the previous plan, developed in 2001. Through an extensive public input process throughout 2012 that included public meetings, focus groups, and a survey, community members have articulated their concerns and aspirations and helped shape this Master Plan.

Purpose of Plan

The purpose of the Park, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails (PROST) Master Plan is to:

- Articulate a vision for parks, recreation, open space, and trails as it relates to Envision 2020.
- Guide sustainable planning for parks, recreation, open space, and trails for the next 5 to 10 years.
- Identify strategies to address community needs and interests in a sustainable way.

Throughout the planning process, members of the community repeatedly voiced their support for the value and benefits of parks, recreation, open space, and trails. This plan will help the Town of Nederland manage the natural, cultural, and recreational assets now and into the future.

Benefits of Parks and Recreation

- Physical activity makes people healthier and increases with access to parks.
- Contact with the natural world improves physical and psychological health.
- Residential and commercial property values may increase as public spaces are well-planned.
- Value may be added to community through economic development.
- Trees improve air quality, act as natural air conditioners, and assist with storm water control and erosion.
- Crime and juvenile delinquency can be reduced by offering recreation for youth.
- Stable neighborhoods and strong communities are created when public spaces are maintained.

Contents of the Plan

The Master Plan consists of seven chapters.
1. Executive Summary
2. The Planning Context
3. Community Profile and Needs Assessment
4. Inventory Assessment
5. Gateway Park Area Planning
6. How We Manage – Services and Operations
7. Recommendations and Implementation Plan

The first chapter is the Executive Summary and is meant to stand alone as a brief synopsis of the plan. Chapters 2-4 provide a review of the planning process and context, the needs assessment which included a statistically-valid survey, and the inventory and level of service analysis. Planning for the gateway park area is found in Chapter 5. Chapter 6 focuses on topics including administration, programs and services, and funding. The final chapter details the plan recommendations and implementation.

Summary of Findings and Analysis

Following are highlights of findings and analysis that have helped shape the Master Plan recommendations.

Community Profile and Needs Assessment
Nederland grew through successive mining booms in the late 1800s and early 1900s. In the 1920s, tourism helped Nederland rebound from the bust that followed the tungsten boom of World War I. Today, Nederland has a population of over 1,400 and serves a larger area population. The Town attracts tourists, enjoy outdoor recreation – hiking, biking, camping, fishing, and horseback riding in summer and skiing, snowboarding, and snowshoeing in winter.

Through the public meetings and focus groups held as part of master planning process many strengths of the parks, recreation, open space, and trails system were identified: surrounding open space and trails, diversity of facilities in Town, and dedicated volunteers and non-profit organizations. Interest was expressed in balancing active and passive recreation, better managing visitor use of recreation areas and facilities, and identifying stable capital and operational funding to support the parks, recreation, open space, and trails system.

The survey conducted as part of the master planning process provided some insights into community priorities. The activities and programs that were identified by survey respondents as most important to be added, expanded, or improved include the following.
- Biking/hiking/running
- Indoor swimming/aquatics
- Non-motorized boating
- Events (e.g., movies, concerts, festivals)
- Cultural/arts/dance/music/crafts
- Snow and ice activities
The top ranked facilities to be added, expanded, or improved by survey respondents include the following:

- Pedestrian/bike paths (soft surface)
- Community gardens
- Indoor swimming pool
- Community greenhouse
- The proposed gateway park area at the end of Barker Reservoir
- Boating on the Reservoir
- An outdoor amphitheater

The following list highlights responses on the two separate questions. The first measures top priorities of Nederland area households and the second question evaluates the extent to which residents feel their needs are being met. There are distinct differences in results – needs for biking/hiking/running, events, and snow and ice activities are generally being met. In contrast, needs for indoor swimming and non-motorized boating are largely unmet, as indicated by the bold font.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent indicating that it is among their Top 3 Priorities</th>
<th>Needs Being Completely Met (4 or 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biking/hiking/running</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor swimming/aquatics</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized boating</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events (e.g., movies, concerts, festivals)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/arts/dance/music/crafts</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow and ice activities</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional resources and partnerships would be needed to help realize any new improvements.

**Inventory Assessment**

The Town of Nederland and neighboring public lands provide a host of open space areas, trails, parks, and recreational opportunities. Nederland’s close proximity to Arapaho Roosevelt National Forest, Indian Peaks Wilderness Area, and Boulder County Open Space areas offers residents and visitors unique opportunities to hike, bike, fish, horseback ride, and ski in or within a short distance of Town.

For a small town, Nederland offers a wide assortment of recreational opportunities. The Town, in partnership with many other groups, has added new amenities in the decade since the last master plan. New recreation facilities include the Nathan Lazarus Skatepark and Ice and Racquet Park. In addition, the renovation of the Nederland Community Center (2005-2007) has allowed this facility to thrive as a hub of community activity and recreation and cultural opportunities. New recreation uses that have been discussed as part of this master planning process include boating, sledding, and community gardens/greenhouse, to name a few. Enhancing trail connectivity and walkability remain central goals to encourage alternative transportation and healthy, active lifestyles.
Gateway Park Area Planning
The Nederland gateway park area refers to the lakeshore areas near the east entrance to the Town of Nederland, Colorado. This area is well-used by community members and is highly visible. As such, it is effectively the front yard of the community, a site where a well-considered plan is critical.

The gateway park area includes the shoreline of Barker Reservoir west to East Street, bounded on the north by Highway 119 and by Middle Boulder Creek to the south. The gateway area also includes East 1st Street, Middle Boulder Creek, and Chipeta Park to ensure these areas function as a singular recreation area well-integrated with Nederland’s downtown.

The gateway park area offers tremendous opportunity for recreational activities in Nederland. It is presently being used for recreational purposes, but the quality of these experiences could be greatly enhanced by improving the ecological and environmental value of the site.

The Nederland gateway park area has the potential to become a truly special place, a treasure to residents, and a destination for visitors. The Nederland Gateway Park Area Master Plan, a site plan that was developed as a component of this Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan, includes many concepts well-supported by the community and intended to enhance the gateway area, add to the vitality of downtown Nederland, and encourage environmental responsibility and sustainable practices.

Management – Services and Operations
Parks and recreation services are provided through collaborative efforts of the Town of Nederland and many other organizations. The Town of Nederland does not have a separate parks and recreation department or budget. There is one staff person who oversees the Nederland Community Center, and a portion of the Public Works Department’s staff time is devoted to helping maintain parks and trails along with volunteer efforts such as the Adopt-a-Park program. However, the Town has an active Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Board (PROSAB) that is charged with implementing Town’s master plan for parks, recreation, open space, and trails.

Recreation programs and activities are provided by volunteers and other organizations, often in partnership with the Town. There is an interest in expanding the partnership with the school district, especially for mutual use of recreational facilities. While much has been accomplished through community initiatives, the public input process revealed concern about fragmented recreation services as well as marketing and communication to get the word out about these offerings.

The Town will need to assess its ability to continue to achieve a more sustainable parks, recreation, open space, and trail system with existing resources, volunteers, and partnerships. During the public input process for this plan, many expressed a concern that continued growth of such a system was not sustainable and that additional Town resources would be necessary to achieve the desired improvements towards a more sustainable system. With no identified budgetary relief in sight and other Town budget priorities, achieving a more sustainable parks, recreation, open space, and trail system will likely depend on citizen initiatives or perhaps creation of a special parks and recreation district. Public support was expressed for a special district through the survey and public input opportunities, though the financial viability remains unknown. This is an attractive option, as it could allow more centralized and planned oversight of recreational projects and a reliable revenue stream.
Themes of the Master Plan

There are several themes that emerged from the planning process that are woven through the PROST Master Plan recommendations. These guiding themes include:

- Highlighting the unique natural features of Nederland and outdoor recreational opportunities
- Caring for the land and promoting sustainable practices
- Improving trail connections
- Fostering lifelong recreational enthusiasts and environmental stewards
- Prioritizing projects that focus on the greatest community needs and interests
- Managing visitor use of assets and balancing these with the needs of residents
- Leveraging resources through partnerships and alternative funding

In addition, the 2012 Nederland Area Open Space, Trails, Parks, and Recreation Survey results shows the following value statements for parks and recreation activities in the Nederland area:

- Maintaining what we have
- Promoting healthy active lifestyles
- Promoting environmental stewardship
- Providing connectivity/alternative non-motorized transportation
- Providing positive activities for youth
- Strengthening sense of community

These themes provide a framework for the Master Plan recommendations.

Recommendations – Goals, Objectives, and Actions

The Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan recommendations are shaped by extensive public input, a needs assessment, and sound planning practices. Master Plan Goals, Objectives, and Actions are summarized below. There are a total of five recommended goals and 29 objectives in the following categories: Overall Vision, Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails. Chapter 7 includes an implementation plan that identifies responsibility, basis/rationale, and timing for each of these recommendations.

Over the next 5 to 10 years, many influences will have an impact on the success of this plan. Funding availability, staff resources, and political and community support will play significant roles in the implementation process.

On March 20, 2012, with passage of Resolution 2012-12, the Nederland Board of Trustees approved the Nederland Planning Process (NPP). Projects identified in this PROST Master Plan will be examined through the NPP Process before implementation.
GOAL 1: Overall Vision for Nederland-Area Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Trails

Nederland’s parks, recreational opportunities, open space, and trail system together fulfill the needs of residents of the greater Nederland area for local facilities, programs, and natural areas that support their well-being, their active lifestyles and their needs for indoor and outdoor recreation, their cultural and educational interests, and their desire to interact with the natural environment and with each other, while supporting the environmental, social, and economic sustainability goals of the community.

Objectives:
1.1. Address funding and staffing needs for Nederland parks, recreation, open space, and trails, including current inventory, maintenance schedules, and costs in order to create a more sustainable system.

Actions:
  a. Conduct a feasibility study for a parks and recreation district and move forward with formation of the district if financially feasible, (and pursue alternative options, if not).
  b. Develop and implement a sustainable maintenance plan for all existing Nederland parks, recreation, open space, and trails.
     i. Identify and detail all existing amenities and conditions relative to how well the amenity serves its intended purpose.
     ii. Identify how each amenity impacts ecosystem functionality.
     iii. Identify and detail actions required for improving current recreational and environmental conditions.
  c. Look creatively at user fees and other potential funding mechanisms, while continuing to pursue grants from outside funding sources.
  d. Continue to promote fee reduction or scholarship programs to ensure that residents who do not have the ability to pay full user fees have access to public programs and services.
  e. Encourage efforts to cultivate, support, and relieve stress from the demands of the Nederland-area volunteer community.
  f. Collaborate when possible with local and regional non-profit organizations, local governments, and governmental agencies.
i. Reach an agreement with Boulder Valley School District (BVSD) for expanded mutual use of recreational facilities. (Also see Objective 3.4.)
ii. Explore feasibility of a volunteer coordinator.
iii. Partner with regional volunteer groups for trail repair and maintenance.
iv. Explore the expansion of the Adopt-a-Park program into other areas of parks, recreation, open space, and trails (PROST).

1.2. Endeavor to follow the principles of the Sustainable Sites Initiative or similar sustainability guidelines in the implementation of all PROST projects to the greatest extent possible in order to promote sustainable land development and management practices.

**Actions:**
- a. Prioritize projects based on sustainability analysis and community recreational needs not being met by current conditions.
- b. Improvements to recreational amenities should take into consideration multi-functionality. Additional functionalities could include habitat restoration, preservation and protection of natural areas, and improved ecosystem service like stormwater management.

1.3. Pay particular attention to the recreational needs of youth – the future of our society – and seniors – a rapidly expanding demographic.

**Action:**
- c. Give youth and senior accommodations high values in evaluation criteria for project priorities.

1.4. Seek to make facilities ADA-compliant to increase accessibility of public facilities.

**Actions:**
- a. Develop evaluation criteria for new facility and program proposals that incorporate assessments of these elements.
- b. Evaluate existing PROST facilities for the feasibility of retrofitting for ADA compliance.
- c. Incorporate consideration of special needs groups into all facility management plans.

1.5. Assure that all Nederland PROST facilities are adequately maintained. (Also see Objective 1.1.b.)

**Actions:**
- a. Complete management plans for all Town recreational assets. (Also see Objective 2.3.)
- b. Seek funding for PROST maintenance.

1.6. Recognize the vulnerability of the Nederland area and its PROST assets to wildfire and proactively plan to reduce risks.

**Actions:**
- a. Emphasize forest health, including forest floor/soil health, and wildfire mitigation in the management plans for all Town property.
b. Work to implement wildfire mitigation in the greater Nederland area using the Nederland Community Wildfire Protection Plan as a guide to promote fuel reduction activities by area land owners.

c. Support and help coordinate wildfire mitigation efforts by Saws and Slaws, the USDA Forest Service, Boulder County, and others.

d. Actively pursue funding opportunities for forest health, including forest floor/soil health, and wild fire mitigation efforts in the greater Nederland area.

1.7. Make PROST-related community outreach and education a priority to promote a well-informed public.

**Actions:**

a. Continue and expand efforts to develop printed resources that educate and inform the public (e.g., trails maps, forest health, noxious weeds).

b. Continue to improve electronic communication efforts, including PROST pages on the Town of Nederland website.

c. Collaborate with local environmental education programs (e.g., TEENS, Inc., Wild Bear Mountain Ecology Center, and BVSD).

1.8. Consider parking, bicycle, and pedestrian needs for PROST assets, and encourage sustainable transportation at all PROST facilities.

**GOAL 2: Parks**

*Nederland-area parks are well-maintained and provide a diverse and abundant variety of environmentally and financially sustainable park facilities that adequately accommodate residents’ needs for indoor and outdoor recreation, social gathering places, and local and regional cultural events on a scale that is appropriate for the size and character of the town.*

**Objectives:**

2.1. Implement the Gateway Park Area Master Plan in order to expand social and recreational opportunities and enhance environmental stewardship.

**Actions:**

a. Name the gateway park area.

b. Identify existing conditions that require immediate attention for satisfying intended recreational purpose and improving ecosystem functionality.

c. Identify opportunities to protect and improve ecosystems and use sustainable strategies to improve existing recreational facilities.

d. Prioritize gateway park area improvements based on unmet recreational needs, ability to cost effectively improve ecosystem functionality, measured community priorities, availability of funding, partnership opportunities, etc.

e. Partner with local non-profit organizations (e.g., NedRec) to construct gateway park area improvements.

2.2. Improve safety and operation of Nederland Ice and Racquet Park for all users, including ice quality issues to alleviate skater safety concerns and extension of the effective ice season.
**Action:**
- Support the efforts of Racquets and Ice for Nederland Kids (R.I.N.K.) to identify and pursue funding for the construction of a shade structure that can accommodate both tennis and ice usage or other means including separate facilities for tennis and ice.

2.3. Continue to create and implement management plans for all Town parks to enhance sustainable operations. (Also see **Objective 1.5**.)

2.4. Standardize Town park fixtures to promote ease of maintenance and replacement and uniform appearance.

**Actions:**
- Select standard designs for trail signs, interpretive signage, kiosks, benches, picnic tables, etc.
- Develop selection process and set of guidelines for PROST amenities that encourage use of local recycled or rapidly renewable material and result in the lowest life cycle cost to the community.

2.5. Support efforts to provide facilities for community gardening to expand locally grown food and enhance community health.

**Actions:**
- Identify suitable locations for community gardens and greenhouse.
- Identify opportunities to partner with a local group to provide community gardening facilities.

2.6. Support efforts to create sustainable recreational opportunities for dog owners and their pets.

**Actions:**
- Explore the feasibility of a community dog park.
- Promote responsible dog guardianship by expanding availability of dog waste bag dispensers and evaluating Nederland park areas for off-leash suitability.
- Develop a compostable dog waste program.

**GOAL 3: Recreation**
*Nederland-area recreational activities and programs address the expressed recreational needs and preferences of the Nederland-area community and promote healthy, active, and culturally-rich lifestyles in an environmentally sensitive manner.*

**Objectives**
3.1. Support the measured need for indoor aquatic recreation by creatively exploring ways to compensate for Nederland’s lack of a pool.

**Actions:**
- Seek to negotiate agreements with area pools for a community discount.
- Support a reestablishment of the Gilpin Connector.
- Explore options to promote car-pooling among pool users.
d. Explore a partnership opportunities to build a community pool.

3.2. Institute a boating program on Barker Meadow Reservoir that meets the demonstrated need for local boating and enhances local recreational opportunities.

**Actions:**
- Negotiate with the City of Boulder to define a safe, environmentally and economically sustainable program for non-motorized boating that is acceptable to both parties.
- Partner with NedRec for program fundraising and management.

3.3. Develop the Nederland Community Center site to its full potential as a community gathering place for recreational, cultural, and social enrichment, in partnership with the Community Center Foundation Board when appropriate.

**Actions:**
- Complete a site plan for the Community Center property, including a plan to utilize or replace the west wing and return the outbuildings to active use.
- Collect and assess information to help identify opportunities to use sustainable strategies to guide the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of the site.
- Explore increasing hours of operation.
- Seek funding for construction of energy efficient, renewable-powered locker rooms and showers.

3.4. Negotiate a mutual use agreement with BVSD for outdoor recreational facility use to maximize and leverage public resources. (Also see Objective 1.1.)

3.5. Support area non-profit organizations offering critical recreational programming to the fullest extent possible (e.g., R.I.N.K., Peak to Peak Soccer, Nederland Youth Hockey Association, Nederland Tennis Association, TEENS, Inc.). (This is included in feasibility study for a district – see Objective 1.1.a.)

**Actions:**
- Explore feasibility of insurance coverage.
- Support the establishment of a common venue for local program registration.
- Explore providing Town support for facilities where possible (e.g., utilities, equipment, and expertise).

3.6. Support community demand for additional gardening opportunities (both communal and individual) to promote the health of the community.

**Actions:**
- Explore partnerships with local businesses to provide backyard gardening materials (e.g., composters, greenhouses) at a discount.
- Sponsor educational gardening presentations (e.g., by the State Extension Service or by successful local gardeners).
- Support creative approaches to mountain gardening (e.g., hugelkultur, vermicomposting).
3.7. Address the need for safe venues for recreational sport shooting. Acknowledge the negative community impacts of shooting at the old dump site off Magnolia Road, by supporting the efforts of the U.S. Forest Service to lead a multi-county task force to locate appropriately-sited venues for this activity.

**Actions:**
- Maintain close contact with the U.S. Forest Service and Boulder County to encourage their efforts and to feed progress reports back to the community.
- Communicate with state and national elected officials to support this effort.

3.8. Support a mix of recreational and cultural activities and programs responsive to the interests and needs of Nederland-area residents to support healthy, active, and culturally-rich lifestyles.

**Actions:**
- Enhance programs of interest to various age groups (e.g., music, talent night/open mic).
- Continue to support special events such as races, concerts, and festivals.
- Identify strategies to enhance fitness, cultural arts, multi-generational, and family programs through contract instructors, partnerships, or volunteers.
- Promote environmental education, interpretation, and stewardship through interpretive signage and stewardship activities such as those offered through the Wild Bear Mountain Ecology Center.
- Promote awareness of the history of Nederland through the Nederland Area Historical Society, incorporation of interpretive signage throughout Nederland, and historical walking tours.

**Goal 4: Open Space**
*The Nederland community’s desire for open space preservation is recognized by creative pursuit of land preservation opportunities that arise with a priority placed on preserving sensitive natural resources, viewsheds, and riparian areas and by responsible management of the Town’s open space property.*

**Objectives:**

4.1. Establish Town documentation for acquiring desirable open space property in order to pursue land preservation opportunities.

**Actions:**
- Compile list of potential open space acquisitions that score highly when evaluated according to the evaluation criteria in Appendix H.
- Maintain a list of potential funding partners for open space acquisition.

4.2. Develop Sustainability Analysis for current town-owned open space property for:
- Increasing ecosystem functionality
- Improving wildlife habitat
- Improving stormwater management by use of natural passive systems
- Water, natural resources, and current land use data
4.3. Implement management plans for current open space that emphasize best practices for forest health, including forest floor/soil health, wildfire mitigation, and site-appropriate public access. (Also see Objective 1.6.)

Goal 5: Trails
The Nederland-area trails system provides safe, accessible, and well-maintained multi-modal, non-motorized pathways that link Nederland’s commercial district, neighborhoods, schools, area parks, recreational facilities, and regional trails; encourage physical activity; and provide opportunities for alternative transportation.

Objectives:

5.1. Update the 2005 Town of Nederland Trails Master Plan to guide enhancements to the trail system.

Actions:
- Gather public input regarding needs for additional area trails and linkages.
- Encourage rebuilding plans for recreational trails and adjacent soil restoration in areas impacted by forest mitigation work.
- Update maps for existing trails, trail opportunities and constraints, and proposed trails.
- Revise trail design standards in keeping with current Town sustainability goals.

5.2. Find resources for effective trails maintenance and new trail construction.

Actions:
- Partner with groups such as the Mountain Youth Corps, Nederland Area Trails Organization (NATO), and Wildlands Restoration Volunteers to repair and maintain local trails.
- Seek grant funding for trails maintenance and construction.

5.3. Improve trail safety.

Actions:
- Identify needs for ground-level trail lighting (e.g., Community Center Connector Trail, Tungsten Trail) and find funding for installation and maintenance.
- Identify needs for safe roadway crossings (e.g., near Community Center) and seek funding for appropriate crossing solutions (that could include underpasses or overpasses).
- Make trails maintenance a priority.

5.4. Continue working with surrounding public and private land holders for increased linkages to area trails and attractions.

Actions:
- Participate in the management plan update process for Boulder County’s open space lands in the Nederland vicinity.
- Collaborate with the U.S. Forest Service and Boulder County to identify desirable trail linkages.
5.5. Develop the Tungsten Trail along Middle Boulder Creek and the western shoreline of Barker Reservoir as a riverwalk, with sensitivity towards both public needs for water access and preservation of riparian habitat.
Chapter 2. The Planning Context

This chapter provides context for the plan by highlighting the vision and mission of the Town of Nederland, the relationship of this Plan with other related plans, and the methodology and timeline for the master planning process.

A. Purpose of this Plan

The Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails (PROST) Master Plan will articulate a vision for and guide the Town of Nederland in planning for and delivering parks and recreation services for the next five to ten years. The plan provides a framework to respond to the evolving needs of the community and identifies priority areas for implementation.

B. Nederland Vision 2020

The Town of Nederland is guided by the following Vision 2020 statement. This provides an important framework for this Master Plan.

In Nederland, our greatest assets are our residents – the diverse people who live, work, play and contribute to all aspects of our unique mountain community.

Nederland is a complete community guided by a shared vision reflecting community values and priorities. It is a place where our children thrive and people connect; neighbors know and care for one another; and community members are proud of their town, their deep and rich history, and a quality of life that is both deliberate and second to none.

Our community proudly maintains its small-town feel and distinct identity – a small is beautiful, less is more approach. While our town has grown, we have remained true to our origins while internalizing a model of sustainability in which a healthy society comes from a healthy economy and a healthy environment is essential for both.

Additional elements of the Nederland Vision 2020 report related to topics of this Master Plan are excerpted below.

In 2020, Nederland is a town recognized for its trails, natural areas and unwavering commitment to the environment. Open spaces are abundant and balanced with active recreation areas and opportunities. Nederland’s surrounding wilderness area and other sensitive natural areas are restored, protected and preserved.
In 2020, Nederland continues to focus planning and economic development activities on efforts that address:

- Alternative energy sources to fossil fuels for transportation
- Alternatives for building and the use of sustainable materials
- Non-motorized travel in town
- Clean air, clean water and water conservation in and around Nederland
- Connections to the outdoor environment providing active, healthy lifestyles for people of all ages
- Minimal/reduced light and noise pollution
- Focused community education programs and stewardship to reduce environmental impact fostering agricultural, economical and community sustainability

In 2020, Nederland provides arts and culture, education and community activities that include the entire community and provide opportunities for youth.

In 2020, Nederland’s economy encourages and welcomes new, non-traditional economic models, the responsible management of tourism and stewardship of the environment. The community consistently recognizes and responsibly encourages the thoughtful and meaningful relationship between recreation, culture and the economy.

(Source: Draft Envision Nederland 2020 Process Report, June 30, 2011)

C. Accomplishments from Previous Plan

As previously mentioned, this PROST Master Plan is an update of the 2001 Town of Nederland and Surrounding Areas Open Space, Trails, Parks and Outdoor Recreation Master Plan. Over the last decade, several key goals of that plan have been met, in full or in part.

- Appointment of an official advisory body to oversee implementation of the Plan and make recommendations on decisions that affect open space, trails, parks, and outdoor recreation
- Develop an outdoor skate park that serves as both an ice skating rink in the winter and a skateboard park in the summer (Note: two separate parks were created)
- Active and aggressive pursuit of potential funding sources partnerships with other government agencies and non-profit organizations
- Provide high quality and safe recreational experiences for trail users by establishing a well-marked and maintained multiple-use trail system
- Acquisitions of Mud Lake and Wingate open space areas

These accomplishments were realized through community collaboration and partnerships (notably the ice skating rink and Nathan Lazarus Skate Park) that leveraged resources from many sources, including Great Outdoor Colorado (GOCO) funds, in-kind contributions from Town staff, foundation grants, and funds and in-kind contributions from non-profit partners.

While significant progress has been made since the 2001 Plan, some recommendations were not addressed and will be carried forward in this Master Plan update, including creating “a gateway park to the Town of Nederland at the west end of Barker Reservoir to East 1st Street.”
D. Relationship to Other Plans

This PROST Master Plan is an update of the Town of Nederland and Surrounding Areas Open Space, Trails, Parks, and Outdoor Recreation Master Plan (September 2001). This plan is informed by and relates to other Town plans including the Envision Nederland 2020 Process Report (July 2011) and the Town of Nederland Trails Master Plan (August 2005).

Envision 2020 goals are reflected in this plan including – trail connections and non-motorized travel in town; opens spaces balanced with active recreation areas and opportunities; alternatives for building and the use of sustainable materials; water conservation; connections to the outdoor environment providing active, healthy lifestyles for people of all ages; arts and culture, education, and community activities that include the entire community and provide opportunities for youth; and responsible management of tourism and the stewardship of the environment. (See goals of Nederland Vision 2020 in Section B earlier in this chapter for additional information.)

The Nederland Comprehensive Plan Update process ran concurrent to the PROST master planning process. The intention is for this PROST Master Plan to be adopted as a part of the Comprehensive Plan in 2013.

In addition, other Town documents were reviewed including financial information, annual reports, and past community surveys. References to these documents are made in relevant sections of this Plan.

E. Methodology and Timeline of Planning Process

This project has been guided by a Steering Committee made up of stakeholders and staff that met with the GreenPlay consultant team and provided input throughout the planning process. This collaborative effort fully utilizes the consultant’s expertise and incorporates local knowledge and institutional history. The project consisted of the following phases and tasks.

PHASE 1: INFORMATION GATHERING January-April 2012

Community & Stakeholder Input Process
1. Conducted public meeting and focus groups
2. Received guidance from Steering Committee

Survey
1. Conducted statistically-valid survey of Nederland-area residents
2. Provided additional open web-based survey

Inventory and Assessment of Existing Facilities and Services
1. Conducted inventory and analysis of parks and recreation facilities and services
2. Identified key issues and opportunities

Demographic and Trends Analysis
1. Analyzed Town demographics and population projections
2. Identified parks and recreation-related trends
PHASE 2: FINDINGS & VISIONING  
May-June 2012

1. Presented key findings to the Steering Committee and public
2. Validated findings
3. Identified focus areas for recommendations

PHASE 3: PLAN DEVELOPMENT & REVIEW  
July 2012-January 2013

1. Developed Draft Master Plan
2. Presented Draft Master Plan to Steering Committee; Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Board; Sustainability Advisory Board; Nederland Community Center Foundation Board; Nederland Downtown Development Authority; and Planning Commission
3. Refined plan based on feedback

PLAN ADOPTION  
February 2013
Chapter 3. Our Community and Identified Needs

Understanding community demographics and needs is an important component of planning for future parks and recreation services and facilities in Nederland. This chapter of the Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan first provides a demographic overview of Nederland. Then, it highlights results of the statistically-valid survey and the public process. Next, recreation trends impacting Nederland are summarized. The chapter concludes with a summary of key findings.

A. Community Profile and Demographics

Nederland Context
Nederland is located in southwestern Boulder County, 17 miles west of Boulder. The Town occupies the gently sloping Middle Boulder Creek basin and extends west to the base of a long, forested glacial ridge; north to Mud Lake Open Space; and south along the forested ridges above Barker Reservoir.

Native Americans hunted in the mountain and meadows in the Nederland area. It was not until the late 1800s that the Town of Nederland began as a settlement for gold, silver, and later, tungsten miners. It grew through successive mining booms and drew thousands of residents to the area in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Early growth was spurred primarily by the 1871 development of the famous Caribou Mill. The Town had around 3,000 residents at its peak (twice the size it is today).

In the 1920s, tourism helped Nederland rebound from the bust that followed the tungsten boom of World War I. From 1990 to 2000, the population of Nederland grew 27 percent. Today Nederland has a population of over 1,400 and serves a larger area population. The Town attracts tourists and is a popular jumping off point for outdoor recreation activities. Nederland is located along the Peak to Peak Scenic Byway that travels from Central City to Estes Park. Residents, as well as tourists, enjoy outdoor recreation – hiking, biking, camping, fishing, and horseback riding in summer and skiing, snowboarding, and snowshoeing in winter. The Nederland community especially values its natural features, scenic views, history, and sense of community.

Demographics
The demographic profile for the Town of Nederland was created using ESRI Business Information Solutions, Inc. This report reviews demographic data, including comparisons between the Town and Boulder County in the areas of household income and age.

In 2011, the Town of Nederland’s population was 1,465. The annual rate of population growth from 2011 to 2016 is projected to be small at .86% (and increase of less than 100). It is important to note that the Town of Nederland draws participation in programs and services from a larger service area. The Town estimated the Library District population to be about 4,043 in 2012. (Note: The Library District boundaries are used as the study area for this Master Plan.)
**Age**

The age distribution of Nederland is compared to Boulder County. Nederland has slightly higher percentages of population in the 35-64 age cohorts and lower percentages of the population in the older age cohorts (65+). The median age for Nederland is 39.4, higher than the County (35.9). As the community ages, the Town will need to design and plan facilities and services with consideration to the needs and interests of older adults, including those that are more active.

**Figure 1: 2011 Age Distribution Comparison**

The following age breakdown is used to separate the population into age sensitive user groups.

- **Under 5 years:** This group represents users of preschool programs and facilities. As trails and open space users, this age group is often in strollers. These individuals are the future participants in youth activities.

- **5 to 14 years:** This group represents current youth program participants.

- **15 to 24 years:** This group represents teen/young adult program participants moving out of the youth programs and into adult programs. Members of this age group are often seasonal employment seekers.

- **25 to 34 years:** This group represents potential adult program participants. Many in this age group are beginning long-term relationships and establishing families.

- **35 to 54 years:** This group represents users of a wide range of adult programming and park facilities. Their characteristics extend from having children using preschool and youth programs to becoming empty nesters.
• 55 to 64 years: This group represents users of older adult programming exhibiting the characteristics of approaching retirement or already retired and typically enjoying grandchildren.

• 65 years plus: Nationally, this group will be increasing dramatically. Pew Research reports that by the time all Baby Boomers turn 65 in 2030, 15 percent of the nation’s population will be at least that old. Recreation centers, senior centers, and senior programs can be a significant link in the health care system. This group ranges from very healthy, active seniors to more physically inactive seniors.

**Household Income**

According to ESRI Business Information Solutions, the estimated median household income for the Town of Nederland is $65,892, lower than the County ($73,175). A comparison of household income, as shown in **Figure 2**, illustrates that the majority of residents are in the $50,000-$150,000 income range. According to ESRI, in 2010 the annual average amount spent on entertainment and recreation by household in Nederland was $3,883. This amount does not include travel.

The 2012 *Nederland Community Survey* indicated that 11 percent of respondents cited “price/user fees” as a reason why they did not use Nederland programs and facilities. While ability to pay does not appear to be a top issue in Nederland, fee reduction or scholarship programs are important to enable program participation by interested residents and should be considered for future program planning. For example, some area recreational facilities allow users of recreational services to volunteer in lieu of paying user fees, including the Nederland Community Center and the Nederland Ice and Racquet Park.

**Figure 2: 2010 Households by Income Comparison – Nederland, Boulder County**

![Figure 2: 2010 Households by Income Comparison – Nederland, Boulder County](image)

**Source:** ESRI Business Information Solutions 2010 Market Profile

---

**Active Adults**

Over half (53.3%) of the Nederland estimated 2011 population is between 35-64 years old, higher than Boulder County (41%). Planning for adult and multi-generational recreation opportunities will be important.
Demographic Trend Analysis Summary
In summary, key demographic trends to reference for future planning efforts in Nederland are the following.

- The estimated 2011 population in Nederland is 1,465.
- The median age for Nederland is 39.4, higher than Boulder County (35.9).
- Median household income for the Town of Nederland is $65,892; lower than the Boulder County ($73,175).
- Population change in Nederland is projected to show a slight increase from 2011-2016 at an annual rate of 0.86 percent.

B. Statistically-Valid Survey Results

Methodology
The purpose of the statistically-valid survey conducted for this Master Plan was to gather public feedback on Nederland area open space, trails, and park and recreation programs and services. The survey targeted residents of Nederland, as well as households that live in the area immediately adjacent to the Town.

The survey was conducted using three methods: 1) an online invitation-only survey, 2) a paper mailback survey distributed upon request, and 3) an open-link online survey for members of the public that did not respond using the invitation survey form.

The three versions of the survey garnered 361 responses from within the Town of Nederland and the surrounding area contained within the Library District. Responses were obtained from survey invitations that were sent by postcard to 2,704 local households, followed by an “Open Link” survey that provided opportunities for interested citizens that had not responded to the Invitation Survey to participate. The invitation version of the survey got a response from 291 households, and the open link captured another 70, for a total of 361 responses.

The survey contained a series of questions designed to measure recreation behavior and perceptions by area residents. In addition, there were numerous opportunities for survey participants to respond in their own words to “open ended” questions. The survey report in Appendix A summarizes findings from the statistical analysis of results. In addition, open ended responses have been provided under separate cover. These comments are extensive; there are over 100 pages of input.

The data suggest that area residents are using recreation programs and facilities provided by a number of different entities. The most mentioned sources included U.S. Forest Service lands and Boulder County Open Space lands, but there were over 20 different providers identified, all offering recreational opportunities.

The survey focused on local residents and their opinions. A number of the open ended comments stressed that residents, not tourists, should receive primary attention in Town planning efforts.

Following is a summary of select survey findings. The full survey report is in Appendix A which includes additional analysis of program needs and opinions on parks, recreation, open space, and trails.
Selected Findings

Parks and recreational opportunities are important to area residents. Respondents to the survey from the Nederland area indicated that the availability of local parks and recreational opportunities in the Town are very important, with an average rating of over 4 on a 5-point scale where 5 means “extremely important.” Eighty-three percent (83%) of respondents rated the importance of parks and recreational opportunities a “4” or “5.”

Activities and programs that are important to be added, expanded, or improved. The list below provides a rank ordering of relative importance of the top rated categories based on a list of 21 categories.

- Biking/hiking/running
- Indoor swimming/aquatics
- Non-motorized boating
- Events (e.g., movies, concerts, festivals)
- Cultural/arts/dance/music/crafts
- Snow and ice activities

Facilities to be added, expanded, or improved. The survey evaluated priorities of the community, both in town and in the larger area (Library District Boundary). Results from the two groups are very similar. Based on a list of 31 categories, the eight most identified facilities in approximate rank order included:

- Open space/conservation land
- Pedestrian/bike paths (soft surface)
- Community gardens
- Indoor swimming pool
- Community greenhouse
- The proposed gateway park at the end of Barker Reservoir
- Boating on the Reservoir
- An outdoor amphitheater

In a related question, respondents were asked to pick their top three priorities from the list. This question resulted in the following five choices being most identified by both residents of the Town and the remainder of the Library District area.

- Indoor swimming pool
- Boating on the reservoir (non-motorized)
- Open space/conservation land
- Pedestrian bike paths (soft surface)
- The proposed gateway park

(Note: See additional analysis on swimming/aquatic facilities in Chapter 6 in the Nederland Community Center section.)

Boating on the Reservoir. Slightly over 6 in 10 Nederland area respondents indicate support for a boating program on the reservoir, measured by a “4” or “5” on a 5-point scale where “5” is “definitely support.”

These results vary somewhat by whether the respondent lives in town versus outside of Nederland, with slightly higher support from those outside. Further, while there is a significant group that did not support boating among town residents (about 3 in 10), the negative sentiment is weaker in the County.
Interestingly, on this issue, there are few respondents that are neutral. Overall, less than 10 percent gave boating a “3” or “neutral” on the scale. While a majority are in favor overall, residents are generally on one side or the other of this issue.

Figure 3: Survey Results – Boating on Barker Reservoir

![Survey Results Chart]

The Gateway Park Area. The survey probed various policy aspects of the gateway park area. There is strong support and consensus around “Improving/protecting water quality” (almost 9 in 10 “definitely” or “probably support”) and “Creating a unique gateway and identity for Nederland” (about 7 in 10). Further, there is very little support for “Discouraging people from using this location for recreational purposes” (less than 10% support this alternative). Enthusiasm for active recreation on the site is less clear, although a majority of respondents (50% plus) show support for all of the alternative policy choices.

C. Community and Stakeholder Input

In addition to the statistically-valid survey, several community and stakeholder input opportunities were provided to gain valuable feedback about the current state and the future of parks, recreation, open space, and trails in the Nederland area. The process that was undertaken included:

- Five community focus groups
  - Teens (one at TEENS, Inc. and one at the high school)
  - Active Recreation
  - Seniors
  - Business
  - Conservation, Open Space, and Trails
- Three public meetings (at various stages of the planning process)
- Two public workshops to gain input on the gateway park area site master plan

The notes from the six community focus groups and the first public meeting held are found in Appendix B, summarizing input from over 120 area resident and stakeholder meeting attendees.

The following is an overview of the community opinions from the face-to-face meetings held in January and February 2012.
Community Input

Focus group and public meeting participants were asked a variety of questions regarding Nederland area parks and recreation facilities, programs, and services. Themes from the responses to questions about current strengths, issues/needs/problems, and opportunities are summarized in the boxes that follow.

**Strengths**
- Dedicated volunteers and non-profit organizations
- Strong community ownership
- Diversity of facilities – Nederland Community Center, ice/tennis park, skate park, Chipeta Park
- Surrounding open space and trails (e.g., Mud Lake, Caribou Ranch, U.S. Forest Service)
- Community programs and special events
- Walkable, accessible recreation

**Key Issues & Values**
- Guiding vision provided by Nederland Vision 2020
- Interest in balancing active and passive recreational opportunities
- Fragmented recreational programming and communication
- Over reliance on volunteers
- Lack of capital and operational funding
- Management of visitors (e.g., parking, traffic congestion)

**Opportunities for Improvements**
- Trail linkages
- Barker Reservoir and Middle Boulder Creek corridor
- Community Center enhancements (e.g., expanded hours, fitness equipment, renovation of west wing)
- Interest in additional amenities like a dog park, community gardens, bike pump track, etc.
- Improvements to existing facilities (e.g., athletic field, Chipeta Park restrooms, etc.)
- Central coordination of recreation services and volunteers
- Communication
- Funding and leveraging resources

Residents expressed appreciation for the diversity of recreational opportunities – both passive and active – available in and around Nederland. They identified the following benefits of parks and recreation in the community:
- Quality of life
- Health
- Community building
- Economic development – managing the impacts of visitors to the benefit of the whole community
D. Trends

Trend Analysis Summary
The following are key behavioral trends reflective of the Town. These will be important to evaluate for future planning efforts.

- According to the 2010 National Sporting Goods Association, some of the top ten athletic activities ranked by total participation in the U.S. included: exercise walking, exercising with equipment, swimming, camping, bicycle riding, hiking, and working out at athletic clubs. All of these activities are available in Nederland, except for swimming.
- Following are some trends reported in the Recreational Management Magazine’s, June 2011 “State of the Industry Report.”
  - The most common programs offered in communities are holiday events and other special events; fitness programs; educational programs; day camps and summer camps; mind-body/balance programs such as yoga, tai chi, Pilates, and martial arts; and youth sports teams. Many of these activities are offered in Nederland by various groups, but program offerings are limited.
  - Fitness programs, educational programs, teen programs, mind body balance, and active older adults were listed at the top of the ten programs parks and recreation departments are planning to add within the next three years.
- National trends in the delivery of parks and recreation systems reflect more partnerships and contractual agreements to support specialized services. As a small town, Nederland relies heavily on volunteers and partnerships to provide parks and recreation services.
- Obesity continues to be a serious issue in the United States, growing at an epidemic rate—almost tripling since 1990. In fact, about one in three adults is currently considered obese. This statistic illustrates the importance of intercepting the epidemic in youth. Currently, 27.5 percent of people in the United States are obese. Parks and recreation services can play a significant role in promoting community public health.
- The majority of Americans agree that preserving undeveloped land for outdoor recreation is important. A large percentage of outdoor participants also believe that developing local parks and hiking and walking trails is important.

See Appendix C for more detailed trends information.

E. Summary

Nederland has a population of over 1,400 and serves a larger area population. The Town attracts tourists and is a popular jumping off point for outdoor recreation activities. Residents, as well as tourists, enjoy outdoor recreation – hiking, biking, camping, fishing, and horseback riding in the summer and skiing, snowboarding, and snowshoeing in winter – and many other activities like playing soccer and ice hockey and skateboarding.
Through the public meetings and focus groups held as part of master planning process many strengths of the parks, recreation, open space, and trails system were identified: surrounding open space and trails, diversity of facilities in Town, and dedicated volunteers and non-profit organizations. The top ranked facilities to be added, expanded, or improved according to the survey included trails, community gardens, indoor swimming pool, community greenhouse, the gateway park, boating on Barker Reservoir, and an outdoor amphitheater. There are opportunities to explore these priorities. Additional resources and partnerships would be needed to help realize improvements. However, it is unlikely that an indoor swimming pool would be feasible to build and run due to high operating costs, unless significant additional resources were to be identified. (See additional aquatics analysis in Chapter 6 and recommendations to increase access to existing area aquatic facilities in Chapter 7.)
Chapter 4. Inventory Assessment

This chapter provides an overview of the Nederland area parks, recreation, open space, and trails inventory. Inventory has been analyzed using maps and other tools. This chapter concludes with a summary of key findings.

A. Inventory Overview

Parks, Recreation, and Trails
The Town of Nederland and neighboring public lands provide a host of open space amenities, trails, parks, and outdoor recreational opportunities. A tabulation of the total land area and recreational features within each of these lands is shown in Appendix D. Nederland’s close proximity to Arapaho Roosevelt National Forest, Indian Peaks Wilderness Area, and Boulder County Open Space offers residents and visitors unique opportunities to hike, bike, fish, horseback ride, and ski in, or within a short distance of Town.

Existing Opportunities – Town of Nederland

Trails: The 2005 Town of Nederland Trails Master Plan identifies existing trails in the Nederland area and discusses potential opportunities for improving the system of trails. A variety of trails are located throughout the study area. These are primarily soft-surface trails, many of which are not formally maintained. Trails also exist throughout the open space lands managed by Boulder County and the U.S. Forest service, providing miles of opportunities for hiking and mountain biking. However, multi-use trails as a means of getting around, and places where children can learn to ride a bike, were mentioned during the public input process as being needed in Nederland. In particular, a trail to provide access from downtown to the high school was mentioned as a need.

One important trail within the Town of Nederland begins at the covered bridge downtown and proceeds easterly through Chipeta Park and the gateway park area, then along the north shore of Barker Reservoir to the dam, a total distance of approximately 1.8 miles. There is a desire among local residents to find a way to continue this trail towards the east and also provide a way to cross Middle Boulder Creek below the dam and continue the trail back towards downtown as a loop along the south side of Barker Reservoir. Accomplishing this would require a bridge and access to private lands. Another maintained and marked trail extends from Eldora Road to Mud Lake. This trail includes interpretive signage.

Sidewalk connections also can contribute to trail connectivity by providing safe off-road links between destinations within Nederland, especially the downtown area.

Parks: The two main parks within the Nederland town limits include Chipeta Park and Joe Smith Park. Recreation facilities at Chipeta Park include a basketball court, fishing pond for children, group picnic facilities, and a playground. Joe Smith Park is slightly smaller than Chipeta Park and lacks any formal recreation facilities.
**Fishing:** Barker Reservoir provides the main fishing opportunities within Town limits. Here, shoreline fishing is a popular activity during the summer. The Colorado Division of Wildlife (DOW) stocks the reservoir with different fish species including rainbow trout. Just above Barker Reservoir, there are additional fishing opportunities along portions of Middle Boulder Creek.

**Recreation Programs:** A variety of recreation programs are offered by non-profit organizations and private instructors in the Nederland area. Fitness and cultural activities are offered at the Nederland Community Center. See Chapter 6 for additional information.

**Outdoor/Environmental Education:** At the northernmost boundary of the Town of Nederland lies Mud Lake where the Town of Nederland, Boulder County, and the Wild Bear Mountain Ecology Center jointly purchased 185 acres of open space in the fall of 2000. The long-term goal is to develop a Nature Center on four acres of this property. As of 2010, the Wild Bear Center opened a small nature center in downtown Nederland. The Wild Bear provides year-round environmental education programming for all ages, including day camps, afterschool programs, outreach programs for schools, and family workshops.

**Sports Fields:** The Nederland Community School Program rents out the soccer and baseball fields at Nederland Elementary School. These fields are available to the public when students are not using them for after school sports activities.

The Town baseball field is located on the eastern edge of the Town just off of 1st Street. The baseball field is used for both baseball and softball during the summer and fall. It is also used for special events, such as festivals and concerts. Though heavily used, the field is in poor condition due to infertile soil and other issues.

**Ice and Racquet Recreation:** Since completion of the 2001 Master Plan, a citizen initiative resulted in the development of the Nederland Ice and Racquet Park on Town-owned land. The facility is maintained by the non-profit organization, RINK (Racquets and Ice for Nederland Kids). It is a dual-use facility that has three tennis courts during warmer months and a regulation-sized hockey rink in the winter. This is accomplished by volunteer workers who move one-third of the perimeter boards between two positions in the spring and fall to accommodate the outer dimensions of either the tennis courts or the ice rink. Because the facility is open to the sky, the quality of the ice during the skating season is impacted by the sun and can present a safety concern. The RINK board is implementing various approaches to improve the quality of the ice in the short term, but feels that ultimately a shade structure that can accommodate both tennis and ice usage will have to be constructed to continue to operate an outdoor ice facility in a warming climate.

During the warm months of the year, the Town's Ice and Racquet Park has three tennis courts that are available to the public. Leveraging on U.S. Tennis Association (USTA) and Colorado Tennis Association grants, the courts have also been lined to provide multiple smaller courts for USTA sanctioned 10 and under youth tennis programs that supports lessons and opportunities to play for area kids.

**Skateboarding:** The Nathan Lazarus Skatepark is located in the gateway park area next to the Teen Center. This amenity is highly valued by the skating community and provides an important amenity for the youth of the community.
Other Attractions: A recent attraction added to downtown Nederland is the Carousel of Happiness. This historic carousel has 56 whimsical, hand-carved animals to ride. The carousel is run by a non-profit organization and includes a gift shop and small party room and play area upstairs.

Table 1 summarizes the indoor facilities found within the study area. The Nederland Community Center provides the primary venue for indoor activities and includes community meeting space, a gymnasium, fitness facilities, an auditorium, and multi-purpose space.

Another primary venue is the Teen Center, which has a gymnasium and several multi-purpose spaces. It is a popular drop-in space and provides an important service for local youth.

The Nederland Library, built in 2010, is another important indoor space that includes an attractive and well-appointed multi-purpose room that is used for meetings and other events.

The Visitor Center provides a small indoor space that is used to orient visitors and disseminate information, and offers public restrooms within the downtown area.

Several other unique indoor spaces are provided by private providers, such as the Carousel. This facility houses a hand-built fully-operational carousel and is the venue for birthday parties and other social events. There are also two museums that are open at various times.

Table 1: Indoor Inventory in Nederland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Amusement Ride</th>
<th>Auditorium/Theater</th>
<th>Small Theater</th>
<th>Fitness/Dance</th>
<th>Food-Café/Concessions</th>
<th>Gymnasium</th>
<th>Kitchen-Kitchenette</th>
<th>Lobby/Entryway</th>
<th>Multi-Purpose Room</th>
<th>Patio/Outdoor Seating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors Center</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carousel</td>
<td>Non-Profit Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillaspie House</td>
<td>Non-Profit Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Center</td>
<td>Non-Profit Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining Museum</td>
<td>Town (managed by Boulder County)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing Opportunities: Nederland Service Area

Just outside the Town of Nederland, Arapaho Roosevelt National Forest and Boulder County Open Space provide an array of parks, trails, and outdoor recreational opportunities. Below is a list of opportunities for the Nederland area.

Winter Sports: The Nederland area offers numerous opportunities for winter sports such as downhill and cross-country skiing, snowboarding, and snowshoeing. For downhill skiing and snowboarding, Eldora Mountain Resort offers over 680 acres and 1,400 vertical feet of terrain. Eldora Mountain Resort’s Nordic Center, located at the base of the downhill ski slopes and extending onto more moderate terrain just north of the resort, provides about 28 miles of cross-country ski trails.

The Town’s ice rink provides ice skating, youth and adult hockey programs, curling leagues, and broomball during the winter months.

In addition, numerous cross-country ski trails can be found at the following locations.

- Jenny Creek Trail
- Hessie Trailhead
- West Magnolia Trails
- Rainbow Lakes Road
- Caribou Townsite/Caribou Park/Caribou Flats

Backcountry Huts: Two backcountry huts in the Nederland area – Guinn Mountain Hut and Tennessee Mountain Cabin – are located in Arapaho Roosevelt National Forest and are open for year round use. The Colorado Mountain Club oversees the Guinn Mountain Hut, which sleeps seven to eight people and is located about five miles from the Eldora Nordic Center Trailhead. Guinn Mountain Hut is situated at about 11,120 feet in elevation. Access to this hut requires a skilled navigator, because it is not located along a major trail.

Reservations for the Tennessee Mountain Cabin can be made with the Eldora Nordic Center. The Tennessee Mountain Cabin is about two miles from the Eldora Nordic Center and accommodates up to ten people. The cabin is situated at about 9,860 feet, and provides access to numerous cross-country skiing opportunities. The cabin is closed in the summer.

Rock Climbing: Platte Rogers Open Space has numerous opportunities for rock climbing at High Energy Crag, Frisky Cliff, Castle Rock, and Mountain Rose Crag, as well as ice climbing during the winter just west of Castle Rock.
**Hiking Trails:** About three miles west of Nederland is the Hessie Trailhead, which provides access to King Lake, Woodland Lake, and Jasper Lake, and the Fourth of July Trail. Trails extending from the Hessie Trailhead and the Fourth of July Trailhead provide access to Indian Peaks Wilderness – a popular destination for Front Range hikers and backpackers. About ten miles northwest of Nederland is the Rainbow Lakes Trail, which also extends into Indian Peaks Wilderness.

Additional hiking opportunities exist on the many trails in Reynolds Ranch and Mud Lake. Most of the trails in the Reynolds Ranch area are on National Forest lands along Magnolia Road, including the Front Range Trails. Additional hiking trails are in the West Magnolia and the Caribou Town site/Caribou Flats/Caribou Park area.

**Campgrounds:** There are three developed campgrounds in the Nederland area including: Buckingham Campground at the Fourth of July trailhead (located at the northwest terminus of County Road 111); Rainbow Lakes trailhead (located just east of Indian Peaks Wilderness along Forest Road 298); and Kelly Dahl Campground (located four miles south of Nederland on S.H. 119 between the intersection of S.H. 72 and Rollinsville).

**Parks and Open Space:** Open space areas managed by Boulder County Parks and Open Space are available for passive recreational use such as hiking, photography or nature studies, and if specifically designated, bicycling, horseback riding, or fishing. Such areas include Reynolds Ranch, the Mud Lake Open Space property (managed by Boulder County, the Town of Nederland, and the Wild Bear Mountain Ecology Center), and Caribou Ranch Open Space.

**Horseback Riding:** Horseback riding opportunities exist throughout Arapaho Roosevelt National Forest. One of the more popular areas for horseback riding is located just southwest of Nederland where numerous informal trails are located in Arapaho Roosevelt National Forest. Riders often share trails with hikers and even ORVs. Some horseback riding also occurs on trails located near Magnolia Road. Sundance Riding Stables operates during the summer.

**Fishing:** Shoreline fishing for rainbow and brook trout is available on Middle Boulder Creek at Rainbow Lakes, and lakes within the Indian Peaks Wilderness. Currently, the Division of Wildlife does not stock Middle Boulder Creek with trout.

**Mountain Biking:** Mountain biking is one of the most popular outdoor recreational activities on the Front Range, and there are numerous opportunities for mountain biking in the Nederland area. The West Magnolia trail system is the epicenter of Nederland mountain biking and the most popular, consisting of approximately 30 miles of single and double track trails. The West Magnolia trail system can be easily connected to the trails to the East, known as the “Dots” or “Boy Scout Trails” and to the North and West, known as the “505 to Caribou.” These additional trails provide yet another approximately 30 miles of single and double track trails. Around town, the Mud Lake trails, the Ridge Road trail system, and the “Sherwood Forest” trail system provide yet another 15 miles of trails. From easy fire roads to challenging downhill accents and descents, Nederland-area mountain biking has it all.

**Off-Road Driving:** Opportunities for four-wheel drive vehicles exist along FDR 505 and FDR 355.
Open Space

The Town of Nederland is situated close to important open space areas such as the Reynolds Ranch, Caribou Ranch, and Mud Lake Open Space, as well as extensive National Forest and federally-designated wilderness lands.

Based on current GIS information from Boulder County, it has 3,132 acres of publicly-owned open space located within the study area for this plan, which accounts for nearly seven percent of the total acres within the study area boundary. This number does not include Mud Lake, which is jointly-owned by Boulder County and the Town of Nederland.

These areas provide important wildlife habitats, buffers between development, and abundant recreational opportunities around the Town of Nederland.

Public land agencies are faced with balancing the protection of natural areas with managing public access to enjoy these areas through recreational uses like trails. Nederland will need to continue to responsibly manage its parks and open spaces through the development of management plans to ensure a logical balance between conservation and recreation. In addition, the Town should continue to collaborate with the U.S. Forest Service and Boulder County Parks and Open Space on land management concerns in surrounding open space areas.

Open Space – Town of Nederland

Mud Lake Open Space: Mud Lake is part of a 195-acre open space property purchased jointly in 1999 by the Town of Nederland, Boulder County Parks and Open Space, and the Wild Bear Mountain Ecology Center. During the summer of 2000, over 130 volunteers helped remove 30 tons of trash from the lake and its surrounding area. Restoration efforts at Mud Lake have been ongoing since this time.

The Wild Bear Mountain Ecology Center owns a five-acre parcel at the site and uses the property for daytime, hands-on educational programs. Their long-term goal is to develop an off-grid nature center on the site.

Wingate Open Space: The Wingate Open Space area is approximately 16 acres. (The Town entered into a lease/purchase agreement in September 2000 for a portion of the property, and another portion of the open space area was gifted.) Passive trail uses are permitted here. The Nederland Parks, Recreation and Open Space Advisory Board (PROSAB) is developing a management plan for this site.

Open Space – Nederland Area

Caribou Ranch: Caribou Ranch is located about two miles northwest of the Town of Nederland and is the largest open space property that Boulder County Parks and Open Space oversees in the Nederland Area. Caribou Ranch encompasses about 3,589 acres (2,100 acres of which is owned outright and 1,489 acres under easement).

Platte Rogers Memorial Park: The westernmost corner of Platte Rogers Memorial Park (Platte Rogers) extends into the Nederland area one mile east of Barker Reservoir. Boulder County purchased Platte
Rogers in October 1994. Primary reasons for the acquisition of Platte Rogers were preservation of approximately three miles of Middle Boulder Creek riparian corridor; preservation of the viewshed along this segment of SH 119; preservation of the value of the property to wildlife because much of the property has been relatively inaccessible to people; and the inexpensive purchase price of less than $1,000/acre (BCPOS 2000a).

Platte Rogers continues to be managed in accordance with adopted County goals and policies outlined in the Boulder County Master Plan. Additional management directives for the property outlined by Boulder County Parks and Open Space in the Platte Rogers Memorial Park, Reynolds Ranch, and Rogers Property Management Plan (2000) were established to:

- Protect scenic quality
- Preserve ecosystem functions
- Protect significant plant and animal communities
- Preserve the cultural, historical, geological, and archaeological integrity of the area
- Encourage and plan for naturally occurring processes
- Maintain and encourage desirable native species
- Protect wildlife habitat
- Provide passive outdoor recreational opportunities which do not adversely impact sensitive resources
- Provide opportunities for continued research, and environmental and cultural interpretation
- Provide a “good neighbor” policy to adjacent landowners

In addition, the Platte Rogers Memorial Park, Reynolds Ranch, and Rogers Property Management Plan envisions a major conservation area retained for the benefit of plants and animals in the area. This area covers rugged terrain and secluded natural features that make it important habitat for large mammals such as black bears and mountain lions. (It should be noted that Boulder County was in the process of updating the management plans for these properties in 2012.)

**Rogers Property:** The 88-acre Rogers Property was acquired in November 1997 by Boulder County to protect the scenic corridor in Boulder Canyon and to preserve ¼ mile of high quality riparian habitat along Middle Boulder Creek. Management directives guiding land use management and planning are the same as those outlined for the Platte Rogers Memorial Park.

**Reynolds Ranch:** Boulder County began acquiring the 850-acre Reynolds Ranch in April 1995 and completed the acquisition in 1999. The property was purchased by Boulder County to preserve an important movement corridor and habitat for wildlife, to protect important wetlands, and to preserve the viewshed along Magnolia Road. In addition, Boulder County Open Space identified a high priority conservation area on the property that covers important wildlife movement corridors and is critical range for elk. Currently, the Reynolds family is leasing back approximately 370 acres of the ranch (called Reynolds Homestead) for grazing cattle and use of the residence for 20 years until 2015. Management directives guiding land use management and planning are the same as those outlined for the Platte Rogers Memorial Park.

**Arapaho Ranch:** The Arapaho Ranch near Nederland was preserved as a wildlife refuge through the grant of two conservation easements in 1987 and a third in 1991. The 690-acre ranch encompasses the
main portion of the valley floor between the towns of Nederland and Eldora and is home to over 200 varieties of plants and wildflowers and over 140 species of birds. Through the conservation easement, future development of the site has been restricted to a small number of sites.

Other: The single largest contributor to open space in the Nederland Area is the U.S. Forest Service. Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forest lands are located throughout the Nederland area and provide a host of open space amenities. (Note: these are two distinct National Forests within a single management district.) In addition, Indian Peaks Wilderness, which includes about 71,391 acres, crosses much of the western portion of the Nederland area. Although the Indian Peaks Wilderness Area is one of the most heavily used wilderness areas in the United States, there are numerous opportunities to explore its many hiking trails and recreational opportunities.

B. Inventory Analysis

As part of the 2012 Master Plan update, a detailed inventory and analysis of lands and facilities in the Nederland area was conducted. The purpose of this analysis is to evaluate how facilities and parks in Nederland are provided for the community.

Background

The process used for this analysis included the assembly of a detailed inventory of the public and semi-public physical assets found within a defined study boundary and available for use by the community of Nederland. The study area boundary used was the boundary of the Nederland Library District.

Creating the Assets Inventory

The inventory of assets was created to serve the Town in a number of ways. In addition to this plan, it can be used for a wide variety of planning and operations tasks, such as asset management and future strategic and master plans. The assets inventory currently includes a variety of assets from multiple providers including public parks, recreation, and trails assets managed by the Town of Nederland, Boulder County, the City of Boulder, Boulder Valley School District, nonprofit organizations, and the U.S. Forest Service. The dataset is expandable, so other types may be inventoried and added to the digital dataset at a later time, if desired.

The following maps show the study area and key locations of properties. NOTE: The maps are shown here for the purposes of helping the reader know which map is being discussed, and are not intended to be legible at this scale. The larger maps found in Appendix G should be referred to for clarity.

The first map, Resource Map A: System Map shows the general area of the study. The boundary used for the study area is the library district boundary, which encompasses 46,142 acres, or just over 72 square miles. General recreational activities associated with parcels are identified along with trails and other features.
The second map, *Resource Map B: System Map Enlargement* is an enlargement of a portion of Map A and shows more detail for the area closer to the Town of Nederland. See *Appendix G* for larger versions of all maps.

**Assets**

The current inventory of parks, recreation, and open space lands and facilities includes the following main parcels and features in *Table 2*. 
Table 2: Nederland Area Inventory Parcel Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name/Identification</th>
<th>Ownership/Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>Chipeta Park</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td>Street Planters</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td>Guinn Mountain Hut</td>
<td>United States Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td>Tennessee Mountain Cabin</td>
<td>United States Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td>Mining Museum</td>
<td>Nederland/Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td>Visitors Center</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td>Nederland Ice and Racquet Park</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td>Guercio Memorial Ball Field</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td>Nathan Lazarus Skatepark</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td>Covered Bridge</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Corridor</td>
<td>Indian Peaks trail</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>Boulder Valley School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Middle High School</td>
<td>Boulder Valley School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>Rainbow Lakes Campground</td>
<td>United States Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>Buckingham 4th of July Campground</td>
<td>United States Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>Kelly Dahl Campground</td>
<td>United States Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservoir</td>
<td>Barker Meadow Reservoir</td>
<td>City of Boulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Caribou Ranch</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Platt Rogers Memorial Park</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Reynolds Ranch</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Rogers Park</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Mud Lake</td>
<td>Nederland/Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>National Forest</td>
<td>United States Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Gateway Park Area</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
<td>Big Springs Park</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
<td>Caribou Ridge</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
<td>Joe Smith Park</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
<td>Tom Riley Park</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
<td>Angel Park</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
<td>Pine West</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
<td>Tilden Park</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
<td>Flarty Park</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
<td>West Indian Peaks</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
<td>East Indian Peaks</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
<td>No Name Park</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
<td>Wingate</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing Infrastructure of Assets
In planning for the delivery of parks and recreation services, it is useful to think of parks, trails, natural areas, indoor facilities, and other public spaces as parts of an infrastructure. This infrastructure allows people to exercise, socialize, and maintain their physical, mental, and social health. The infrastructure is made up of components that support this purpose. Components include such amenities as playgrounds, picnic shelters, courts, fields, indoor facilities, and other elements that allow the system to meet its intended purpose. For a more detailed discussion on this see the section on the Composite-Values Methodology (CVM) process which is included in Appendix E. The level of service analysis of Nederland-area parks, recreation, open space, and trails assets is found in Appendix F.

In preparing the inventory of assets, the following information was collected:

- Component type and location
- Evaluation of a component’s functionality for its intended purpose
- Evaluation of comfort and convenience features that affect the experience of using the component
- Evaluation of the design and ambience of the component and its surroundings
- General comments about the component
- Photos of the component in some instances

The inventory team used the following three-tier rating system to evaluate and score each component on such things as the condition of the component, its size or capacity relative to the need at that location, and its overall quality:

- Below Expectations = (1)
- Meets Expectations = (2)
- Exceeds Expectations = (3)

The setting for a component and the conditions around it affect how well it functions, so in addition to scoring the components, the parcel or immediate surroundings of the each component was given a set of scores to rate its comfort, convenience, and ambient qualities. This includes traits such as the availability of restrooms, drinking water, shade, scenery, etc.

Table 3 shows a summary of components by provider/owner.
Table 3: Nederland Area Inventory Components Summary

| OWNER                         | Backstop, Practice | Ballfield | Basketball | Educational Experience | Garden, Display | Hockey, Ice | MP Field, Large | Multiuse Court | Natural Area | Open Turf | Open Water | Other-Active | Other-Passive | Passive Node | Picnic Grounds | Playground, Local | Shelter | Group | Skate Park | Tennis | Track, Competition | Trail, Multi-use | Trailhead | Water Access, Developed | Water Access, General |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|------------|-------------------------|-----------------|------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|----------------------|---------------------|------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Nederland                     | 1                  | 1         | 3           | 3                        | 1                | 11         | 1              | 3              | 1            | 2         | 1         | 1           | 1            | 1             | 1              |                  | 1              | 1      | 3      | 1         | 1      | 1                    | 1                   |
| Boulder County/Nederland      |                    | 1         | 1           | 1                        |                  | 11         | 1              | 3              | 1            | 2         | 1         | 1           | 1            | 1             | 1              |                  | 1              | 1      | 3      | 1         | 1      | 1                    | 1                   |
| Boulder County                | 3                  | 4         | 1           |                         |                  | 11         | 1              | 3              | 1            | 2         | 1         | 1           | 1            | 1             | 1              |                  | 1              | 1      | 3      | 1         | 1      | 1                    | 1                   |
| City of Boulder               |                    |           |             |                         |                  | 11         | 1              | 3              | 1            | 2         | 1         | 1           | 1            | 1             | 1              |                  | 1              | 1      | 3      | 1         | 1      | 1                    | 1                   |
| Boulder Valley School District| 1                  | 1         | 3           | 1                        |                  | 11         | 1              | 3              | 1            | 2         | 1         | 1           | 1            | 1             | 1              |                  | 1              | 1      | 3      | 1         | 1      | 1                    | 1                   |
| United States Forest Service  | 4                  | 3         | 1           |                         |                  | 11         | 1              | 3              | 1            | 2         | 1         | 1           | 1            | 1             | 1              |                  | 1              | 1      | 3      | 1         | 1      | 1                    | 1                   |
| Totals:                       | 1                  | 2         | 7            | 3                        | 1                | 20         | 1              | 5              | 1            | 3         | 2         | 3           | 1            | 3             | 1              | 1                | 2              | 2      | 1      | 1         | 1      | 1                    | 1                   |

The Nederland-area level of service analysis based on the inventory is found in Appendix F.

C. Trails

Trails mapping available to the public and for use in this study is incomplete and limited. Trails are located on lands owned by a variety of agencies, and there is no accurate and detailed mapping that shows all trails on all lands in the County’s GIS at this time. The 2005 Town of Nederland Trails Master Plan provides a map of trails found at that time. The map below is one of the best available current sources of trail information in and around Nederland. While this map is useful for general purposes, it is not prepared to the standards needed for GIS-based analysis and display.

The map does give the sense that there is a network of trails to be found within the study area and that if uniformly mapped, signed, and connected, could become part of an overall network of trails that would serve the community.
Other maps exist that, if verified and brought into the GIS, could be used to generate an overall map of the trail system. Below is an example of such maps:

Note: Map obtained from the Boulder Mountainbike Alliance.  
“http://bouldermountainbike.org/sites/default/files/Dots_1.JPG”
It is a recommendation of this Plan that a more thorough mapping of trails be completed and entered into the GIS for use in informing the public and planning for a better system of trails. See Chapter 7 for recommendations.

D. Summary

The inventory and analysis of assets is intended to provide a clear picture of what currently exists in the Nederland area. What it is not intended to provide is discrete measurements of what does not exist; i.e., it is not a measurement of needs. Needs are measured by other tools in the planning process, including the public survey, focus groups, and public meetings. However, it is useful to mention here some items that have surfaced from the public process and which are not found in the inventory for Nederland at this time.

Off-leash dogs are an issue in Nederland that has come up in the planning process. The inventory does not include areas specifically designated for dogs and their owners. However, dogs are allowed on leash on some of the lands included in the inventory. Management issues regarding dogs include public education regarding health and safety issues and enforcement of the Nederland leash law. There has also been interest in designating an off-leash dog area.

Boating is an activity that is also not specifically accommodated in the inventory of components. Small craft, non-motorized boating on Barker Reservoir is an issue that has been under discussion but not allowed at the time the inventory was conducted.

Swimming is an activity that has also been discussed in the public process. At this time, there are no designated facilities for swimming in the inventory. Similarly, various types of water play have been mentioned, but no specific facilities for this are found in the inventory.

Bicycling has been discussed in terms of providing safe places for children to learn to ride and improve their skills. Trails exist throughout the study area and have been discussed above, but these may not suit the needs and desires of all residents. A bike skills course has been mentioned in the public process, and at the current time there is not one in the inventory.

Walkability is a concern that has been mentioned by the public, especially for the main part of town. This includes connecting the lands and facilities in the inventory to the businesses and residences found there. Commercial areas and specific destinations such as restaurants and coffee shops might be considered part of the “recreation” infrastructure of Nederland by some people, but were not included in the inventory. However, connections to these and improving the overall walkability of the community are goals supported by this Master Plan. The community should be looked at holistically and not just as a collection of parks, trails, natural areas, and other recreational features.
Chapter 5. Gateway Park Area Planning

One of the components of the Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan includes a study of opportunities for enhancements to the gateway park area. This chapter includes a review of existing conditions and site analysis, a summary of the public input process to site planning, and recommendations for improvements in the proposed Nederland Gateway Park Area Master Plan.

A. Overview

Nederland is a community blessed with an abundance of recreational opportunities. It draws recreationists from all over the world to enjoy its natural wonders. Its residents live active lifestyles and make good use of every opportunity to engage in healthy activities. The vision for the gateway park area builds on the recreational opportunities of Nederland residents and guests by capitalizing on one of Nederland’s most unique features—its waterfront. Of the many small communities found throughout the region, Nederland is truly unique to have a water body such as Barker Meadow Reservoir at its front door. This site has the potential to become a landmark, a feature emblematic of all the Town of Nederland has to offer.

The mission for the Gateway Park Area Master Plan is to integrate immediate recreational opportunities with the downtown core of Nederland to provide a holistic experience of cultural and recreational offerings to locals and visitors, and to do so in an environmentally conscious and sustainable manner.

The Gateway Park Area Master Plan envisions a recreation area well-suited to the interests, priorities, and needs of the Town of Nederland. It builds on the significance of the gateway area as the “front yard” of this unique mountain community. It acknowledges the Town’s stated commitment to a “thoughtful, meaningful relationship between recreation, culture, and economy,” is consistent with the community’s environmental consciousness and commitment to sustainability, and is intended to serve those who make Nederland their home as well as welcome visitors from near and far.

B. Existing Conditions/Site Analysis

The Nederland gateway park area refers to the eastern edge of the Town of Nederland, Colorado where the community meets the western shoreline of Barker Reservoir. This area is well-used by residents and is highly visible to those arriving or passing through town from the Front Range. It is effectively the front yard of the community, a site where a well considered plan is critical to Nederland’s cultural and economic future.

The gateway park area may be defined as the expanse from the shoreline of Barker Meadow Reservoir west to East Street, bounded on the north by Highway 119 and by Middle Boulder Creek to the south. For the purpose of this master plan, East 1st Street, Middle Boulder Creek, and Chipeta Park have been included to ensure these areas function as a singular recreation area well integrated with Nederland’s downtown core.
This area has been the topic of study and planning in the past. It received mention in the *Town of Nederland and Surrounding Areas Trails, Parks, and Open Space Master Plan* in 2001 which listed the creation of a gateway park on the site as a stated goal. A conceptual design was completed in 2002 by the Colorado State University Cooperative Extension Service with the aid of a grant from the Colorado Department of Local Affairs. In 2009 the site was the focus of a University of Colorado environmental design studio and was the subject of a community survey that same year coordinated by the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Advisory Board (PROSAB) intended to guide future development. Any of these materials deemed relevant were consulted in the drafting of the *Gateway Park Area Master Plan*.

Existing site amenities include shoreline access for fishing or passive recreation, picnic tables, a baseball diamond, a teen center, a skate park, and portable restrooms all found along the shore of the reservoir. Chipeta Park currently offers open turf, a kids’ fishing pond, a basketball court, a pavilion with restrooms, and a newly upgraded children’s playground. A trail runs along the edge of the reservoir and connects to downtown Nederland along the south side of Middle Boulder Creek.

**Figure 4: Gateway Park Area Site Analysis**
Opportunities

- Breathtaking mountain and lake views
- Proximity to cultural opportunities and business offerings in downtown Nederland
- Proximity to adjacent residential neighborhoods
- Creek access
- Existing events and programming on-site

Constraints

- The Town wastewater treatment facility on-site
- A propane vendor operating on-site
- Drainage through the site from adjacent areas, including effluent seeps carried down Stinky Gulch from retired mining operations
- Sensitivity of nearby residents to noise produced on-site
- A shallow shoreline slope which creates a barren and mostly unusable “moonscape” during periods of low water
- High vehicular traffic volumes and speeds along East 1st Street relative to other local streets
C. Planning Process

The planning process for the Nederland Gateway Park Area Master Plan has consisted of:
1. Site analysis of the gateway park area and downtown Nederland
2. A statistically-valid survey conducted as part of the planning process for the Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan for the Nederland area
3. Steering Committee review and guidance
4. Public review and input at three public meetings
5. Opportunity for online comment from community members

Each step of the way has yielded valuable input from the gamut of stakeholders toward a master plan vision for the area that will make it centerpiece of Nederland’s future. These include neighbors, business owners, recreationists, and environmentalists as well as design and planning professionals. All such input has been subject to full review by the planning team and those ideas most strongly supported by the community have been carried forward. Input from focus groups, the statistically-valid survey, and public workshops yielded programming for trails, shelters, picnic areas, an outdoor gathering space, a multi-use field, a sculpture park, a bouldering feature, a mountain bike track, a community greenhouse and garden, fishing, boating, and restrooms. All of these components can be found in the final Nederland Gateway Park Area Master Plan along with other concepts which have been supported throughout this process.

D. Gateway Park Area Master Plan

The Nederland Gateway Park Area Master Plan is structured to prioritize those concepts that have been best supported throughout the public process. Additional concepts are included as optional. The plan suggests three types of improvements:
1) Priority Improvements
2) Short Term Optional Improvements
3) Long Term Optional Improvements

Priority Improvements are those that gathered the most support from community respondents and are clearly suitable uses for this site. Short Term Optional Improvements received some public support during the planning process but could benefit from further study. Long term optional improvements are those that have some support but will require substantial coordination and planning efforts to be realized. All priority and optional improvements are described in the following sections.

Priority Improvements

These improvements of the Gateway Park Area Master Plan are well-supported by the community.

- Circulation is enhanced substantially. Existing trails are improved by widening and surfacing with crushed granite. New trails are added. A new pedestrian bridge (built to accommodate emergency vehicular access, if deemed feasible) is built on Town property spanning Middle Boulder Creek to improve connectivity between the park area and downtown. Streetside pedestrian circulation and stormwater management are also improved in conjunction with the Nederland Downtown Development Authority NedPeds project to enhance existing pedestrian infrastructure. Wayfinding signage strengthens the link between the gateway park area and Nederland’s business core.
• Natural areas and water access abound. Bioswale filtration areas are established to protect water quality. Improvements to the North Beaver Creek drainage (east of East Street) create habitat, provide educational opportunities, and allow for safe creek access. These include riparian plantings and creek diversion to slow water flow. Access to Middle Boulder Creek is enhanced by soft surface trails, benches, and creekside boulders. Natural plantings are added to areas along the lakeshore. Boating access is introduced to Barker Reservoir with a boat inspection station, pull-in boat launch, camp host site, and informational kiosk. Existing fishing access is maintained.

• A constructed hill slope serves as a community gathering space. The “Big Hill” is built as a grassy hillock of rounded boulders evocative of a moraine landscape for young and old to engage with and enjoy. It includes a staging area and small pavilion oriented to the northeast to best mitigate noise concerns of nearby residents in the event of small concerts or public engagements. If necessary, a small bandshell is engineered for additional noise mitigation.

• The existing ballfield is converted to a multi-use field, the “Great Lawn,” which includes improvements to turf, stormwater drainage, access, and equipment. Irrigation is added.

• A core area with amenities such as seating, tables, trees, and a shelter completes the park center and serves both the Big Hill and Great Lawn.

• Other site amenities include off-street parking, picnic areas, shelters, restrooms, canopy trees, additional landscaping, and interpretive signage. Trees and landscaping create habitat, improve water quality, provide a buffer from the elements (wind, rain, sun), and create discrete spaces for users seeking seclusion. Interpretive signage provides insight into local history, geology, and ecology and is fully integrated with wayfinding signage.

**Short-Term Optional Improvements**

*These improvements are additional options for the Gateway Park Area Master Plan which have some community support and could fit well within the plan but could benefit from further consideration.*

• A sculpture park is installed on the current fishermen’s parking site as an entry space to the park area from downtown via East 1st Street and from Chipeta Park across the new pedestrian bridge. This includes permanent commissioned sculptural installations and temporary exhibit pieces as well as an interactive area with natural materials (stones, log stumps, branches, etc.) for artistic engagement and play. Some sculptural pieces are interactive as well, intended to be sprayed with water to ice over in the winter or filled with annual plantings in the summer. Additionally, a few public art pieces are interspersed along trails elsewhere in the park area.

• Traffic calming features along East 1st Street encourage pedestrian use by defining a walking route through use of barriers, materials, texture, color, signage, or other effective devices to put drivers on the alert and encourage slower speeds. Street art is painted on the roadway to mark critical intersections and further promote awareness of pedestrians in the area.

• A small mountain bike pump track is added directly west of the multi-use field along East Street.
• The baseball backstop is replaced and re-oriented to face northeast to help prevent sun glare and to allow for better organization as a multi-use field.

• Several new activities are added to Chipeta Park. A bouldering feature, slackline anchors, and horseshoe pits are added as well as seasonal activities such as volleyball and sledding. The existing basketball pad is re-purposed as a multi-use court which retains basketball but allows for additional types of play such as four-square, shuffleboard, hopscotch, volleyball, badminton, and/or other uses. A nine-hole disc golf course runs from Chipeta Park throughout the entire gateway park area with optional holes in the lake bed to be used at low water.

• Should the Big Hill gathering space concept not gain sufficient public support for future development, Alternative Optional Improvements include:
  o A community greenhouse (with a heat sink for year-round use) and seasonal community garden plots added east of the existing propane yard.
  o A dog park created in the location of the former settling pond north of the wastewater treatment facility. This location is intended to be temporary until a more suitable site can be selected. Fencing installed is built to be relocated.
  o Natural plantings added and the area re-graded as a gentle slope to the shoreline. Canopy trees are planted as appropriate.

**Long Term Optional Improvements**
*These improvements are options for the Gateway Park Area Master Plan which have some support within the community but will require more extensive coordination and significant planning to be realized.*

• Earthwork is conducted and an intermittent shore wall is constructed to extend the shore of the reservoir and preserve additional land for active and passive uses. Gaps between wall sections allow for high water to inundate specific areas in a controlled manner. Natural plantings are added in these areas to create wetlands and wildlife habitat. These lakeshore wetland areas also serve to visually enhance the shoreline, add depth, and create the sense of isolation many people seek in a natural area.

This option has not been fully vetted by the City of Boulder. As these improvements will involve City of Boulder land and will affect Barker Meadow Reservoir, coordination with Boulder utility officials is a critical first step should this option be pursued. Consultation with additional agencies will be necessary at the federal, state, and county level and will likely involve permitting and regulatory oversight. Additional information is available from the City of Boulder Water Quality Coordinator.
The SHORE WALL option has not been fully vetted by the City of Boulder. As these improvements will involve City of Boulder land and will affect Barker Meadow Reservoir, coordination with Boulder utility officials is a critical first step should this option be pursued. Consultation with additional agencies will be necessary at the federal, state, and county level and will likely lead to permitting and regulatory oversight.
E. Additional Notes

This section provides further explanation in regard to design, installation, and operation of the gateway park area as outlined in this master plan.

A Note About Landscaping

The existing gateway park area site is a highly exposed and relatively barren place. Site landscaping is intended to create a more inviting space for both wildlife and people. Plantings will provide habitat, improve water quality, and enhance the user experience. Yet growing conditions in Nederland are difficult. The harsh climate, high-altitude, rocky soils, and high winds present certain challenges. These factors will necessitate thoughtful plant selection and considered placement for greatest success. Xeric and native plant species should be used whenever possible. Exceptions will include wetland plantings along the reservoir edge and riparian plantings along creek drainages. Non-native adapted species may be acceptable in ornamental planting beds or landscape areas. Irrigation will be necessary on a temporary basis for all new plant materials as specimens become established.

Canopy trees and turf grass will require particular attention to ensure success. As part of the planning process, Colorado State University Extension was consulted in regard to plant viability. Colorado State University Extension is a network of academics and professionals dedicated to providing credible, research-based knowledge to the public. These experts have offered assurance that canopy trees and turf grass can be viable under the gateway park area site conditions given appropriate species selection and proper care. A brief summary of this discussion follows below. It should be noted that a full planting plan will be needed to better understand all plant selections and planting locations based on microclimates, soils, water availability, and other factors.

Canopy trees are included as site amenities in the Gateway Park Area Master Plan. Though these trees will function as habitat and protection from the elements, they are largely intended to create spaces for people to enjoy. The “canopy” refers to the expanse of branches and leaves overhead which help create shade and seclusion beneath. As more traditional canopy tree species are unlikely to grow in such challenging site conditions, some consideration must be given to these limitations. Some locations could be well enhanced by a species with less of a canopy and more of an upright form, such as the Quaking Aspen (Populus tremuloides) which is ubiquitous and well-established in the Nederland area.

For those locations where canopy trees are preferred a few other species of the poplar family have proven very adaptable to similar growing conditions including the Lanceleaf Cottonwood (Populus x acuminata), Narrowleaf Cottonwood (Populus angustifolia), and Balsam Poplar (Populus balsamifera). Other options include Bur Oak (Quercus Macrocarpa) and Thinleaf Alder (Alnus incana). Though these trees do not exhibit as broad a canopy as some lower elevation species, they are fast growers which should be successful once established. These species were suggested as appropriate selections by the CSU Extension due to their natural elevation range and suitability to local soils. It should be noted that water availability will be critical in establishing any species of tree on site. Irrigation will be necessary for the initial 2-5 years as the roots take hold. Transplanted specimens from a similar mountain environment will have a greater chance of success. Smaller, younger trees (less than 1½” caliper or 6’ height) will also be easier to establish.
For newly planted trees, trunks should be wrapped to protect from sunscald and freezing in the winter, and measures should be taken to prevent damage from wildlife such as deer, elk, or moles. Clustering with denser trees and shrubs of smaller stature on the windward side should help protect canopy tree specimens and ensure viability. Additional information is available from Colorado State University Extension forest stewardship experts.

Efforts to sustain turf grass in the Nederland area have failed in the past. As green, grassy turf is desired in some locations in the Gateway Park Area Master Plan the challenges of high-altitude turf growing will need to be addressed as well. An appropriate seed mix will need to be selected, irrigation will be critical to establishing any turf on site and proper on-going maintenance will be required. Several species of fescue grass are well adapted to the poor soils and cold winters typical of the Nederland area. A turf specialist should be consulted to determine the ideal seed mix specific to the gateway site. Limitations to high elevation turf may include moderate tolerance to wear, slow recuperation, thatchy appearance, difficulty of mowing, and greater potential for dormancy. Additional information is available from Colorado State University Extension turfgrass specialists.

As an alternative to turfgrass, synthetic turf may be a worthwhile consideration, though not without its own limitations. Advantages of synthetic turf surfacing include reliability, durability, and lower maintenance costs. Several disadvantages exist as well, aside from substantial upfront costs. It can become very hot in the sun (+10-20 degrees relative to surroundings), should not be used for vehicular traffic (e.g. Miner’s Days), is not ideal on a slope, and can be difficult to clean (e.g. chewing gum, cigarette butts, spilled drinks, etc.). Also, the artificial appearance may not suit the sensibilities of the Nederland community (e.g., green “grass” in the winter).

The primary locations for turf installation are the Great Lawn and the Big Hill. As these are adjacent and are intended to function as a unified space, any chosen turf treatment (synthetic or live turfgrass) for these areas will be the same ideally.

**A Note About Irrigation**

Irrigation will be needed to establish any landscape plantings added to the gateway park area site. For most trees, shrubs, and bunch grasses, irrigation can be planned on a temporary basis. Most of these plants will be well established after five years or less, at which point irrigation may be eliminated or used only to reduce stress on the plantings in drought conditions. Turfgrass will require permanent irrigation as part of a regular maintenance regime.

To reduce costs and promote sustainability efforts should be made to utilize reclaimed water for irrigation, if at all possible, from the Town of Nederland wastewater treatment plant on site. This would provide a reliable and cost effective water source for all landscape irrigation and could provide an educational component while putting an existing byproduct to use.
A Note About Special Events
The gateway park area site is currently used for several special events every year. These have a significant economic impact on the Town and are cultural assets important to the Nederland identity. Festivals, concerts, and other large scale gatherings must be recognized by any future development on-site. Though the Gateway Park Area Master Plan is intended to be compatible with existing special event uses, conflict may emerge as a result of planning decisions. Such conflict will require some accommodation to maintain existing on-site special event uses. The following example illustrates such accommodation:

To prevent damage to new turf installed on the Great Lawn heavy equipment use is prohibited during Miners’ Days. Heavy equipment demonstrations are relocated to the expanded north parking area. This limits on-site parking availability. A parking contingency plan, such as shuttling from remote parking areas, is required.

This shuffling of resources may be necessary for other special events as well. Creative planning and anticipation of such conflicts before they emerge will be critical to ensure the success of large scale events held on-site in the future.

A Note About Parking
Parking has been carefully considered in the Gateway Park Area Master Plan. A significant amount of parking is planned, including an expanded lot on the north end of the site and two off-street pull in parking areas along East Street. Nonetheless the plan will likely have the effect of decreasing total parking availability on-site as some existing parking areas are intended for other purposes. Despite the occasional need for extensive vehicular accommodation during special events there should be no lack of parking on a typical day-to-day basis. Coordination may be necessary to prevent use of the Teen Center parking lot by gateway park area users, unless an arrangement allows for this alternative.

Large scale events (e.g. Frozen Dead Guy Days, Ned Fest, Miners’ Days) may require additional parking options. Alternative parking scenarios for such events are currently being considered by Town of Nederland officials. Recommended options include a shuttle from remote parking areas and on-site paid parking. Such options should be viable and may be desirable as they encourage sustainable practices such as carpooling and alternative transit usage. Taken together these alternatives can be at a minimum cost neutral, as revenue generated by paying parking users can defray the cost of shuttle service. Other options may exist and should be considered. These could include partnering with RTD for special events, arranging use of private land for overflow paid parking, and encouraging visitors to park at the community center and stroll to the gateway area via downtown.

A Note About Emergency Access
Emergency access is an important consideration in a mountain community such as Nederland. The new pedestrian bridge proposed to span Middle Boulder Creek between Chipeta Park and the existing fisherman’s parking area could serve this purpose. Ideally this bridge would be built to accommodate vehicular use as an added creek crossing in the event of an emergency. However, such an undertaking will involve substantial cost (approximately $200/sq foot), challenging logistics (auto access to/from the bridge), and will require other infrastructural considerations (stability of upstream bridges in a flash flood event). Further discussion of this topic will be needed to determine planning priorities.
A Note About Maintenance
For the gateway park area to best serve its users, appropriate funding must be allocated for maintenance of all new improvements and existing facilities. For such a diverse park area there will be some locations and amenities that will require a higher level of maintenance than others. For example, the multi-use field will require a higher intensity of maintenance with greater frequency than natural areas.

However, based on the high visibility and high community importance afforded the gateway park area it seems appropriate to estimate maintenance costs based on a higher overall intensity of use. This level of service will include mowing and grooming of turf areas, annual fertilizations, weed control, pest control, aeration and top dressing, weeding of ornamental planting beds, and efforts to keep native plantings free of invasive species. Trees will be pruned annually. Site furnishings, plazas, and signage will be in excellent working and aesthetic condition. The property will have waste bins emptied regularly and restrooms cleaned at least once daily regardless of visitation rates. Snow removal for sidewalks, trails, and parking lots with any accumulation will be a priority.

The cost for this level of maintenance is approximately $3,000/acre annually. The gateway park area site itself is estimated at approximately 15 acres. Costs for site maintenance should therefore approximate $45,000/year.

Funding Sources
The following funding sources may or may not be applicable to the gateway park area development. This list includes many popular and proven funding sources which may be considered to help fund the gateway park area project as envisioned.

City and Local Revenue Sources:
- Earmarked Sales and Use Tax
- User Fees and Charges
- District Revenues
  - E.g. Business Improvement District
- Local Downtown Development Association
  - E.g. Nederland Downtown Development Authority
- Charitable Foundations
- Charitable Donors
- Volunteer Involvement
  - In-kind support to help reduce city expenditures on maintenance
  - Park stewardship programs
- Charitable Remainder Trusts

State Revenue Sources:
- Conservation Trust Fund
- Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO)
  - Includes a variety of grant options awarded to local governments for parks, outdoor recreation, and environmental education facilities
    - GOCO Local Government Park and Outdoor Recreation Grant
    - GOCO Open Space Grant
• GOCO Planning Grant
• GOCO Trails Grant
• GOCO Conservations Grant
• Colorado State Trails Grant Program
• Colorado Department of Local Affairs Grants
• Fishing Is Fun In Colorado, Colorado Parks and Wildlife Grant

Federal Revenue Sources:
• Land and Water Conservation Fund from Colorado Lottery proceeds
• North American Wetlands Conservation Small Grants Program
• Recreation Trails Program

Other:
• Colorado Health Foundation Healthy Places Initiative
• Xcel Energy Solar Rewards Program
• American Academy of Dermatology Shade Structure Program
• Kaiser Family Foundation
• Gates Family Foundation
• Daniels Fund
• Hewlett Foundation
• El Pomar Foundation

F. Summary

The Nederland gateway park area has the potential to become a truly special place—a treasure to townsfolk and a destination to those from afar. The Nederland Gateway Park Area Master Plan includes many concepts well-supported by the community and intended to enhance enjoyment of the Nederland area, strengthen the local culture, promote economic growth, and encourage environmental responsibility and sustainable practices.

The plan prioritizes those concepts that have been best supported throughout the public process while including additional improvements which could benefit from further discussion. This approach allows for some flexibility to accommodate the realities of funding challenges and evolving public support. All components of the Gateway Park Area Master Plan are considered suitable to the character, sensibility, and charm of the Town of Nederland.

It is hoped that the gateway park area will emerge as a centerpiece of Nederland’s future—a place dear to neighbors and visitors alike, a place to enjoy everything this special community has to offer in the unparalleled setting of the majestic Rocky Mountains.
Chapter 6. How We Manage – Services and Operations

This chapter first provides an overview of the Town of Nederland and how the parks, recreation, open space, and trail system is managed. It then highlights the Nederland Community Service as a hub of recreation, cultural, and social activities. Next, the service delivery approach is reviewed, with a focus on partnerships and volunteer efforts. Finally an overview of current funding for parks, recreation, open space, and trails services is provided.

A. Town of Nederland Overview

The Town of Nederland is made up of several departments: Administration, Public Works, Police/Municipal Court, and Community Center. The Town does not have a separate parks and recreation department, but has a full-time Community Center Coordinator staff person. With only one staff person, volunteers contribute to staffing the Center. There is no other dedicated staff for parks and recreation services; however, Public Works staff contribute to park maintenance, along with volunteer support. (Note: Fire protection and library services are operated by separate districts serving larger areas and are financially supported through property taxes collected by the respective districts.)

The Town has several Advisory Boards and Commissions that advise the Board of Trustees on different topics. The Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Board (PROSAB) was formed as a result of the previous 2001 Town of Nederland and Surrounding Areas Open Space, Trails, Parks and Outdoor Recreation Master Plan. PROSAB’s charge is to maintain, implement, and now update that Plan and functions, to a certain extent, as the Town’s parks and recreation department. Representation on PROSAB includes residents of the greater Nederland Area.

B. Nederland Community Center

Overview
The Nederland Community Center was originally a school (circa 1880). It was remodeled by a WPA project in 1936-37, creating the gymnasium and the stone wall in the community room. In the 1960s, the building was expanded, and a west wing was added. In 1997, the Town of Nederland purchased the site and re-opened the building as a community center, housing the police station, library, and a variety of local non-profits.

After a snowstorm wrecked the roof in March 2003, the center was completely renovated with “green” technology. It re-opened in 2007 and soon added a fitness facility, new seats in the theatre, daylighting in the gym and community room, and an up-to-date commercial kitchen.

The west wing, a part of the former elementary school building, was left out of the 2005-2007 Community Center renovation process, mainly for cost reasons. During renovation of the main building, the west wing was shut down, and its heat and water disconnected. Since 2007, it has been used for passive storage by several non-profits and one business.
The Nederland Community Center – Mission

The Nederland Community Center is a public facility dedicated to building a stronger Nederland-area community by providing opportunities for recreation, fitness, entertainment, cultural enrichment, and community gatherings and meetings.

(Source: http://www.nederlandcommunitycenter.org)

The Center functions as a community hub for government, non-profit organizations, fitness enthusiasts, and a wide variety of classes and special events. Classes are offered by several different organizations and instructors including dance, tai chi, and fitness classes. It is also home to several organizations that lease space. The Community Center is also available for community meetings and rentals. The Town of Nederland uses the Center for regular town government meetings.

The “Fitness Place” offers drop-in visits, 10-visit punch cards, and annual memberships (fees vary) for use of this fitness space. The Center also has several rental spaces including the community room, conference room, theatre (265-seat), studio (with wood floor), and full-size gymnasium.

The center is open Mondays through Thursdays 8 am – 8 pm, Fridays from 8 am – 5 pm, Saturday from 10 am – 7 pm, and is closed on Sundays. As mentioned earlier, since the Community Center has only one staff person, volunteers greatly contribute to its operations. There were 746 documented volunteer hours at the Community Center in 2011. These hours were put in by 32 different volunteers.

Nederland Community Center Foundation

A volunteer board of directors oversees the Nederland Community Center Foundation whose mission is: to advise the Nederland Board of Trustees on capital projects related to the Community Center, pursue grants and other funds for Community Center improvements and programming, and increase Community Center use and visibility, all with a focus on the long-range needs of the greater Nederland community.

The Foundation in the annual report for 2011 highlighted efforts to expand marketing of the Community Center and build awareness and financial support through new “Friends” of the Center campaign and other efforts including community events like the “Art at the Center” exhibitions (three were held in 2011). The long-term vision of the Foundation is to renovate the west wing of the Community Center for community use.

Public Input

Survey

The Nederland Community Center had the second highest frequency of use (an average of 25 times a year) by households who completed the survey, after trails in the Town/Barker Reservoir area.

The top five programs to add, expand, or improve as indicated by the greatest proportion of survey respondents included:

- Biking/hiking/running (36%)
- Indoor swimming/aquatics (32%)
- Non-motorized boating (28%)
- Events (e.g., movies, concerts, festivals) (26%)
- Cultural /arts/dance/music/crafts (25%)
Indoor swimming is a desire that has a very high operational cost and is not feasible in the short-term. Depending on the willingness of residents to provide tax subsidy in the future, this may become more feasible. In the meantime, Nederland area residents make use of aquatic facilities in Gilpin County and in the City of Boulder. Fifty percent (50%) of survey respondents indicated that they use recreation facilities and centers in neighboring towns, while 21 percent stated that they use private health and fitness clubs.

Focus Groups and Public Meetings
Participants in the public input meetings see the Nederland Community Center as a strong community asset. They also expressed some wishes or desires related to the Community Center.
- Longer hours (including earlier hours and opening on Sunday)
- Expanded programs including:
  - Multi-generational and family programs
  - Fitness classes – spin, karate, etc. (including more user-friendly times)
  - Cultural arts – dance, arts
  - Events of interest to teens – music, talent night, etc.
- West wing renovation
- Addition of showers
- Improved fitness equipment
- Safe crossing to center

A Note about Aquatic/Swimming Facilities
Public input has demonstrated a desire for an indoor aquatic facility. Aquatic facilities, however, are expensive to build and operate. For example, a leisure pool of approximately 12,000 to 15,000 square feet would cost between $6-8 million to build, depending on design details. (The cost also includes support spaces such as locker rooms, lobby, control desk, etc.) The annual operating costs for this type of facility could range between $300,000 to $400,000 or more annually depending on staffing costs, operating hours, and cost of utilities. (For example, Gilpin County estimates $1 million per year to maintain their pool.) While fees and charges would offset these operating costs (typically about 50-60%), significant subsidy would be required for ongoing operations (staffing, supplies, equipment, etc.). If a lap pool was desired, expected cost recovery would be even lower at 20-30%.

Alternate ways to address the demand for aquatics could include: negotiating agreements with area pools for a community discount, supporting a reestablishment of the Gilpin Connector, exploring options to promote car-pooling among pool users, and exploring a partnership with Boulder Valley School District to build a community pool at the Nederland Middle School/High School. (These recommendations are also included in Chapter 7.)

C. Service Delivery Approach – Partnership and Volunteers Efforts

Due to limited Town resources, community initiatives through non-profit organizations and volunteers have driven parks and recreation facility development and services in Nederland. From popular special events, to classes and events at the Nederland Community Center, to facilities operated by non-profit organizations, a diversity of activities abound.
For example, Nederland is known for several signature special events including the Frozen Dead Guy Festival (named by New York Times in 2010 as one of the Top 10 Best Parties of the Winter) and NedFest. Other popular annual events include the High Peaks Art Festival, 4th of July, Miner’s Day, Hotrods and Classics in the High Country, Neder-Nederland Race, and Windfest.

**Partnerships**

Through collaboration and partnerships, a multitude of recreational and cultural opportunities are available. Following are highlights of some of the prominent partnerships in Nederland.

**Adopt-a-Park Program** – This relatively recent Town program allows individuals or groups to adopt a specific park, trail, or open space area. Through adoption, volunteers agree to assist with the general care and maintenance of the area as well as report to the Town any items of concern. Volunteer tasks may include: litter control, graffiti reporting, weeding/raking playgrounds, sweeping shelters, cleaning picnic tables, restocking doggie bags, and reporting vandalism. Volunteers may also perform other improvement projects as approved. Most all Town parks and trail corridors have been adopted at the time of this Plan.

**Memorial Program** – In September 2012, the Town Board of Trustees adopted a memorial installation/adoption policy. This policy sets consistent standards and guidelines for the acceptance of donated memorials into the Town’s parks, recreation, open space, and trails system. Memorials could range from benches and interpretive signs to public art and land for public open space.

**Backdoor Theater** – This non-profit organization that operates out of the Nederland Community Center offers regular weekend first-run movie showings in the 260-seat auditorium. They also offer live theater events throughout the year.

**Boulder Valley School District** – In 2011, a short-term Memorandum of Understanding between the Nederland Elementary School and the Nederland Community Center was reached to foster a partnership related to school- and youth-oriented programs. This agreement centered on the rent-free use of the Community Center for school-related activities such as theater nights and special events as well as youth programs. Public input for this Plan indicated interest in an expanded partnership between the Town and the School District, especially for community use of school athletic fields.

**Nederland Area Seniors** – The Nederland Area Seniors hold events at the Community Center including lunch programs twice a week.

**NEDSK8/NedRec** – NEDSK8 is a 501(c)(3) organization incorporated in 2005 to pursue the development of a concrete skatepark in Nederland. NEDSK8 raised the needed funds and managed all aspects of the project and turned over the completed 12,340 sq. ft. Nathan Lazarus Skatepark to the Town of Nederland in November of 2008. Now doing business as NedRec, the all-volunteer organization has helped raise funds for Chipeta Park playground equipment and this master plan update, and is partnering with the Parks, Recreation, Open Space Advisory Board in pursuing a non-motorized boating program on Barker Reservoir.
Racquets and Ice for Nederland Kids (RINK) – This non-profit organization spearheaded the development of the Nederland Ice and Racquet Park on Town property funded with a GOCO grant. Utilizing usage fees and community volunteers, RINK manages the operation of the park, provides maintenance of the facility, and transitions the park between ice and tennis configurations twice a year. The organization has had a lease agreement since 2006 with the Town for its operation.

TEENS, Inc. – This non-profit organization has had a lease with the Town of Nederland since 1997 to construct and operate a Teen Center on Town-owned land near Barker Reservoir. Teens, Inc. offers youth services in a 6,800 square foot Youth and Family Center that houses the Nederland Teen Center. This facility opened in 2000. The Center has been home to the Chinook West Alternative High School since 2002.

Volunteerism
Many of these partnerships rely on volunteer efforts. Volunteerism has many positive benefits including building a sense of community through harnessing the talents and energy of residents. However, relying on volunteers for service delivery can also present challenges such as fluctuating levels of time commitment and burn-out on the part of volunteers over time.

D. Funding

Operating Expenses
A parks budget allocation for maintenance is included within the Public Works budget. The Parks budget is primarily personnel (the 2011 increase was an added ½ FTE, which was accounted for in general Public Works). The Nederland Community Center also includes a budget for operations and one staff position.

Note: 2010-2011 numbers are budget actuals; 2012 reflects budgeted numbers
The Community Center’s non-tax revenue is primarily from the fitness center fees and rental income. The center has recovered an average of 74 percent of its expenses through generated revenues over the five years from 2008-2012.

### Table 4: Nederland Community Center Expenses and Revenues (2008-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$129,286</td>
<td>$106,511</td>
<td>$108,040</td>
<td>$124,111</td>
<td>$125,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$77,127</td>
<td>$88,963</td>
<td>$87,162</td>
<td>$91,474</td>
<td>$93,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recovery</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2008-2011 numbers are budget actuals; 2012 reflects budgeted numbers.

### Capital Funding

The Town of Nederland has limited capital funds available for parks, recreation, open space, and trails projects. The Town is currently spending $16,000 a year for the Wingate Open Space acquisition, which is scheduled to be paid off in October of 2020. In addition, the Town will continue payments over the next 10 years on a sales tax bond for the 2005-2007 renovation of the Nederland Community Center.

Currently, the 2013 Draft Capital Improvement Budget includes some site planning for the Community Center. The Town also anticipates seeking grant funding in the next several years for the gateway park area, trails improvements, and other projects.

### Alternative Funding

The Town in the past has utilized a variety of private foundation and governmental grants to support many planning and capital projects, many of these through its non-profit partners. Following is a list of some of these grant sources.

- Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO)
- Gates Family Foundation
- Daniels Fund
- Anschutz Family Foundation
- Community Foundation Serving Boulder County
- The Denver Foundation
- El Pomar Foundation
- Department of Local Affairs (DOLA)
- Tony Hawk Foundation

### Financial Sustainability

The Town of Nederland serves as a regional hub for smaller mountain communities in western Boulder and Gilpin Counties, which look to the Town for basic services and entertainment. The Town has failed to meet all of its parks and recreation goals and recommendations identified in the 2001 Master Plan, primarily due to budget constraints, the large number of recommendations, limited staff, and other priorities. However, progress has been made as a result of citizen initiatives; non-profit organizations have been instrumental in the development of the ice rink/tennis court facility and a skatepark. Also, the Town has been fortunate to have many dedicated volunteers, although concern was expressed about the long-term sustainability of a service delivery model that primarily relies on volunteers and non-profit organizations to provide parks, recreation, open space, and trails services.
With no identified budgetary relief in sight and in the face of other Town budget priorities, future progress for parks and recreation will likely depend on citizen initiatives or perhaps creation of a special parks and recreation district. A special district is an attractive option, as it could allow more centralized and planned oversight of recreational projects and a reliable revenue stream.

Although an earlier attempt at creating a Nederland-area park and recreation district over 20 years ago was not successful, times have changed. During the public input process for this Plan, the need to create a dedicated and sustainable source of funding to support the parks, recreation, open space, and trails goals of the Nederland-area community was expressed by many. The first step of a renewed effort to pursue the creation of a district will be to develop a Service Plan using the outline provided by the Colorado Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) to determine district parameters and the practicality of proceeding with an election.

Building on priorities identified in this master planning process, this process will be critical in obtaining community support and validation for creating a special parks and recreation district.

**Survey Input**

*Special District or Town Recreation Department?* The survey conducted for the Master Plan asked respondents about two alternative approaches to paying for and managing parks and recreation services. There was majority support for both alternatives:

- **Special District Approach.** The creation of a special district (similar to a fire district) supported by property taxes received support from over 6 in 10 respondents. About 2 in 10 reported that they “definitely” or “probably” would not support the creation of a special district.
  - Comparing responses from residents in Town to those outside of Nederland, the support for a district is somewhat higher among unincorporated county residents.

- **Town Parks and Recreation Department supported by property tax of Town residents.** On the second question of financial alternatives, about 6 in 10 overall would support a parks and recreation department in the town funded by a property tax for residents.
  - Support for this approach was about equal among in-town and out-of-town respondents. It should be noted that out-of-town residents would not vote on this tax, nor would they pay it. Once again, negative sentiment was higher among Nederland residents with 3 in 10 saying they “definitely” or “probably” would not support it.
Figure 6: Survey Results – Funding Options

Would you support the creation of a special district (similar to a fire district) supported by property taxes?

Alternatively, would you support the addition of a separate parks and recreation department that would be funded by an increase in property tax for Town of Nederland residents?

E. Summary

The Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan positions the Town of Nederland to effectively and collaboratively plan for and manage the parks, recreation, open space, and trail system. The Town of Nederland, along with many dedicated volunteers and organizations with aligned missions, will continue to creatively provide quality services and manage the budget pressures to meet growing needs with limited resources. The Town will need to assess its ability to continue to maintain and grow the system with existing resources, volunteers, and partnerships. During the public input process for this Plan, many expressed a concern that this approach was not sustainable for the long-term and that additional resources are necessary to maintain and grow the parks, recreation, open space, and trail system.
Chapter 7. Recommendations and Implementation Plan

The Nederland-Area Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails (PROST) Master Plan recommendations and implementation plan are outlined in this section. This Plan will guide Town of Nederland in planning for and managing parks and recreation services, programs, and facilities for the next 5 to 10 years. These recommendations evolved from the planning process that included extensive analysis and input from staff, community members, and Town leadership.

A. Overview

This PROST Master Plan provides a guiding mechanism to meet existing and future community needs. The strength of this plan stems from extensive research, community involvement, analysis of needs, and public review that forms the basis for the recommendations it contains. The Plan contains goals that:

- Focus on consistently meeting and exceeding resident expectations.
- Use innovative ideas and methods to successfully meet challenges posed by budgetary, facility, and staffing limitations.
- Provide a system that benefits residents by providing diverse recreational opportunities to all ages.
- Are guided by a stewardship approach to providing high-quality facilities, both existing and future, through judicious use of public funds.
- Foster cooperation and partnerships in providing recreational services and facilities.
- Facilitate a proactive planning process guided by community needs and executable strategies and establish a process for reviewing and updating this document regularly.

This Plan is designed to serve as a decision-making tool for the Town to help set priorities for implementation. The following implementation plan chart summarizes the plan recommendations and identifies responsibility, basis or rationale for the recommendation, and timing where appropriate. The implementation plan is subject to further study and annual review, and should be part of the budget development and work plan each year.

This Plan is intended to focus on short and medium-term priorities in the next 5 to 10 years. Long-term priorities are also identified to guide planning efforts beyond 10 years. The implementation plan is based on the following time framework for short, medium, and long-term priorities:

- Mid-Term: 5-10 years (2018-2022)
- Long-term: 10 years and beyond (2023-2032)
- Ongoing
### B. Recommendations and Implementation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals, Objectives &amp; Actions</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL VISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL 1:</strong> Nederland’s parks, recreational opportunities, open space, and trail system together fulfill the needs of residents of the greater Nederland area for local facilities, programs, and natural areas that support their well-being, their active lifestyles, and their needs for indoor and outdoor recreation, their cultural and educational interests, and their desire to interact with the natural environment and with each other, while supporting the sustainable environmental, social, and economic goals of the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1.1.</strong> Address funding and staffing needs for Nederland parks, recreation, open space, and trails (PROST), including current inventory, maintenance schedules, and costs in order to create a more sustainable system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Conduct a feasibility study for a parks and recreation district and move forward with formation of the district if financially feasible, (and pursue alternative options, if not).</td>
<td>Town of Nederland (Town); Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Board (PROSAB)</td>
<td>Stakeholder and Public Input, Economic Sustainability</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Develop and implement a sustainable maintenance plan for all existing Nederland parks, recreation, open space, and trails.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Identify and detail all existing amenities and conditions relative to how well the amenity serves the intended purpose.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Stakeholder Input, Best Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Identify how each amenity impacts ecosystem functionality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Identify and detail actions required for improving current recreational and environmental conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Look creatively at user fees and other potential funding mechanisms, while continuing to pursue grants from outside funding sources.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB, Nederland Community Center Foundation (NCCF)</td>
<td>Stakeholder Input, Best Practice, Economic Sustainability</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals, Objectives &amp; Actions</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Basis</td>
<td>Timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Continue to promote fee reduction or scholarship programs to ensure that residents who do not have the ability to pay full user fees have access to public programs and services.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Stakeholder Input, Best Practice, Social Sustainability</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Encourage efforts to cultivate, support, and relieve stress from the demands of the Nederland-area volunteer community.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB, NCCF, Nederland Area Trails Organization (NATO), Wildlands Restoration Volunteers</td>
<td>Stakeholder Input</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Collaborate when possible with local and regional non-profit organizations, local governments, and governmental agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Reach an agreement with Boulder Valley School District (BVSD) for expanded mutual use of recreational facilities.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB, BVSD</td>
<td>Stakeholder Input, Best Practice, Economic Sustainability</td>
<td>Short to Mid-Term, Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Explore feasibility of a volunteer coordinator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Partner with regional volunteer groups for trail repair and maintenance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Explore the expansion of the Adopt-a-Park program into other areas of parks, recreation, open space, and trails (PROST).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 1.2.** Endeavor to follow the principles of the *Sustainable Sites Initiative* or similar sustainability guidelines in the implementation of all PROST projects to the greatest extent possible in order to promote sustainable land development and management practices.

**Actions:**

a. Prioritize projects based on sustainability analysis and community recreational needs not being met by current conditions.  
   - Town, PROSAB, Nederland Sustainability Advisory Board (SAB)  
   - Survey Results, Sustainability Goals  
   - Short-Term, Ongoing

b. Improvements to recreational amenities should take into consideration multi-functionalities. Additional functionalities could include habitat restoration, preservation and protection of natural areas, and improved ecosystem service like storm water management.  
   - Town, PROSAB  
   - Sustainability Goals  
   - Ongoing
**Objective 1.3.** Pay particular attention to the recreational needs of youth – the future of our society – and seniors – a rapidly expanding demographic.

**Action:**
- a. Give youth and senior accommodations high values in evaluation criteria for project priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROSAB, NCCF</td>
<td>Stakeholder Input</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 1.4.** Seek to make facilities ADA-compliant to increase accessibility of public facilities.

**Actions:**
- a. Develop evaluation criteria for new facility and program proposals that incorporate assessments of these elements.
- b. Evaluate existing PROST facilities for the feasibility of retrofitting for ADA compliance.
- c. Incorporate consideration of special needs groups into all facility management plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>ADA Requirements</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town with support from PROSAB, as applicable</td>
<td>ADA Requirements</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>ADA Requirements, Best Practice</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 1.5.** Ensure that all Nederland PROST facilities are adequately maintained in order to support the environmental, social, and economic goals of the community. (Also see Objective 1.1.b.)

**Actions:**
- a. Complete management plans for all Town recreational assets.
- b. Seek funding for PROST maintenance.
- c. Support and help coordinate wildfire mitigation efforts by Saws and Slaws, the USDA Forest Service, Boulder County, and others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Best Practice, Sustainability Goals</td>
<td>Short-Term, Ongoing (as applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town, PROSAB, NCCF</td>
<td>Fiscal Management Responsibility</td>
<td>Short-Term, Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town, PROSAB, NFPD</td>
<td>Supports CWPP</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town, PROSAB, NFPD</td>
<td>Supports CWPP</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 1.6.** Recognize the vulnerability of the Nederland area and its PROST assets to wildfire and proactively plan to reduce risks.

**Actions:**
- a. Emphasize forest health, including forest floor/soil health, and wildfire mitigation in the management plans for all Town property.
- b. Work to implement wildfire mitigation in the greater Nederland area using the Nederland Community Wildfire Protection Plan as a guide to promote fuel reduction activities by area land owners.
- c. Support and help coordinate wildfire mitigation efforts by Saws and Slaws, the USDA Forest Service, Boulder County, and others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Supports</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Existing Plan (Community Wildfire Protection Plan - CWPP)</td>
<td>Short-Term, Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town, NFPD, PROSAB, Saws &amp; Slaws</td>
<td>Supports CWPP</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town, NFPD</td>
<td>Supports CWPP</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals, Objectives &amp; Actions</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Actively pursue funding opportunities for forest health, including forest floor/soil health, and wild fire mitigation efforts in the greater Nederland area.</td>
<td>Town, NFPD (with support from PROSAB and others as applicable)</td>
<td>Supports CWPP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 1.7.** Make PROST-related community outreach and education a priority to promote a well-informed public.

**Actions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d.</th>
<th>Actively pursue funding opportunities for forest health, including forest floor/soil health, and wild fire mitigation efforts in the greater Nederland area.</th>
<th>Town, NFPD (with support from PROSAB and others as applicable)</th>
<th>Supports CWPP</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Objective 1.8.** Consider parking, bicycle, and pedestrian needs for PROST assets, and encourage sustainable transportation at all PROST facilities.

**GOAL 2:**

_Nederland-area parks are well-maintained and provide a diverse and abundant variety of environmentally and financially sustainable park facilities that adequately accommodate residents’ needs for indoor and outdoor recreation, social gathering places, and local and regional cultural events on a scale that is appropriate for the size and character of the town._

**Objective 2.1.** Implement the Gateway Park Area Master Plan in order to expand social and recreational opportunities and enhance environmental stewardship.

**Actions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Name the gateway park area.</td>
<td>Town Board of Trustees, PROSAB</td>
<td>Creates Community Identity</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Identify existing conditions that require immediate attention for satisfying intended recreational purpose and improving ecosystem functionality.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Best Practice, Survey Results,</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Identify opportunities to protect and improve ecosystems and use sustainable strategies to improve existing recreational facilities.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB, SAB</td>
<td>Best Practice, Supports Sustainability Goals</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals, Objectives &amp; Actions</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Basis</td>
<td>Timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Prioritize gateway park area improvements based on unmet recreational needs, ability to cost effectively improve ecosystem functionality, measured community priorities, availability of funding, partnership opportunities, etc.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Survey Results, Supports Community Goals</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leverage / Maximize Resources, Economic Sustainability</td>
<td>Short to Mid-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Partner with local non-profit organizations (e.g., NedRec) to construct gateway park area improvements.</td>
<td>Town, Non-Profit Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2.2.</strong> Improve safety and operation of Nederland Ice and Racquet Park for all users, including ice quality issues to alleviate skater safety concerns and extension of the effective ice season.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Support the efforts of Racquets and Ice for Nederland Kids (RINK) to identify and pursue funding for the construction of a shade structure that can accommodate both tennis and ice usage or other means including separate facilities for tennis and ice.</td>
<td>RINK</td>
<td>Stakeholder Input</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2.3.</strong> Continue to create and implement management plans for all Town parks to enhance sustainable operations. (Also see Objective 1.5.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2.4.</strong> Standardize Town park fixtures to promote ease of maintenance and replacement and uniform appearance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Select standard designs for trail signs, interpretive signage, kiosks, benches, picnic tables, etc.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Best Practice</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Develop selection process and set of guidelines for PROST amenities that encourage use of local recycled or rapidly renewable material and result in the lowest life cycle cost to the community.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB, SAB</td>
<td>Supports Town Sustainability Goals</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2.5.</strong> Support efforts to provide facilities for community gardening to expand locally grown food and enhance community health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Identify suitable locations for community gardens and greenhouse.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Public Support/Survey Results, Supports Sustainability Goals</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals, Objectives &amp; Actions</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Basis</td>
<td>Timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Identify opportunities to partner with a local group to provide community gardening facilities.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Public Support/Survey Results, Supports Sustainability Goals</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2.6.</strong> Support efforts to create sustainable recreational opportunities for dog owners and their pets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Explore the feasibility of a community dog park.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Public Input</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Promote responsible dog guardianship by expanding availability of dog waste bag dispensers and evaluating Nederland park areas for off-leash suitability.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Public Input, Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Develop a compostable dog waste program.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supports Town Sustainability Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECREATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL 3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nederland-area recreational activities and programs address the expressed recreational needs and preferences of the Nederland-area community and promote healthy, active, and culturally-rich lifestyles in an environmentally sensitive manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 3.1.</strong> Support the measured need for indoor aquatic recreation by creatively exploring ways to compensate for Nederland’s lack of a pool.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Seek to negotiate agreements with area pools for a community discount.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Strategy to Support Public Interest In Aquatics (per Survey), Supports Social Sustainability</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Support a reestablishment of the Gilpin Connector.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Public Interest, Supports Social Sustainability</td>
<td>Short to Mid-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Explore options to promote car-pooling among pool users.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Public Interest, Supports Sustainability Goals</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Explore a partnership opportunities to build a community pool.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Public Interest, Supports Social Sustainability</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 3.2.</strong> Institute a boating program on Barker Meadow Reservoir that meets the demonstrated need for local boating and enhances local recreational opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Negotiate with the City of Boulder to define a safe, environmentally and economically sustainable program for non-motorized boating that is acceptable to both parties.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Survey Results, Supports Sustainability Goals</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals, Objectives &amp; Actions</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Basis</td>
<td>Timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Partner with NedRec for program fundraising and management.</td>
<td>Town, NedRec, PROSAB</td>
<td>Operational Sustainability Goal</td>
<td>Short-Term, Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 3.3.** Develop the Nederland Community Center site to its full potential as a community gathering place for recreational, cultural, and social enrichment, in partnership with the Nederland Community Center Foundation (NCCF) Board when appropriate.

**Actions:**

a. Complete a site plan for the Community Center property, including a plan to utilize or replace the west wing and return the outbuildings to active use.  
   - **Responsibility:** Town, NCCF  
   - **Basis:** Supports Recreation and Sustainability Goals  
   - **Timing:** Short-Term

b. Collect and assess information to help identify opportunities to use sustainable strategies to guide the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of the site.  
   - **Responsibility:** Town, NCCF, SAB  
   - **Basis:** Supports Sustainability Goals  
   - **Timing:** Ongoing

c. Explore increasing hours of operation.  
   - **Responsibility:** Town  
   - **Basis:** Public/Stakeholder Input, Social Sustainability Goals  
   - **Timing:** Short-Term

d. Seek funding for construction of energy efficient, renewable-powered locker rooms and showers.  
   - **Responsibility:** Town, NCCF  
   - **Basis:** Stakeholder Input, Sustainability Goals  
   - **Timing:** Short-Term

**Objective 3.4.** Negotiate a mutual use agreement with Boulder Valley School District for outdoor recreational facility use to maximize and leverage public resources. (Also see Objective 1.1.)

**Objective 3.5.** Support area non-profit organizations offering critical recreational programming to the fullest extent possible (e.g., RINK, Peak to Peak Soccer, Nederland Youth Hockey Association, Nederland Tennis Association, TEENS, Inc.). (This is included in feasibility study for a district – see **Objective 1.1.a.**)

**Actions:**

a. Explore feasibility of insurance coverage.  
   - **Responsibility:** Town  
   - **Basis:** Stakeholder Input, Economic Sustainability  
   - **Timing:** Short to Mid-Term

b. Support the establishment of a common venue for local program registration.  
   - **Responsibility:** Town, PROSAB  
   - **Basis:** Stakeholder Input  
   - **Timing:** Short to Mid-Term

c. Explore providing Town support for facilities where possible (e.g., utilities, equipment, and expertise).  
   - **Responsibility:** Town, PROSAB  
   - **Basis:** Stakeholder Input  
   - **Timing:** Short to Mid-Term

**Objective 3.6.** Support community demand for additional gardening opportunities (both communal and individual) to promote the health of the community.

**Actions:**

a. Explore partnerships with local businesses to provide backyard gardening materials (e.g., composters, greenhouses) at a discount.  
   - **Responsibility:** PROSAB, Gardening Groups  
   - **Basis:** Stakeholder Input, Supports Sustainability Goals  
   - **Timing:** Short-Term
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals, Objectives &amp; Actions</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Sponsor educational gardening presentations (e.g., by the State Extension Service or by successful local gardeners).</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB, Partners</td>
<td>Stakeholder Input, Supports Sustainability Goals</td>
<td>Short-Term, Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Support creative approaches to mountain gardening (e.g., hugelkultur, vermicomposting).</td>
<td>Town, Gardening Groups</td>
<td>Stakeholder Input, Supports Sustainability Goals</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 3.7.** Address the need for safe venues for recreational sport shooting. Acknowledge the negative community impacts of shooting at the old dump site off Magnolia Road, by supporting the efforts of the U.S. Forest Service to lead a multi-county task force to locate appropriately-sited venues for this activity.

**Actions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Maintain close contact with the U.S. Forest Service and Boulder County to encourage their efforts and to feed progress reports back to the community.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Supports Safety Goals, Social Sustainability</td>
<td>Short-Term, Ongoing (as applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Communicate with state and national elected officials to support this effort.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Support Safety Goals, Social Sustainability</td>
<td>Short-Term, Ongoing (as applicable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 3.8.** Support a mix of recreational and cultural activities and programs responsive to the interests and needs of Nederland-area residents to support healthy, active, and culturally-rich lifestyles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Enhance programs of interest to various age groups (e.g., music, talent night, etc.).</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB, Collaborating Organizations</td>
<td>Stakeholder Input/Survey Results, Social Sustainability</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Continue to support special events such as races, concerts, and festivals.</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Public Input/ Survey Results, Social Sustainability</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Identify strategies to enhance fitness, cultural arts, multi-generational, and family programs through contract instructors, partnerships, or volunteers.</td>
<td>Town, Nederland Community Center</td>
<td>Best Practices/Operational and Social Sustainability Goals</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Promote environmental education, interpretation, and stewardship through interpretive signage and stewardship activities such as those offered through the Wild Bear Mountain Ecology Center.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB, Wild Bear Mountain Ecology Center</td>
<td>Public/Stakeholder Input, Supports <em>Envision</em> 2020</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Promote awareness of Nederland history through the Nederland Area Historical Society, incorporation of interpretive signage throughout Nederland, and historical walking tours.</td>
<td>Town, Boulder County, Nederland Area Historical Society</td>
<td>Staff, Stakeholder Input/Support <em>Envision</em> 2020</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPEN SPACE

Goal 4:
The Nederland community’s desire for open space preservation is recognized by creative pursuit of land preservation opportunities that arise with a priority placed on preserving sensitive natural resources, viewsheds, and riparian areas and by responsible management of the Town’s open space property.

Objective 4.1. Establish Town documentation for acquiring desirable open space property in order to pursue land preservation opportunities.

Actions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Town, PROSAB</th>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>Short-Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Compile list of potential open space acquisitions that score highly when evaluated according to the evaluation criteria in Appendix H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Maintain a list of potential funding partners for open space acquisition.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximize Resources</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 4.2. Develop Sustainability Analysis for current Town-owned open space property for:

- Increasing ecosystem functionality
- Improving wildlife habitat
- Improving storm water management by use of natural passive systems
- Water, natural resources, and current land use data

Objective 4.3. Implement management plans for current open space that emphasize best practices for forest health, including forest floor/soil health; wildfire mitigation; and site-appropriate public access. (Also see Objective 1.6.)

TRAILS

GOAL 5:
The Nederland-area trails system provides safe, accessible, and well-maintained multi-modal, non-motorized pathways that link Nederland’s commercial district, neighborhoods, schools, area parks, recreational facilities, and regional trails; encourage physical activity; and provide opportunities for alternative transportation.

Objectives 5.1. Update the 2005 Town of Nederland Trails Master Plan to guide enhancements to the trail system.

Actions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Town, PROSAB</th>
<th>Stakeholder Input/ Survey Results Supporting Trails</th>
<th>Short-Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Gather public input regarding needs for additional area trails and linkages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Encourage rebuilding plans for recreational trails and adjacent soil restoration in areas impacted by forest mitigation work.</td>
<td>Town, U.S. Forest Service</td>
<td>Sustainability Goals</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Update maps for existing trails, trail opportunities and constraints, and proposed trails.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Stakeholder Input/ Survey Results</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Revise trail design standards in keeping with current Town sustainability goals.</td>
<td>Town, PROSAB</td>
<td>Public Education and Sustainability Goals</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals, Objectives &amp; Actions</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Basis</td>
<td>Timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Objective 5.2.** Find resources for effective trails maintenance and new trail construction to enhance trail quality and connectivity. | **Actions:**
| a. Partner with groups such as the Mountain Youth Corps, Nederland Area Trails Organization (NATO), and Wildlands Restoration Volunteers to repair and maintain local trails. | Town, PROSAB, Trail Organizations | Maximize Resources Through Partnerships, Supports Sustainability Goals | Short-Term, Ongoing |
| b. Seek grant funding for trails maintenance and construction. | Town, PROSAB, Trail Organizations | Maximize Resources, Supports Economic Sustainability | Short-Term, Ongoing |
| **Objective 5.3.** Improve trail safety to promote community walkability, health, and alternative transportation. | **Actions:**
| a. Identify needs for ground-level trail lighting (e.g., Community Center Connector Trail, Tungsten Trail) and find funding for installation and maintenance. | Town, PROSAB, Trail Organizations (as applicable) | Stakeholder/Public Support of Trails | Short-Term |
| b. Identify needs for safe roadway crossings (e.g., near Community Center) and seek funding for appropriate crossing solutions. | Town, PROSAB | Stakeholder Input/Public Support | Short-Term, Ongoing |
| c. Make trails maintenance a priority. | Town, PROSAB | Stakeholder Input/Public Support, Supports Sustainability Goals | Ongoing |
| **Objective 5.4.** Continue working with surrounding public and private land holders for increased linkages to area trails and attractions to increase trail connectivity and usage. | **Actions:**
| a. Participate in the management plan update process for Boulder County’s open space lands in the Nederland vicinity. | Town, PROSAB | Stakeholder/Public Support of Trails | As Applicable |
| b. Collaborate with the U.S. Forest Service and Boulder County to identify desirable trail linkages. | Town, PROSAB | Stakeholder/Public Support of Trails | Ongoing |
| **Objective 5.5.** Develop the Tungsten Trail along Middle Boulder Creek and the western shoreline of Barker Reservoir as a riverwalk, with sensitivity towards both public needs for water access and preservation of riparian habitat, in order to promote healthy lifestyles and environmental awareness and stewardship. |
C. Capital Improvement Summary

General cost estimates are included for recommended capital project in the Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan to help guide fundraising efforts and the development of the Town’s Capital Improvement Plan. Potential funding sources as well as operational and maintenance considerations are included in Table 5.

Recommended capital projects are identified as high or medium priority based on meeting some of the decision-making criteria listed below.

- Project has broad Town-wide appeal and meets an identified need or interest (e.g., survey, etc.).
- Project is compatible with current Town plans and vision (e.g., promotes social, environmental, and economic sustainability).
- Project addresses improvements to assets in poor physical condition.
- Project has identified funding or partnership resources.
- Project has a low cost and a high impact.

Estimates are provided in 2012 dollars and should be adjusted as needed in future years.

Table 5: Recommended Capital Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source(s)</th>
<th>Operational and Maintenance</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of Nederland Community Center Site Master Plan</td>
<td>Consultant design/engineering fee varies based on scope</td>
<td>Town of Nederland, Grants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community greenhouse (with heat sink) – 5,000 SF</td>
<td>$53,000-$60,000</td>
<td>Donations, Grants</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Park Area Master Plan</td>
<td>Full Build Out – $3.32 Million (See detailed cost estimate in Appendix K)</td>
<td>Grants, Town of Nederland</td>
<td>$3,000 per acre (15 acres)</td>
<td>High/Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Implementation

Through the creative use of partnerships and grants, the Town of Nederland has enhanced its parks, recreation, open space, and trails system and will continue to do so in the future. A strong network of non-profit organizations and groups like the Nederland Community Center Foundation and the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Advisory Board provide strong support to advancing the goals of this Master Plan.

The largest future capital investments identified in this Plan will be for the gateway park area enhancements and improvements to the Nederland Community Center building, grounds, and out buildings. Sustainable funding to support quality maintenance and operations is also a future need.
Preservation of open space and trail connectivity are also high priorities. By continuing to collaborate with public land agencies, private land owners, and other organizations, the Town will continue to protect valuable open spaces and creek corridors in and around Nederland and make critical trail connections. (Appendix J provides additional information about preservation tools and funding sources.)

The Town of Nederland is a community with a strong sense of identity and committed volunteers. This community pride and investment will be the driving force to the implementation of the goals of this Master Plan, guided by the aspirations set out in Envision 2020.
Appendix A – Survey Report
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OVERVIEW OF SELECTED FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to gather public feedback on Nederland area open space, trails, park and recreation programs and services. This feedback and subsequent analysis was designed to provide input to the Nederland Open Space, Trails, Parks & Recreation Master Plan Project. This study is based on survey research that targeted residents of Nederland, as well as households that live in the area immediately adjacent to the Town.

The survey was conducted using three methods: 1) an online invitation-only survey, 2) a paper mailback survey distributed upon request, and 3) an open-link online survey for members of the public that did not respond using the invitation survey form.

The three versions of the survey garnered 361 responses from within the Town of Nederland, and the County area contained within the Library District. Responses were obtained from a combination of survey invitations that were sent by postcard to 2,704 local households, followed by an “Open Link” survey that provided opportunities for interested citizens that had not responded to the Invitation Survey to participate. The invitation version of the survey resulted in 291 households responding and the open link captured another 70 for a total of 361 responses.

The survey contained a series of questions designed to measure recreation behavior and perceptions by area residents. In addition, there were numerous opportunities for survey participants to respond in their own words to “open ended” questions. The attached report summarizes selected findings from the statistical analysis of results. In addition, open ended responses have been provided under separate cover. These comments are extensive; there are over 100 pages of input that have been organized by version of the survey that resulted in response, as well as whether the respondent lives in Nederland or the Library District.

The data suggest that area residents are using recreation programs and facilities provided by a number of different entities. The most mentioned sources included U.S. Forest Service lands, and Boulder County Open Space lands, but there were over 20 different providers identified, all offering recreation opportunities.

The survey focused on local residents and their opinions. A number of the open ended comments stressed that residents, not tourists, should receive primary attention in Town planning efforts.

The majority of the written discussion of the survey findings will focus on results from the Invitation Survey sample of residents. However, results from all surveys have been considered and open-ended comments from all surveys have been reported verbatim in a manner consistent with the Town of Nederland Board of Trustees Working Agreements for public input.
Selected Findings

Parks and recreation opportunities are important to area residents. Respondents to the survey from the Nederland area indicated that the availability of local parks and recreation opportunities in the Town are very important, with an average rating of over 4 on a 5-point scale where 5 means “extremely important.” About 8 in 10 respondents rated the importance of parks and recreation opportunities a “4” or “5.”

Activities and programs that are important to be added, expanded or improved. The list below provides a rank ordering of relative importance of the top rated categories based on a list of 21 categories:

- Biking/hiking/running
- Indoor swimming/aquatics
- Non-motorized boating
- Events (e.g., movies, concerts, festivals)
- Cultural/arts/dance/music/crafts
- Snow and ice activities

Facilities to be added, expanded or improved. The survey evaluated priorities of the community, both in town and in the county area described by the Library District Boundary (Survey Question 18). Results from the two groups are very similar. Based on a list of 31 categories, the 8 most identified facilities in approximate rank order included:

- Open space/conservation land
- Pedestrian/bike paths (soft surface)
- Community gardens
- Indoor swimming pool
- Community greenhouse
- The proposed gateway park at the end of Barker Reservoir
- Boating on the Reservoir
- An outdoor amphitheater

In a related question, respondents were asked to pick their top three priorities from the list in Question 18. This question resulted in the following five choices being most identified by both residents of the town and the remainder of the Library District area. The consistency in responses is notable.

- Indoor swimming pool
- Boating on the reservoir (non-motorized)
- Open space/conservation land
- Pedestrian bike paths (soft surface)
- The proposed gateway park

Boating on the Reservoir. Slightly over six in 10 Nederland area respondents indicate some support for a boating program on the reservoir, measured by a “4” or “5” on a 5-point scale where “5” is “definitely support.”

These results vary somewhat by whether the respondent lives in town versus outside Nederland, with slightly higher support from those outside. Further, while there is a significant group that will “definitely
not support” boating among town residents (about 3 in 10), the negative sentiment is weaker in the county. Interestingly, on this issue there are few respondents that are neutral. Overall less than 10% gave boating a “3” or “neutral” on the scale. While a majority are in favor overall, residents are generally on one side or the other side of this issue.

The gateway park area. The survey probed various policy aspects of the gateway park area. There is strong support and consensus around “Improving/protecting water quality” (almost 9 in 10 definitely” or “probably support”) and “Creating a unique gateway and identity for Nederland” (about seven in 10). Further, there is very little support for “Discouraging people from using this location for recreational purposes” (less than 10% support this alternative). Less clear is the support for active recreation on the site, although a majority of respondents (50% plus) support all of the alternative policy choices that were evaluated in Question 17 of the survey.

Special District or Town Recreation Department? The survey asked respondents about two alternative approaches to paying for and managing parks and recreation services. There was moderate support for both alternatives:

**Special District Approach**
- The creation of a special district (similar to a fire district) supported by property taxes received support from slightly over 6 in 10 respondents. About 2 in 10 reported that they “definitely” or “probably” would not support the creation of a special district.
- Comparing responses from residents in Town to those outside Nederland, the support for a district is somewhat higher among unincorporated county residents.

**Town Parks and Recreation Department supported by property tax of Town residents.**
- On the second question of financial alternatives, about 6 in 10 overall would support a parks and recreation department in the town funded by a property tax for residents.
- Support for this approach was about equal among in-town and out-of-town respondents. It should be noted that out-of-town residents would not vote on this tax, nor would they pay it. Once again, negative sentiment was higher among Nederland residents with 3 in 10 saying they “definitely” or “probably” would not support it, and 2 in 10 county residents answering this way.

**METHODOLOGY**

The purpose of this study was to gather public feedback on Nederland Area open space, trails, park and recreation programs and services. This feedback and subsequent analysis was designed to provide input to the Nederland Open Space, Trails, Parks & Recreation Master Plan Project. This study is based on survey research that targeted residents of Nederland, as well as households that live in the area immediately adjacent to the Town.

The survey was conducted using three methods: 1) an online invitation-only survey, 2) a paper mailback survey distributed upon request, and 3) an open link online survey for members of the public that did not respond using the invitation survey form.

The primary list source used for the mailing was a third party list purchased from Melissa Data Corp., a leading provider of lists. A total of 2,704 postcard invitations were mailed to all identified Nederland
postal boxes, all Rollinsville boxes, as well as to homes that were identified to fall on delivery routes within the Library Tax District (an approximate five mile radius around the Town of Nederland). A total of 291 survey responses were obtained from households in and around Nederland using a password provided on the mailed postcard; 142 of these responses were obtained from households within the Town limits. Based on current estimates (by ESRI Business Solutions, a firm that is specialized in population estimates) there are 667 in-Town households. An estimated 21% of Town households were represented in the survey responses. Additionally, 146 surveys were returned by households outside the Town in the Library District.

A copy of the postcard that provided the survey invitation is presented in the Appendix. The postcard contained a pass code that permitted one member of a household to complete the questionnaire online. In addition, other members of the household were encouraged to call for a paper version of the survey if more than one member wanted to participate in the research. Paper surveys were submitted by 15 persons. Additionally, following broad publicity of the invitation version of the survey, the public was invited to complete the survey using the “Open Link” version. The Open Link survey generated 55 responses. In total, survey 173 respondents reported they live in the Town.

In the following sections of the report, tables generally portray the results from the Email Invitation Survey, as distinguished from responses to the Open Link and Paper (Mailback) versions of the survey. Responses to the open-link version of the questionnaire, and the paper versions, are “self-selected”; therefore, results from the open-link questionnaire are kept separate from the invitation web versions of the survey for the overall analysis. The majority of the written discussion that follows focuses primarily on results from the Email Invitation Survey. However, results from all surveys have been considered and open-ended comments from all surveys have been reported verbatim.

The underlying tabular data for the Email Invitation Survey responses were weighted by age to ensure appropriate representation of Nederland area residents. In other words, because younger residents were under represented in the total survey responses (they are slightly less likely to respond to these types of surveys), a statistical correction was made to increase the responses from the younger segment to more accurately represent the broad community. For purposes of this weighting, 2011 ESRI data for the Nederland Library District were used. The proportions of the population that are estimated to fall in each age category according to ESRI were the basis for weighting of the survey data so that the resulting analysis most accurately reflects the conclusions and opinions of the underlying population.

In general, in the following sections, results are reported for the combined responses from in Town and out of Town (Library District) households. In a number of instances where comparisons are important to interpreting results, responses from each group are also presented graphically. Full sets tabular results have been provided to the Town under separate cover.

**RESPONDENT PROFILE**

A profile of respondents that includes both in-Town and residents outside Nederland may be summarized as follows:
Location and Length of Residence

- 47 percent of respondents live outside the town limits of Nederland
- 53 percent live in the town
- Average number of years lived in the area: 13.2 years

Figure 1
Average Number of Years Lived in the Area

Household Characteristics

- 31 percent of households earn annual incomes of $100,000 or greater
- 41 percent earn between $50,000 and $99,999
- 28 percent earn $49,999 or below
- 80 percent own their own residence
- 19 percent rent their residence

Figure 2
Household Income and Ownership of Residence
Age, Gender, and Household Status

- Average age of respondents was 56.8 years
- 57 percent of respondents were female; 43 percent were male
- 32 percent are in households with children at home
- 28 percent are singles or couples with no children at home
- 17 percent are “empty nesters”

Figure 3
Age, Gender, and Household Status

As described in the Methodology Section, the survey included residents of Nederland, as well as respondents from within an approximate five mile radius of the Town. In general, the demographic profile of respondents that live in-Town and outside Nederland, are similar. The responses from the invitation survey were almost equally balanced between Town and County area respondents (53% in Town, 47% outside the town limits). This finding is important. There are strong similarities among residents of the area that are reflected in various ways including demographics, recreation participation and opinions on various priorities. This shared “community of interest” suggests that there are opportunities to plan more broadly than just for residents within the Town, whether the considerations are for parks, recreation and open space, or for other public policy issues.

The demographics of in Town and out of Town respondents are summarized by the two graphs below.
CURRENT FACILITIES, AMENITIES AND SERVICES

Parks and recreation opportunities are important to area residents

Respondents to the survey from the Nederland area indicated that the availability of local parks and recreation opportunities in the Town are very important with an average rating of 4.3 on a 5 point scale where 5 means “extremely important.” About 83% rated the importance of parks and recreation opportunities a “4” or “5.”
Why are residents not using programs and facilities?

When survey respondents were asked why they do not use Nederland programs and facilities there were a large number of different factors cited. Understanding what local residents use and want is one of the important purposes of this survey. The most mentioned was “Don’t have the programs/facilities I want” (44%). Second most identified is “No time/other personal reasons” (31%). This reason for not using facilities is commonly identified but it is not usually a focus of community parks and recreation efforts. However, the third most identified reason for not participating is “Not aware of what is available.” This represents a challenge to the community but is one that can be effectively addressed through a number of different actions. Later sections of this report discuss enhanced opportunities for communications concerning open space, parks and recreation.

![Figure 6](image_url)

Also frequently identified is, “Prefer other recreation providers/clubs.” This condition is described further in below; Nederland area residents are relying on a large number of different providers for recreation facilities and it should be recognized that the Town is not the only provider.
Comments

Q. Reason you do not use parks, recreation, programs or facilities? (Don't have the programs I want)
Click View (or type http://rrcinfo.com/nederland/comments/Ned3.pdf)

What other types of parks, recreation facilities, open space, trails, and programs are used?

Survey results suggest that Nederland area residents are using parks and recreation sources that are
owned and maintained by a wide variety of providers. While the U.S. Forest Service lands were most
identified (92%), Boulder County Open Space and Mountain Parks was a close second at 87%. Other
resources including Eldora Mountain Resort and recreation facilities in neighboring towns were
mentioned by over 50% or respondents. Additionally, various public and private facilities were also
mentioned by a significant number of respondents. Clearly, the data suggest that Nederland area
residents are active and they are availing themselves of a wide variety of recreation lands, programs and
amenities.

![Figure 7
Other Parks & Recreation Providers Being Used](chart.png)
Comments

Q. What other parks, recreation facilities, open space, trails, and programs do you use? (OTHER)
Click View (or type http://rrcinfo.com/nederland/comments/Ned4.pdf)

Usage frequency of selected existing facilities

Households in the Nederland area used trails in Town and the Barker Reservoir area far more frequently over the past year than other existing facilities. The survey measured use by “you or any member of your household.” Use of the Nederland Community Center was also high (multiple times per month) and Chipeta Park was used at least once per month on average.

The following facilities were used most frequently over the past year by households of the Nederland area:
- Trails in Town/Barker Reservoir area (44 times on average over the past 12 months)
- Nederland Community Center (25 times)
- Chipeta Park (20 times)

Second tier of frequent usage:
- Carousel of Happiness (11 times)
- Nederland Ice Park (7 times)

The survey indicates that the Teen Center, Nederland Racquet Park and the Nathan Lazarus Skate Park receive relatively lower usage by the community (in town and out of Town) at large. These results are not surprising—a facility like TEENS, Inc. is designed for use by a small segment of the overall population and activities like tennis and skateboarding have relatively low participation when measured against the entire population of residents.

Figure 8
Current Facilities – Average Annual Frequency of Use

![Bar chart showing average annual frequency of use for various facilities in Nederland area.]

- Trails in Town/Barker Reservoir area: 44
- Nederland Community Center: 25
- Chipeta Park: 20
- Carousel of Happiness: 11
- Nederland Ice Park: 7
- Teen Center (TEENS, Inc.): 3
- Nederland racquet park: 2
- Nathan Lazarus Skate Park: 2
- Other: 1
Degree to which Current Facilities are Meeting Household Needs

Respondents rated the performance of the above evaluated facilities in Town in terms of whether “household” needs are being met. In general, all of facilities received over 50% scores for “needs being met” with the Carousel of Happiness highest rated at 88%. However, by these measures there is room for improvement with about one in four respondents indicating that the Lazarus Skate Park, the Racquet Park, Ice Park and Teen Center are not meeting household needs.

The topic of the ice rink and tennis courts generated extensive comments. There were a number of specific open ended comments about that addressed the need for improvements and various aspects of joint use. The comments in support of the ice rink were more extensive and spoke to ideas for improvements, problems with joint use with tennis, maintenance, and high use of the rink facilities by youth and adults. Also, some comments specifically called out the importance of tennis. Comments regarding tennis and ice rink facilities were interspersed throughout the survey. For purposes of review, they have been compiled and can be reached by clicking here. Click View Comments (or type: http://www.rrcinfo.com/nederland/comments/Ice%20Rink%20Comments.pdf). While the interest expressed through the extensive comments suggest that the perceived problems are clearly a major issue for some, the quantitative results (see above) suggest that these residents are in the minority. The majority of respondents, both in Town and living outside, feel that community needs are being met.

![Figure 9: How are the Following Facilities Meeting the Needs of your Household](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Meeting Needs (4 or 5)</th>
<th>Not Meeting Needs (1 or 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carousel of Happiness</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Lazarus Skate Park</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nederland racquet Park</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipeta Park</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nederland ice park</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nederland Community Center</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails in Town/Barker Reservoir area</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Center (TEENS, Inc.)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments

Q. Do you have any comments or suggestions for how the current facilities and services can better meet the needs of your household or the community? Click View
(or type http://rrcinfo.com/nederland/comments/Ned2.pdf)

CURRENT ACTIVITIES

Usage Frequency

Residents of the Nederland area were asked to indicate how many times they (or someone in their household) used or participated in a general list of activities or programs in the last 12 months. Nederland households engaged in “Biking/hiking/running” and “Walking the dog” significantly more frequently than other activities and programs. The following activities and programs were used most frequently over the past year by residents of the Nederland area:

- Biking/hiking/running (an average of 518 times in the past year)
- Walking the dog (232 times)
- Snow & ice activities (71 times)
- Outdoor informal, unstructured activities (46 times)
- Other activities (36 times)
- Fitness and wellness programs (17 times)
- Volunteering (17 times)
- Events (e.g., movies, concerts, festivals (12 times)

The participation in the full list of activities is summarized by the graph below.
Figure 10
Program - Frequency of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biking/hiking/running</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking the dog</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow &amp; ice activities</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor informal, unstructured activities</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness and wellness programs</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events (e.g., movies, concerts, festivals)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor informal, unstructured activities</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural / arts / dance / music / crafts</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor swimming/aquatics</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education, skills education</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic/sports leagues - youth</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school &amp; summer youth programs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized boating</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target shooting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+ programs / seniors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic/sports leagues - adult</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding/inline skating</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental programs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events (e.g., movies, concerts, festivals)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

Q. If you use outdoor sports fields/courts, please specify type. Click View (or type: http://rrcinfo.com/nederland/comments/Ned10.pdf)

Degree to which Programs are Meeting Household Needs

Programs. After providing an indication of frequency of use for programs and activities, respondents were then asked to rate the same list of activities and programs according to “How well they are meeting household needs.” The activities that were participated in most frequently were also rated highest in the degree to which needs are being met.

Programs with the highest degree of “needs being met” include:
- Biking/hiking/running (82%)
• Snow & ice activities (76%)
• Walking the dog (75%)
• Events (e.g., movies, concerts, festivals (74%)
• Outdoor informal, unstructured activities (68%)
• Volunteering (66%)
• Skateboarding/inline skating (62%)

For most programs and facilities, the proportion of the community that indicated their needs were being met was larger than the proportion whose needs were not being met. However, there were a number of programs for which a third to two-thirds of respondents indicated their needs were not at all being met (1 or 2 on a 5 point scale). The largest proportion occurred with indoor swimming/aquatics and non-motorized boating where approximately two-thirds of respondents indicate their household needs are not being met:
• Indoor swimming/aquatics (66%)
• Non-motorized boating (62%)
• General education, skills education (44%)
• Target shooting (36%)
• Teen Programs (34%)
• Athletic/Sports League- Adult (34%)
• Athletic/Sports League- Child (32%)
• After-school & summer youth programs (32%)

These results are summarized in the following graph with the activities that are not being fully met shown at the bottom of the graph.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Moderately/Completely Meeting Needs (4 or 5)</th>
<th>Not Meeting Needs (1 or 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biking/hiking/running</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow &amp; ice activities</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking the dog</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events (e.g., movies, concerts, festivals)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor informal, unstructured activities</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding/inline skating</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target shooting</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+ programs /seniors</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental programs</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural / arts / dance / music / crafts</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor informal, unstructured activities</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen programs</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness and wellness programs</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic/sports leagues - youth</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school &amp; summer youth programs</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic/sports leagues - adult</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education, skills education</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized boating</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor swimming/aquatics</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These results are further probed by residents that live in Town and outside Nederland. As shown, there are generally very similar responses in terms of “needs being met.” Both of these segments are especially likely to respond that their needs for indoor swimming/aquatics and non-motorized boating are not being met.

**Figure 12**
Programs- Degree to Which Household Needs are Being Met
Percent Responding 4 or 5 (Completely Meeting Needs)
Live In vs Outside the Town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Live In</th>
<th>Outside the Town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biking/hiking/running</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow &amp; ice activities</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking the dog</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events (e.g., movies, concerts, festivals)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor informal, unstructured activities</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding/inline skating</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+ programs / seniors</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target shooting</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental programs</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor informal, unstructured activities</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen programs</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural / arts / dance / music / crafts</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness and wellness programs</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school &amp; summer youth programs</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic/sports leagues - youth</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic/sports leagues - adult</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education, skills education</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized boating</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor swimming/aquatics</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Responding "4" or "5"
Highest Priorities for Programs to be Added, Expanded, or Improved

From the same list of programs, respondents were asked to identify their top three priorities for additions, expansions, or improvements. These results provide one measure of priorities of residents of the area. Programs selected among the top five by the greatest proportion of respondents included:

- Biking/hiking/running (36%)
- Indoor swimming/aquatics (32%)
- Non-motorized boating (28%)
- Events (e.g., movies, concerts, festivals) (26%)
- Cultural /arts / dance / music / crafts (25%)

The following table highlights responses on the two separate questions. The first measures top priorities of Nederland area households and the second question evaluates the extent to which residents feel their needs are being met. There are distinct differences in results – needs for biking/hiking/running, events and snow and ice activities are generally being met. In contrast, needs for indoor swimming and non-motorized boating are largely unmet as indicated by the yellow highlights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities/Facilities</th>
<th>Percent indicating that it is among their Top 3 Priorities</th>
<th>Needs Being Completely Met (4 or 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biking/hiking/running</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Swimming Aquatics</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized boating</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events (e.g., movies, concerts, festivals)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural /arts / dance / music / crafts</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow and Ice Activities</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities and Facilities

The survey asked respondents about activities/facilities that would be used by households, and the importance of “adding, expanding or improving these facilities in the Nederland area in the next 5 to 10 years.” A total of 31 categories of recreational activities were identified and there was an opportunity provided for missing activities to be identified as “other.” Note that some of these activities overlap with categories that were evaluated by the “programs” list that was discussed previously. These questions provide additional ways of measuring and potentially prioritizing various improvements. Shown below is a rank ordered graph of responses broken out by in-Town and out of Town households. The first graph illustrates the most identified 15 facilities. The following graph portrays the next tier of facilities in similar ranked order. As shown, the priorities of both groups of respondents are generally similar but not identical. For example, community gardens are rated higher by in Town residents (65% versus 57%). The proposed gateway park is rated higher by out of Town residents (74% out of Town residents versus 64% in-Town residents).
Figure 13
15 Top Rated Facilities to be Added, Expanded or Improved (4 or 5)
Live in the Town vs. Outside the Town

- Open space / conservation land
- Pedestrian / bike paths (soft surface)
- Community gardens
- Indoor swimming pool
- Community greenhouse
- The proposed gateway park at the west end of Barker Reservoir
- Boating on the reservoir (non-motorized small craft)
- Outdoor amphitheater
- Other priorities
- Fitness and weight room equipment
- Sledding hill
- Playgrounds
- Picnic areas / wind shelters
- Dog park
- Festival / event space(s)
Figure 14
15 Bottom Rated Facilities to be Added, Expanded or Improved (4 or 5)
Live in the Town vs. Outside the Town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Description</th>
<th>In the Town</th>
<th>Outside the Town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic habitat improvement / catch and release fishing</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports fields / courts (type)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouldering / rock climbing structures</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisbee® / disc golf</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle park</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian / bike paths and trails (hard surface/paved)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball courts</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking on the creek</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand senior program spaces</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor gymnasium space</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball fields</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor track</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand volleyball</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting range</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slacklining</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were also asked to identify their first, second and third highest priority for improvements from the list of 31 facilities and activities. As shown below, there is a distinct pattern of results with the top four categories identified by 25% or more of respondents, followed by a second tier that ranged from 17% down to 12% (6 types of facilities). The remainder of the list was identified by 9% or less of respondents.

Most identified categories included:
- Indoor swimming pool (35%)
- Boating on the reservoir (non-motorized) (31%)
- Open space/conservation land (27%)
- Pedestrian/bike paths (soft surface) (25%) (Note that hard surface paths received 12%)

### Figure 15
Top Three Highest Priority Activities or Programs to be Added, Expanded, or Improved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor swimming pool</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating on the reservoir (non-motorized small craft)</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space / conservation land</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian / bike paths (soft surface)</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed gateway park at the west end of Barker</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog park</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community greenhouse</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian / bike paths (hard surface/paved)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor amphitheater</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness and weight room equipment</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sledding hill</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisbee® / disc golf</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festival / event space(s)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other priorities</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle park</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking on the creek</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouldering / rock climbing structures</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball courts</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports fields / courts</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic habitat improvement / catch and release fishing</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas / wind shelters</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball fields</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting range</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor track</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor gymnasium space</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slacklining</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand senior program spaces</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand volleyball</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice rink</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

Q. If chose other priorities to add, expand, or improve in the Nederland area, please specify. Click View (or type http://rrcinfo.com/nederland/comments/Ned11.pdf)
Q. Which activities would you consider most important to your household to add, expand or improve in the Nederland area? Click View (or type http://rrcinfo.com/nederland/comments/Ned1.pdf)

Q. Which three activities/programs would you consider to be the most important to your household to be added/expanded, or improved in the Nederland area? (COMMENTS) Click View (or type: http://rrcinfo.com/nederland/comments/Ned12.pdf)

TRAILS AND OPEN SPACE

The survey results provide a measure of priorities of area residents with respect to trails and open space. While all aspects of open space are considered important by the community, receiving a “4” or “5” on the five point importance scale, the most identified categories included:

- Preserve wildlife habitat (90% a 4 or 5)
- Maintain existing trails (87%)
- Preserve the view corridors (85%)

The lower rated categories, in terms of importance, included:

- Build more trails (50%)
- Provide trail amenities (44%)

These findings are consistent with many of the ratings in the survey where residents favor “maintaining” and “preserving” as a general management approach, rating these techniques higher than “building” and “creating more” (see the graph in the next section). The finding is also borne out in a number of the open-ended comments where a significant segment comment in various ways that they would like to see more done with what exists.
It is notable that the responses from in Town and out of Town households are very similar in terms of open space management priorities.

The survey asked respondents to identify specific trail linkages that should be pursued. There were a large number of specific suggestions provided. These suggestions are listed in the appendix.

**Comments**

Q. Do you have any comments on Nederland trails and open space, including specific linkages that you would like to see pursued? Click View (or type http://rrcinfo.com/nederland/comments/Ned7.pdf)

**FUTURE FACILITIES, AMENITIES, AND SERVICES TO ADD, EXPAND, OR IMPROVE**

**Greatest Needs for Facilities to be Added, Expanded, or Improved**

Respondents were asked questions concerning a series of potential programs or amenities and responses provide measures of community sentiment concerning some of the alternatives that may be considered for the future. These questions were asked in no particular order or priority on the survey.
Further, an effort was made to offer, in some cases, a “no action” alternative as one of the choices available to respondents.

**A boating program on Barker Reservoir**

Over 60% of Nederland area respondents indicate some support for a boating program on the reservoir, a “4” or “5” on a five point scale where “5” is “definitely support.”

![Figure 17](image)

A Boating Program on Barker Reservoir

These results vary somewhat by whether the respondent lives in Town (63% support) versus outside Nederland (67%). Further, while there is a significant group that will “definitely not support” among Town residents (28%), the negative sentiment is weaker out of town with approximately 10% saying they would “definitely not support.” Interestingly, on this issue there are few respondents that are neutral (overall only 8%) gave boating a “3” or “neutral on the scale. While a majority are in favor overall, residents are generally on one side or the other side of this issue.

![Figure 18](image)

A Boating Program on Barker Reservoir
Live In the Town vs Outside the Town

**Changes to the Middle Boulder Creek area in Nederland**

A series of questions probed interest in various changes to the creek as it passes through Town. While most respondents favor “Water quality improvement...” (91%) and “Aquatic habitat improvement to restore the creek to a more natural state” (84%) there is less consensus on “Increased shoreline access through natural surface trail improvements (riverwalk)” (73%) and “Increased public waterway access by construction of a small number of “drops” (small waterfalls) in the business district area (kayak playpark)” (56%).
Results were more divided when the responses from In-Town and Out of Town residents are considered. As summarized below, there is considerably more resistance to changes to the creek from Town residents compared to out of Town residents. Note that in the following graph the responses are summarized for those that would not support, a 1 or 2 rating.

The gateway park area

The survey probed various policy aspects of the gateway park area. There is strong support and consensus around “Improving/protecting water quality” (87% “definitely” or “probably support”) and “Creating a unique gateway and identity for Nederland” (71%). Further, there is very little support for “Discouraging people from using this location for recreational purposes” (only 8% support this alternative). Less clear is the support for active recreation on the site, although a majority of respondents (50% plus) support the three alternative policy choices that were evaluated.
When these choices are probed by whether respondents live in Town or outside Nederland, there are once again some differences. These differences are shown in the graph below.

**Figure 22**  
**Broadly Speaking, What Would You Like to See in the Gateway Park Area?**  
Percent Responding “Definitely or Probably Support” (4 or 5)  
 Live In the Town vs Outside the Town

**Comments**

Q. Comments on what you would like to see in the gateway parks area. Click View (or type http://rrcinfo.com/nederland/comments/Ned9.pdf)

**Special Events**

The survey also evaluated community support for outdoor festivals and events. As illustrated below, a majority of both in Town and Outside the Town respondents believe festivals and events contribute
positively to the community. About 68% of both groups of residents rate events as providing “very positive” or “somewhat positive” community impact. Once again, residents within the Town are slightly more likely to give a negative rating (21% Town versus 9% of County residents rating events/festivals a “1” or “2”)

**Figure 23**
Special Events Community Impact
Live In the Town vs Outside the Town

![Bar chart showing community impact of special events](chart.png)

Events were further probed in terms of frequency, size and mix/type. Again, most respondents are positive with 73% of the overall responses saying there is the “right mix” of events, 75% saying the size of events is “just right” (but with 20% saying “too large”). Most respondents also believe the current mix/type of events is appropriate with 74% indicating the “right mix” on the survey and 26% saying “wrong mix.” There was virtually no difference in these responses between in-Town and County residents.

**Figure 24**
Evaluation of Outdoor Festivals and Events

![Bar chart showing evaluation of outdoor festivals and events](chart.png)

This question also provided an opportunity for respondents to comment on events. A sampling of comments is provided below with a full listing of the comments identified in the Appendix.

**Comments**

Q. Comments on outdoor festivals in the Nederland area. Click [View](http://rrcinfo.com/nederland/comments/Ned8.pdf)
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FINANCIAL CHOICES

The survey asked respondents about two alternative approaches to paying for and managing parks and recreation services. As shown below, there was moderate support for both alternatives:

- **Special District Approach.** Respondents were first asked if they would support the creation of a special district (similar to a fire district) supported by property taxes (66% “definitely/probably support,” a “4” or “5” on the five point scale). About 20 percent reported that they “definitely” or “probably would not support” the creation of a special district.

- Comparing responses from residents in Town to those outside Nederland, the support for a district is somewhat higher among unincorporated County residents. About 70% of County residents would “definitely” or “probably support,” compared to 64% of in-Town residents. And 23% of Town residents would “definitely” or “probably not support” compared to 19% out of Town residents.

- **Town Parks and Recreation Department supported by property tax of Town residents.** On the second question of financial alternatives, about 62% overall would support a parks and recreation department in the Town supported by a property tax for residents.

- Support for this approach was about equal among in-Town and out of Town respondents, with 63% of Nederland respondents in support, compared to 62% of County residents. It should be noted that out of Town residents would not vote on this tax, nor would they pay it. Once again, negative sentiment was higher among Nederland residents with 31% saying they “definitely” or “probably would not support” and 19% of County residents answering this way.

### Figure 25

**Program and Facility Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely/Probably Support (4 or 5)</th>
<th>Definitely/Probably Not Support (1 or 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you support the creation of a special district (similar to a fire district) supported by property taxes?

Alternatively, would you support the addition of a separate parks and recreation department that would be funded by an increase in property tax for Town of Nederland residents?

### Potential Impact of Fee Increases

Respondents were asked, “How much additional property tax would you be willing to pay annually to increase recreational opportunities in the Nederland area?” Results indicate that about 22% of respondents overall would not be willing to pay any tax. Consistent with responses reported on the previous questions. The survey results indicate there would be support from about 37% of respondents for a property tax in the $51 to $150 annual property tax range. About 11% overall would said they would support a tax over $200 annually.
COMMUNICATION

Residents were asked how they currently receive information. Additionally, they were asked the best way to receive information. As illustrated below, newspapers and word of mouth are most used currently. However, there are strong feelings that Web sites and the Town newsletter could be used more. These two categories receive strong support as the “best way” to reach households and the results suggest that the Town might further evaluate the methods of communications that are currently being used.

How Currently Receive Information

Respondents were asked how they usually receive information on parks and recreation facilities, services and programs. There are clear differences between the various information sources.

- Newspapers, magazines and other media (70%)
- Word of mouth (68%)
- Internet/website (47%)
- Posters, brochures and bulletin boards (43%)

Best Way to Reach Residents of Nederland?

Respondents were also asked how they may best be reached by Nederland Parks & Recreation. Again, there are differences that should be taken into account as Nederland reevaluates communication opportunities. While newspapers, magazines and other media are most often mentioned as a source today, on line sources (the Internet and Town E-mail) are frequently mentioned as the best way to reach households.

- Internet/website (32%)
- Town E-mail (Listserve) (20%)
- Newspapers, magazines and other media (19%)
- Social Networking (e.g., Twitter, Facebook) (11%)
Figure 27
How Currently Receive Information and How Best Reach You

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Medium</th>
<th>Current Receive</th>
<th>Best Reach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers, magazines and other media</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet/ website</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters, brochures and bulletin boards</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the recreation facilities / program location</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School announcements</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networking (e.g., Twitter, Facebook)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town E-mail (Listserve)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town utility bills</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

Q. How do you usually or currently receive information on Nederland owned/operated parks, recreation facilities, services, and programs? Click [View](http://rrcinfo.com/nederland/comments/Ned5.pdf) (or type http://rrcinfo.com/nederland/comments/Ned5.pdf)

Q. Recognizing there is a cost to communicating with you, how can we best reach you? (OTHER) Click [View](http://rrcinfo.com/nederland/comments/Ned6.pdf) (or type http://rrcinfo.com/nederland/comments/Ned6.pdf)

HIGHEST PRIORITIES OF PARKS AND RECREATION PROGRAMS – OVERALL DIRECTION.

The highest priorities of residents were also measured using a series of value statements. These priorities are summarized below.
As noted previously, these priorities were also reflected in the large number of open ended comments that offer specific suggestions and comments on the many aspects of parks, trails, recreation and open space that were probed through the survey.

Comments

Q. What should be the goals and objectives of parks and recreation programs in the Nederland area? (OTHER) Click View (or type http://rrcinfo.com/nederland/comments/Ned13.pdf)

SUGGESTIONS / OPEN ENDED COMMENTS

The survey provided respondents with the opportunity to list any additional comments or suggestions regarding parks, recreation facilities, open space, trails and programs in the Nederland area. The resulting comments cover a wide variety of issues important to residents as well as a number of specific areas for consideration and for potential changes or improvements. The full set of comments, found in the appendix, should be viewed in order to understand the extent of community interest and to gain additional perspective on the topics covered by the survey. Write-in survey comments have been reported verbatim in a manner consistent with the Town of Nederland Board of Trustees Working Agreements for public input.

Comments

Q. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding parks, recreation facilities, open space, trails, and programs in Nederland? Click View (or type http://rrcinfo.com/nederland/comments/Ned13.pdf)
Appendix B – Focus Group and Public Meeting Summaries

Nederland, Colorado
Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan Project
FOCUS GROUP NOTES

Focus Group #1: Teens
January 19, 2012 – 10 am
Teen Center
Attendees: 9 students, 10 staff/adults

1. When you have free time, what do you do for recreation?
   - Skate board
   - Hang out with friends
   - Slide on ice
   - Snow boarding
   - Biking
   - Mountain board

2. What parks and recreation facilities do you currently use? Why?
   - Sometimes use them
   - Eldora
   - Other skate parks (Boulder, Denver, Lafayette)
   - Mountain Trails
   - Boulder Canyon for climbing

   Do you or members of your household currently use the Nederland Community Center? What do you like to do at the Center?
   - Movies

   What other parks and recreation facilities in the area do you use?
   - Gilpin Rec Center

3. When you were younger, what type of structured recreation activities were you involved in? What ones would you have like to be involved in if they were available?
   - Basketball
   - Track
   - Cheerleading
   - Rodeo
   - Hockey (involved in RINK)

4. What are the key strengths of the programs and facilities operated by the Town of Nederland?
   - Skate Park
   - The woods – find a chill spot – open woods
   - The reservoir (looking and fishing)
5. What needs to be improved (i.e., fixed, changed, added regarding recreation facilities, etc.)?
   • Dog park (noted by adult staff)
   • Wind huts – shelters to protect from the wind across town (bus stops, parks, hanging out by the skate park)
   • Labyrinths (presented by a staff member)
   • Greenhouse
   • Bigger trampoline
   • Zip line
   • Bowling
   • Pool – recreation pool
   • Feel can get around town safely
   • South side of Reservoir is eroded – trail
   • Possibly trails to Nederland Elementary School /Mud lake/NMSHS (staff)
   • Intramural sports (presented by staff)
   • Improved field, better turf (by Reservoir)
   • Place to practice
   • Mini golf
   • Outdoor classroom /beautiful place for Tai Chi/open air gathering space (staff)
   • Shelters outside
   • Graffiti wall
   • Outdoor amphitheater (staff) possibly in Chipeta Park (student)
   • Small recording studio

6. What programs or special events would you like to participate in that are not available in Nederland currently?
   • Theater camp
   • Demos at the skate park
   • Concerts for local talent (all ages venue)

7. If you could design an ideal park at the gateway to Nederland near the reservoir, what would it have in it?
   • Alpine sled
   • Tag wall/graffiti wall
   • Sculpture park
   • Non motorized boating
   • More street skating
   • Bathrooms (staff)
   • Dock to go out and fish
   • Boat rentals / bumper boats

8. Where do you get your information about events and activities? What is the best way for the Town to communicate with you and provide you information?
   • Internet – Facebook
   • Older people in Nederland see teenagers as trouble
   • Town information boards (several around town)
FOCUS GROUP NOTES

Focus Group #2: Active Recreation
January 19, 2012 – 7:30 pm
Nederland Community Center
19 Attendees

1. What are the strengths of the open space, trails, parks, and recreation services and facilities in the Town of Nederland?
   - Good facilities – ice rink, skate park, Community Center, Mud Lake, Mid-west Magnolia trail system, Caribou Ranch open space
   - Dedicated volunteers
   - Tennis court
   - Eldora Ski Resort
   - Trails connecting schools to Mud Lake
   - Reservoir
   - Access – trails and open space accessible from Town and other areas, open to dogs, horses
   - Recreation your own way – not a lot of rules limiting use

   Additional comments submitted in writing:
   - Great natural setting
   - Free activities
   - It is a hub to the open space
   - Chapita Park is centrally located and has potential
   - The Barker Reservoir has great potential

2. What improvement/changes would you make to the parks and recreation system?
   - Community Center – swimming pool, leaky roof in MP community room
   - Barker Reservoir – should be able to use, trail loop
   - Lack of Town funding for acquisition, maintenance – Town needs some reliable source of funding
   - Umbrella liability insurance for the non-profit groups that offer programs
   - Central registration for all activities
   - Publicity of programs offered by many groups
   - Central point for coordinating volunteers
   - Town to be more cooperative with non-profits – may need to be a budget line item; Town staff point person; there is a parks budget – minimal for trash pick-up, etc.
   - District or Parks and Recreation Department for reliable funding
   - Trails – more connections, more information about what exists, have a few signs out including interpretive signs, going forward there could be an education component – water issues, etc., maps
   - Organized sports – basketball courts not in good shape, not a good field, would like to work out an IGA with Schools
   - Ambassadors – look at employing teens to be at park sites to share information with users (stewardship, etc.)
   - Identify other resources and funding sources such as Boulder County, users from Boulder; would like a bigger voice in Boulder County
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• Eldora – impact fees on lift tickets to help fund area parks and recreation?

Additional comments submitted in writing:
• A river walk
• Parks & Recreation district to coordinate development and volunteer usage, insurance umbrella

3. Are there programs/services or facilities you would like to see that are not currently offered?
• Pump track adjacent to the skate park, BMX courses (dirt bikes, example Valmont Park in Boulder)
• Disc golf course
• Climbing, bouldering, rock wall, ropes
• Program – enrichment type programs such as arts and education
• Races, endurance events – Xterra event, etc.; would like more regional premier events – Eldora could be involved
• Music festivals – opportunities for Eldora to offer more summer events
• Cultural – could include this in the concept of a District that is broader than “recreation”
• Gateway park area – bandshell for concerts, events
• Swimming pool – many drive to recreation centers in Boulder and Gilpin
• Building more trails to interconnect parks, etc.
• Environmental stewardship – incorporate into system, consistent ethic, educational piece, integrate recreation within the natural world, example skating at Mud Lake instead of rink; many recreationalists are coming to Nederland, a District would help organize all the programs and facilities; coordinating and planning so things happen the way we want them to happen
• Waterway in town is controversial – can improve a trail next to and tie people to it; currently not a natural waterway; Reno, NV example of waterway that’s been improved
• Examples from other communities – Estes Park has a swimming pool next to their school; Lyons charges for parking for festivals to generate revenue; Steamboat Springs – connected trails, Rotary volunteers help build trails
• People are going to still come to and through Nederland – want to manage this so it doesn’t destroy natural resources, need public education
• Fixed orienteering course

Additional comments submitted in writing:
• Youth programs – baseball, soccer, etc.
• Mountain biking at Eldora mountain
• Swimming pool

4. What are the key issues and values to be considered while developing this Plan?
• Balancing needs of locals and visitors – fear of Nederland getting overrun by outsiders (e.g., West Magnolia trail)
• Caring for the land, being aware of abuses of natural areas; would like to see restoration of some areas; mountain bikers often destroy
• Work with the land, be sensitive to sustainable design
• Identify projects that serve the community and are focused on greatest needs and interests – be cognizant of the wider community versus smaller interest groups
• Pursue projects that give the biggest bang for the buck – leverage resources, identify grant opportunities, etc.
• Focus on kids – create lifelong recreational enthusiasts – have a wide variety of opportunities, appreciation for the environment
• Maintain the variety of recreational opportunities versus focusing on competitive recreation
• Be environmentally sensitive while recognizing that there are human recreation needs – makes sense to concentrate recreation development within Town, outside of Town conservation is higher priority
• Envision Nederland 2020 values
• Avoid duplicating resources; soccer fields – have one at the elementary school, do we need another at the gateway park area? Explore partnership opportunities
• We are unique and are different, not like other places – Plan needs to reflect Nederland’s character, want community ownership and pride – want to be known as “the Town that did it right” (quote from Vision 2020 process)
• New projects should reflect the community character
• Teach visitors stewardship ethic when they use Nederland trails, etc.
• Reservoir – a missed opportunity – waste water treatment plant, etc.; would like to transform into an attract resource for residents (but recognize that visitors will use and and plan for and direct usage)

Additional comments submitted in writing:
• Sustainability – minimal impact and cost, minimize dependence on volunteers (self operating parks)
• Keep it non-commercial – informal, many people oppose commercial development

5. What are some trends in Nederland that will impact parks and recreation planning?
• Obesity – assume it’s an issue here like elsewhere
• Community is pretty stable – school enrollment has remained fairly consistent for many years
• Sustainability focus – part has been expressed as anti-growth and anti-tourist; also need to recognize that economic sustainability is important and tourism contributes to the sustainability of the community
• Channeling or directing tourism needs to be a focus, more congestion in town, more use on mountain biking trails; people will continue to come to Nederland
• Shouldn’t let tourism scare us away from something that would benefit residents, i.e., boating at the Reservoir
• Trend in the Town – tourists are not desired, liked
• Trash around the reservoir
• Attract families – carousel, path along the creek – teach children about the environment, nature walk
• Getting kids outdoors
• Aging population – keep population active, volunteering and sharing their expertise, keep them empowered
• Sports are rapidly disappearing from schools, increased role of parks and recreation

Additional comments submitted in writing:
• Many agencies to coordinate with
• People oppose commercial development
• Anti-development backlash
• Changing weather patterns

6. How can the Town best partner or collaborate with other organizations?
• Would like to have community buy-in, need commitment
• Need to pick our battles – schools
• Past successes have come from non-profits; culture change with Town – greater willingness of Town staff to collaborate; idea of a District is of great interest, but don’t know feasibility; other idea is a volunteer-run Parks and Recreation Department – concept positively received by non-profits in the past; clear direction to Town staff to engage non-profits and volunteers is needed
• Need an information and resource clearinghouse of what’s going on in Nederland – businesses, government, non-profits
• Look at load on volunteer base – fixed number of volunteers
• Draw on youth volunteerism
• Town could help recognize or reward volunteers – points and awards and you get a token to a movie, etc.; need to attract new volunteers
• Town access to resources – direct staff to play more active coordination role
• Non-profits bring grant funding – can leverage resources

Additional comments submitted in writing:
• Boulder Mountain Bike Alliance can help with trails and working with the Forest Service

7. What are top parks, recreation, and open space priorities for the Town to address in the future?
• Communication between groups, centralization
• Funding
• Boating on Barker – will be before the Town board in the coming weeks, idea originally initiated to meet resident’s needs (not conceived of as a tourism attraction)
• Gateway park area – opportunity to enhance the site due to the redesigning of the sewage treatment plant; do we channel visitors here?; will serve residents and visitors; people will remember Nederland because of a great lake by the park, like the carousel that is a unique feature; need to recognize needs of immediate neighbors; a better appearance – people will be more respectful of the space
• Open space and trails
• Creek corridor and tie into the area – walk from the lake to the carousel

Additional comments submitted in writing:
• Maintain multi-use access
• Try to build consensus to minimize community divisions
• Barker Reservoir shoreline
• Creek development
• River walk
• Ice Rink/Tennis Park
FOCUS GROUP NOTES

Focus Group #3: Seniors
January 23, 2012 – 12 pm
Nederland Community Center
19 attendees

Nederland Community Center
1. What do you like best about the Nederland Community Center (e.g., facility, programs, staff, etc.)?
   - Appreciate the senior activities (e.g., holiday market, lunches)
   - International folk dances every Monday
   - Movies on the weekend
   - Food and clothing pantry
   - Library has surplus donated books (rent room in old Elementary to story – west wing is storage)
   - Renovated building – appreciate the reuse of an existing building
   - Recreation and exercise spaces/fitness center used by all ages
   - Rotating art displays
   - Multi-use room used for many different activities, flexible use of space
   - Tai Chi twice a week
   - Dawn’s leadership, Center Director
   - Access to kitchen to use for community functions

   Additional comments submitted in writing:
   - Welcoming atmosphere and attitude of the small staff
   - Art programs
   - Backdoor Theater
   - Site for many community events

2. What Community Center improvements may be needed for the future and why?
   - Would like to see showers (loss of revenue due to lack of showers); also steam and hot tub would be nice (used to have one in the shopping mall); some that live away from Town have problems with water at home
   - West wing renovation – make more rooms available for senior activities, dedicated rooms (e.g., game tables, art room, etc.)

   Additional comments submitted in writing:
   - More use of the west wing
   - Swimming
   - Improved equipment at the fitness center
   - More programs for adults as well as family programs

3. Are there programs/services or facilities you would like to see that are not currently offered?
   - Community vegetable garden is too small (areas raised as possibilities – meadow by Post Office and area zoned commercial, west of the library 72nd and 3rd street)
   - Sledding hill
   - Also see comments from question #2
Additional comments submitted in writing:

- Cooking, pottery, and art classes for adults and kids
- Programs that unite seniors with children
- Hire instructors (instead of all outside instructors and fees)

Overall System

4. What are the strengths of parks, recreation, open space, and trail services and facilities in Nederland?
   - Trail by the reservoir – handy to get to, parking available, well-maintained, pleasant walk
   - New trail from community center to Town
   - Important to keep some open spaces, quiet spaces
   - Raise awareness of existing trails; publicize activities to increase use and introduce people to what exists
   - Caribou Ranch Open Space (eight focus group attendees said they use) – some use County-run programs; would be nice to have organized walks and activities

Additional comments submitted in writing:

- Mud Lake has a good series of trails available for all; Trails overall
- A lot has been done by independent, self-funded, interest groups (Ice Rink, skatepark, carousel, etc.) – although some groups are having trouble maintaining expenses, volunteers are dwindling

5. What are the key issues and values to be considered while developing this Plan?
   - Different values in the community – progress, moving forward and the other we like it the way it is – creates some animosity; need to anticipate this ahead of time, try to moderate both a little
   - Keep community character, small unique mountain time
   - Love the historic old areas of town; don’t have franchises, locally owned businesses
   - Tax support for water and sewage
   - Strong community – Thanksgiving community gathering, movies on weekends
   - Independence and sustainability
   - Town of volunteers

Additional comments submitted in writing:

- Remembering nature – not making it off limits, but also not paving it over
- Expansion of current programs and space to include a growing community with many children; all this while keeping the small town charm without overdevelopment
- Sustainability
- Community volunteers and gatherings
- Parking and traffic congestion
- Funding of all projects is highly fragmented between non-profit groups; we need a recreation tax district to expand funding for projects

6. What improvement/changes would you make to the parks, recreation, open space, and trail system?
   - Make trail map more accessible
   - Non-motorized boating on the reservoir (sailing, kayaking, etc.)
   - Allowing electric golf vehicles for in town use
• Gateway park area – reservoir is an opportunity, tasteful use of the shoreline (gravel pit will be going away); is there a practical way to move the gas company?
• Pavilion at Chipeta Park – would like to see it enclosed to use year-round or some wind shelter

Additional comments submitted in writing:
• Preservation of natural lands
• Move Northern Energy off the shores of the reservoir
• More trails and outdoor programs for all ages

7. What partnership opportunities exist?
• Create entrepreneurial opportunities
• Create a Parks and Recreation District like the library
• Nederland Sustainability Project (becoming a non-profit) could partner with the community gardens
• Many existing well-functioning cooperative efforts – Nederland with Boulder County (use of open spaces, IGA’s) – many could be creatively expanded; Other ideas – partner with the Colorado University business school regarding economic development opportunities (e.g., kids ice cream parlor in Gilpin school)
• Use the wind to our benefit

Additional comments submitted in writing:
• Boulder Historical Society
• Tax district to raise money and make this happen
• Guercio and Carline families
• Wind energy

8. Where do you get your information about events and activities? What is the best ways for the Town to communicate with you and provide you information?
• Mountain-Ear (Council updates are included)
• Senior events and newsletter (once a month)
• Town webpage
• Bulletin boards like at the library, etc.
• Word of mouth
• Phone calls

Additional comments submitted in writing:
• Email
FOCUS GROUP NOTES

Focus Group #4: Teens
January 23, 2012 – 4 pm
High School
10 attendees

1. When you have free time, what do you do for recreation?
   • Concerts – go to Denver, NedFest
   • Teen Centers
   • Hang out at parks when it’s nice – Chipeta Park
   • Walk by the reservoir
   • Trails
   • Mountain bike
   • Eldora

2. What parks and recreation facilities do you currently use? Why?
   a. Do you or members of your household currently use the Nederland Community Center?
      What do you like to do at the Center?
      • Go to movies
      • Go to gym
      • Workout
   b. What other parks and recreation facilities in the area do you use?
      • Boulder parks and recreation
      • Go to malls
      • Music classes in Boulder
      • Younger brother does hockey
      • Mountain biking trails

3. What are the key strengths of the programs and facilities operated in the Town of Nederland?
   • Community centers for movies

4. What needs to be improved (i.e., fixed, changed, added regarding recreation facilities, etc.)?
   • Would like to ride horse on reservoir trail
   • A place where teens can go on the weekends, dance, lounge area – open late; do go to the Teen Center, but not much going on
   • Add pool (many supported this idea) – some go to Gilpin Recreation Center; leisure, lap pool
   • Indoor rink
   • Big slide
   • Rodeo area
   • Shooting range (there is one in West Magnolia)
   • Archery range
   • Amphitheatre
   • Teen Center – club for evening activities; Concert Hall
5. What programs or special events would you like to participate in that are not available in Nederland currently?
   - Jam, music night
   - Open mic, talent night
   - Creek Fest

6. If you could design an ideal park at the gateway to Nederland near the reservoir, what would it have in it?
   - More accessible trails, connecting Chipeta Park to reservoir, make area to the bridge safer; get nicer picnic tables
   - Make reservoir swimmer-friendly
   - Riverwalk
   - Restrooms (open Chipeta restrooms more and keep clean)
   - Boating (many supported this idea) – need education
   - Youth camps
   - Improve field – multi-use field
   - BMX course
   - Sledding

7. Where do you get your information about events and activities? What is the best way for the Town to communicate with you and provide you information?
   - Email
   - Flyer
   - School
   - Facebook

OTHER – Nederland Values
   - Eco-friendly
   - Thrifty
FOCUS GROUP NOTES

Focus Group #5: Business
January 23, 2012 – 5:30 pm
Nederland Community Center
7 Attendees

1. What are the strengths of the open space, trails, parks, and recreation services and facilities in the Town of Nederland?
   - Outdoor spaces around Nederland: skiing, hiking, trails,
   - Trails accessible to town
   - Access to recreation in front and in back yard
   - Community Center is centrally located
   - Skatepark
   - Ice skating rink
   - Tennis courts
   - Kind of town where kids can go do something; improved from 20 years ago when kids had nothing to do
   - Can walk anywhere
   - Good volunteer network that has enabled so many things to be available – small town, we take care of each other; you help out; there is no one else to do it, ownership, limited resources; there has been a change regarding welcoming new people to town – not as good as it used to be

2. What improvement/changes would you make to the parks, recreation, open space, and trail system?
   - Boating on Reservoir
   - Community Center needs some improvements
   - More formal consistent services – hard to communicate and understand what is going on where; a brochure would be great – there seems to be enough going on now to include in it
   - People don’t know about what is going on (boating issue; sidewalk issue). Where is a centralized place to get information
   - Volunteer operations – sometimes leaves feeling that some people “own” things and they are not available to all (ice rink)
   - If you are outside the schools setting without kid, it can be hard to get information
   - Rugged individualism – sometimes things happen that are not coordinated within town (training for non-profits example) – not coordinated with non-profit group, the town, etc.
   - Visitor center not always open – need other ways to get maps and information
   - Community center not used to capacity, only one paid staff member. Current conversation in town regarding renovation and use of West Wing that we need to be aware of
   - Some use of West side now for food pantry, storage, etc.
   - Trail around dam – officially designate as bicycle trail with restrictions as necessary. Historical understanding is that person who funded the trail set it up for hiking and equestrian – used “illegally” by some bikes now. Should formalize bike use.
• Visitor center would not advise anyone about camping on West Magnolia – should make it a more desirable area with sanitary facilities. It attracts some undesirables now. Things are in flux now with Forest Services because of turnover in staff. Trying to get someone to come to a PROSAB meeting
• Land west of hardware store – Wolf Tongue Mine – is privately owned – seems to be some talk of solar farm. Might be brownfield grant possibility; about 10 acres owned by an individual from Boulder, understanding is that EPA study found no superfund activity issues. Could be a great asset; needs some clean up – lightly used now (not authorized)

3. Are there programs/services or facilities you would like to see that are not currently offered?
• Infrastructure issue with parking and traffic. Need more long term parking for those who come up all day and need to park and are using parking needed for short term retail. Town hall staff is using parking behind visitor center and taking up valuable spaces for visitors and local shoppers
• More people need more access to Community Center to teach their classes. Too expensive for rentals for teacher entrepreneurs
• More would use this facility if hours were longer, one staff member is a barrier to having longer hours
• There is a certain attraction to shiny and new, this center is not that, and it is not at center of town. Library became a reality, so why not recreation facility. New centralized facilities might be more used
• Softball on the softball field, not really turf, not safe. Gilpin County has a large program, we don’t have one here
• Need to understand what is going on around us
• Pump track adjacent to skate park

4. What are the key issues and values to be considered while developing this Plan?
• Vision 2020 really addressed key issues and values so we can pick them up from that document

5. How important is it that Nederland have recreational facilities and programs that appeal to visitors?
• Very important as a business owner, but also makes the community more livable for residents
• Need recreational facilities to get people to come here, need a reason to get people to stop in town
• We should build for ourselves – that will attract visitors as well
• Concern also about visitors driving locals out from shopping here because of traffic issues – have to address the parking and traffic infrastructure before facilities are built/approved
• Changes in last ten years in ability to get around in traffic; it is really bad. Boulder is too convenient to entice folks to stop 20 minutes earlier in Nederland if there are traffic/parking issues

6. Should recreational facilities be located in the business district (e.g., a riverwalk and kayak play park)?
• Needs to be a connection to the business district in a way that allows short term visitors to have some connection to a broad range of services – restaurant, gift shop, hiking
• Mountains are away from the business district – they just leave to go hiking
• Challenge is difficulty in getting people to come to the business district during the week, not enough here. Locals go away on weekends. Visitors sometimes just drive through. How do we get them to stop and use the town services? Is not happening enough.
• Stuffing more in downtown is a challenge, still need to connect downtown to immediate recreational activity
• Need to add more services in town – like bike shop example – to attract people
• Monthly art walk – successful in Iowa – took a while to grow, but now is a major event. Two things keep it from happening in Nederland – no place to stay in Nederland, and people don’t want to navigate the canyon at night. Maybe a daytime activity
• Local people are not big on the festivals – but festivals would be a good draw
• Needs to be managed long term. Need to decide what we are going to be as a town and then build the infrastructure to support that
• As a business owner, experience is that I do get customers from events
• Maybe what we need is recreational consistency to even out the flow
• Shuttle bus – mid day hours from ski area to town for lunch – didn’t materialize
• Best times of year are July and Sept – the leaf people
• Riverwalk would be tremendous. Interactive learning opportunities, wrap up in a package, kayak play park. Least amount of property issues in the business district, that’s also where the holes are, need to turn around business to face the water. Need to have a loop, needs to work for older folks, people with young children. Need a place to fulfill a short amount of time (river walk would be perfect)

7. How can the Town best partner or collaborate with other organizations?
• DDA and PROSAB are really important pieces that are gaining some momentum; need groups that can go after grants; recreation foundation – tie in with community wellness
• Naming rights in parks, pay for and name the bridge ($5K - $10K increments), signage to purposefully find things; bring groups together around a focal idea
• Get groups talking with PROSAB, historical society for example and see what happens

8. What are top parks, recreation, and open space priorities for the Town to address in the future?
• Trail downtown – riverwalk – to get people to stay longer. Need to have a navigable trail for those who are not so steady. Could provide a place for dog walking
• Focus on the Nederland community; visitor services are a by-product of that. Saying we are building for visitors will alienate residents
• Trail from town to a recreational area like West Magnolia – a designated trail to get them there through a natural area – experience in and of itself. Keeps people parked in town, more likely to stay longer if they are already parked
• There is a lack of parks – pleasant places to hang out, but want to focus on downtown
• Trails – need a way to understand how to get up to Mud Lake
• Connect web sites town, NEDREC, chamber etc.
• This has to be about the people of NED. Visitors have always come and will always come
• Need some guiding light providing the infrastructure to succeed to pull off the recommendation of this plan. How can we get groups to work together? We talked about some of these types of things in 1994 and now it is 2012 – How do we get this to happen this time? Don’t need more talk – need action
FOCUS GROUP NOTES

Focus Group #6: Conservation, Open Space & Trails
January 23, 2012 – 7 pm
Nederland Community Center
12 Attendees

1. What are the strengths of the open space, trails, parks and recreation services and facilities in the Town of Nederland?
   - Existing open space parks – Mud Lake, West Magnolia Road trails, Caribou Ranch, Reynolds Ranch, reservoir – serve a diverse group of people; opportunities to better connect these
   - Diversity of activities and open space lands
   - Leverage resources – City and County of Boulder, etc.
   - Accessible – people can walk from the visitor’s center
   - Interest in preserving and keeping open space
   - Middle Boulder Creek corridor – lots of passive recreation
   - Diversity – active recreation such as skate park and smaller public undeveloped pocket parks/area
   - People that are using – people are fairly knowledgeable and want to protect the open space, respect for the land; don’t see things being trashed; transients that camp at West Magnolia campground don’t seem to have the same respect and care of the land
   - Community Center a big strength
   - Ice and Tennis Center
   - Nature Center

2. What improvement/changes would you make to the open space and trail system in Nederland?
   - More preservation of open space
   - More human powered access to open space and trail linkages – could use more corridors to Reynolds Ranch; off highway route to Eldora – especially to High School
   - Concept of a trail hub centered in downtown – would like to have a good trail map
   - Cannot change the topography – not a good way to ride to Big Springs, etc., kids don’t ride much in town; bike lanes – not that safe to ride through town
   - Challenge is a safe crossing from Community Center across the highway
   - Reservoir – would like to be able to use – open up to recreation, trail around reservoir; improved areas for fishing; restoration of plants/passive areas with some improvements; non-motorized boating – cost, water quality, cold temperature, winds, safety, traffic concerns; concerns that we might lose peaceful quality; also positive economic impacts; opportunities for activities and fluctuations of the lake levels
   - Need to come up with a vision for the water and recreational opportunities; reclaim the shoreline; what we and future generations want our front yard to look like
   - Educational opportunities, like the signs along Middle Boulder Creek; important for people recreating to understand the value of the natural habitats; would like to improve habitats, wetlands and into the reservoir; alpine garden educational opportunity; interpretive environmental signage
   - Survey – find out what people don’t want, have an option for “leave it alone”; don’t just ask what you want
   - Need a serious look at environmental impact and how we can improve habitats
• More visitors, we are a gateway to recreational areas – many visitors don’t know how to behave; could be a gateway to learn about the mountain environment; Nederland can be an example, model of people living with nature

3. How can Nederland do a better job of conserving local natural resources?
• Education – common theme in focus groups
• Concentrate activity in town
• Dog park – have a place for dogs to go to preserve open space; informal off-leash dog area in meadow next to Post Office; concerned with water quality; need better education of dog owners
• Wind and water erosion to roads and trails – do we consider paving some more roads

4. Are there programs/services or facilities you would like to see that are not currently offered?
• Nature Center at Mud Lake – more educational programs
• Shower at Community Center
• Community Center – swimming pool, more organized fitness classes – spin, karate, etc., more user-friendly times; cultural arts – dance, arts
• Fishing – improve habitat in Middle Creek for fishing; knock out weir (there to measure water) so fish could go upstream from reservoir; Division of Wildlife possible partner
• Application for the trail maps, can incorporate educational information; partnership opportunity
• Better restroom facilities at Chipeta Park (open year round) and the reservoir (Boulder has some money being held for restroom in the skate park/bridge area)
• No one central point for information about programs and services, not coordinated
• Could use a Parks and Recreation office as part of our Town government

5. What are the key issues and values to be considered while developing this Plan?
• Divide between those who want to improve by adding and those that want things to stay less developed
• Many of values came out in the visioning process – need to keep the Envision 2020 values at the forefront
• Few restrictions on trail use – open to dogs, horses, bikes, etc.
• Things for kids to do – a lot of families have moved here as a result of these activities – more activities now than in the past; want to keep kids active, happy, enjoying activities outdoors
• What’s the balance – what is the impact of a couple of play holes in Middle Creek?
• How much recreation is enough; how much do we need or can we drive a few miles?
• More recreation, impact is less
• More active recreation – used to be “leave no trace” approach
• Boulder County Plan principles recognized concern of mountain communities with visitor impact from more populated area and that decisions are being made by more heavily populated areas for these open space areas
• We are possessive because we work so hard on our Town, community ownership is strong
• Balance of recreation for residents and visitors; how much do visitors really drive economic development and how many decisions are being made to attract visitors? It is not black and white, clear cut; economic sustainability is important – 10 hockey families that came to Nederland – benefit local kids and brought visitors to spend money; revitalization of the gateway park area will help
• Keep it small and informal – envision “simple” at the gateway park area (simple, small trail)
• 10,000 people come to Frozen Dead Guy Days – lack of a plan for parking, traffic management, etc. (opportunity to pay for parking)

6. How can the Town best partner or collaborate with other organizations regarding conservation, open space, and trails?
   • Boulder County
   • GOCO
   • Division of Wildlife – fishing, Trout Unlimited
   • CDOT (possible pull-off bathroom along reservoir)
   • Forest Service
   • County transportation for road to High School
   • Vista program (brownfields/Vista/EPA state funded program) – three year program Town is pursuing
   • Nederland Area Trails Organization
   • International Mountain Biking
   • Boulder Mountainbike Alliance
   • Wild Bear Nature Center
   • Education of large lot owners about conservation easements, end of life donations
   • Boulder Valley School District

7. What are top conservation, open space, and trail priorities for the Town to address in the future?
   • Driving vision for trails – Boulder Open Space
   • Wolf Tongue Mill area preserved as open space
   • Creek path enhanced
   • Barker Reservoir enhanced with native plants
   • Middle Creek corridor is a top priority – heart of the town
   • Gateway park area (sewage treatment plant is impetus)
   • Linkages of trails
   • Trails to remain open – don’t want all the regulations (against bike use)
Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan Update

PUBLIC MEETING NOTES
February 23, 2012
Nederland Community Center
7 p.m.

Welcome
Randy Lee, chair of the Nederland Parks, Recreation and Open Space Advisory Board (PROSAB) welcomed participants. He provided an overview of the Open Space, Trails, Parks and Outdoor Recreation Master Plan Update project and invited people to provide input as we start the planning process to update the previous plan from 2001. He introduced the consultant team of Chris Dropinski, Principal and Anne Miller, Project Manager of GreenPlay as well as Rob Layton, Principal of Design Concepts, and RRC Associates. Approximately 35 people attended the meeting.

Overview of Agenda & Ground Rules
Chris Dropinski from GreenPlay provided an overview of the public meeting agenda and highlighted the meeting ground rules.

Presentation of Project Purpose & Process
Anne Miller from GreenPlay provided a brief PowerPoint presentation of the master plan components and process. Themes from the six focus group meetings held in January were also summarized.

Questions/Answers – Discussion
After the presentation, meeting participants brought up the following discussion topics in response to the project overview.

- Environmental stewardship needs to be defined in the master plan
- Another theme that came up in the focus group meetings was to do little and maintain what we have now – we need to make sure this view is represented and it is an option for the survey
- There is a range of opinions from do nothing to lots of improvements
- Participants wanted to know when details of specific proposals would be available. (Respondents to the survey will be asked to indicate their support, or not, for conceptual proposals. Those with support may be recommended for further action in the Master Plan which would allow further vetting and public input regarding details.)
- Survey – Concern was expressed in getting the input of residents in the Nederland area, not just town residents; it was suggested that we consider getting input from the library district area; input from in town and outside of town could be analyzed together and separately

Large Group Discussion – Values and Vision
Participants were asked to provide input into the values and vision for parks, recreation, open space, and trail in Nederland.

1. What is the value of parks and recreation to the Nederland community?
   - Health benefits – physical and mental, active and passive recreation
   - Access – needs to be available to all – age, income; local access matters – not having to travel for youth sports, etc.
• Healthy productive outlook for kids, youth development and growth
• Recreation for “us” also opens up opportunities for “them” / out of community; development will bring people into the area and impacts need to be discussed; most of “us” were “them” at one point
• Planning – a good plan can help manage and direct visitors
• Builds community – provides opportunities to socialize with neighbors
• Quality of life – provides positive impact on families and provides recreational opportunities and things to do
• Economic – recreation can bring economic benefits to town
• Balance – passive and active recreation are important; need to capture economic benefits but manage impacts of visitors

2. What is your vision for future parks, recreation, trails and open space in Nederland?
• Trails connections – link to Boulder County open space and US Forest Service lands, provide pedestrian and bike access to wilderness areas; less dependence on cars; need safe access – highway is an issue; need connectivity within town for children and residents
• Trail quality – need well-built sustainable trails to avoid erosion; need to deal with trash on trails
• Information hub in downtown to provide a central plan for recreational opportunities in the area, perhaps in the visitors center or a kiosk
• Centralized coordination for recreational opportunities either through the town or a district; centralized maintenance and operations
• Funding sustainability – we need to take care of what we put in place; volunteer fatigue is an issue; need resources to maintain the system
• Education – teach children and adults about the impacts of recreation on the ecosystem; help educate users of the park system about the environment through signage, etc.
• Water quality – preserve and protect water quality of Middle Boulder Creek and reservoir
• Need balanced response to desired goals
• Maintain and improve the facilities and parks that we have; we need to move beyond the desire for more and more and improve what we have
• Sustainability – if we have recreational opportunities close to home, it saves driving to other places
• Be comprehensive – need to look at project in context of the whole system, not in pieces
• Balanced, mixed-use approach – need to look out of the box at opportunities in different parts of town, including downtown or commercial areas, 1st Street could be considered a park
• Barker Reservoir area
  o Non-motorized boating on the reservoir (like in 1999) – some expressed support, others did not want to see boating and boat docks
  o Improve area around the reservoir/ gateway park area (concern about issue of dog feces); need more oversight and management of the area
  o Beautify the area – everyone would take better care of the area; no portable toilets, etc.
  o Revegetation around the shoreline
• Continue community involvement
• Break down “us” and “them” mentality
• Community gardening – edible gardens, greenhouses, permaculture
Other comments:

- Watershed – model projects around biomimicry principles
- Someone has to pay – how will we raise funds?
- Cultural programming is also important
- Question for participants to think about: Would Nederland be a place you would want to live and raise your children?
- Use the Sustainability Resolution as a foundation for the master plan
- Some areas are not natural, such as the reservoir and the Middle Boulder Creek channel; they have been manipulated in the past

Wrap-up & Next Steps
Anne Miller thanked people for their participation and input. The project next steps include the survey which will go out in March. Another public meeting will be held in May to report back on findings including results from the survey and inventory analysis. Members of the PROSAB and the steering committee for the master plan project were recognized and thanked for their volunteer contributions.
Appendix C – Trends

Park and Recreation Influencing Trends

A challenge of parks and recreation departments is to continue to understand and respond to the changing recreation interests of those it serves. In this fast-paced society, it is important to stay on top of current trends impacting parks and recreation. The following information highlights relevant local, regional, and national parks and recreational trends from various sources that may influence the Town of Nederland for the next ten years.

Athletic Recreation National Trends

Sports Participation

The 2010 National Sporting Goods Association, (NSGA) survey on sports participation found some of the top athletic activities ranked by total participation included: exercise walking, exercising with equipment, camping, swimming, bowling, and working out at athletic clubs. Additionally, the following active recreation activities remain popular: bicycle riding, hiking, running/jogging, basketball, golf, and soccer. Table 6 further outlines the top twenty sports ranked by total participation in 2010 and the percent change from 2009.

Table 6: Top Twenty Sports Ranked by Total Participation 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Change*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Walking</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercising with Equipment</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping (vacation/overnight)</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>-12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Riding</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>-13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobic Exercising</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workout at Club</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running/Jogging</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Lifting</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>-8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billiards/Pool</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoga</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating, Motor/Power</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>-16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Shooting (net)</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting with Firearms</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>-13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent Change is from 2009

Source: NSGA 2011
The Ten-year History of Sports Participation Report, published by NSGA, shows national trends in team sports and individual sports. Overall participation trends indicate a decrease in general. Team sports such as basketball, soccer, tackle football, softball, and volleyball had an increase in participation through 2008; however, by 2010 show a decline. Since the report, lacrosse has become one of the country's fastest growing team sports. Participation in high school lacrosse has almost doubled this decade. An estimated 1.2 million Americans over the age of seven have played lacrosse within the previous year. Individual sports show an increase in backpacking, swimming, boating, camping, and exercising with equipment. Table 7 illustrates a ten-year change in participation for selected activities including both team sports and individual sports.

Table 7: Ten-Year History of Sports Participation (in millions) 2000-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerobic Exercising</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpack/Wilderness Camp</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Riding</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billiards/Pool</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating, Motor/Power</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Walking</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercising' with Equipment</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football (tackle)</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey (ice)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting w/Bow &amp; Arrow</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting with Firearms</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Line Roller Skating</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Biking (off road)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzzleloading</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paintball Games</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racquetball</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running/Jogging</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scooter Riding</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing(alpine)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowboarding</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Shooting</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Shooting – Airgun</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Skiing</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Lifting</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workout at Club</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSGA 2011
Youth Sports
Specific offerings for children’s fitness are slowly increasing in recreation facilities. Facilities are offering more youth-specific exercise equipment. Individualized youth sports training opportunities are becoming more popular as well. For youth ages 7 to 11, bowling, bicycle riding, and fishing had the highest number of participants in 2010; however, ice hockey, mountain biking, and tennis saw the highest percent of increase of the sports in 2010. It is important to note that of the six mentioned sports above, ice hockey is the only team sport. In-line skating experienced the largest percentage decrease in participation followed by scooter riding and fishing.

Aquatics National Trends
According to the NSGA, swimming ranked third in terms of participation in 2010. There is an increasing trend towards indoor leisure and therapeutic pools. Additional amenities such as “spray pads” are becoming increasingly popular as well.

Swimming is a desired recreational activity in Nederland. The Community Survey indicates swimming ranked highest in Unmet Need (66%), and second (32%) in Highest Priorities for Programs to Be Added, Expanded, or Improved.

Baby Boomer/ Older Adult Trends – Planning for the Demographic Shift
Baby boomers are those born between 1946 and 1964, as stated in Leisure Programming for Baby Boomers, authored by Cochran, Rothschild, and Rudick in 2009. They are a generation that consists of nearly 76 million Americans. As baby boomers enter retirement, they will be looking for opportunities in fitness, sports, outdoors, arts and cultural events, and other activities that suit their lifestyles. With their varied life experiences, values, and expectations, baby boomers are predicted to redefine the meaning of recreation and leisure programming for mature adults.

In the leisure profession, this generation’s devotion to exercise and fitness is an example of their influence on society. When boomers entered elementary school, President John Kennedy initiated the President’s Council on Physical Fitness; physical education and recreation became a key component of public education. As boomers matured and moved into the workplace, they took their desire for exercise and fitness with them. Now as the oldest boomers are nearing 70, park and recreation professionals are faced with new approaches to provide both passive and active programming for older adults.

**Boomer Basics:**

Boomers are known to work hard, play hard, and spend hard. They have always been fixated with all things youthful. Boomers typically respond that they feel 10 years younger than their chronological age. Their nostalgic mindset keeps boomers returning to the sights and sounds of their 1960s youth culture. Swimming pools have become less of a social setting and much more of an extension of boomers’ health and wellness program. Because boomers have, in general, a high education level they will likely continue to pursue education as adults and into retirement.

The highest ranking age cohorts in Nederland are 35-44, 45-54, and 55-64. Planning for the next ten years suggests a growing demand for programs and services for baby boomers.

Boomers will look to park and recreation professionals to give them opportunities to enjoy many life-long hobbies and sports. When programming for this age group, a customized experience to cater to their need for self-fulfillment, healthy pleasure, nostalgic youthfulness, and individual escapes will be important. Recreation trends will shift from games and activities that boomers associate with senior citizens. Ziegler suggests activities such as bingo, bridge, and shuffleboard will likely be avoided because boomers relate these activities to being old. Boomers will reinvent what being a 65-year-old means. Parks and recreation agencies need to adapt programming to these trends.

**Recreation Facility National Trends**

According to *Recreation Management* magazine’s “2011 State of the Industry Report,” national trends show an increased user-base of recreation facilities. To meet that growing need, a majority of the 2011 State of the Industry Survey respondents (60.3%) reported that they have plans to build new facilities or make additions or renovations to their existing facilities over the next three years. Nearly a quarter (24.2%) of respondents said they have plans to build new facilities, and just over a quarter (25.9%) said they plan to add to their existing facilities. Another 43.6 percent are planning renovations.

Also according to the Report, parks and recreation respondents said that the average amount planned for construction for parks fell by 12.7 percent from an average of $3,907,000 in the 2010 survey to $3,411,000 in 2011. There was very little change in the types of features and amenities included in facilities of survey respondents from 2010 to 2011. The features most commonly found include locker rooms (57.5% of respondents have locker rooms); classrooms and meeting rooms (57.4%); bleachers and seating (56.8%); outdoor sports courts for basketball, tennis, etc. (54.1%); and concession areas (53.9%).

The current national trend is toward “one-stop” indoor recreation facilities to serve all ages. Large, multi-purpose regional centers help increase cost recovery, promote retention, and encourage cross-use. Agencies across the U.S. are increasing revenue production and cost recovery. Multi-use facilities versus specialized space is a trend, offering programming opportunities as well as free-play opportunities. “One-stop” facilities attract young families, teens, and adults of all ages.
Amenities and specialty parks that are still considered “alternative” but increasing in popularity include the following:

- Climbing walls
- Cultural art facilities
- Green design techniques and certifications such as Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED). A recent Building Commissioners Association survey indicated that 52 percent of the recreation industry survey respondents indicated they were willing to pay more for green design knowing that it would significantly reduce or eliminate the negative impact of buildings on the environment and occupants.
- Two of the emerging specialty parks include skate parks and adult fitness parks. The Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association estimates there are about 1,000 skateboard parks in the United States.

Outdoor fitness equipment provides a new opportunity for park and recreation departments to increase the health of their communities, while offering them the opportunity to exercise outdoors. Such equipment can increase the usage of parks, trails, and other outdoor amenities while helping to fight the obesity epidemic and increase the community’s interaction with nature.

**Fitness and Health National Trends**

There have been many changes in fitness programs in the last ten years. What clients wanted then is not necessarily what they want today. Fitness programs that have increased in popularity in the last ten years include outdoor exercise, boot camp, personal training, post-rehabilitation, dance fitness, and sport-specific training. Declining programs include health fairs, sports clinics, aerobics, stress-management classes, and weight-management classes. *(IDEA Health and Fitness Association)*

The American College of Sports Medicine’s (ACSM’s) *Health and Fitness Journal* conducted a survey to determine trends that would help create a standard for health and fitness programming. *Table 8* shows survey results that focus on trends in the commercial, corporate, clinical, and community health and fitness industry. The Worldwide Survey indicates the following shift in fitness trends between 2011 and 2012.

**Table 8: Worldwide Fitness Trends for 2011 and for 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Educated and experienced fitness professionals</td>
<td>1. Educated and experienced fitness professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fitness programs for older adults</td>
<td>2. Strength training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strength training</td>
<td>3. Fitness programs for older adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Children and obesity</td>
<td>4. Exercise and weight loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personal training</td>
<td>5. Children and obesity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Core training</td>
<td>6. Personal training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exercise and weight loss</td>
<td>7. Core training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Boot camp</td>
<td>8. Group personal training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: American College of Sport Medicine*

Zumba and other dance workouts and group personal training were added to the top ten fitness trends in 2012.
Health and Obesity Trends
The United Health Foundation has ranked Colorado 9th in its 2011 State Health Rankings, up four ranks from 2010.

The State’s biggest strengths include:
- Lowest percentage of childhood obesity
- Lowest percentage of stroke among adults
- Second lowest percentage of high blood pressure among adults
- Second lowest percentage of diabetes among adults

Some of the challenges the State faces include:
- Ranked 45th in early prenatal care
- Ranked 45th in premature births
- Ranked 30th in binge drinking

In the last decade, the annual improvement in America’s health has declined 69 percent compared to the 1990s (comparison is based on the annual growth rate from 1990 to 2000). Obesity continues to be a serious issue in America, growing at an epidemic rate—almost tripling since 1990. In fact, about every 1 in 3 adults is currently considered obese. This statistic illustrates the importance of intercepting the epidemic in youth. Currently, 27.5 percent of people in the United States are obese. Parks and recreation services can play a significant role in promoting community public health.

Healthy Lifestyle Trends
The health care issue is front and center. Park and recreation departments are finding they are in a position to be a catalyst in creating healthy lifestyles in communities. Steps such as assessments, policy creation, financial analysis, and management process are occurring around the country to create and validate a method for building healthy communities and gaining credibility as a public health provider.

According to a study published in the journal Environmental Science and Technology, in February of 2011, research indicates outdoor exercise is healthier than gym workouts.” Researchers found that going for a run outdoors is better than exercising in the gym because it has a positive impact on mental, as well as physical health. Levels of tension, confusion, anger, and depression were found to be lowered. This aligns with the trend of adult fitness playgrounds that are popping up all over the world. There is also a link between health and the built environment that continues to grow as a trend for local governments. Communities are increasingly incorporating active living and physical activity into daily routines.

Events and Festivals
From the early 1980s, there has been a process that can be characterized as “festivalization,” which has been linked to the economic restructuring of towns and cities and the drive to develop communities as large-scale platforms for “cultural experiences.” Nederland has several annual festivals that draw visitors.

Events ranked fourth highest (26%) among Priorities for Programs to be Added, Expanded, or Improved in the 2012 Community Survey. However, events ranked lower (14th) when survey respondents were asked to rank their top three priorities. Additionally 74% responded that their needs for events were being met.
General Programming Trends – National Trends

One of the most common concerns in the recreation industry is creating innovative programming to draw participants into facilities and services. Once in, participants recognize the many benefits. According to Recreation Management magazine’s June 2011, “State of the Industry Report,” the most popular programs, offered by more than half of survey respondents, include holiday events and other special events (64.3%); fitness programs (61.1%); educational programs (60.4%); day camps and summer camps (56.3%); mind-body/balance programs such as yoga, tai chi, Pilates and martial arts (51.4%); and youth sports teams (50.7%). Sports training was not in the top ten; however, golf instruction and tennis lessons are a fast paced trend.

The report also suggested slightly less than a third (31.9%) of respondents indicated that they are planning to add additional programs at their facilities over the next three years. The most common types of programming they are planning to add include:

- Fitness programs (26.8% of respondents planning to add programs)
- Educational programs (25%)
- Teen programming (24%)
- Mind-body/balance programs (22.5%)
- Active older adults (20.9%)
- Day camps and summer camps (20.8%)
- Environmental education (20.3%)
- Individual sports activities (18.9%)
- Holiday events and other special events (18.6%)
- Sports tournaments or races (18%)

Intergenerational programming is still in demand: while parents are finding themselves hitting the gym, they are in need of programs for children at the same time.

Marketing

Niche marketing trends have experienced change more frequently than ever before as technology affects the way the public receives information. Web 2.0 tools and now Web 3.0 tools are a trend for agencies to use as a means of marketing programs and services. Popular social marketing electronic tools include:

- Facebook
- Twitter
- YouTube
- Tagged
- LinkedIn

Mobile marketing is a trend of the future. Young adults engage in mobile data applications at much higher rates than adults in age brackets 30 and older. Usage rates of mobile applications demonstrate that millennials tend to get information more frequently using mobile devices such as smart phones. For example, 95 percent of 18-to-29-year-old cell phone owners send and receive text messages, compared to 82 percent of 30-to-49-year-olds, 57 percent of 50-to-64-year-olds, and 19 percent of 65 and older. It is also a fact that minority Americans lead the way when it comes to mobile access. Nearly two-thirds of African-Americans (64%) and Latinos (63%) are wireless internet users, and minority Americans are significantly more likely to own a cell phone than are their white counterparts (87% of African-Americans and Hispanics own a cell phone, compared with 80% of whites).
Natural Environments and Open Space

Economic and Health Benefits of Parks
There are numerous economic and health benefits of parks, including the following:

- Trails, parks, and playgrounds are among the five most important community amenities considered when selecting a home.
- Research from the University of Illinois shows that trees, parks, and green spaces have a profound impact on people’s health and mental outlook. U.S. Forest Service research indicates that when the economic benefits produced by trees are assessed, total value can be two to six times the cost for tree planting and care.
- Fifty percent (50%) of Americans regard outdoor activities as their main source of exercise.

The 2012 Nederland Area Open Space, Trails, Parks, and Recreation Survey (referenced throughout as the 2012 Nederland Community Survey) results provide a measure of priorities of area residents with respect to trails and open space. While all aspects of open space are considered important by the community, receiving a “4” or “5” on the five point importance scale, the most identified categories included:

- Preserve wildlife habitat (90%)
- Maintain existing trails (87%)
- Preserve the view corridors (85%)

The lower rated categories, in terms of importance, included:

- Build more trails (50%)
- Provide trail amenities (44%)

Figure 7 illustrates importance of trails and open space to Nederland residents.

**Figure 7: Importance of Nederland Trails and Open Space to Households**

![Figure 7: Importance of Nederland Trails and Open Space to Households](chart.png)
The Trust for Public Land published a report titled: “The Benefits of Parks: Why America Needs More City Parks and Open Space.” The report makes the following observations about the health, economic, environmental, and social benefits of parks and open space:

- Physical activity makes people healthier.
- Physical activity increases with access to parks.
- Contact with the natural world improves physical and physiological health.
- Residential and commercial property values increase.
- Value is added to community and economic development sustainability.
- Benefits of tourism are enhanced.
- Trees are effective in improving air quality and act as natural air conditioners.
- Trees assist with storm water control and erosion.
- Crime and juvenile delinquency are reduced.
- Recreational opportunities for all ages are provided.
- Stable neighborhoods and strong communities are created.

**Nature Programming**

The National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) sent out a survey to member agencies in order to learn more about the programs and facilities that public park and recreation agencies provide to connect children and their families with nature. A summary of the results follow:

- Sixty-eight percent (68%) of public park and recreation agencies offer nature-based programming, and 61 percent have nature-based facilities.
- The most common programs include nature hikes, nature-oriented arts and crafts, fishing-related events, and nature-based education in cooperation with local schools.
- When asked to describe the elements that directly contribute to their most successful programs, agencies listed staff training as most important followed by program content and number of staff/staff training.
- When asked what resources would be needed most to expand programming, additional staff was most important followed by funding.
- Of the agencies that do not currently offer nature-based programming, 90 percent indicated that they want to in the future. Additional staff and funding were again the most important resources these agencies would need going forward.
- The most common facilities include: nature parks/preserves, self-guided nature trails, outdoor classrooms, and nature centers.
- When asked to describe the elements that directly contribute to their most successful facilities, agencies listed funding as most important followed by presence of wildlife and community support.

The Wild Bear Mountain Ecology Center is a non-profit agency based in Nederland that provides environmental education opportunities at its current location in downtown and at Boulder County’s Mud Lake Open Space.

**Outdoor Recreation**

Local parks and recreation departments are a common place for residents to look when getting outside for leisure activities. It is often the mission of parks and recreation departments to get more people outdoors.
The Outdoor Foundation released the “2011 Participation in Outdoor Recreation Report” which highlights that participation in outdoor recreation in 2010 remained steady for a third year in a row, matching levels seen in 2008. Notably in 2010, ethnically diverse participants made up a significantly higher percentage of participants than in previous years, up over four percentage points since 2007 to 29.5 percent of participants. Adventure sports, including triathlon, adventure racing, backpacking, climbing, kayaking, rafting and scuba diving, showed significant growth in 2010 as well, up 23 percent in participation as a group. Compared to 2009, youth participation in outdoor activities was flat among ages 6 to 12, but increased slightly among ages 13 to 17 and 18 to 24. Running, biking, and camping were popular among youth, ages 6 to 24, though bicycling and camping (backyard, car, and RV) continued to see participation decreases in 2010, part of a three-year trend.

**Recreation and Park Administration National Trends**

Municipal parks and recreation structures and delivery systems have changed, and more alternative methods of delivering services are emerging. Certain services are being contracted out and cooperative agreements with non-profit groups and other public institutions are being developed. Newer partners include the health system, social services, justice system, education, the corporate sector, and community service agencies. These partnerships reflect both a broader interpretation of the mandate of parks and recreation agencies and the increased willingness of other sectors to work together to address community issues. The relationship with health agencies is vital in promoting wellness. The traditional relationship with education and the sharing of facilities through joint-use agreements is evolving into cooperative planning and programming aimed at addressing youth inactivity levels and community needs.

Additional administrative national trends are listed below:

- Level of subsidy for programs is lessening and more “enterprise” activities are being developed, thereby allowing subsidy to be used where deemed appropriate.
- Information technology allows for better tracking and reporting.
- Pricing is often determined by peak, off-peak, and off-season rates.
- More agencies are partnering with private, public, and non-profit groups.

In Nederland, several parks and recreation facilities are provided by the Town, while most recreation services and programs are provided by private and non-profit organizations. In the absence of a funded parks and recreation department, recreation partnerships and volunteer efforts have provided the most effective management option in Nederland.

**Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) - Compliance**

On September 14, 2010 the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) issued an amended regulation implementing the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA 2010 Standards). On March 15, 2011 the amended Act became effective and, for the first time in history, includes recreation environment design requirements. Compliance with the regulations was to be effective March 15, 2012. This includes design and construction requirements and the development of three-year transition. By March 15, 2015 implementation of the three-year transition plan must be complete.
**Trend Analysis Summary**

The following are key behavioral trends reflective of the Town. These will be important to evaluate for future planning efforts.

- Some of the top ten athletic activities ranked by total participation included: exercise walking, exercising with equipment, camping, swimming, bowling, and working out at athletic clubs.
- The most common programs offered in communities are holiday events and other special events; fitness programs; educational programs; day camps and summer camps; mind-body/balance programs such as yoga, tai chi, Pilates, and martial arts; and youth sports teams.
- Fitness programs, educational programs, teen programs, mind body balance, and active adults were listed at the top of the ten programs parks and recreation departments are planning to add within the next three years.
- Trails, parks, and playgrounds are among the five most important community amenities considered when selecting a home.
- National trends in the delivery of parks and recreation systems reflects more partnerships and contractual agreements to support specialized services.
- The majority of Americans agree that preserving undeveloped land for outdoor recreation is important. A large percentage of outdoor participants also believe that developing local parks and hiking and walking trails is important.
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THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>GIS</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backstop, Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden, Display</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey, Ice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiuse Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Turf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Node</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground, Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter, Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track, Competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail, Multi-use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Access, Developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Access, General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:** 11307.4 12173131 2 1 151332311312 1 0 13
### Capacities Level of Service for Community Components

#### October 2012

#### INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>System Acres</th>
<th>Backstop, Practice</th>
<th>Ballfield</th>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>Educational Experience</th>
<th>Garden, Display</th>
<th>Hockey, Ice</th>
<th>Multi-use Field</th>
<th>Multisport Court</th>
<th>Natl Turf</th>
<th>Open Water</th>
<th>Other Active</th>
<th>Other-Passive</th>
<th>Picnic Grounds</th>
<th>Playground, Local</th>
<th>Shelter, Group</th>
<th>State Park</th>
<th>Tennis</th>
<th>Trailhead</th>
<th>Water Access, Developed</th>
<th>Water Access, General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nederland</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder County/Nederland</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Boulder</td>
<td>3133</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder Valley School District</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Forest Service</td>
<td>7,596</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>113,081</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CURRENT RATIO PER POPULATION

**CURRENT POPULATION 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Ratio per 1000 Population</th>
<th>3,074</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population per component</td>
<td>3.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonly Referenced * Standards*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECTED POPULATION - 2016**

| Total # needed to maintain current ratio of all existing facilities at projected population | 11849 |
| Number that should be added to achieve current ratio at projected population | 541   |

*2011 population estimate and 2016 population projection for the Nederland Library District area (Source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, Inc.)
Appendix E – Composite Values Methodology for Level of Service Analysis

Composite Values Methodology (CVM) for Level of Service Analysis

A. Level of Service Analysis

Analysis of the existing parks, open space, trails, and recreation systems are often conducted in order to try and determine how the systems are serving the public. A Level of Service (LOS) has been typically defined in parks and recreation master plans as the capacity of the various components and facilities that make up the system to meet the needs of the public. This is often expressed in terms of the size or quantity of a given facility per unit of population.

Brief History of Level of Service Analysis

In order to help standardize parks and recreation planning, universities, agencies and parks and recreation professionals have long been looking for ways to benchmark and provide “national standards” for how much acreage, how many ballfields, pools, playgrounds, etc., a community should have. As examples, in 1906 the fledgling “Playground Association of America” called for playground space equal to 30 square feet per child. In the 1970’s and early 1980’s, the first detailed published works on these topics began emerging (Gold, 1973, Lancaster, 1983). In time capacity ratios emerged with 10 acres of parklands per thousand population becoming the most widely accepted standard application. Other normative guides also have been cited as “traditional standards,” but have been less widely accepted. In 1983, Roger Lancaster compiled a book called, “Recreation, Park and Open Space Standards and Guidelines,” that was published by the National Park and Recreation Association (NRPA). In this publication, Mr. Lancaster centered on a recommendation “that a park system, at minimum, be composed of a core system of parklands, with a total of 6.25 to 10.5 acres of developed open space per 1,000 population (Lancaster, 1983, p. 56). The guidelines went further to make recommendations regarding an appropriate mix of park types, sizes, service areas, and acreages, and standards regarding the number of available recreational facilities per thousand population. While the book was published by NRPA and the table of standards became widely known as “the NRPA standards,” for Level of Service Analysis, it is important to note that these standards were never formally adopted for use by NRPA.

Since that time, various publications have updated and expanded upon possible “standards,” several of which have also been published by NRPA. Many of these publications did benchmarking and other normative research to try and determine what an “average LOS” should be. It is important to note that NRPA and the prestigious American Academy for Park and Recreation Administration, as organizations, have focused in recent years on accreditation standards for agencies, which are less directed towards outputs, outcomes and performance, and more on planning, organizational structure, and management processes. The following table gives some of the more commonly and historically used “capacity standards.”
### Common Historically-Referenced LOS Capacity “Standards”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Facility</th>
<th>Recommended Space Requirements</th>
<th>Service Radius and Location Notes</th>
<th>Number of Units per Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseball</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Little League</td>
<td>3.0 to 3.85 acre minimum</td>
<td>% to ½ mile Unlighted part of neighborhood complex; lighted fields part of community complex</td>
<td>1 per 5,000; lighted 1 per 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth High school</td>
<td>2,400 – 3,036 s.f.</td>
<td>% to ½ mile Usually in school, recreation center or church facility; safe walking or bide access; outdoor courts in neighborhood and community parks, plus active recreation areas in other park settings</td>
<td>1 per 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Minimum 1.5 acres</td>
<td>15 – 30 minute travel time Usually part of sports complex in community park or adjacent to school</td>
<td>1 per 20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>1.7 to 2.1 acres</td>
<td>1 to 2 miles Youth soccer on smaller fields adjacent to larger soccer fields or neighborhood parks</td>
<td>1 per 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>1.5 to 2.0 acres</td>
<td>% to ½ mile May also be used for youth baseball</td>
<td>1 per 5,000 (if also used for youth baseball)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
<td>Varies on size of pool &amp; amenities; usually % to 2-acre site</td>
<td>15 – 30 minutes travel time Pools for general community use should be planned for teaching, competitive &amp; recreational purposes with enough depth (3.4m) to accommodate 1m to 3m diving boards; located in community park or school site</td>
<td>1 per 20,000 (pools should accommodate 3% to 5% of total population at a time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Minimum of 7,200 s.f. single court area (2 acres per complex)</td>
<td>% to ½ mile Best in groups of 2 to 4 courts; located in neighborhood community park or near school site</td>
<td>1 court per 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>Minimum 4,000 s.f.</td>
<td>% to 1 mile Usually in school, recreation center or church facility; safe walking or bide access; outdoor courts in neighborhood and community parks, plus active recreation areas in other park settings</td>
<td>1 court per 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total land Acreage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:**
In conducting planning work, it is important to realize that the above standards can be valuable when referenced as “norms” for capacity, but not necessarily as the target standards for which a community should strive. Each community is different and there are many varying factors which are not addressed by the standards above. For example:

- Does “developed acreage” include golf courses”? What about indoor and passive facilities?
- What are the standards for parks, ice arenas, public art, etc.?
- What if it’s an urban land-locked community? What if it’s a small town surrounded by open federal lands?
- What about quality and condition? What if there’s a bunch of ballfields, but they haven’t been maintained in the last ten years?
- And many other questions....

B. GRASP® Composite-Values Method (CVM) for Level of Service Analysis

In order to address these and other relevant questions, a new methodology for determining Level of Service was developed. It is called a Composite-Values Methodology (CVM) and has been applied in many communities across the nation since 2001, to provide a better way of measuring and portraying the service provided by parks and recreation systems. Primary research and development on this methodology was funded jointly by GreenPlay, LLC, a management consulting firm for parks, open space and related agencies, Design Concepts, a landscape architecture and planning firm, and Geowest, a spatial information management firm. While Composite-Values Methodology can be utilized by anyone, the proprietary trademarked name for the CVM process that these three firms use is called GRASP® (Geo-Referenced Amenities Standards Process). The GRASP® name for the methodology for analysis is proprietary, but the CVM process is generic and the software used is common and typical for most agencies. The data and information collected is owned and can be updated and managed by the agency for ongoing usage.

For CVM analysis, capacity is only part of the LOS equation. Other factors are brought into consideration, including quality, condition, location, comfort, convenience, and ambience. To create GRASP® inventory and analysis, parks, trails, recreation, open space and any other relevant amenities and properties being studied are looked at as part of an overall infrastructure for a community made up of various components, such as playgrounds, multi-purpose fields, passive areas, etc. The methodology inventories characteristics that are part of the context and setting of a component. They are not characteristics of the component itself, but when they exist in proximity to a component they enhance the value of the component.

The characteristics of components include:

- Quality – The service provided by anything, whether it is a playground, soccer field, or swimming pool is determined in part by its quality. A playground with a variety of features, such as climbers, slides, and swings provides a higher degree of service than one with nothing but an old teeter-totter and some “monkey-bars.”
Condition – The condition of a component within the park system also affects the amount of service it provides. A playground in disrepair with unsafe equipment does not offer the same service as one in good condition. Similarly, a soccer field with a smooth surface of well-maintained grass certainly offers a higher degree of service than one that is full of weeds, ruts, and other hazards.

Functionality – Functionality is a measure of how well something serves its intended purpose, and is a result of its quality and condition.

Location – To receive service from something, you need to be able to get to it. Therefore, service is dependent upon proximity and access. All components are geographically located using GPS coordinates and GIS software.

Comfort – The service provided by a component is increased by having amenities. For example, outdoor components are often enhanced by attributes such as shade, seating, and a restroom nearby. Comfort enhances the experience of using a component.

Convenience – Convenience encourages people to use a component, which increased the amount of service that it offers. Easy access and the availability of trash receptacles, bike rack, or nearby parking are examples of conveniences that enhance the service provided by a component.

Ambience – Simple observation will prove that people are drawn to places that “feel” good. This includes a sense of safety and security, as well as pleasant surroundings, attractive views, and a sense of place. For example, a well-designed park is preferable to poorly-designed one, and this enhances the degree of service provided by the components within it.

Capacity is still part of the LOS analysis and the quantity of each component is recorded as well. By combining and analyzing the composite values of each component, it is possible to measure the service provided by a parks and recreation system from a variety of perspectives and for any given location. Typically this begins with a decision on “relevant components” for the analysis, collection of an accurate inventory of those components, analysis and then the results are presented in a series of maps and tables that make up the analysis of the study area.

Data for Analysis and Making Justifiable Decisions
All of the data generated from the GRASP® evaluation is compiled into an electronic database that is then available and owned by the agency for use in a variety of ways. The database can help keep track of facilities and programs, and can be used to schedule services, maintenance, and the replacement of components. In addition to determining LOS, it can be used to project long-term capital and life-cycle costing needs. All portions of the information are in standard available software and can be produced in a variety of ways for future planning or sharing with the public.
It is important to note that CVM analysis provides not only accurate LOS and facility inventory information, but also works with and integrates with other tools to help agencies make decisions. It is relatively easy to maintain, updatable, and creates easily understood graphic depictions (analysis maps and/or “Perspectives”) of issues. Combined with a needs assessment, public and staff involvement, program and financial assessment, CVM analysis allows an agency to defensibly make recommendations on priorities for ongoing resource allocation along with capital and operational funding.

C. Inventory Data Collection Process

A detailed inventory of relevant components for the project is conducted. The inventory locates and catalogues all of the relevant components for the project, and evaluates each one as to how well it was serving its intended function within the system. The planning team first prepares a preliminary list of existing components using aerial photography and the community’s Geographic Information System (GIS). Components identified in the aerial photo are given GIS points and names according to a list of standard components.

Next, field visits are conducted by the consulting and project team staff to confirm the preliminary data and collect additional information. Additionally indoor facilities are scored and for the purposes of this study, each relevant space is considered a component and is scored based on its intended function. During the field visits and evaluations, any missing relevant components are added to the data set, and each component is evaluated as to how well it meets expectations for its intended function. During the site visits the following information is collected:

- Component type and location
- Evaluation of component functionality
- Evaluation of comfort and convenience features
- Evaluation of park design and ambience
- Site photos and general comments

After the inventory is completed, it is given to the project team for final review and approval for accuracy.

D. Standardized Process for Scoring Components

Component Scoring
The approved inventory is the basis for the creation of values used in analysis. Each component received a functionality score that is related to the quality, condition, and ability of the space to meet operational and programming needs.

For the GRASP® process, the range of scores for each component is as follows:

- **Below Expectations (BE)** – The component does not meet the expectations of its intended primary function. Factors leading to this may include size, age, accessibility, or others. Each such component is given a score of 1 in the inventory.
- **Meeting Expectations (ME)** – The component meets expectations for its intended function. Such components are given scores of 2.
• **Exceeding Expectations (EE)** – The component exceeds expectations, due to size, configuration, or unique qualities. Such components are given scores of 3.
• If the feature exists but is not usable because it is unsafe, obsolete, or dysfunctional, it may be listed in the feature description, and assigned a score of **zero (0)**.

If a feature is used for multiple purposes, such as a softball field that is also used for T-Ball or youth soccer games, it is scored only once under the description that best fits the use for which the component is designed.

**Neighborhood and Community Scoring**
Components are evaluated from two perspectives: first, the value of the component in serving the immediate neighborhood, and second, its value to the entire community.

**Neighborhood Score**
Each component is evaluated from the perspective of a resident that lives nearby. High scoring components are easily accessible to pedestrians in the neighborhood, are attractive for short and frequent visits, and are unobtrusive to the surrounding neighborhood. Components that do not have a high neighborhood score may not be located within walking distance of residents, may have “nuisance features” such as sports lighting, or may draw large crowds for which parking is not provided.

**Community Score**
Additionally each component is evaluated from the perspective of residents in the community as a whole. High scoring components in this category may be unique components within the parks and recreation system, have a broad draw from throughout the community, have the capacity and associated facilities for community-wide events, or are located in areas that are accessible only by car.

**Indoor Components**
Indoor components are generally thought to be accessible to the entire community, partially because it is often not financially feasible to provide indoor facilities at a walking distance from every distance from each residence. Additionally indoor facilities often provide programs and facilities that are geared to the community as a whole, or in larger communities, are intended for a region of the community. For these reasons, unless a detailed indoor analysis is completed, indoor facilities are given only one score.

**Modifiers (Comfort and Convenience Features) Scoring**

**Outdoor Modifiers**
Besides standard components, this inventory also evaluates features that provide comfort and convenience to the users. These are things that a user might not go to the parks specifically to use, but are things that enhance the users’ experience by making it a nicer place to be and include: drinking fountains, seating, BBQ grills, dog stations, security lighting, bike parking, restrooms, shade, connections to trails, park access, parking, picnic tables, and seasonal and ornamental plantings. These features are scored as listed above with the 1-3 system. In this case it is not important to get a count of the number or size of these components; instead the score should reflect the ability of the item to serve the park.
Indoor Modifiers
For indoor facilities the comfort and convenience features change slightly to reflect the characteristics of the building. Building modifier categories include: site access, setting aesthetics, building entry function, building entry aesthetics, overall building condition, entry desk, office space, overall storage, and restrooms and/or locker rooms.

Activity and Sports Lighting
This modifier accounts for lighting that allows for component use in the evening/night hours and is applied to the quantity of the component as it affectively expands the capacity of the component. This modifier does not apply to security lighting.

Shade
Like Activity and Sports lighting, shade can be added to outdoor components to extend use beyond normal hours or seasons.

Design & Ambience Scoring
Using the same rating system that is used for components and modifiers, the quality of Design and Ambience is scored. Good design not only makes a place look nice, it makes it feel safe and pleasant, and encourages people to visit more often and stay longer.

Trails and Greenways Scoring
Trails and/or greenways can be scored as independent parcels or as individual components within another parcel. The former type of trail receives its own set of scores for modifiers and design and ambiance. The trail in the latter situation takes on the modifiers and design and ambiance of the larger park in which it resides. Multi-use trails are assumed to consist of three components including one active component, one passive component, and the parcel itself. Because traveling the length of any given trail is time consuming, trail information is often collected with the aid of staff.

For the purposes of most studies, a list of trails is obtained to provide a reasonable dataset that offers some park and recreational value to the public. While no specific listing of components at each greenway or trail is generated, it is assumed that each greenway provides a value equivalent to three (3) components. Think of these as one active component (walking, running, biking, etc.), one passive component (quiet contemplation along the trail), and one experiential component (observing nature, perhaps art and interpretive signage).

These three components and the parcel are assumed to be meeting the expectations (scores 2) of the community in the same way that park components meet expectations. The other parts to the GRASP® score relate to the comfort and design of the location, and are called modifiers. The aesthetic and recreational standards for greenways are typically similar to those for parks, so modifiers at greenways are generally assigned a value of meeting expectations (score 2). Multi-use trails that typically are adjacent to major roads are assumed to have less aesthetic and recreational standards and are therefore assigned a value of below expectations (score 1). The final component in the GRASP® score is the ownership modifier. This is a percentage that is applied to the score that relates to the general public's ability to access the facility.
This translates into the following formula for calculating the GRASP® score:

**Trails or Greenway Scoring**

\[
(\text{Component number } + \text{Parcel}) \times \text{Component score} \times (\text{Comfort} \times \text{Design}) \times \text{ownership} = \text{GRASP® score or (3 +1) } 2 \times 2.2 \times 1 = 17.6
\]

**Multi-Use Trail Scoring**

\[
(\text{Component number } + \text{Parcel}) \times \text{Component score} \times (\text{Comfort} \times \text{Design}) \times \text{ownership} = \text{GRASP® score or (3 +1) } 2 \times 1.1 \times 1 = 8.8
\]

_In the GRASP® Perspectives, that value is assigned to the location where each trail is found and buffered accordingly. This value also is included in computations for the GRASP® Indices that are calculated along with each Perspective._

**Ownership Modifier**

This modifier is generally weighted with a percentage that is applied to the GRASP® score after other modifiers have been applied. It accounts for access and control of components that are provided by alternative providers. For example, in most cases components that are owned and managed by schools are given a 50% weighted ownership modifier, which halves the GRASP® score to account for the limited access that the neighborhood has to school facilities (it’s only open to the public outside of school hours).

**E. Calculating GRASP® Functional Scores**

Once the components are inventoried and scored, calculations can be made for any combination of components to derive average scores, scores per combinations of various components, scores per sub-areas, etc., depending on the key issues being studied and objectives for the project. These are very helpful for analyzing area comparisons and setting of target scores for component service and agency target standards.

For example, a total composite GRASP® score for each individual component is determined by using the following formula:

\[
(\text{total component score}) \times (\text{adjusted modifier score}) \times (\text{design and ambiance score}) \times (\text{ownership modifier}) = \text{Composite GRASP® Score}
\]

These individual scores can be additively combined in various ways to examine service from various subsets of the agency’s system.

**F. GRASP® Perspectives**

GRASP® scores are often used to create analysis maps to show how the study area is being served for parks and recreation benefits. These maps are called Perspectives, because each one provides a certain perspective on the way service is being provided.

The types of Perspectives used to analyze and depict the community’s LOS will depend upon the key issues being studied. The inventory and analysis section of the report explains the particular types of perspectives used for this study.
G. GRASP® Project Technical Standards for GIS Data

The GRASP® Team utilizes the most up to date computer hardware and software to produce and enhance project-based GIS data. The following technical details are standard with all GRASP® Team projects.

- All GRASP® Team GIS workstations employ Microsoft® Windows® operating systems. All project files conform to PC-based architecture and extension naming standards.
- The GRASP® Team employs ESRI® ArcGIS™ 10.0 for all GIS applications. Final project GIS data is submitted to the client in Microsoft® Access™-based Geodatabase (*.mdb) Feature Class format and/or Shapefile (*.shp/*.dbf/*.shx) format. ArcMap™ Layer files (*.lyr) or Map Package files (.mpk) are submitted to ease client replication of all project map legend formats.
- All final GIS datasets (deliverables) are submitted to the client using the geographic coordinate system(s) from the original client source data. The GRASP® team will assign a coordinate system that is most appropriate for the client location if the client does not require a predetermined standard coordinate system.
- All GRASP® Perspectives and Resource Maps (deliverables) are submitted to the client in standard PDF and JPEG formats. The project PDFs are high resolution, print-ready files for scalable print operations. Most project map-based PDFs are 300dpi, 36”x54’ images. The project JPEGs are lower resolution digital presentation-ready files for insertion into Microsoft® Office® productivity suite applications – MS Word®, MS Power Point®, etc. Most project map-based JPEGs are 300dpi 4”x6” images.

Project Deliverables and Future Use

All information and deliverables are transmitted “as-is” to fulfill specific tasks identified in a scope of services for a contract. While these may be useful for other purposes, no warranties or other assurances are made that the deliverables are ready for such use. The database can be modified to add, change, or delete information as needed by personnel trained in use of these standard software applications. For example, if new parks or facilities are constructed, the components of these may be added to the database to keep it current. The database may also be queried in a variety of ways to produce tables, charts, or reports for use in operations, management, and planning or other agency tasks. Such modification, updating, reformatting, or other preparation for other purposes is the sole responsibility of the client.

Similarly, the database information can be used to prepare a variety of maps and analysis perspectives using GIS software. Such use by the client is beyond the scope of a single contract, and no warranties or assurances are made that the deliverables are ready or intended for such future use. If desired, the GRASP® Team can make such modifications, and/or prepare additional or updated maps or Perspectives upon request for a negotiated fee.
Appendix F – Nederland-Area Level of Service Analysis

GRASP® Perspectives
An analytical technique known as Composite-Values Methodology (CVM) was used to analyze levels of service (LOS) provided by assets for Nederland. The proprietary version of CVM used is known as GRASP®. A series of analyses was performed and each individual analysis is referred to as a Perspective.

The Perspectives show how well the community is served by any given set of components. Perspectives may be made up of maps, graphs, spreadsheets, or other representational devices. This system provides a benchmark against which the community can measure its success in providing services at present and over time.

Composite-Values Level of Service (LOS) Analysis – This is the process used to inventory and analyze the assets, including quantity, location, and various qualities of each. The process utilizes Microsoft Excel and Access, and common GIS software. The composite-values based LOS analysis process used by GreenPlay and Design Concepts is proprietary, and known as “GRASP®” (Geo-referenced Amenities Standards Process). It has been somewhat automated through creation of additional software code and template design for efficiency in data collection and analysis. See Appendix C for a detailed history and overview of Composite-Values Based Level of Service Analysis.

To produce the Perspectives, each inventoried component has been assigned a score as described earlier.

For purposes of this study the Nederland Library District boundary was used as the extent of the study area. The estimated population within this boundary is 3,074 within an area of 46,142 acres and a population of .07 per acre. This number was also used to calculate the Population per Acre, so that the population density could be used in the level of service analyses.

Perspective A & B: Level of Service Analysis for All Components

Perspectives A & B show the overall level of service value provided by each site or facility. A darker orange value indicates a higher level of service. The actual numerical score for each location is shown in the enlargement (Perspective B). To get an idea of how the scores relate to one another, notice that the scores for the two schools are each 26.4, while the score for Chipeta Park is 48. This indicates that the LOS provided to the community by Chipeta Park is 1.8 times that which is provided by each school.

However, the high score for Chipeta Park can be looked at in different ways. It does not necessarily mean that the park is perfect. In fact, the high score corroborates input from the public suggesting that Chipeta Park’s many components are well-used and at times crowded.

The scoring system accounts for both developed recreation and natural areas when assessing LOS, but areas with a greater variety of components tend to score higher under this particular system. For this reason, natural areas show up on the map as providing service, but the score for these areas tends to be lower than for more developed sites. That does not mean that natural areas are assumed to be less important, just that they provide service in a different way.
Table 9 shows statistical information derived from Perspective A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Total GRASP Score</th>
<th>GRASP® Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nederland Library District</td>
<td>3074</td>
<td>46,142</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>201.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **Total GRASP® Score** shown in the table indicates the sum of the scores for all components in the system after “modifiers” such as the availability of restrooms, etc. are taken into account.

The **GRASP® Index** shown in the next column is the result of a simple numerical calculation that involves dividing the total numerical value of all of the components in a given area by the population of that area, in thousands. This allows density and population to be taken into account for LOS.

**Resource Map C: Zoning Map**

**Resource Map C** is provided to allow comparisons to be made between where service is being provided and where residences and other land uses are located. When this map is compared to the previous Perspective maps one can see that current amenities are reasonably located relative to current zoning and population within the study area.
While direct comparisons to other communities or districts are sometimes difficult, one can draw some simple conclusions. The following table shows some basic comparisons to the Evergreen, Colorado Park and Recreation District. While Nederland is similar in land size to the Evergreen district it has a significant difference in population. The table indicates that compared to Evergreen, Nederland has more sites in the inventory, but fewer components. However, when the value of all components is adjusted for population in the GRASP® Index, Nederland ranks much higher than Evergreen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>STUDY AREA SIZE (Acres)</th>
<th># OF SITES (Parks, Facilities, etc.)</th>
<th>TOTAL # OF COMPONENTS</th>
<th>AVG. # COMPONENTS per SITE</th>
<th>TOTAL GRASP® VALUE (Entire System)</th>
<th>GRASP® INDEX</th>
<th>AVG. SCORE / SITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Evergreen PRD</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>22,736</td>
<td>48,154</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Nederland</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,074</td>
<td>46,142</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>201.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capacities
The capacities table shown in Appendix D is a traditional method of looking at the current system on an individual component basis. This table provides a current per-population ratio for a number of specific components for the current population. It also shows the number needed to maintain those ratios if the population grows. Based on population projections, relatively few lands or facilities are needed in the near future to maintain current ratios. The table is quantitative only and does not account for the quality of the features shown.

GRASP® Index
The following table not only looks at quantity of individual components within the Nederland system, it also captures the functional quality of those components. It provides a way to index the value of the recreational system to the population served. While Nederland is projected to have minimal population growth at 2016, this table shows the projected increase in GRASP® value that would need to be added to maintain the current level of service. It is important to note that this does not necessarily imply an addition of more components but could simply mean upgrades to components or an increase in value of the associated modifiers. In this way, the GRASP® Index is also a way to track the value of “maintaining what you have.”

To explain this, consider that if the population does not change over time and no features listed in the Capacities Table above are added or taken away, no change in LOS is recorded in the Capacities Table. If, however, the features listed in the table are allowed to deteriorate over time due to lack of maintenance and their GRASP® scores go down as a result, the GRASP® Index will go down and a decrease in LOS will be recorded.

If the population increases, as expected in Nederland, the ratio of both quantity of features and the quality of features needs to be maintained. The following table shows the combined value of quantity and quality that should be added to maintain current LOS ratios.

Low-Functioning Components
During the inventory process a few components were scored with a value of “1,” meaning they fell below expectations. One of the recreation components that scored low was the Guercio Memorial Ballfield. Recommendations for addressing improvements are found in Chapter 7.
### Table 10: Projected Community Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Community Components</th>
<th>Current Population 2011</th>
<th>GRASP® Index (Meeting Expectation with Standard Modifiers)</th>
<th>Total GRASP® Community Score per component type</th>
<th>GRASP® score per 1000 population (GRASP® Index)</th>
<th>Total GRASP® score needed at projected population</th>
<th>Additional GRASP® score needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total, All Components</td>
<td>3,074</td>
<td>497.5</td>
<td>161.84</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backstop, Practice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Experience</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden, Display</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey, Ice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP Field, Large</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiuse Court</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Area</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>27.03</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Turf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Water</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Active</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Passive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Node</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Grounds</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground, Local</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter, Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track, Competition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail, Multi-use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailhead</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Access, Developed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Access, General</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2011 and 2016 population estimates are for the Library District boundaries.
AGENDA ITEM:
Discussion Regarding Short-term Rentals (STR) and Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)

SUMMARY:
The Board of Trustees met with the Planning Commission in a joint work session on August 22, 2018 to discuss STRs and ADUs. Based on the conversation, staff was given direction to research the current language in Nederland Municipal Code and provide a report of findings to the Board of Trustees. Staff was also directed to research enforcement processes and costs and to provide an example of a lodging tax ordinance.

HISTORY AND PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION:
Short Term Rentals (STR's) have been in existence for years in the Nederland area, despite a lack of associated regulations to address impact to neighborhoods and infrastructure. The Planning Commission (PC) continued a hearing to consider a DRAFT Ordinance for a Short-Term Rental Licensing Program on June 27, 2018. They voted to send a revised DRAFT Ordinance to the Board of Trustees (BOT) for consideration. The BOT considered the DRAFT Ordinance as a discussion item at their July 17, 2018 meeting. After public comment and a discussion, the BOT decided to continue the discussion in a work session on August 7, 2018. The BOT directed staff to schedule a joint meeting with the Planning Commission to discuss STRs and revisit Ordinance 785 permitting ADUs, which was adopted on May 17, 2018.

QUESTION BEFORE THE BOARD:
What are the next steps in this process?
ATTACHMENTS:

- Power Point Presentation Addressing STR and ADU language in code and enforcement options of regulations
- Code Definitions and Possible Edits
- SAMPLE Lodging Tax Ordinance
- Ordinance 785 ADUs
- DRAFT amending Ordinance 785
Code Definitions

Bed and breakfast means a portion of a residence used for rental of five (5) or less bedrooms, access to a bathroom, and provision of limited meal service. A bed and breakfast shall provide at least one (1) additional off-street parking space for each room available to rent, shall not provide for cooking in any of the rooms rented, shall not allow guests to stay for more than seven (7) consecutive days, and the bedrooms and bathrooms used by the guests shall not occupy more than twenty-five percent (25%) of the residence in which the bed and breakfast is located.

Suggested edit: Deletion or Alter: Short Term Rental definition + unique property considerations on allowable rooms for rental, septic compliance pertaining to # of bedrooms, with at least one (1) additional off-street parking space for each room available for rent, which may include provision of limited meal service or basic means for making meals, shall not allow guests to stay for more than (_____) days if desired, and bedrooms and baths not occupy more than 50% (?) of residence. Requires active business license and remittance of appropriate fees and taxation, and life/safety (self) inspection.

Building, accessory means a detached, smaller building from the principal building on the lot which is:

a. Integrally related to the principal use on the lot;
b. Subordinate in size and use and clearly incidental to the principal building or use of the lot;
c. Customarily incidental to the principal building or use of the lot;
d. Located on the same lot as the principal building;
e. Used only at the same time as the principal building use is active and operational;
f. Not detrimental or an alteration of the character of the area in which the building is located; and

g. Not used for living or sleeping quarters.

Dwelling unit means one (1) or more rooms with internal connections including bathroom and kitchen facilities designed, occupied or intended for occupancy as separate quarters for the exclusive use of a single family for living, cooking and sanitary purposes.

Suggested edit: Fits ADU well as-is, esp if referring to in-home ADU)

Multiple dwelling units exist if any of the following conditions exist:

a. There is more than one (1) meter for any utility;
b. There is more than one (1) address to the property;
c. There is more than one (1) kitchen in the building;

d. There are separate external entrances to rooms which could be used as separate dwelling units;

e. There is a physical separation between rooms in the dwelling unit, capable of being locked, such that a room or rooms on each side of the separation could be used as a dwelling unit;

f. There are rooms with no internal connections.

Suggested edit: This definition would need to be changed with clear ADU parameters.

*Family* means an individual or two (2) or more persons related by blood or marriage, or an unrelated group of not more than four (4) persons living together in a dwelling unit.

*Guest house* means an accessory building to a single-family dwelling unit which is serviced through the same utility meters or connections as the principal use and is intended for occupancy only by guests of the family residing in the single-family residence. The guests may not pay compensation for the use of the guest house and may not stay in the guest house for more than thirty (30) consecutive days, and kitchen facilities shall not be allowed. The same guests residing in the guest house for more than thirty (30) days in any one-year period shall be prima facie evidence of an intent by the occupant of the single-family dwelling to circumvent this provision.

Suggested edit: Keep guest home as is, but change allotted allowable days (for summer housers), allow compensation (?)

Suggested edit: If referencing detached ADU, a separate PIF and tap must be purchased, along with base fees and metered usage fees. Intended solely for long term rental.

*Guest room* means a room in a hotel, apartment hotel, motel or tourist home offered to the public for compensation, used only for transient occupancy, and in which no provision is made for cooking.

Suggested edit: This description fits well for STR, does Commission/BOT desire to limit the length of each guest (?), otherwise 2nd clause works, allow cooking (?)

*Rooming unit* means a room within a principal structure which provides minimal housing accommodations for a roomer, is arranged primarily for sleeping and study, and in which may be included a private bath; but such a room shall not include any kitchen equipment such as a refrigerator, sink or cooking device.

Suggested edit: This description fits well for STR, as it doesn’t seem intended for LTR due to inability to have kitchen eqpt. This allowance or prohibition of cooking seems primary in the mindset of the code that delineated STR from LTR. What does the board want to encourage? Existing kitchens in ADUs and STR that allow independent living or reliance upon restaurants, shops, stores? Limited kitchen allowed would not impair existing units with kitchens.
Use, accessory means a subordinate use of a building, other structure or tract of land or a subordinate building or other structure subordinate to the principal use of a lot which is:

a. Integrally related to the principal use on the lot;

b. Subordinate and clearly incidental to the principal use of the lot;

c. Customarily incidental to the principal use of the lot;

d. Located on the same lot as the principal use;

e. Used only at the same time as the principal building is active and operational; and

f. Not detrimental or an alteration of the character of the area in which the use is located.

The maximum square footage of the portion of a lot used for an accessory use shall be determined based on the above criteria; however, in no event shall the square footage of the portion of the lot used for the accessory use exceed twenty-five percent (25%) of the square footage of the principal use which is active and operated at the same time as the accessory use of the accessory use. There shall be no more than two (2) accessory uses on one (1) lot.

Suggested edit: This description fits well for STR, does Commission/BOT desire to note violations within subsection (f).

Use, principal means the main use of land or of a structure as distinguished from a subordinate or accessory use.
ORDINANCE NO. 2121

INTRODUCED BY: Scott

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BRIGHTON, COLORADO, ADOPTING A NEW ARTICLE 3-40, BRIGHTON LODGING TAX, FOR THE BRIGHTON MUNICIPAL CODE IMPOSING A 3% LODGING TAX ON SHORT TERM LODGING OF LESS THAN THIRTY DAYS TO PROVIDE REVENUE TO BE ALLOCATED BY THE CITY COUNCIL FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, SPECIAL EVENTS, CULTURAL ARTS FACILITIES, ADVERTISING AND MARKETING, AND PROMOTING TOURISM AND OTHER ACTIVITIES WHICH UTILIZE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS; PROVIDING DEFINITIONS, REGULATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE LODGING TAX; REQUIRING A LICENSE FOR ANY PERSON ENGAGED IN THE BUSINESS OF FURNISHING LODGING; AND OTHER PROVISIONS RELATED THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City Council, in response to information and the recommendation from business owners within the community, and after careful consideration of the same determined that it is in the best interests of the citizens of Brighton to refer to the registered electors of the City the question of imposing a three percent (3%) lodging tax on the price paid by or charged to the guest, renter, or user, for the lease, rental, provision, or on the transaction of furnishing rooms or accommodations within the City; and

WHEREAS, the use of the revenue generated from the lodging tax would benefit the community and citizens by contributing to and encouraging economic development, special events, cultural arts facilities, advertising and marketing, promoting tourism and other activities which utilize public accommodations within the City; and

WHEREAS, acting pursuant to Article X, Section 20 of the Colorado Constitution, which requires voter approval of any new tax, the City Council approved and authorized the submission of the proposed lodging tax to the electors at the general election on November 8, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the electors at the general election on November 8, 2011, approved the lodging tax proposal submitted to them by the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City Council in response to the action of the electors of the City does by this ordinance adopt the lodging tax.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BRIGHTON, COLORADO, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The Brighton Municipal Code is hereby amended by the addition of a new Article 3-40, Brighton Lodging Tax to read as follows:

ARTICLE 3-40. Brighton Lodging Tax

Sec. 3-40-10 Legislative Intent
Sec. 3-40-10 Legislative Intent and Purpose
It is the legislative intent of the City Council that every person who purchases short term lodging in the City is exercising a taxable privilege and every person who furnishes lodging shall collect the tax imposed by this article. The city council declares that the purpose of the levy of the tax imposed by this article is for the raising of funds to promote economic development, tourism, conventions and related activities within the City by marketing the City and sponsoring community events, in support of these purposes.

Sec. 3-40-20 Definitions.
The following words, terms and phrases, when used in this article, shall have the meanings ascribed to them in this section, except where the context clearly indicates a different meaning:

City Manager shall mean the City Manager of the City of Brighton, or his/her designee.

Finance Director shall mean the Director of the Finance Department of the City of Brighton, or his/her designee.

Gross taxable sales means the total amount received in money, credits, property, or other valuable consideration from sales and purchases of lodging that shall be subject to the tax imposed by this article.

Lodging accommodation shall mean the leasing, rental or furnishing of any room or other accommodation in any hotel, apartment-hotel, motel, guesthouse, trailer court, guest ranch, mobile home, automobile camp or any such similar place that furnishes rooms or accommodations under any concession, permit, right of access, license to use, or agreement to any person who, for a consideration, uses, possesses or has the right to use or possess such room or other accommodation for a total continuous duration of less than thirty (30) days.
Lodging customer shall mean any person who, through a taxable lodging transaction, acquires lodging accommodation from a lodging provider.

Lodging price shall mean the gross taxable sales price paid, exclusive of other taxes paid or value given by the customer for the provision of lodging accommodation.

Lodging provider shall mean any person furnishing lodging accommodation or such provider's authorized agent.

Lodging tax shall mean an excise tax payable by the purchaser of lodging accommodation or the aggregate amount of taxes due from a lodging provider during the period for which such person is required to report the collections of lodging tax as herein specified.

Lodging transaction shall mean the furnishing of a lodging accommodation to any person who, for consideration, uses, possesses or has the right to use or possess any room or rooms in any hotel, apartment-hotel, guesthouse, guest ranch, mobile home, automobile camp, trailer court or park under any concession permit, right of access, license to use or other agreement, or otherwise.

Person means an individual, partnership, society, club, association, joint stock company, corporation, estate, receiver, trustee, assignee, referee, or any other person acting in a fiduciary or representative capacity, whether appointed by a court or otherwise, and any other group or combination of individuals acting as a unit, including the United States of America, the state and any political subdivision thereof.

Purchase or sale means the acquisition for a price by any person of the taxable services of lodging within the city.

Purchaser means any person to whom the taxable service of lodging has been rendered.

Tax means either the tax payable by the purchaser or the aggregate amount of taxes due from a vendor during the period for which the vendor is required to report collections under this article.

Taxpayer means any person obligated to account to the finance director for taxes collected or to be collected under the provisions of this article.

Vendor means a person making sales to a purchaser in the city of the taxable service of lodging.

Sec. 3-40-30 Imposition of the tax

On and after 12:00 a.m. January 1, 2012, there is levied and shall be paid and collected an excise tax of three (3%) percent on the lodging price paid for any lodging accommodation or transaction provided in the City. This tax shall be in addition to the sales and use tax as established pursuant to Articles 3.28 and 3.32 of this Chapter 3. It shall be a violation of this Code for any lodging customer provided lodging accommodations in the City to fail to pay, or for any lodging provider of such lodging accommodations to fail to collect, the tax levied pursuant to this article.
Sec. 3-40-40  Exemptions
The following lodging transactions are exempt from taxation under this Article 3-40:
   a.  All lodging services provided to the United States Government; to the state, its departments or institutions and political subdivisions in their governmental capacities only, including the City and any department thereof;
   b.  All lodging services provided to religious and charitable non-profit corporations and associations, provided the corporation or association holds a tax exempt status under Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c), but only in the conduct of their religious and charitable functions and activities;
   c.  All lodging services provided to persons which the City is prohibited from taxing under the United States Constitution or laws of the United States or under state law; and
   d.  All sales and purchases by any purchaser or vendor where the purchaser is a permanent resident who has entered into a written agreement with a lodging provider for the occupancy or use for lodging for a period of at least 30 consecutive days during the calendar year.

Sec. 3-40-50  Use of the tax
   a.  The lodging tax shall be used by the City in accordance with the allocation limitations set forth in subsection b. hereof for the purpose of supporting economic development endeavors, special events, cultural arts facilities, advertising and marketing, and promoting tourism and other activities that utilize and require public accommodations with the City.
   b.  The revenue, interest and investment income from the Lodging Tax, less applicable administrative expenses incurred by the City for the administration thereof, shall be placed and maintained in a “Lodging Tax Fund” and allocations therefrom shall be used for the purposes set forth in subsection A hereof, and the allocations from the “Lodging Tax Fund” shall be made by the City Council solely for those purposes.

Sec. 3-40-60  Collection of tax
   a.  Every lodging provider and vendor making sales to a lodging customer or purchaser in the City that are taxable under the provisions of this article is required to collect the tax imposed by Section 3-40-30 from the lodging customer or purchaser at the time of making such sales.
   b.  The tax to be collected as provided in subsection (a) of this section shall be stated and charged separately from the sale price on any record thereof at the time when the sale is made or at the time when evidence of the sale is issued or employed by the lodging provider or vendor; provided, however, that when added, such tax shall constitute a part of such sale price or charge and shall be a debt from the purchaser to the lodging provider or vendor until paid and shall be recoverable at law in the same manner as other debts. The tax shall be paid by the lodging customer or purchaser to the lodging provider or vendor, who shall act as trustee for and on account of the City, and the vendor shall be liable for the collection therefore and on account of the City.
   c.  Taxes paid on the amount of gross taxable sales that are represented by accounts that are found to be worthless and are actually and properly charged off as bad debts for the purpose of the income tax imposed by the laws of the state may be credited upon a subsequent payment of the tax as herein provided. Should, however, any such amounts be thereafter collected by the vendor, the tax shall be paid to the city upon the amount so collected.
**Sec. 3-40-70 Lodging Provider or Vendor responsible for payment of tax**

a. Every lodging provider or vendor shall be entitled as collecting agent of the City to withhold a vendor's fee, in the amount provided in Section 3-28-70, Brighton Municipal Code, as the same may be amended from time to time, to cover the lodging provider or vendor's expense in the collection and remittance of the tax.

b. Every lodging provider or vendor shall, before February 20, 2012, and before the 20th day of each month thereafter, make a return to the Finance Director for the preceding calendar month commencing with the month of January, 2012, and remit to the Finance Director, the total amount due to the City. The monthly returns of the lodging provider or vendor as required hereunder shall be made in such manner and upon such forms as the Finance Director may prescribe.

c. If the accounting methods regularly employed by the lodging provider vendor in the transaction of business, or other conditions, are such that the returns aforesaid made on a calendar month basis will impose an unnecessary hardship, the Finance Director may, upon request of the lodging provider or vendor, accept returns at such intervals as will, in the opinion of the Finance Director, better suit the convenience of the lodging provider or vendor and will not jeopardize collection of the tax; provided, however, the Finance Director may permit a lodging provider or vendor whose monthly tax collected is less than $60.00 to make returns and pay taxes at intervals not greater than three months.

**Sec. 3-40-80 Applicability of other provisions**

The procedures established in Articles 3-28, Sales Taxes and 3-32, Use Taxes, Brighton Municipal Code, as the same may be amended from time to time, relating to the collection of sales and use tax, including any provisions for penalty, shall be applicable to the lodging tax unless such provisions conflict with the provisions of this article.

**Sec. 3-40-90 Duty to keep books and records; audit**

a. It shall be the duty of every person subject to the provisions of this article to keep and preserve suitable records of all sums of money paid for lodging in order to determine the amount of lodging tax that is due and owing to the City by any person subject to the provisions of this article.

b. The Finance Director, may make, permit, or cause to be made the examination, inspection, or audit of books, invoices, accounts, and other records so kept or maintained by any person subject to the provisions of this article.

**Sec. 3-40-100 Unlawful assumption of tax**

It shall be unlawful for any person subject to the provisions of this article to advertise or hold out or state to the public or any person, directly or indirectly, that the lodging tax or any part thereof imposed by this article, will be assumed or absorbed by such person, or that it will not be added to the price charged for lodging, or, if added, that it or any part thereof will be refunded.

**Sec. 3-40-110 Interest on deficiency**

Any interest on deficiency, including computation, penalty, or jeopardy enforcement, shall be enforced in the amount prescribed in sections 3-28-95 through and including 3-28-130, Brighton Municipal Code, as the same may be amended from time to time.
Sec. 3-40-120 Disputes; refunds
Any dispute or claim for refund arising under any provision of this article shall be resolved in a manner prescribed in Sec. 3-28-105, Brighton Municipal Code, as the same may be amended from time to time.

Sec. 3-40-130 Tax information to be confidential
Subject to any limitation of a judicial order, the Finance Director or any other officer or employee of the City shall not divulge any information regarding any lodging tax report or return filed with the City as required by any provision of this article.

Sec. 3-40-140 Administrative hearings
Any person subject to the provisions of this article may request a hearing on the imposition of the lodging tax after receiving a notice of final determination, assessment, demand for payment, or denial of claim for refund as set forth in Sec. 3-28-110, Brighton Municipal Code, as the same may be amended from time to time.

Sec. 3-40-150 Enforcement of tax liability
The lodging tax imposed pursuant to this article, together with all interest and penalties pertaining thereto, shall be a first and prior lien on tangible personal property in which the person responsible to collect and remit the lodging tax has an ownership interest, subject only to a perfected security interest. The finance director may also treat lodging taxes and penalties or interest due thereon and then paid as a debt due to the city from any person subject to the provisions of this article, which shall be recoverable by the city in an action at law.

Sec. 3-40-160 Administration of the lodging tax
The Finance Department shall administer the provisions of this article. The City Manager may promulgate rules or regulations to aid in the enforcement and administration of this article pursuant to the provisions of Sec. 3-28-90, Brighton Municipal Code, as the same may be amended from time to time.

Sec. 3-40-170. Lodging Tax Advisory Committee.
   a. Committee Established. There has hereby been established a Lodging Tax Advisory Committee.
   b. Purpose.
      The Committee created under this Section shall study, investigate and advise the City Council as to the development and promulgation of policies for the implementation, support, and use of revenues from the lodging tax for economic development, special events, cultural arts facilities, advertising and marketing, promotion of tourism and other activities related thereto. In particular, the Committee will advise the City Council on allocation, budgeting and appropriation of funds from the Lodging Tax Fund consistent with the provisions of Sec. 3-40-50, Use of the tax, as the same may be amended from time to time.
   c. Powers and duties.
      The Committee shall adopt rules and regulations for the conduct of its meetings.
   d. Membership.
      The Lodging Tax Advisory Committee shall be composed of seven (7) voting members, who shall be appointed as follows:
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1. All members and alternates shall be recommended by the City Council, and appointed by the Mayor with approval of the City Council;
2. Two (2) member(s) shall be representative(s) of lodging providers located within the corporate limits of the City;
3. Two (2) member(s) from the Board of Directors of the Brighton Economic Development Corporation;
4. One (1) member from the Brighton City Council;
5. Two (2) at-large member(s) who are residents of the City of Brighton; and
6. The City Manager, non-voting ex-officio.
7. Two (2) alternates who are residents of the City of Brighton.

The recommendation and appointment of members and alternates of the Committee shall be in accordance with Section 2-8-25, Policy for Appointment of Members to City Boards, Commissions and Authorities, and Section 2-8-30(b), Duties of boards and commissions, Brighton Municipal Code and the adopted policies of the City Council related thereto, as the same may be amended from time to time.

c. Terms of office.
1. The terms of office for members of the Committee shall expire on December 31 and begin on January 1.
2. The terms of office of the members of the Committee shall be as follows:
   (a) The term of office for the member appointed from the City Council both voting and alternate members, shall be the same as his or her tenure in office.
   (b) The terms of office for all other voting members shall be three (3) years. The members of the Committee first appointed shall serve for terms of one (1), two (2) and three (3) years, respectively, determined by lot from the date of their appointment; and thereafter the term of office of each member shall be for three (3) years. A member shall hold office until his or her successor has been appointed and has qualified.
   (c) The terms of office for alternate members shall be two (2) years. The alternate members of the Committee first appointed shall serve for terms of one (1) and two (2) years, respectively, determined by lots from the date of their appointment; and thereafter the term of office of each alternate member shall be for two (2) years. An alternate member shall hold office until his or her successor has been appointed and qualified.
3. The first appointment of voting members to the Committee shall be made upon the effective date of the ordinance codified in this Article.
4. The terms of office of appointed members of the Lodging Tax Advisory Committee shall be limited to two terms. Except as may be otherwise determined by the City Council, no person may be appointed to serve a succeeding term on the Committee beyond the term limits herein stated. The term limits shall not apply to the appointment to an unexpired term of no more than one-half of the full term of office.

d. Organization and rules.
At the first meeting of the Committee in 2012, the Committee shall elect a chairperson, vice chairperson and secretary from among its members, each of whose term shall be for one (1) year, with eligibility for reelection. The Committee shall meet as necessary. It shall adopt such bylaws, rules and regulations governing its procedures as it may consider necessary or advisable, and shall keep a record of its
proceedings, which record shall be a public record. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the voting members.
g. Code of Ethics.
Each member of the Committee shall be and is subject to the provisions set forth in Article 2-10 Code of Ethics of the Brighton Municipal Code, as the same may be amended from time to time.
h. Absences/alternates.
Any member of the Committee who is unable to attend a meeting shall notify the chairperson, vice chairperson or City staff in advance of the meeting, stating the reason for his or her absence. Two (2) unexcused absences constitute the resignation of that member. Any member not present at the start of the meeting shall be considered absent and an alternate will be seated. In the case of absences of regular members, the alternates shall be seated in the following order: the alternate with seniority shall be seated first. If both alternates have served for the same amount of time, seating shall be by alphabetical order of the last names. All members and alternates in attendance may participate in the discussion. Only seated members may vote.
i. Removal.
Members, other than City Council members and the ex officio City Manager, may be removed by the Mayor for inefficiency, neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, or the City Council may remove the member representing it for the same reasons. The Mayor or City Council, as the case may be, shall file a written statement of reasons for such removal.
j. Compensation and reimbursement for expenditure.
Members of the Committee shall serve without compensation; provided, however, that each member may be reimbursed for any actual expenditure incurred by him or her in connection with his or her duties as a member of the Committee.
k. Vacancies.
Any vacancy occurring on the Committee shall be filled by appointment of a successor by the Mayor, with the advice and consent of the City Council, for the balance of the unexpired term of office. The person appointed must meet those qualifications required of the office to which he or she is appointed as set forth herein.

Sec. 3-40-180 Severability
If a court of competent jurisdiction adjudges any provision of this article or application thereof to any person or circumstance invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the remaining provisions of this article that can be effective without the invalid provision, and to this end this article is declared to be severable.

Sec. 3-40-190 Effective Date
The provisions of this Article 3-40. Brighton Lodging Tax shall be effective on January 1, 2012.

LICENSE

Sec. 3-40-210 License required; exemption
Sec. 3-40-220 Application
Sec. 3-40-230 Fee
Sec. 3-40-240 Term
Sec. 3-40-250 Revocation
Sec. 3-40-210  License required; exemption
a. It shall be unlawful for any person to engage in the business of furnishing lodging without having first obtained a license therefor, which license shall be issued as part of the sales tax license, and in accordance with all applicable provisions of Article 3-28 of the Brighton Municipal Code, as the same may be amended from time to time.
b. No license shall be required of any person engaged exclusively in the business of furnishing lodging, rooms, or accommodations that are exempt from taxation under this article.

Sec. 3-40-220 Application
Each license issued pursuant to this article shall be issued only upon application for a sales tax license pursuant to Article 3-28 of the Brighton Municipal Code, as the same may be amended from time to time, which shall include the name and address of the person desiring such license and the street number of the business and such other facts as may be reasonably required by the city clerk.

Sec. 3-40-230 Fee
No separate fee for each license issued under this article shall be required, as the same shall be included in the fee for a sales tax license as required in Sec. 3-28-18 of the Brighton Municipal Code, as the same may be amended from time to time.

Sec. 3-40-240 Term
Each license issued shall be in force until revoked or until the licensee is no longer engaged in the business of furnishing lodging or liable to account for the tax herein, consistent with the provisions of Article 3-28 of the Brighton Municipal Code, as the same may be amended from time to time.

Sec. 3-40-250 Revocation, notice, hearing
The Finance Director may revoke the license of any person found by the Finance Director to have violated any provisions of this article; provided, however, that any such revocation shall be subject to an administrative hearing as provided in Sec. 3-28-110, Brighton Municipal Code, as the same may be amended from time to time.

SECTION 2. Repeal. Existing or parts of ordinances covering the same matters as embraced in this Article 3-40 are hereby repealed and all ordinances or parts of ordinances inconsistent with the provisions of this Article 3-40 are hereby repealed.

SECTION 3. Validity. If any part or parts of this Article 3-40 are for any reason held to be invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of the provisions of this Article 3-40. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance and each part or parts thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one part or parts be declared invalid.

SECTION 4. Interpretation. This Ordinance shall be so interpreted and construed as to effectuate its general purpose.
INTRODUCED, PASSED ON FIRST READING AND ORDERED PUBLISHED THIS 6th DAY OF December, 2011.

CITY OF BRIGHTON, COLORADO

By: ____________________________
Richard N. McLean, Mayor

ATTEST:
______________________________
Natalie Hoel, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
______________________________
Margaret R. Brubaker, City Attorney

Published in the Banner
First Publication: December 15, 2011

PASSED ON SECOND AND FINAL READING AND ORDERED PUBLISHED BY TITLE ONLY THIS 20th DAY OF December, 2011.

CITY OF BRIGHTON, COLORADO

By: ____________________________
Richard N. McLean, Mayor

ATTEST:
______________________________
Natalie Hoel, City Clerk

Published in the Banner
Final Publication: December 29, 2011
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TOWN OF NEDERLAND, COLORADO

ORDINANCE NUMBER 785

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 16 OF THE NEDERLAND MUNICIPAL CODE TO PERMIT AND REGULATE ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS

WHEREAS, pursuant to C.R.S. § 31-23-301, the Board of Trustees ("Board") of the Town of Nederland, Colorado ("Town") possesses the authority to create regulations and restrictions concerning planning and zoning within the Town; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has made certain recommendations to the Board of Trustees regarding amendments to Chapter 16, Zoning, of the Town of Nederland Municipal Code ("Code"), related to regulating accessory dwelling units; and

WHEREAS, after due and proper notice as required by C.R.S. §§ 31-23-304 and 305, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on April 25, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has found that it is advantageous to the Town's goal of increasing diverse and affordable housing stock to permit and regulate accessory dwelling units; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees has conducted its own review of the issues, including the Planning Commission's recommendations, and finds that it would further the health and welfare of the citizens of Nederland to permit and regulate accessory dwelling units.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Trustees of the Town of Nederland, Colorado, as follows:

Section 1. The Nederland Municipal Code is hereby amended by the addition of a new section 16-98, set forth as follows:

Sec. 16-98. Accessory Dwelling Units.

(a) Definitions. As used in this section, the following words shall be interpreted and defined as set forth below:

(1) Accessory dwelling units means a second dwelling unit created on a lot with an existing residential structure such as a house, attached house or manufactured home, or within said existing principal residential structure, which shall be a distinct and separate housekeeping unit.

(2) Primary residence means a residence which is the usual place of return for housing for more than six months out of the calendar year as documented by the occupant's: (1) driver's license OR Colorado state identification card; AND (2) voter registration; motor vehicle registration; OR designated
residence for tax purposes. An applicant for an accessory dwelling unit may have only one (1) primary residence for purposes of this section.

(b) An owner(s) of a single family dwelling in the residential zone districts may construct and/or permit the occupancy of an accessory dwelling unit in such principal residential structure, attached to a principal residential structure, or in an accessory building on the same lot, provided the following conditions are met:

(1) The residence in which the accessory unit is constructed or permitted shall be the primary residence of the owner(s).

(2) Both dwelling units shall be on the same Town utility service.

(3) The accessory dwelling unit shall meet the setbacks of a principal use and all other yard and bulk requirements set forth in Section 16-33 of this Code. Maximum lot coverage and maximum floor area ratios may not be exceeded.

(4) The applicant shall provide a parking plan for off street parking for renters of the accessory dwelling unit.

(5) Separate outside access shall be created for the accessory dwelling unit, provided, however, that one airlock type entry may be used if separate access to the accessory dwelling exists following the initial outside entry of the principal residential structure.

(6) There shall be no more than one (1) accessory dwelling unit per property.

(7) The accessory dwelling unit shall not exceed 800 gross square feet, unless said accessory dwelling unit is located within the principal residential structure, in which case there shall be no limitation to gross square footage.

(8) The accessory dwelling unit shall be more than 200 gross square feet.

(9) There shall be a maximum of two bedrooms within an accessory dwelling unit, unless said accessory dwelling unit is located within the principal residential structure, in which case there shall be no limitation on number of bedrooms.

(10) The applicant shall comply with the provisions of Chapter 13 of this Code as it relates to sewer and water utilities and fees.
(11) The accessory dwelling unit shall meet the standards of the International Building Code applicable at the time.

(12) The applicant shall demonstrate approved, inspected septic for all bedrooms, if applicable.

(13) The applicant for accessory dwelling units shall apply on forms provided by the town administrator, showing how and in what manner the criteria of this subsection are met, provide a statement of current ownership and a legal description of the property, and pay the appropriate application fee(s).

(14) The accessory dwelling unit shall be used exclusively for long term rental(s).

(15) If ownership is transferred, the new owner shall apply with the Town within ten (10) days after the transfer.

(16) The accessory dwelling unit must otherwise follow all applicable provisions within Chapter 16 of this Code.

Section 2. Section 16-32 of the Nederland Municipal Code, concerning Residential Use Groups, is hereby amended as follows:

Sec. 16-32. Use Groups.

(a) This Section provides for grouping of similar uses into use groups. In each zoning district, use groups permitted outright are designated "Y," use groups permitted by special review are designated "R" and use groups prohibited are designated "N."

(b) Any use that is not specifically permitted in this Section shall be deemed to be a prohibited use. If a question arises as to whether a specific use does or does not fall within the expressed use categories, application may be made to the Planning Commission for a determination as to whether a specific use is permitted. Any decision by the Planning Commission may be reviewed by the Board of Trustees within thirty (30) days of the decision of the Planning Commission.

(c) Use group table...
Section 3. This ordinance shall go into effect six months after final date of adoption.

Section 4. Should any one or more sections or provisions of this Ordinance or of the Code provisions enacted hereby be judicially determined invalid or unenforceable, such judgment shall not affect, impair or invalidate the remaining provisions of this Ordinance or of such Code provision, the intention being that the various sections and provisions are severable.

Section 4. Any and all Ordinances or Codes or parts thereof in conflict or inconsistent herewith are, to the extent of such conflict or inconsistency, hereby repealed; provided, however, that the repeal of any such Ordinance or Code or part thereof shall not revive any other section or part of any Ordinance or Code provision heretofore repealed or superseded.

INTRODUCED, ADOPTED AND ORDERED PUBLISHED THIS 17th DAY OF MAY, 2018.

TOWN OF NEDERLAND, COLORADO

Kristopher Larsen, Mayor

ATTEST:

Nicole Cavalino, Town Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Carmen Beery, Town Attorney
TOWN OF NEDERLAND, COLORADO

ORDINANCE NUMBER 785

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 16 OF THE NEDERLAND MUNICIPAL CODE CONCERNING ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS

WHEREAS, pursuant to C.R.S. § 31-23-301, the Board of Trustees (“Board”) of the Town of Nederland, Colorado (“Town”) possesses the authority to create regulations and restrictions concerning planning and zoning within the Town; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission made certain recommendations to the Board of Trustees regarding amendments to Chapter 16, Zoning, of the Town of Nederland Municipal Code (“Code”), related to regulating accessory dwelling units; and

WHEREAS, after due and proper notice as required by C.R.S. §§ 31-23-304 and 305, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on April 25, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission found that it is advantageous to the Town’s goal of increasing diverse and affordable housing stock to permit and regulate accessory dwelling units; and

WHEREAS, the Board has conducted its own review of the issues, including the Planning Commission’s recommendations, and found that it would further the health and welfare of the citizens of Nederland to permit and regulate accessory dwelling units; and

WHEREAS, on May 16, 2018, by Ordinance 785, the Board therefore amended the Nederland Municipal Code by the addition of a new section 16-98 concerning Accessory Dwelling Units; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance 785 was scheduled to go into effect six months after May 16, 2018; and

WHEREAS, since that time, the Board has conducted additional meetings with the public, and has determined that it is in the best interests of the health and welfare of the citizens of Nederland to remove the requirement that accessory dwelling units be exclusively limited to long term rentals.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Trustees of the Town of Nederland, Colorado, as follows:

Section 1. Nederland Municipal Code section 16-98 is hereby amended as follows:

Sec. 16-98. Accessory Dwelling Units.
(a) Definitions. As used in this section, the following words shall be interpreted and defined as set forth below:

(1) **Accessory dwelling units** means a second dwelling unit created on a lot with an existing residential structure such as a house, attached house or manufactured home, or within said existing principal residential structure, which shall be a distinct and separate housekeeping unit.

(2) **Primary residence** means a residence which is the usual place of return for housing for more than six months out of the calendar year as documented by the occupant’s: (1) driver’s license OR Colorado state identification card; AND (2) voter registration; motor vehicle registration; OR designated residence for tax purposes. An applicant for an accessory dwelling unit may have only one (1) primary residence for purposes of this section.

(b) An owner(s) of a single family dwelling in the residential zone districts may construct and/or permit the occupancy of an accessory dwelling unit in such principal residential structure, attached to a principal residential structure, or in an accessory building on the same lot, provided the following conditions are met:

(1) The residence in which the accessory unit is constructed or permitted shall be the primary residence of the owner(s).

(2) Both dwelling units shall be on the same Town utility service.

(3) The accessory dwelling unit shall meet the setbacks of a principal use and all other yard and bulk requirements set forth in Section 16-33 of this Code. Maximum lot coverage and maximum floor area ratios may not be exceeded.

(4) The applicant shall provide a parking plan for off street parking for renters of the accessory dwelling unit.

(5) Separate outside access shall be created for the accessory dwelling unit, provided, however, that one airlock type entry may be used if separate access to the accessory dwelling exists following the initial outside entry of the principal residential structure.

(6) There shall be no more than one (1) accessory dwelling unit per property.

(7) The accessory dwelling unit shall not exceed 800 gross square feet, unless said accessory dwelling unit is located within the principal residential structure, in which case there shall be no limitation to gross square footage.
(8) The accessory dwelling unit shall be more than 200 gross square feet.

(9) There shall be a maximum of two bedrooms within an accessory dwelling unit, unless said accessory dwelling unit is located within the principal residential structure, in which case there shall be no limitation on number of bedrooms.

(10) The applicant shall comply with the provisions of Chapter 13 of this Code as it relates to sewer and water utilities and fees.

(11) The accessory dwelling unit shall meet the standards of the International Building Code applicable at the time.

(12) The applicant shall demonstrate approved, inspected septic for all bedrooms, if applicable.

(13) The applicant for accessory dwelling units shall apply on forms provided by the town administrator, showing how and in what manner the criteria of this subsection are met, provide a statement of current ownership and a legal description of the property, and pay the appropriate application fee(s).

(14) The accessory dwelling unit shall be used exclusively for long-term rental(s).

(14) If ownership is transferred, the new owner shall apply with the Town within ten (10) days after the transfer.

(15) The accessory dwelling unit must otherwise follow all applicable provisions within Chapter 16 of this Code.

Section 2. This ordinance shall go into effect three months after final date of adoption.

Section 3. Should any one or more sections or provisions of this Ordinance or of the Code provisions enacted hereby be judicially determined invalid or unenforceable, such judgment shall not affect, impair or invalidate the remaining provisions of this Ordinance or of such Code provision, the intention being that the various sections and provisions are severable.

Section 4. Any and all Ordinances or Codes or parts thereof in conflict or inconsistent herewith are, to the extent of such conflict or inconsistency, hereby repealed; provided, however, that the repeal of any such Ordinance or Code or part thereof shall not revive any other section or part of any Ordinance or Code provision heretofore repealed or superseded.

INTRODUCED, ADOPTED AND ORDERED PUBLISHED THIS DAY OF , 2018.
TOWN OF NEDERLAND, COLORADO

_________________________________
Kristopher Larsen, Mayor

ATTEST:

_________________________________
Nicole Cavalino, Town Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_________________________________
Carmen Beery, Town Attorney
AGENDA ITEM:

Status of Comprehensive Development Plan Intergovernmental Agreement between Nederland and Boulder County

SUMMARY:

There exists a Comprehensive Development Plan Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between Boulder County and the Town of Nederland which went into effect in March, 2002 with a 20 year term.

The current IGA requires a five-step process for amending the IGA to approve annexations, with recommendations from both the town and county planning commissions, approval by the Nederland Board of Trustees (BOT) and Boulder County Commissioners, and a vote of the town electorate.

The BOT created a list of goals for pursuing revisions to the 2002 Boulder County Comprehensive Development Plan IGA.

Town staff, Boulder County Land Use staff, the Boulder County Commissioners, and the BOT have spent the past 8 months discussing the DRAFT IGA and proposed map. Based on these conversations the Boulder County Land Use staff drafted a version of the proposed IGA.

The draft IGA includes changes to streamline amendment procedures, and to ensure timely responses to referrals and establishment of clear procedures for processing amendments.

The draft IGA included a Primary Planning Area within which annexation can occur with no amendment to the IGA or decision role for the county, and no vote of the town electorate. Annexation would need to be instigated by the property owner.
The draft reflected an expiration date of 2032, 10 years from the current 2022 expiration date.

Staff was given direction to delete Boulder County’s parcel specific provisions from the latest version of the DRAFT IGA and to research the language in 3.1.5 regarding annexing of roads. Staff researched and substituted the language to align with the state statute. This version of the DRAFT IGA was sent to the Boulder County Commissioners and the BOT is awaiting a response.

The Board of Trustees requested that staff put a timeline together that includes the intersection of the Evans Annexation process and the process to revise the IGA.

**ATTACHMENTS AND LINKS:**

- Requested Timeline
- DRAFT Revised IGA Sent to County Commissioners
- 2009 Amendment to IGA

Link to June 19, 2018 Board Packet for more information
https://nederlandco.civicweb.net/Portal/MeetingInformation.aspx?Org=Cal&Id=126
### Timeline for Annexation IGA with Boulder County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Town enters into IGA with Boulder County with restrictions for annexation outside town limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>BOT eliminate the requirement imposed by the NMC Sec 15-5 that all annexations require voter approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/2009</td>
<td>Town and County enter into an Amendment to the 2002 IGA that expands category of exceptions to referral/voter approval requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town authorized to annex and issue other land use approvals for lands determined necessary for Town utilities, roads and other municipal governmental purposes without BoCo referral/approval or voter approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2013</td>
<td>Town Administrator meets Ben Perlman of Boulder County to discuss potential annexation of Evan's property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town is asked to consider extension of IGA for 10 more years, and to include this property in Town boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/5/2013</td>
<td>Town Administrator sends a memo to applicant outlining the application process for annexation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/10/2014</td>
<td>Annexation application and proposed fee waiver submitted to the town by Aspen Trails Inc, Kayla Evans, Joe Evans and Tammra Holmboe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2014</td>
<td>BOT unanimously accepts a petition for annexation and directs staff to initiate annexation proceedings, including setting a public hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution 2014-2 is approved and adopted accepting annexation petition and initiating next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Trustees approves reducing the annexation fee application by $6,450 for a total fee of $2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town notifies County of annexation petition and continues to update County as new evidence is made available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/26/2014</td>
<td>Planning Commission passes a motion to recommend that BOT deny consideration of annexation of 1250 Eldora Rd. (Evans Property)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/18/2014</td>
<td>Public Hearing For Annexation at Board of Trustees Meeting-Motion to extend to May 6 unanimously passes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/26/2014</td>
<td>Planning Commission Further Considers Proposed Annexation which has been Continued by the BOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6/2014</td>
<td>Continuation of Public Hearing which is then continued to July 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation of Public Hearing which is then continued to October 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/2014</td>
<td>Board of Trustees adopts Resolution 2014-24 to move annexation case for County review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/2014</td>
<td>Town Administrator sends memo to Dale Case, County Land Use Director notifying County of BOT's decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Memo, TA outlines issues of interest to County officials which includes extension of IGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/2014</td>
<td>Boulder County Planning Commission Considers Proposed Amendment to the Nederland Area Boulder County Comp Development Plan:Evans Annexation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boulder County Planning Commission voted 4 -2 to recommend the Board of County Commissioners Deny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/5/2015</td>
<td>Public Hearing for the Proposed Annexation at Boulder County Commissioners Meeting- No action was taken, more information requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/7/2015</td>
<td>County Staff visits Ned Staff to discuss Commissioners request for more information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Town Administrator has an email exchange with Dale Case to verify outstanding information for Commissioners. Need to firm up development cost breakdown, utilities available and cost from the Town. Details of % of permanently affordable housing proposed, overall number of units/density options. More defined site plan. Representation of recognized wildlife immigration patterns. Wildfire mitigation needs and plans. Road access points and any restrictions. Nearby/proposed transit access. Pedestrian Trails and connections. Building height/visibility analysis. Transferrable Development Rights details. Town’s willingness to extend the IGA and the County’s expectations related to this.

Dale Case suggests that once this information is submitted, another hearing with the commissioners can be set.

Town Administrator continues to work with applicant to finalize an annexation agreement, there are outstanding items including the following:
- Water storage on Evans property
- Easement through Evans property for trail to school
- Wildlife corridors defined

Follow-up meeting with Commissioners was never scheduled due to lack of completed information including BOT decision on IGA.

- **9/17/2017** BOT holds an executive session to receive legal advice and discuss IGA with Boulder County
- **10/12/2017** Town Staff, Mayor and Legal meet with Boulder County Land Use Department to discuss IGA
- **11/12/2017** BOT holds an executive session to receive legal advice and discuss IGA with Boulder County
- **11/15/2017** Town Staff, Mayor and Legal meet with Boulder County Land Use Department to discuss IGA
- **12/5/2017** BOT holds an executive session to receive legal advice and discuss IGA with Boulder County
- **12/19/2017** BOT discusses updates to the IGA process during a regular business meeting
- **1/16/2018** Joint meeting between BOT and County Commissioners
- **1/17/2018** BOT establishes goals for IGA revision at a regular business meeting
- **1/17/2018** Town Staff, Mayor and Legal meet with Boulder County Land Use Department to discuss IGA
- **2/20/2018** BOT presents the revised IGA Map and Draft text at a regular business meeting
- **3/5/2018** IGA DRAFT and MAP sent to boards and commissions who review during public meetings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/9/2018</td>
<td>Town Staff, Mayor and Legal meet with Boulder County Land Use Department to discuss IGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/1/2018</td>
<td>BOT discusses updates to the IGA and Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/15/2018</td>
<td>BOT discusses IGA and Map and feedback for County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/2018</td>
<td>BOT discusses language of IGA and Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21/2018</td>
<td>BOT holds an executive session to receive legal advice and discuss IGA with Boulder County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT

This Intergovernmental Agreement ("IGA") by and between the Town of Nederland, a Colorado statutory municipal corporation ("Nederland" or the "Town"), and the County of Boulder, a body politic and corporate of the State of Colorado ("Boulder County" or the "County") (collectively, the “Parties”) is made to be effective on the Effective Date as defined on the signature page of this IGA.

RECITALS

A. Sections 29-20-101 through 29-29-109, C.R.S. as amended ("LUCEA") authorizes the Parties to enter into intergovernmental agreements to plan for and regulate land uses in order to minimize the negative impacts on the surrounding areas and to protect the environment. LUCEA specifically authorizes local governments to cooperate and contract with each other for the purposes of planning and regulating the development of land by means of a "comprehensive development plan."

B. Sections 29-1-201 through 29-1-207, C.R.S., as amended, authorizes the Parties to cooperate and contract with one another with respect to functions lawfully authorized to each of the Parties and the people of the State of Colorado have encouraged such cooperation and contracting through the adoption of Colorado Constitution, Article XIV, § 18(2).

C. The functions described in this IGA are lawfully authorized to the Parties which perform such functions hereunder, as provided in Article 20 of Title 29; Part 1 of Article 28 of Title 30; Part 1 of Article 12 of Title 31; and Parts 2 and 3 of Article 23 of Title 31, C.R.S., as amended.

D. On March 7, 2002, the Parties entered into a Comprehensive Development Plan Intergovernmental Agreement (the “Original IGA”) for a period of 20 years. The Original IGA was amended in 2009 for the Town to annex the 6.68 acre Town Maintenance Shop Parcel.

E. The term of the Original IGA as amended ends in March 2022, and the Parties believe it is in the best interests of the citizens of the Town and the County to enter into a new intergovernmental agreement with the goal of continuing the spirit of collaboration that was established by the Original IGA and demonstrated through the Parties’ course of dealing throughout the current term of the Original IGA.

F. In October 2003, the Parties entered into the Boulder County Countywide Coordinated Comprehensive Development Plan Intergovernmental Agreement (the “Super IGA”) which is designed to coordinate all of Boulder County’s comprehensive development plan IGAs, to recognize and protect each municipality’s planning area, and to preserve the rural character of the land outside of each community’s respective planning areas.

G. The Parties believe that it is in the best interest of the residents of both communities to enter into a new IGA in order to preserve Nederland’s unique and individual character through the orderly development within a newly defined Nederland Planning Area (the “NPA”). The NPA contains a Primary Planning Area (“PPA”) where annexation and
development may occur in accordance with the provisions of this IGA. The areas of the map not designated as PPA are designated as Rural Preservation Area ("RPA") where the Parties’ intent is to preserve the rural quality of the land.

H. The Parties have each held hearings after proper public notice for the consideration of entering into this IGA and the adoption of a comprehensive development plan for the subject lands.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the above and the mutual covenants and commitments made herein, the Parties agree as follows:

1.0 PURPOSE AND INTENT. This IGA is intended to protect and enhance the Town's ability to coordinate its future growth into the PPA, and specifically for the following purposes:

1.1 Implementing Comprehensive Plans. This IGA is designed to implement the goals and policies set forth in the Parties’ respective comprehensive plans.

1.1.1. The Nederland Comprehensive Plan (referred to herein as the NCP) emphasizes the Town’s commitment to quality of life, sustainability and preservation of small town character, while addressing the need for quality, affordable housing, a diversified, sustainable local economy, and a compact, walkable land use pattern.

1.1.2. The NCP emphasizes proactively planning for the future and balancing the demands of environmental and economic sustainability with community character, historical preservation and property owners’ rights.

1.1.3. The Boulder County Comprehensive Plan, as amended from time to time, (the “BCCP”) seeks to protect agricultural lands, channel growth to municipal planning areas and consider environmental and natural resources in land use decisions.

1.1.4 BCCP policy CW 1.07 states that “[t]o accomplish a cooperative and coordinated land use planning effort among the region’s municipalities, it is herein the policy of Boulder County to enter into intergovernmental contracts with the municipalities for the purpose of implementing the land use proposals and policies of the jointly adopted municipal comprehensive plans.”

1.2 Recognizing Future Development is Appropriate in the PPA. This IGA intends to direct future development within the PPA to: avoid sprawl, ensure the provision of adequate services, provide access to opportunities for affordable housing and living, maximize the utility of funds invested in public facilities, transportation and services, distribute fairly and equitably the costs of government services among those persons who benefit therefrom, extend government services and facilities in an efficient, logical fashion, simplify the governmental structure of the affected areas, and reduce and avoid, where possible, conflict between the Parties.

1.2.1—Affordable Housing. The Town commits to seek ways to implement its land use and development regulations in a manner that reflects the community values of diverse housing choice and affordability. To do so, the Town will evaluate whether existing regulations include unnecessary barriers to creation and preservation of affordable
1.2.2.1 Areas 1 & 3. Areas 1 and 3 are composed primarily of developed parcels in County-approved subdivisions. They contain single-family development in forested areas with some steep slopes. The areas are very susceptible to wildfire and have limited access. Therefore, the areas are not suitable for increased levels of development or density. The Town has indicated it has capacity in its water and sewer systems to serve some of the existing development if properties in Areas 1 and 3 were annexed. Service provision would benefit water quality. Therefore, the County and Town agree that the areas are eligible for the Town to annex provided that, at annexation, a conservation easement, a deed restriction, or other similar mechanism is provided in a form acceptable to the Town and County that allows no more density than currently permitted under the County Land Use Code for the areas, with the following exception:

(a) Nederland may allow for accessory dwellings on existing parcels that are not yet subject to a conservation easement. For parcels already subject to a conservation easement, accessory dwellings may require a separate review and approval process by the County that may require payment to the County for a loss in value to the conservation easement if approval is granted.

1.2.2.2 Area 2. Properties in this area are subject to Boulder County deed restrictions that only allow annex for utility-related purposes. Increases in density are not allowed.

1.2.2.3 Area 4(a) (the “Evans Parcel”). The Evans Parcel contains a number of development constraints that must be addressed at the time of annexation. Previous development proposals for the site have recognized the need for affordable housing in the Town. Because the provision of affordable housing is a key benefit to the region, including this parcel in any annexation is contingent upon the following limits, which restrictions shall be implemented at the time of annexation through a mechanism acceptable to both the Town and County: (a) Residential development on the parcel may not exceed 50 units; (b) No development will occur on the steeper-sloping areas, as shown on the Map; (c) Prior to any development on the parcel, the following plans for the site must be established with input and approval from the County: wildfire mitigation, safe routes to school, access location and improvements, and a plan for how impacts to elk migration will be minimized. In addition, prior to annexation, the property owner must agree to restrict a minimum of 50% of the total number of units to be affordable, as evidenced by a separate restrictive covenant, deed restriction, or

Commented [NW1]: To complete: Identify areas of the parcel where development is not appropriate such as areas on steep slopes, provide adequate buffers for neighbors and wildlife movement and wildfire protection.
similar mechanism to be recorded at the time of annexation, in a form acceptable to the Town and County.

1.2.2.4 Area 4(b) ("Eldora Road Parcel, Northeast"). The Town has indicated it has capacity in its water and sewer systems to serve existing development if the "Eldora Road Parcel, Northeast" was annexed. Service provision would benefit water quality. Therefore, the County and Town agree that the parcel is eligible for the Town to annex provided that, at annexation, a conservation easement, a deed restriction, or other similar mechanism is provided in a form acceptable to the Town and County that allows no more density than currently permitted under the County Land Use Code for the area.

1.2.2.5 Area 4(c) ("Water Utility Parcel"). The County and Town agree that the parcel is eligible for the Town to annex provided that, at annexation, a conservation easement, a deed restriction, or other similar mechanism is provided in a form acceptable to the Town and County that allows no more density than currently permitted under the County Land Use Code for the area.

1.2.2.6 Area 4(d) (the "Nederland High School Parcel"). The Nederland High School Parcel is eligible for the Town to annex, provided that any additional development on or redevelopment of the parcel is subject to approval by the Town and County.

1.2.2.7 Areas 5 & 6. Any new development approved by Nederland will be limited to that which would currently be allowed under the Boulder County Land Use Code for that area. Any development will be completed in a manner that is sensitive to natural resources and habitat, and does not conflict with the County's trail network in the area. In recognition of potential cumulative impacts on elk migration in the Nederland area, a plan for how impacts to elk migration will be minimized must be established with input and approval from the County.

1.3 Maintaining Community Buffer. This IGA is intended to keep the RPA and the land outside the NPA rural in character to preserve a community buffer.

1.4 Protecting View Corridors, Watersheds and Allowing Only Compatible Development in the NPA. This IGA acknowledges the importance to both Parties of protecting sensitive natural areas, maintaining view corridors, enforcing nuisance ordinances and ensuring that new development is compatible with the character of both Nederland and adjoining County properties.

1.5 Fostering Intergovernmental Cooperation. This IGA encourages the Parties to collaborate to achieve common goals, including becoming more socially, economically and environmentally sustainable and supporting the public and private provision of cultural, educational, social and healthcare services in the NPA.
1.6 Encouraging Transparent and Timely Decisions. This IGA is intended to encourage transparent, open communication between the Parties and to ensure that decisions pertaining to this IGA are made in a timely and efficient manner.

2.0 NEDERLAND COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN (IGA Plan).

2.1 IGA Plan Defined. This IGA, including the Map attached hereto as Exhibit A, is hereby adopted by the Parties as the Nederland Comprehensive Development Plan, and shall be known herein as the IGA Plan, as distinguished from the NCP. The IGA Plan shall govern and control the NPA, which is defined as the unincorporated area of Boulder County as shown on Exhibit A, or as subsequently amended in accordance with this IGA. With the exception of the Super IGA, this IGA Plan replaces and supersedes any and all previous agreements between the Parties concerning the NPA.

2.2 Nederland Planning Area Designations. The Map identifies, designates and defines the land to be known as the NPA, which consists of the Primary Planning Area (the “PPA”) and the Rural Preservation Area (the "RPA”).

- 2.2.1 The PPA is the land that is planned for the expansion of the Town limits and which the Parties recognize is appropriate and intended for development.

- 2.2.3 The RPA represents areas that are expected to remain rural for the duration of this IGA, unless the Parties agree to an amendment of this IGA pursuant to section 11, below.

3.0 ANNEXATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF PROPERTY.

3.1 Land within the Primary Planning Area.

- 3.1.1 The Town may annex into its corporate boundaries any and all property located within the PPA, in accordance with state and local laws governing annexation. The Town agrees that it will only annex parcels in their entirety, not portions of a parcel, into the Town, unless mutually agreed to by the Parties. By executing this IGA, the County finds and declares that a community of interest exists between the Town and all property located within the PPA. The County will make reasonable efforts to cooperate with Town efforts to annex land in the PPA.

- 3.1.3 Any property that is disconnected from the Town after the Effective Date of this IGA (whether currently located within the municipal limits of the Town or later annexed into the Town after the Effective Date of this IGA) shall continue to be within the PPA for purposes of this IGA unless it is specifically excluded by a duly executed amendment to this IGA.

- 3.1.4 The Town and the County acknowledge and agree that the property within the RPA is intended to remain in the County’s regulatory jurisdiction and shall not be annexed or developed by the Town during the term of this IGA, unless mutually agreed to by the Parties.
3.1.5 The Town agrees that **in establishing the boundaries of any area proposed to be annexed, if a portion of a platted street is annexed, the entire width of said street or alley shall be included within the area annexed**, if it annexes any part of a County road it will annex the entirety of that road.

3.2 Land Outside of the NPA.

3.2.1 The area outside the NPA is intended to remain in the County's regulatory jurisdiction for the term of this IGA, unless otherwise provided herein or by a duly executed amendment to this IGA.

3.2.2 The Town may annex lands outside of the PPA and expand the NPA only in accordance with Section 4 of this IGA.

3.3 Developing Areas with Constraints. When evaluating development applications within their respective areas of responsibility, both Parties will consider the impact of proposed development on the floodplain, natural areas, wildlife habitat, steep slopes, watershed and historically-and archaeologically-significant areas, and will require impacts to be reasonably minimized and mitigated.

4.0 EXPANSION OF THE NPA

4.1 Mutual Agreement. During the term of this IGA, expansion of the PPA, RPA, or NPA may only occur with the mutual agreement of the Parties and the corresponding amendment of Exhibit A in accordance with this IGA.

4.2 Nederland Planning Process. Any request for expansion of the PPA, RPA, or NPA must be consistent with the BCCP and the NCP and the Nederland Public Process.

5.0 OPEN SPACE.

Acquisitions within the PPA. The County agrees that for the term of this IGA it will not purchase or otherwise acquire any land within the PPA for open space purposes, including conservation easements and transfer of density right sending sites without the approval of the Town.

6.0 COMMUNITY BUFFER. The County agrees not to allow more intensive zoning classifications for lands remaining in the County’s regulatory jurisdiction within the PPA and RPA, unless mutually agreed to by the Parties.

7.0 TOWN OF NEDERLAND UTILITIES.

7.1 Nederland Service Area. It may be necessary for the Town to seek additional water supplies, water storage, and water and wastewater treatment and delivery facilities, both within and outside the NPA. The areas designated in the Map portion of Exhibit A as the NPA shall constitute the Town's "Service Area" for all purposes, including but not limited to the County's Regulations of Areas and Activities of State Interest in Article 8 of the Boulder County Land Use Code.

8.0 IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES.
8.1 **Plan Amendment Required.** A Plan amendment, agreed to by both the Town and the County, must occur in order to annex or to allow any use or development, or acquire for open space any parcel within the PPA where such annexation, use or development, or acquisition does not comply with the IGA Plan. The provisions of Section 11.0 of this IGA shall apply to any such Plan amendment.

8.2 **Notice Required.** The Parties each agree to undertake all steps necessary to adopt procedures, plans, policies, and ordinances or other regulations as may be necessary to implement and enforce the provisions of this Plan. The Parties agree that in adopting such procedures, plans, policies, ordinances or regulations, each will give the other Party sufficient notice of such action as will enable such Party, if it so desires, to comment upon the planned actions of that Party. Sufficient notice shall generally mean notice delivered to the other Party at least fifteen (15) days before the date of any public hearing or, where no public hearing will be conducted, before any deadline for the submission of public comment.

8.3 **County Zoning Changes within the NPA.** Where the County seeks to approve changes to the zoning of properties within the NPA after referral as provided herein, the Board of Trustees shall respond by resolution, approving or disapproving such change or suggesting conditions of approval.

9.0 **REFERRALS.**

9.1 **Nederland Referrals to Boulder County.** The Town shall refer in writing to the County:

9.1.1 Any application for annexation; and

9.1.2 Any proposed amendment to the NCP affecting any lot, tract, or parcel within the NPA.

9.2 **Boulder County Referrals to Nederland.** The County shall treat the Town as a formal referral agency and shall refer in writing to the Town:

9.2.1 Any application for zoning, rezoning, subdivision, PUD, replat, special use, limited impact special use, vacation, transfer of development rights, conservation easement or development (including site plan reviews) for any lot, tract, easement, rights-of-way or parcel within the NPA; and

9.2.2 Any proposed map amendment to the BCCP affecting any lot, tract, or parcel within the NPA; and

9.2.3 In addition to referring the foregoing applications and proposals to the Town, the County agrees to advise any applicant owning land in the PPA during the pre-application process (i.e., prior to formal application submittal) for any of the categories of development listed in Section 9.2.1 of the possibility of annexation into the Town, to encourage any such applicant to contact the Town concerning possible annexation, and to provide such applicants with the Town’s appropriate contact information.

9.3 **Referral Period and Waiver of Period for Response to Referrals.** The standard period for referrals shall be 30 days. Either Party may, for any given referral, elect to waive or reduce the
period of time it requires to submit a response, and such election shall be made by written letter or electronic mail.

9.4 **Failure to respond to referrals.** Failure by either Party to respond to a referral shall entitle the referring Party to assume that the receiving Party has no comment concerning the application or proposal.

9.5 **Communication with referral party.** For any application or proposal required to be referred by Section 9.1 or 9.2, the referring Party shall use its best efforts to keep the other Party apprised of the status of each application or proposal, including but not limited to, mailing to the other Party notices of public hearings and meetings, staff reports, non-confidential memoranda concerning the status of the application or proposal, and notification of other activities and events associated with the processing of the application or proposal. Upon any final decision concerning the application or proposal, the referring Party shall notify the other Party in writing of the final decision including a general summary of any terms, conditions, or other details of the decision.

10.0 **PARTNERSHIPS.**

10.1 **Intergovernmental Cooperation.** The Parties recognize and acknowledge the need for intergovernmental cooperation on important local and regional land use matters and to achieve common goals. In accordance with the NCP, the Town and the County agree to cooperate in good faith in:

10.1.1 Collaborating to design, fund and construct regional trails that connect Nederland to Boulder County open space and other municipalities;

10.1.2 Working with the Colorado Department of Transportation, the Regional Transportation District and the Denver Regional Council of Governments to improve Nederland’s multimodal transportation system, including continuing to explore ways to improve bus service between the Town, its neighboring communities, and Boulder County destinations and to reduce emissions;

10.1.3 Continuing to freely share geographic information system data, maps and expertise;

10.1.4 Identifying and implementing programs to enhance opportunities for senior housing and affordable housing within the Town and the NPA; and

10.1.5 Cooperating in the identification of sites to provide more efficient governmental services, including, without limitation, sustainable waste management activities, and solar or other forms renewable energy generation facilities.

10.1.7 Enforcing nuisance ordinances to improve the appearance of properties in the NPA.

10.1.8 Implementing the Boulder County Sustainable Energy Plan.
Implementing the Boulder County Regional Affordable Housing Strategic Plan.

10.1.10 Cooperating on joint ventures to finance and provide for cultural and recreational opportunities for Town residents and people living in the NPA and surrounding neighborhoods.

10.1.11 Collaborating to construct a cost effective, highly diverse, and resilient wastewater treatment system to serve the NPA that is both environmentally beneficial and aesthetically pleasing.

10.1.12 Cooperating on the provision of water and sewer services to properties in the RPA by the Town.

10.1.13 Cooperating to preserve historic and cultural resources within the NPA.

11.0 AMENDMENTS.

11.1 Entire Agreement. This IGA, together with the Super IGA, contains the entire agreement between the Parties and, with the exception of the Super IGA, supersedes any other or prior agreements concerning the same subject matter.

11.2 Changes to IGA. Any proposed amendment to the IGA affecting the jurisdiction over lands or the development regulation of lands must be referred to the other Party by the Regulatory Party. The "Regulatory Party" shall mean the Party having final land use or annexation approval jurisdiction, as the context requires. Amendment of the IGA shall take place only upon approval by resolution or ordinance adopted by the governing body of both of the Parties, after notice and hearing as may be required by law. The Regulatory Party shall not approve nor permit any development or change of use of any parcel within the NPA by any means in a manner inconsistent with this IGA until and unless the IGA has been amended so that the proposed development or use of such parcel is consistent with the IGA.

11.3 Timely Decisions on Amendments to IGA. The Parties agree that within thirty (30) days after receipt by one Party of an amendment proposed by the other Party, the Parties will agree on and establish a schedule for processing and taking final action upon the amendment proposal.

12.0 NON-SEVERABILITY. If any portion of this IGA is held by a court of competent jurisdiction in a final, non-appealable decision to be per se invalid or unenforceable as to any Party, the entire IGA shall be terminated, it being the understanding and intent of the Parties that every portion of the IGA is essential to and not severable from the remainder.

13.0 BENEFICIARIES. The Parties, in their corporate and representative governmental capacities, are the only entities intended to be the beneficiaries of the IGA, and no other person or entity is so intended.

14.0 ENFORCEMENT. Either or both of the Parties may enforce this IGA by any legal or equitable means including specific performance, declaratory relief, and injunctive relief. No other person or entity shall have any right to enforce the provisions of this IGA. The Parties
agree to discuss and attempt to resolve any dispute in the interpretation or application of this IGA, including but not limited to any dispute regarding a request to terminate this IGA, but if they are unable to do so, either Party may request that the matter be presented to a mediator selected and paid for jointly by the Parties.

15.0 DEFENSE OF CLAIMS/INDEMNIFICATION  If any person allegedly aggrieved by a provision of this IGA who is not a party to the IGA asserts or attempts to assert any claim against any Party concerning such IGA provision, Boulder County shall, and the Town may, defend such claim upon receiving timely and appropriate notice of the pendency of such claim. Defense costs shall be paid by the Party providing such defense. In the event that any person not a party to the IGA should obtain a final money judgment against the Town for the diminution in value of any regulated parcel resulting from regulations in the IGA or regulations adopted by the Town implementing the IGA, the County shall, to the extent permitted by law, indemnify the Town for the amount of said judgment.

16.0 GOVERNING LAW AND VENUE  This IGA shall be governed by the laws of the State of Colorado and venue shall lie in the appropriate court(s) for Boulder County, Colorado.

17.0 TERM AND TERMINATION  This IGA shall remain in effect until [date], 2032, unless otherwise terminated earlier by mutual agreement of the Parties.

18.0 PARTY REPRESENTATIVES  Referrals made under the terms of this IGA shall be sent to the Parties' representatives as follows:

**County of Boulder**

   Director, Land Use Department  
P.O. Box 471  
Boulder, Colorado 80306  

   With a copy to:  
Boulder County Attorney’s Office  
PO Box 471  
Boulder, Colorado 80306  

**Town of Nederland**  
Karen Gerrity, Town Administrator  
P.O. Box 396  
45 W. First Street  
Nederland, Colorado 80466

Name and address changes for representatives shall be made in writing and mailed to the other representatives at the then current address.

19.0 COUNTERPART.  This IGA may be executed in any number of counterparts which together shall constitute the agreement of the Parties.
**20.0 EFFECTIVE DATE.** The effective date of this IGA shall be the date on which both Parties have approved and executed the IGA by signing where indicated below.

**TOWN OF NEDERLAND:**
Board of Trustees

By: ____________________________ Mayor
   Kristopher Larsen, Mayor

Date: ____________________________

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

____________________________________

**COUNTY OF BOULDER:**
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

By: ____________________________
   Deb Gardner, Chair

Date: ____________________________ , 2017

ATTEST:

____________________________________

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

____________________________________
TOWN MAINTENANCE SHOP ANNEXATION AMENDMENT TO THE NEDERLAND BOULDER COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT

This Amendment to the Nederland Boulder County Comprehensive Development Plan Intergovernmental Agreement by and between the Town of Nederland, a Colorado municipal corporation (Nederland); and the County of Boulder, a body politic and corporate of the State of Colorado (Boulder County) (collectively the "Parties"), is made to be effective on the 12th day of May, 2009.

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, section 29-20-101 et seq., C.R.S. as amended, enables the Parties to enter into intergovernmental agreements to plan for and regulate land uses, in order to minimize the negative impacts on the surrounding areas and protect the environment, and specifically authorizes local governments to cooperate and contract with each other for the purpose of planning and regulating the development of land by means of a "Comprehensive Development Plan"; and

WHEREAS, in order to ensure that the unique and individual character of Nederland is preserved, the Parties entered into the Nederland Boulder County Comprehensive Development Plan Intergovernmental Agreement (the "Agreement") effective March 2, 2002, that recognizes the annexed areas and development approved by Nederland, accompanied by binding commitments by the responsible jurisdictions for the preservation of the rural character of surrounding lands within the Plan Area, is in the best interest of the citizens of each of the Parties; and

WHEREAS, the prohibition of annexation or development of certain lands within the Rural Preservation Area of the Plan by Nederland contained in Section 4 of said Agreement has certain limited exceptions for annexation of parcels of land to be used for Town utilities purposes; and

WHEREAS, since the effective date of the Agreement, Boulder County conveyed to the Town a portion of its County road maintenance shop parcel in the Rural Preservation Area of the Plan, but adjacent to the Town’s boundary, as described on Exhibit A attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference (the "Town Maintenance Shop Parcel"); and

WHEREAS, the Town has expressed the desire to annex the Town Maintenance Shop Parcel and the Parties desire to enable such annexation by amending the Agreement to clearly allow for such annexation; and
WHEREAS, the Nederland Board of Trustees adopted Ordinance No. 661 (codified at Section 15-5 of the Nederland Town Code), that removes the voter approval requirement for annexations of Town-owned properties; and

WHEREAS, it is appropriate to reflect this change in the Town Code in the provisions of the Agreement through this Amendment to enable the Town to proceed to acquire and annex lands needed for municipal governmental uses; and

WHEREAS, the Parties have each held hearings after proper public notice for the consideration of entering into this Amendment to the Agreement and the adoption of an amendment to the comprehensive development plan previously approved in the Agreement.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the above and the mutual covenants and commitments made herein, the Parties agree to amend the Agreement and the Comprehensive Development Plan as follows:

1. ANNEXATION OF TOWN MAINTENANCE SHOP PARCEL:
Notwithstanding any provision of the Agreement to the contrary, the Parties agree that the Town Maintenance Shop Parcel, as described and shown on Exhibit A, may be annexed to the Town, and once annexed, shall be treated for purposes of the Agreement as other lands within the Nederland Town limits, and subject to the regulatory jurisdiction of the Town. No County approvals shall then be necessary for the development of the Town’s Maintenance Shop on said Parcel.

2. AMENDED RURAL PRESERVATION AREA:
The Town Maintenance Shop Parcel shall no longer be considered a portion of the Rural Preservation Area pursuant to the Agreement and the comprehensive development plan incorporated therein. Except for the Town Maintenance Shop Parcel, all other lands in the Rural Preservation Area shall remain in said Area for the term of the Agreement, except for lands annexed by the Town in accordance with the terms of Section 4 of the Agreement.

3. ELIMINATION OF VOTER APPROVAL REQUIREMENT FOR ANNEXATION OF TOWN-OWNED LANDS. The Agreement is amended by the revision of paragraph 4.c. to read as follows:

   4. ANNEXATION.

   c. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Agreement, the Nederland Board of Trustees may determine, in its sole discretion that it needs land in the Rural Preservation Area for utilities, including but not limited to water, water storage, water treatment, sewer, sewage treatment, roads, OR FOR OTHER MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTAL PURPOSES. Should the Town proceed with acquisition of such land, whether or not through the exercise of eminent domain, the Town may then annex such land, AND USE SUCH LAND FOR MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTAL PURPOSES, and such annexation need not be
submitted to review or approval by the Boulder County Planning Commission or the Boulder County Board of County Commissioners. However, such annexation will require referral to the Nederland Planning Commission for recommendation; AND approval by the Nederland Board of Trustees; and approval by the qualified electors of the Town of Nederland at an election.

3. AMENDMENTS AND CONTINUATION OF THE AGREEMENT:
This Amendment to the Agreement, including Exhibit A, contains the entire amendment agreement between the Parties. Except as expressly provided in this Amendment, the Agreement and its incorporated comprehensive development plan shall remain in full force and effect for the term therein stated, and no other amendment to the Agreement shall be implied from the terms of this Amendment.

4. BENEFICIARIES:
The Parties, in their corporate and representative governmental capacities, are the only entities, intended to be the beneficiaries of the Plan, and no other person or entity is so intended.

5. ENFORCEMENT:
Either of the Parties may enforce this Amendment by any legal or equitable means including specific performance, declaratory and injunctive relief. No other person or entity shall have any right to enforce the provisions of this Agreement.

6. GOVERNING LAW AND VENUE:
This Amendment shall be governed by the laws of the State of Colorado and venue shall lie in the County of Boulder.

7. TERM:
This Amendment shall not affect the term of the Agreement, and the Agreement shall be amended by this Amendment as provided herein through the term of the Agreement.

THIS AMENDMENT HAS BEEN APPROVED by the parties as evidenced by the signatures of their authorized representatives below to take effect as set forth above.

TOWN OF NEDERLAND:

(SEAL)

By: Martin Cheshes, Mayor
Date

ATTEST:

Town Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Town Attorney
BOULDER COUNTY, BY ITS
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

(SEAL)

By: Ben Pearlman, Chair

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Clerk to the Board

County Attorney

Date

11/30/09
EXHIBIT A –
TOWN MAINTENANCE SHOP ANNEXATION AMENDMENT TO THE
NEDERLAND BOULDER COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT

Resulting Nederland Town Shop Site Parcel - 6.68 acres
(Existing parcel + Purchase Parcel)

A parcel of land located in the southeast quarter (SE 1/4)
of Section 12, Township 1 South, Range 73 West of the 6th P.M.,
Boulder County, Colorado, described as follows:

Beginning at the southwest corner of the
southeast 1/4 of the southeast 1/4 of Section 12,
monumented by a 5/8 inch diameter rebar with a
2 inch diameter aluminum cap set by Robert Sayre,
Colorado LS 11372;

thence South 87°21'48" East, along the south line of said Section 12;
a distance of 742.09 feet;

thence North 00°00'00" East, a distance of 410.17 feet;

thence North 90°00'00" West, a distance of 739.63 feet
to a point on the west line of the southeast 1/4 of the southeast 1/4
of Section 12;

thence South 00°00'00" West, along the west line of the southeast 1/4
of the southeast 14 of Section 12, a distance of 376.03 feet to the
Point of Beginning.

This parcel contains 6.68 acres, more or less.

-prepared by Lee Stadele
Registered Professional Land Surveyor
Colorado License Number 26300
word file 14274ts6.doc

637 South Broadway, Suite C - Table Mesa Shopping Center
Boulder, Colorado 80305
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