City of Boulder
Open Space and Mountain Parks
66 S. Cherryvale Road, Boulder, CO 80302; 303-441-3440
http://www.osmp.org

TO: Hannah Hippley, Planner II; Boulder County Land Use

FROM: Mark Gershman, Environmental Planning Supervisor; City of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks

CC: Ron West and Janis Whisman Boulder County Parks and Open Space

DATE: April 29, 2011

SUBJECT: Docket SI-09-0001, Southern Water Supply Project II

Thank you for the opportunity to review the above application. Several of the alternatives directly affect City of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks (OSMP) land.

These comments do not include a thorough assessment of the accuracy of the information contained in the docket materials, but rather an assessment of the completeness of the information for comparing the alternatives. Please consider the following comments for the Southern Water Supply Project II 1041 Application (henceforth "the Application") and accompanying Siting Study ("the Study").

For a variety of reasons detailed below, Open Space and Mountain Parks does not consider the application complete. We also do not feel that the information, as presented, allows for a comparison of the alternatives. As described below, we encourage the County to request several additions and modifications to the application materials.

Open Space and Mountain Parks Easement Requests

A portion of the proposed alignments for the Southern Water Supply Project II follows an alignment that crosses city of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks lands. The city owns these properties in conjunction with the Boulder County Parks and Open Space Department.

The Open Space Board of Trustees (OSBT) has an adopted policy for easement requests on OSMP land. A copy of the easement policy has already been provided to the applicant. The applicant must apply for and be granted easements to use OSMP lands, by the OSBT and City Council, before work may proceed on OSMP land. In addition, the conservation easements OSMP holds on these properties contain development restrictions. A utility easement is not a prohibited use under these conservation easements.

The applicant should be aware that Boulder County also has a process for granting easements on county open space. It would be to the applicant's advantage to coordinate the process of obtaining the required easements with OSMP and Boulder County Parks and Open Space.

Consistency with Boulder County Land Use Code

Our review of the Application and Study began with a review of the Application Submittal Requirements found in the Boulder County land use code (Art.8 §507). The following items were either not found in the Application or the Study; or were found to be incomplete as noted.

8-507 D.7.b.(ii).

(A) Flood Hazard The Application includes a section on p. 62 addressing flood issues associated with the project once completed. However, the major of community impacts appear to occur during the construction phase. Therefore, it would be useful to have information about the flood hazard associated with the stockpiling of materials, from the placement of excavated material and other related activities that could increase flood hazard. For example, is it allowable to stockpile construction materials and store construction equipment within the 100-year floodplains or other areas of flood hazard? It seems that the potentially large quantities of materials could pose a flood hazard if stored improperly.

(C) Surface Water Impacts The Application includes a section addressing surface water (p. 62). This section states that water quality information for reaches affected by the project is not listed "on the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, Water Quality Control Commission classification and numeric standards". However, this is not the case, current classification and numeric standards for Lefthand Creek and its Tributaries as well as St. Vrain Creek are readily available on the CDPHE website[1]. A copy of the relevant page is attached to this memorandum.

The applicant does not address "worst case" conditions as required. It seems that the worst case would be a failure of the pipeline. No information is provided about how this would affect surface waters. We recognize that such an event may be unlikely. However it appears the placement (and assumedly failure) of a high-pressure pipeline is suggested as the reason for separating the pipeline from other utilities near State Highway 119. Such "worst case" scenarios should be consistently applied, especially where required.

(D) Ground Water The Application lacks several of the requirements found in this section including:

a. Mapping of all groundwater including aquifers
(2) Artesian pressure in aquifers
(3) Groundwater flows and directions
(4) Existing aquifer recharge rates and methodology used to calculate recharge to the aquifer from any recharge sources
(6) Seepage losses expected at stream-aquifer interfaces and methodology used to calculate seepage losses in affected streams, including description and location of measuring devices.
(7) Existing groundwater quality and classification.
(8) Location of all water wells and their uses.

[1] http://www.cdphe.state.co.us/op/wqcc/Standards/RegsCurrent/38_2010%2811%29-2011%2806%29tables.pdf

Impacts to groundwater could significantly reduce the agricultural productivity of open space lands directly affected by the project and those nearby. The applicant provides assurances elsewhere in the documentation that hydrology will be maintained. However, it seems that having the sort of information required would allow for more informed consideration of the direct and indirect effects of the alternative routes.

8-507 D.7.b.(iii) Terrestrial and Aquatic Animals and Habitat

(A) This section calls for the applicant to address the status and relative importance of livestock in addition to native wildlife species. No mention was found in the Application or the Study about livestock, which are present on many of the parcels affected by the various alternatives.

(B) Similarly, this section includes a requirement to map and describe livestock range to be affected by the project. No mapping or other information was found in either the Application or the Study to satisfy this requirement.

Although prairie dog colonies are identified, commitments to comply with the City of Boulder's Wildlife Protection Ordinance are vague and inconsistent. (e.g., on p. 69 of the Application, it states that "Northern will follow Boulder County guidelines in its management of prairie dogs where they exist within the selected easement", and on p. 71, "Prior to construction, affected prairie dog colonies will be relocated consistent with County and City of Boulder requirements". We recommend that the applicant provide a clear commitment to abide by city regulations where they affect the project. It is also important to note that the city can provide no commitment to provide receiving sites for prairie dog relocation on open space lands.

8-507 D.7.b.(iv) Terrestrial and Aquatic Plant Life

The Application (p.73) states that no noxious weeds from the Colorado Noxious Weeds List A were observed during the field surveys." Purple loosestrife (*Lythrum salicaria*) is an A-listed species and occurs in wetlands on city owned lands west of N. 63rd Street and south of Coot Lake. This occurrence is well known by City of Boulder Parks and Recreation Department which managers of this property. We suggest that the County require the applicants to use available information from land managers about the location and extent of weeds, especially A-listed species.

8-507 D.7.b.(vi) Significant environmentally sensitive factors

The application states: "One property the Boulder Reservoir is used for public outdoor recreation. There will be no recreation closures during construction". Figure 3 of Appendix III from the Study suggests that potentially significant disruption would occur at the both the parking lot and park at Tom Watson Park from the construction of the project. This facility is managed by the City of Boulder Parks and Recreation Department. It also appears that there is potential for impact to ball fields near the Lefthand Water District treatment plant from both alternatives 1 and 2.

Please include the City of Boulder Parks and Recreation Department among the agencies receiving further information about this project.

Table 16 (Application) does not include all City of Boulder open space affected by the project. City-owned open space lies east of North 63rd Street just north of the intersection with Colorado Highway 119. This is a city-owned conservation easement. The city has management responsibility over a portion of this easement. Open Space and Mountain Parks staff can provide information about the location and extent of city open space land and easement ownership.

8-507 D.7.b.(viii) Transportation impacts
Although both the Application and Study refer to jurisdiction of Boulder County and the State of Colorado, no mention was found of the City of Boulder's jurisdiction over North 63rd Street (and potentially elsewhere in the project area). ***Please include the City of Boulder Transportation Division among the agencies receiving further information about this project.***

Consistency with Requirements of October 14, 2009 Letter from Boulder County Land Use
We also reviewed the Application and Study for completeness concerning the components required by Boulder County Land Use in response to an earlier submittal. Several of these requirements are consistent with OSMP interests. The following items were not found in the documentation, or were found to be incomplete as noted.

- Identify the length and width of the Pipeline in National, State, Local Ag Lands – include permanent easement numbers and construction easement numbers.
  No data were found that described construction impacts. It was difficult to understand how the information for permanent easements was derived. We suggest that the County consider requiring the applicant to provide a more transparent presentation of how these numbers were calculated.
- For irrigated lands describe and quantify both the long term and short term impacts of the pipeline on irrigated lands
  As with the item immediately above, construction impacts (short-term) are not clearly distinguished from long-term impacts.

  We noted that the analysis did not differentiate the nature of the impacts to agricultural lands. For example, Alternative 1 passes through the center of several agricultural properties and is therefore likely to be more disruptive and have the potential for longer term and more significant impacts. On the other hand, Alternative 2 is located along roadsides where activities are likely be less disruptive and affects less severe.

- Identify all water feature crossings and the nature and extent of any associated habitat, describe and quantify the impact of pipeline construction on the associated habitat.
  There are significant differences between the information contained in the Application and the Study. We recommend that the County request the applicant review the applicable sections in the two documents and reconcile the information. For water features, we suggest that the applicant use area rather than linear distance when describing environmental impacts. Given the degree to which the easement width may vary, it is impossible to compute and compare the level of impact among the various alternatives based on linear distance alone.

Similarly, the number of trees seems to be a poor measure to compare among alternatives. A mature cottonwood and coyote willow are not ecologically equivalent, and should not be considered one to one equivalents for the alternatives analysis. ,

The inclusion of exotic species and landscape trees in this section is not well explained. For example, it is unclear if the applicant considers impacts to all trees species as a detriment or impacts to non-native species as a benefit. There is no specific description of how the counts of these trees are used in the analysis. We recommend that a more thoughtful measure of riparian impact be developed by the applicant to address these concerns.

- Identify existing Critical Wildlife Habitat areas and describe and quantify the impact of pipeline construction on the identified resource.
  The only measure of critical habitat is the number of crossing. As with impacts to waterways, it would be preferable to have this measure presented as an area. It is unclear why the applicant does not consider the construction related impacts to be of significance. This is especially odd; as the applicant seems to build a strong case that, the long-term impacts of the project are largely benign. If this were the case, a greater focus on the more severe temporary impacts would be in the public's interest.

  All things being equal, riparian habitat at road crossing is probably less valuable than habitat distant from a road. These impacts should not be weighted equally. The applicants should be encouraged however to maintain connectivity for wildlife under or across roads throughout the period of construction.

- Identify where pipeline construction would have a traffic/transportation impact and describe and quantify the nature of this impact.
  As with the water feature crossing, the data appear to be inconsistent between the Application and the Study. In the analysis, the applicants seem to combine the number of road crossings and length parallel to roads. It is unclear from both the Application and the Study how these factors relate to transportation impacts. In some cases, the easement is at a considerable distance from the roadway. We recommend separating the two metrics for traffic/transportation impacts, as they vary independently from each other. Combining these measures into a single index and then comparing among alternatives decreases the validity of the comparisons. We did not find a table showing the total length of the various alternatives [p. 25 of the Study states that they are relatively similar (8.6-9.7 miles)]. We recommend that the County consider asking the applicant to include this information.

Comments on the Application and the Study

- Both documents routinely used abbreviations and acronyms without first spelling them out. This is not conventional in technical writing. The document has difficult to read when encountering an unfamiliar acronym or abbreviations..

- Map 1 in the Study is illegible. Perhaps PDF creation resulted in loss of resolution for this item. Most of the other maps and photos were of high quality. Since Map 1 is the reference for several of the resources described in the document, this made a careful review impossible. We recommend that the County request the applicant improve the quality of this map.

- The route evaluation criteria table (pp. 27-28 in the Application, and 34-35 in the Study) were inconsistent with the listed criteria (p. 32-33 in the Study) and the Alternative Ranking Results (pp. 25-26 in the Application and 36-37 in the Study). For example, "distance through prairie dog towns" is among the criteria listed on p 32 of the Study, but is not included in the summary table or mentioned in the ranking results. Similarly, there are empty cells in the summary table for which there is no relevant elsewhere in either document. There are also criteria in the summary table that we could not find described in the text (e.g., Conflict Rating and Constructability). We recommend that the applicant reconcile this information to make it easier for reviewers to compare the alternatives. In its current state, the alternative analysis is difficult to use.

- The evaluation criteria are not weighted and are not of equal importance. For example, the criterion of landscape trees appears to be given as much consideration as critical wildlife habitat. We recommend that the County ask the applicant to describe their analysis process in detail so that the relative emphasis of the various criteria can be understood.

- It is unclear how the applicant used the results of the Ute Ladies' Tresses and Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse surveys. These were only conducted for one of the alternatives.

- In the Study (p. 12 and 13) City and County land uses seem to be combined. Much of the residential development in the Gunbarrel area is actually outside of the city limits of Boulder. The map should clarify the origin of the "Land Use" information. Was it derived from the land use designations in the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan Land, county zoning designations or city zoning designations?

- In the Study (p. 12), the removal of agricultural lands because of size or location within municipal boundaries seems arbitrary. It is also inconsistent with existing agricultural practices and public policies in the City and County that encourage local food production. We recommend that the County ask the applicant to retain all agricultural lands as part of the analysis—unless they have obviously been irrevocably converted to other uses.

- Map 7 (Study p. 16) shows information about traffic levels for the various roads in the project area. We were struck by the unusual categories displayed. The levels of use vary as follows:

    - The range of category 1 is 1500 annualized trips per day
    - The range of category 2 is 1000 annualized trips per day
    - The range of category 3 is 2000 annualized trips per day
    - The range of category 4 is 1000 annualized trips per day

- The range of category 5 is 4000 annualized trips per day

Using these breaks creates a very specific portrayal of traffic levels. We would be interested in learning why the applicant chose these uneven breaks.

- In the Study (p. 19) the applicant states "CDOT would not allow utilities within the SH 119 median between travel lanes" and on p. 20 that "CDOT would *unlikely* grant approval for siting this line inside of the SH 119 ROW". [*emphasis added*] We recommend that the County ask the applicant document positions of public agencies and either omit conjecture or identify it as such.

- No information is given about total cost or total length of the various alternatives. This information is typically included in an alternatives analysis.

- The Study (p. 42) reads, "At **most** locations where open space is crossed, the pipeline alignment follows a road or land edge to minimize both short and long-term effects." [*emphasis added]*. A comparison of impacts to open space based upon what happens at ***most*** locations fails to distinguish the alternatives. This creates situation where open space impacts are simply measured and ignores the (potentially more significant) criterion of whether the pipeline bisects the property or travels along the edge. We suggest that the County request that the applicant describe and consider the location (nature) of the impact as part of the open space analysis. .

- The Study (p. 43) describes both number of parcels and the number of residential and commercial uses. Both of these are measures of impacts to property owners. This is an important consideration, but these criteria tend to "double count" the same factor. In the project area, alternatives affecting many residential and commercial users will also affect a large number of lots.

- On page 48 of the Study, there is considerable emphasis given to the position of the City of Longmont. However, none of the other affected stakeholders receives a similar level of focus. For example, other municipalities and jurisdictions, or landowners may have similar interest in this project and may have strong positions. We recommend that if the applicant wishes to include the position of Longmont, that they similarly represent the positions of other stakeholders.

REGULATION #38 STREAM CLASSIFICATIONS and WATER QUALITY STANDARDS

REGION: 3 AND 4 BASIN: ST. VRAIN CREEK Stream Segment Description	DESIG	CLASSIFICATIONS	NUMERIC STANDARDS						TEMPORARY MODIFICATIONS AND QUALIFIERS
			PHYSICAL and BIOLOGICAL	INORGANIC mg/l		METALS µg/l			
1. All tributaries to St. Vrain Creek, including all wetlands, which are within the Indian Peaks Wilderness Area and Rocky Mountain National Park.	CW	Aq Life Cold 1 Recreation E Water Supply Agriculture	T=TVS(CS-I) °C D.O.=6.0 mg/l D.O.(sp)=7.0 mg/l pH=6.5-9.0 E.Coli=126/100ml	NH_3(ac/ch)=TVS Cl_2(ac)=0.019 Cl_2(ch)=0.011 CN=0.005	S=0.002 B=0.75 NO_2=0.05 NO_3=10 Cl=250 SO_4=WS	As(ac)=340 As(ch)=0.02(Trec) Cd(ac)=TVS(ti) Cd(ch)=TVS Cr(III)(ac)=50(Trec) Cr(III)(ch)=TVS Cr(VI)(ac/ch)=TVS Cu(ac/ch)=TVS	Fe(ch)=WS(dis) Fe(ch)=1000(Trec) Pb(ac/ch)=TVS Mn(ac/ch)=TVS Mn(ch)=WS(dis) Hg(ch)=0.01(Tot)	Ni(ac/ch)=TVS Se(ac/ch)=TVS Ag(ac)=TVS Ag(ch)=TVS(ti) Zn(ac/ch)=TVS	
2a. Mainstem of St. Vrain Creek, including all tributaries and wetlands, from the boundary of the Indian Peaks Wilderness Area and Rocky Mountain National Park to the eastern boundary of Roosevelt National Forest.		Aq Life Cold 1 Recreation E Water Supply Agriculture	T=TVS(CS-I) °C D.O.=6.0 mg/l D.O.(sp)=7.0 mg/l pH=6.5-9.0 E.Coli=126/100ml	NH_3(ac/ch)=TVS Cl_2(ac)=0.019 Cl_2(ch)=0.011 CN=0.005	S=0.002 B=0.75 NO_2=0.05 NO_3=10 Cl=250 SO_4=WS	As(ac)=340 As(ch)=0.02(Trec) Cd(ac)=TVS(ti) Cd(ch)=TVS Cr(III)(ac)=50(Trec) Cr(III)(ch)=TVS Cr(VI)(ac/ch)=TVS Cu(ac/ch)=TVS	Fe(ch)=WS(dis) Fe(ch)=1000(Trec) Pb(ac/ch)=TVS Mn(ac/ch)=TVS Mn(ch)=WS(dis) Hg(ch)=0.01(Tot)	Ni(ac/ch)=TVS Se(ac/ch)=TVS Ag(ac)=TVS Ag(ch)=TVS(ti) Zn(ac/ch)=TVS	
2b. Mainstem of St. Vrain Creek, including all tributaries and wetlands, from the eastern boundary of Roosevelt National Forest to Hygiene Road.		Aq Life Cold 1 Recreation E Water Supply Agriculture	T=TVS(CS-II) °C D.O.=6.0 mg/l D.O.(sp)=7.0 mg/l pH=6.5-9.0 E.Coli=126/100ml	NH_3(ac/ch)=TVS Cl_2(ac)=0.019 Cl_2(ch)=0.011 CN=0.005	S=0.002 B=0.75 NO_2=0.05 NO_3=10 Cl=250 SO_4=WS	As(ac)=340 As(ch)=0.02(Trec) Cd(ac)=TVS(ti) Cd(ch)=TVS Cr(III)(ac)=50(Trec) Cr(III)(ch)=TVS Cr(VI)(ac/ch)=TVS Cu(ac/ch)=TVS	Fe(ch)=WS(dis) Fe(ch)=1000(Trec) Pb(ac/ch)=TVS Mn(ac/ch)=TVS Mn(ch)=WS(dis) Hg(ch)=0.01(Tot)	Ni(ac/ch)=TVS Se(ac/ch)=TVS Ag(ac)=TVS Ag(ch)=TVS(ti) Zn(ac/ch)=TVS	Temporary modification: Cu(ch)=6.0 µg/l (dis). (Type II). Expiration date of 12/31/2015.
3. Mainstem of St. Vrain Creek from Hygiene Road to the confluence with the South Platte River.		Aq Life Warm 1 Recreation E Agriculture	T=TVS(WS-I) °C D.O.=6.0 mg/l pH=6.5-9.0 E.Coli=126/100ml	NH_3(ac/ch)=TVS Cl_2(ac)=0.019 Cl_2(ch)=0.011 CN=0.005	S=0.002 B=0.75 NO_2=0.5 NO_3=100	As(ac)=340 As(ch)=7.8(Trec) Cd(ac/ch)=TVS Cr(III)(ac/ch)=TVS Cr(VI)(ac/ch)=TVS Cu(ac/ch)=TVS	Fe(ch)=1000(Trec) Pb(ac/ch)=TVS Mn(ac/ch)=TVS Hg(ch)=0.01(Tot)	Ni(ac/ch)=TVS Se(ac/ch)=TVS Ag(ac/ch)=TVS Zn(ac/ch)=TVS	Temporary modifications: NH_3(ac)=TVS(old) NH_3(ch)=0.05 (Type I). Expiration date of 12/31/2011.
4a. Mainstem of Left Hand Creek, including all tributaries and wetlands, from the source to a point immediately below the confluence with James Creek, except for specific listings in Segment 4b.		Aq Life Cold 1 Recreation E Water Supply Agriculture	T=TVS(CS-I) °C D.O.=6.0 mg/l D.O.(sp)=7.0 mg/l pH=6.5-9.0 E.Coli=126/100ml	NH_3(ac/ch)=TVS Cl_2(ac)=0.019 Cl_2(ch)=0.011 CN=0.005	S=0.002 B=0.75 NO_2=0.05 NO_3=10 Cl=250 SO_4=WS	As(ac)=340 As(ch)=0.02(Trec) Cd(ac)=TVS(ti) Cd(ch)=TVS Cr(III)(ac)=50(Trec) Cr(VI)(ac/ch)=TVS Cu(ac/ch)=TVS	Fe(ch)=WS(dis) Fe(ch)=1000(Trec) Pb(ac/ch)=TVS Mn(ac/ch)=TVS Mn(ch)=WS(dis) Hg(ch)=0.01(Tot)	Ni(ac/ch)=TVS Se(ac/ch)=TVS Ag(ac)=TVS Ag(ch)=TVS(ti) Zn(ac/ch)=TVS	
4b. Mainstem of James Creek, including all tributaries and wetlands, from the source to the confluence with Left Hand Creek.		Aq Life Cold 1 Recreation E Water Supply Agriculture	T=TVS(CS-I) °C D.O.=6.0 mg/l D.O.(sp)=7.0 mg/l pH=6.5-9.0 E.Coli=126/100ml	NH_3(ac/ch)=TVS Cl_2(ac)=0.019 Cl_2(ch)=0.011 CN=0.005	S=0.002 B=0.75 NO_2=0.05 NO_3=10 Cl=250 SO_4=WS	As(ac)=340 As(ch)=0.02(Trec) Cd(ac)=TVS(ti) Cd(ch)=TVS Cr(III)(ac)=50(Trec) Cr(VI)(ac/ch)=TVS Cu(ac/ch)=TVS	Fe(ch)=WS(dis) Fe(ch)=1000(Trec) Pb(ac/ch)=TVS Mn(ac/ch)=TVS Mn(ch)=WS(dis) Hg(ch)=0.01(Tot)	Ni(ac/ch)=TVS Se(ac/ch)=TVS Ag(ac)=TVS Ag(ch)=TVS(ti) Zn(ac/ch)=TVS	
4c. Mainstem of Left Hand Creek, including all tributaries and wetlands, from a point immediately below the confluence with James Creek to Highway 36.		Aq Life Cold 1 Recreation E Water Supply Agriculture	T=TVS(CS-II) °C D.O.=6.0 mg/l D.O.(sp)=7.0 mg/l pH=6.5-9.0 E.Coli=126/100ml	NH_3(ac/ch)=TVS Cl_2(ac)=0.019 Cl_2(ch)=0.011 CN=0.005	S=0.002 B=0.75 NO_2=0.05 NO_3=10 Cl=250 SO_4=WS	As(ac)=340 As(ch)=0.02(Trec) Cd(ac)=TVS(ti) Cd(ch)=TVS Cr(III)(ac)=50(Trec) Cr(VI)(ac/ch)=TVS Cu(ac/ch)=TVS	Fe(ch)=WS(dis) Fe(ch)=1000(Trec) Pb(ac/ch)=TVS Mn(ac/ch)=TVS Mn(ch)=WS(dis) Hg(ch)=0.01(Tot)	Ni(ac/ch)=TVS Se(ac/ch)=TVS Ag(ac)=TVS Ag(ch)=TVS(ti) Zn(ac/ch)=TVS	
5. Mainstem of Left Hand Creek, including all tributaries and wetlands from Highway 36 to the confluence with St. Vrain Creek.		Aq Life Warm 2 Recreation E Water Supply Agriculture	T=TVS(WS-I) °C D.O.=6.0 mg/l pH=6.5-9.0 E.Coli=126/100ml	NH_3(ac/ch)=TVS Cl_2(ac)=0.019 Cl_2(ch)=0.011 CN=0.005	S=0.002 B=0.75 NO_2=0.5 NO_3=10 SO_4=WS	As(ac)=340 As(ch)=0.02- 10(Trec) Cd(ac/ch)=TVS Cr(III)(ac)=50(Trec) Cr(III)(ch)=TVS Cr(VI)(ac/ch)=TVS	Cu(ac/ch)=TVS Fe(ch)=WS(dis) Fe(ch)=1000(Trec) Pb(ac/ch)=TVS Mn(ac/ch)=TVS Mn(ch)=WS(dis) Hg(ch)=0.01(Tot) Ni(ac/ch)=TVS	Se(ac/ch)=TVS Ag(ac/ch)=TVS Zn(ac/ch)=TVS	

http://www.cdphe.state.co.us/op/wqcc/Standards/RegsCurrent/38_2010%2811%29-2011%2806%29tables.pdf

Boulder County

Land Use

Courthouse Annex • 2045 13th Street • Boulder, Colorado 80302 • Tel: 303.441.3930 • Fax: 303.441.4856
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 471 • Boulder, Colorado 80306 • **www.bouldercounty.org**

MEMO TO: Agencies and adjacent property owners
FROM: Hannah Hippely, AICP, Planner II
DATE: April 15, 2011
RE: **Docket SI-11-0001**

Docket SI-11-0001: SOUTHERN WATER SUPPLY PIPELINE II

Request: Areas and Activities of State Interest (1041) for the construction of a water pipeline which would deliver Windy Gap and Colorado-Big Thompson water from Carter Lake to the project participants which include the City of Boulder, Left Hand Water District, Longs Peak Water District, and the Town of Frederick. The project consists of a north-south pipeline which will serve the City of Boulder and Left Hand Water District and an east-west pipeline that will branch from the north-south alignment to serve the Longs Peak Water District and the Town of Frederick.

Location: Northeastern Boulder County, the proposed pipeline enters the County at the north approximately 1.0 mile west of N 83rd St. and runs south past the City of Longmont to Boulder Reservoir; the eastern branch of the pipeline is proposed along Vermillion Road beginning approximately 0.5 mile west of N 87th St running east to County Line Road, in Sections 1,12,13,25,36, of Range 3N, Township 70W, and Sections 1,12,13,24,23,26,34,35 of Range 2N, Township 70W, and Section 3 of Range 1N, Township 70W, Sections 7,13,14,15,16,17,18,19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 30, 31 of Range 3N, Township 69W, and Section 6 of Range 2N, Township 69W.

Zoning: Estate Residential (ER), Rural Residential (RR) and Agricultural (A) Zoning Districts

Applicant: Carl Brouwer, Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District

Agents: Rosi Dennett, Strategic Planning, Inc.
John Ko, AECOM

This process includes public hearings before the Boulder County Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners. Adjacent property owners and holders of liens, mortgages, easements or other rights in the subject property are notified of these hearings.

The Land Use staff, Planning Commission, and County Commissioners value comments from individuals and referral agencies. Please check the appropriate response below or send a letter. Late responses will be reviewed as the process permits; all comments will be made part of the public record and given to the applicant. Only a portion of the submitted documents may have been enclosed; you are welcome to review the entire file at the Land Use Department, 13th and Spruce, Boulder, and on-line at http://www.bouldercounty.org/live/property/pages/dockets.aspx. If you have any questions regarding this application, please contact the Land Use Department office at (303) 441-3930 or via email at hhippely@bouldercounty.org .

Please return responses to the above address by **April 29, 2011.**

_____ We have reviewed the proposal and have no conflicts.

__X__ Letter is enclosed.

Signed Marc Gelshman PRINTED Name MARC GELSHMAN

Agency or Address City of Boulder Open Space + Mountain Parks

G:\DOCKETS\SI- Activities of State Interest\SI-2011\SI-11-0001 SWSP\0001REF.DOC