

## Roaring Fork East Neighborhood Master Plan Survey

August 8th , 2003

As you now know, Pitkin County is mandated by law to implement Master Plans of all areas in Pitkin County by January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2004. A list of concerns was sent to all residents, landowners, and renters in the RFEN. We received 24 written responses which represent 86 people. Their responses to the questions are shown below. I have tried to reach those who couldn't respond in writing by phone and will indicate on the last page any special interest or comments from those I could reach.

Many of the residents and landowners of our area would also like to have a neighborhood caucus. This would be a way for all of us to be able to present our concerns to the County and a means for the County to respond to us. 23 of 32 responses signed the first page of this document indicating that they would be interested in being a part of this Caucus.

I'm going to summarize many of the responses to the questions as best I can for those who don't wish to go over the responses to the individual questions in detail. It's interesting to note that there was a large consensus in most of responses.

1. Most people feel that Highway 82 needs some improvement, both in the widening of the now almost non-existent shoulders for the safety of bike riders and/or in the construction of a separate bike path in addition to the existing gravel path that is better for walking or mountain bikes. Speeding is also a concern and it was suggested that additional signs be installed to warn of hidden driveways around curves but the notion of installing speed bumps was rejected as not possible. Only about 1/3 of the respondents felt that they would use a call-up bus service to town and back.
2. Preservation of rural quality, open lands, and environmental quality were most highly valued and desired. House size, sewer, and affordable housing were at the bottom of the list.
3. Houses larger than 5,750 square feet were felt to be both logical and desirable given that we are the lowest density neighborhood in the County. Both a TDR system or a vacating of development rights of a piece of land by an owner wishing to transfer the square footage to another lot in the area were deemed desirable. An interesting take on larger houses that I have never heard before was that larger houses are usually owned by people who are rarely here and impact the environment far less than family-affordable housing which generally has more people, cars, and activity.

1. State Highway 82 is in need of safety improvements, i.e., guard rails, widening, improved shoulders, emergency telephone, etc.

Response :  
strongly support- 9  
mildly support- 15  
mildly oppose- 4  
strongly oppose-4

Consensus:  
Support 3 to 1

comments: Guard rails and widening of shoulders would be OK but I strongly oppose any widening of the ROW or any increase in vehicle speeds; Widen "The Narrows"; Recommendation for improved shoulders off the highway and a road-bike lane for safety; Improvements yes, four-lane no!!

2. I would support an on-road bicycle/slash pedestrian path constructed within the existing state highway right-of-way on Highway 82 from Aspen to Difficult Campground.

Response :  
strongly support-13  
mildly support- 8  
mildly oppose-1  
strongly oppose -9

Consensus:  
Support 2 to 1

comments: We need a trail for road bikes since they don't use the existing trail!; Guard rails and widening of shoulders would be OK but I strongly oppose any widening of the ROW or any increase in vehicle speeds; The off road soft path, The East Aspen Trail, will be finished soon up to Difficult. But the street bikes can't and don't use it. We need CDOT to widen the Highway 82 shoulders.

3. If a dial-up bus service were available from Aspen to Difficult Campground, how often would you or your family or your employees use it?

Response:  
Number of times per day? 12 questionnaires would not use at all;  
Number of times per week? 12 questionnaires would use 3-6 times per week;  
3 questionnaires would use 10 to 25 times per week.

4. Please rank the following issues that you think will be facing the Roaring Fork East area during the next five (5) years.

We received 31 responses. The highest possible score per item is 155, representing an aggregate number.

7. The limit on house size in Pitkin County is 5,750 square feet unless a TDR is purchased to obtain more square footage. Would you support a house size larger than 5,750 square feet if the larger home was accompanied by a commitment by the landowner to preserve additional property as working agricultural land or undeveloped open space in perpetuity?

Response :  
strongly support-11  
mildly support- 15  
no opinion-1  
mildly oppose -2  
strongly oppose- 4

Consensus:  
4 to 1 support

comments: Working agricultural land is gone forever but undeveloped open space is a good thing; Larger houses are usually owned by people who are rarely here and impact the environment far less than family/affordable housing which NEVER seems to be enough. Why not call it what it is – subsidized housing !

8. Caretaker units will result in increased housing density and traffic volume. Would you support the concept of caretaker units for homes in the Roaring Fork East Neighborhood?

Response :  
strongly support:8  
mildly support -12  
mildly oppose-4  
strongly oppose -6

Consensus:  
2 to 1 support

comments: It will be nothing compared to downtown core traffic; NOT as a requirement; Site review should be necessary.

9. Should future residential development be limited to single family dwelling units?

Response :  
strongly support- 20  
mildly support -8  
no opinion-2  
mildly oppose-1  
strongly oppose-1

Consensus:  
9 to 1 support

comments: Does the County know how many bandit units already exist?

10. Would you support the implementation of a TDR (transfer of development rights) program allowing property owners the option of selling and transferring the development rights from their parcel to another property inside or outside the Roaring Fork East Neighborhood?

13. Would you support limited small-scaled home-based cottage businesses in the RFEN?

<b>Response :</b>	<b>Consensus:</b>
strongly support-6	2 to 1 oppose
mildly support -5	
no opinion-1	
mildly oppose-14	
strongly oppose-6	

comment: They already exist, i.e. Stouffer, Lee Pardee, Rod Jacobs, Jimmy Hunting, Bob Lewis, Kevin Cassidy; There should be no commercial and no additional educational facilities.

14. Should additional campgrounds be allowed within the RFEN?

<b>Response :</b>	<b>Consensus:</b>
mildly support -1	30 to 1 oppose
mildly oppose-17	
strongly oppose -14	

comment: Where does the environmental impact end?!; The air pollution from campfires and traffic at Difficult Campground is already bad and the air flow after dark is west, towards RFEN.

15. Should existing campgrounds be expanded beyond their existing boundaries?

<b>Response :</b>	<b>Consensus:</b>
strongly support:1	9 to 1 oppose
mildly support-2	
mildly oppose-8	
strongly oppose - 21	

comment: Those against were so mainly because of increased environmental impact.

16. The current level of access to recreational areas in the RFEN meets your and/or your families needs for the next 10 years?

<b>Response :</b>	<b>Consensus:</b>
strongly support-16	100% support
mildly support -14	
no opinion-1	

comment: Difficult Creek to Gold Hill would be nice but it is not going to happen; The USFS doesn't maintain its existing trails.

20. Below is a list of incentives that could be used by developers or property owners for such things as reduced processing time or fees in the land-use process?

The highest aggregate score possible is 9 times the 28 responses we received which would be 252.

1. Reduces visual impacts of development- 1<sup>st</sup> place with 196/252 although one respondent commented that you expect to see houses in residential areas!
2. Avoids or enhances wildlife habitat-2<sup>nd</sup> place with 195/252
3. Reduces noise pollution-3<sup>rd</sup> place with 160/252 although most thought this was not currently a big problem in RFEN.
4. Supports green building- 4<sup>th</sup> place with 158/252
5. Reduces light pollution-5<sup>th</sup> place with 155/252 although also thought to be not currently a big problem in RFEN.
6. Reduces energy consumption – 6<sup>th</sup> place with 153/252
7. Provides affordable housing- last place! 54/252

21. Should the RF River be monitored for potential water quality impacts by septic systems and other pollution sources?

Response :  
strongly support – 9  
mildly support-15  
no opinion-5  
mildly oppose – 3

Consensus:  
7 to 1 support

comments: Septic systems, especially older or inefficient ones should be monitored; Of course it is a good thing and is already done below Aspen. Is it not already monitored above Aspen?; comment: Older septic systems in the flood plain are a problem as well as cabins without any septic system.

22. To insure that all traffic operates at moderate and safe speeds, suitably designed speed dips and/or bumps should be installed with suitable signage if necessary?

Response :  
no response-1  
strongly support - 5  
mildly support-4  
mildly oppose- 1  
no opinion:10  
strongly oppose - 10

Consensus:  
split 50-/50

comment: It doesn't seem necessary although better signage re hidden driveways is sorely needed, especially in curved road areas; Where would you put it on Hwy 82. It is not appropriate; - comment: At Difficult Campground just off 82 and down long entrance road to campsites, the speeding is terrible.

28. Existing fire protection and emergency services are adequate?

Response :  
strongly support-9  
mildly support-6  
no opinion-7  
mildly oppose-8  
strongly oppose - 2

Consensus:  
3 to 2 in support

comments: We need several emergency phones along Highway 82 up to and beyond the gate, presently we are the nearest phone; Timely response from the fire department appears adequate.

29. Presently there is adequate law enforcement?

Response :  
strongly support 10  
mildly support -6  
no opinion - 14  
strongly oppose -1

Consensus:  
15 to 1 support

comments: Timely response from Sheriff's Dept is adequate; We haven't required any more than what we have.

30. In order to preserve the integrity of the night sky and/or conserve energy, should compliance with Pitkin County prohibitions on lighting for new and existing homes and properties be rigorously enforced?

Response :  
strongly support-9  
mildly support-4  
no opinion-2  
mildly oppose-13  
strongly oppose:4

Consensus:  
3 to 2 oppose

comments: It is not an issue until halogen streetlights appear; It's a little late when most houses are already permitted or built. Would this be retroactive?; It is the city lights that dissipate the stars and light up the night sky.

31. Additional public right-of-ways need to be established in order to give or maintain access to public lands?

Response :  
strongly support- 2  
mildly support-3  
no opinion-3  
mildly oppose-3  
strongly oppose - 18

Consensus:  
4 to 1 oppose

Comment: (Hillmuth): It would be helpful to have a parking area near the RFTA bus line. There is a lot of space in the Cresta House area but no allowable parking.

MEMORANDUM OF INTEREST

TO: The Board of County Commissioners  
FROM: Brian Pettet  
Subject: Hunter Creek Road Work  
Date: June 22, 2000

---

The Hunter Creek Task Force presented a maintenance and management plan for the Hunter Creek Valley near the end of last year. The Board of County Commissioners endorsed this plan with the exception of prohibiting motorized traffic on Smuggler Mountain Road and directed the Hunter Creek Task Force to work with a group interested in maintaining motorized access up Smuggler Mountain Road. Staff is ready to move forward with the implementation of the endorsed plan.

#### **Smuggler Mountain Road Compromise**

The Hunter Creek Task Force met with a group that was interested in maintaining motorized access to Smuggler Mountain Road. The groups reached a compromise that allows motorized access this year with the understanding that the area will be evaluated for USFS resource damage and motorized violations. This evaluation will be completed by the USFS in cooperation with Pitkin County. If it is determined that significant damage has taken place and violations are not subsiding then the Hunter Creek Task Force may again recommend to close the road to motorized access above the private property line. Additionally, the USFS will be completing revegetation work on some of the areas that have been disturbed. County Staff will be placing informational signs along Smuggler Mountain Road informing users of the various uses of Smuggler Mountain Road, to encourage courteous road use and to inform motorized users to stay on the road.

#### **2000 Maintenance Work**

Three priorities of the maintenance plan were to correct drainage problems along the lower portion of Hunter Creek Toll Road, convert several old roads to single track trails (currently utilized as trails) and replace the North Hunter Valley Bridge. The following is a description of the work that will be taking place this year in a joint effort between the USFS and the County.

##### *Drainage Correction*

The Hunter Creek Toll road is in need of basic drainage improvements from the North Entrance Gate to just above the Hummingbird Property. Much of this road slopes the opposite way that it should, small berms along the road retain flowing water on the road surface and water bars, constructed to divert water off the road, are no longer functional. The road grading will be completed with a little impact to surrounding vegetation as possible. The preferred platform of this road will be the Rural and Remote Road Standard of 14 feet. While the road surface will be improved, as a result of the drainage work, the intent of the work is to reduce erosion and resource damage. This work should be completed mid-July. This timing will allow the road surface to "heal" prior to vehicular traffic from hunters actively pursuing big game in the fall.

Additionally, just above the Hummingbird Property there is a significant low area in the road that is consistently saturated and causes vehicles and bicycles to maneuver into vegetation surrounding the hole. As part of the drainage correction, the road will be bedded with large rocks that will allow flowing water to pass over the road and will carry vehicles and bikes without causing degradation of the road and will