

TOWN OF BRECKENRIDGE
OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMISSION
Monday, June 15, 2009
ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE ROOM, BRECKENRIDGE TOWN HALL
150 Ski Hill Road

3:30 Site visit to Culbreath Claims
 Meet at Tiger Dredge Trailhead with mountain bike

5:30 Call to Order, Roll Call

5:35 Discussion/approval of Minutes – May 18, 2009

5:40 Discussion/approval of Agenda

5:45 Public Comment (Non-Agenda Items)

5:50 Staff Summary

- Golden Horseshoe Forest Health evaluation

6:15 Open Space and Trails

- Joint BOSAC/Town Council meeting agenda items
- Joint BOSAC/OSAC meeting agenda items

8:00 Commissioner Issues

8:15 Adjourn

For further information, please contact the Open Space and Trails Program at 547.3110 (Heide) or 547.3155 (Scott).

Memorandum

To: Breckenridge Open Space Advisory Commission
From: Heide Andersen, Open Space and Trails Planner III
Mark Truckey, Asst. Director of Community Development
Scott Reid, Open Space and Trails Planner II
Re: June 15, 2009 meeting

Staff Summary

Golden Horseshoe Forest Health evaluation

Staff has been coordinating with the County and Forest Service staff on forest management in the Golden Horseshoe. The first task initiated (collaboratively with Summit County Government and the Red, White and Blue Fire District) was to hire a company to collect LIDAR data for the Golden Horseshoe area within our jurisdiction. (LIDAR stands for Light Detection and Ranging, and is a remote sensing technology that gathers highly accurate information about topography, canopy cover and heights, landforms, etc. This information can then be used to extrapolate species composition and distribution.) The far eastern portion of the Golden Horseshoe is predominantly National Forest lands and has been excluded from the LIDAR data collection.

Once the LIDAR data has been collected and analyzed, Eric Petterson from Rocky Mountain Ecological Services will use the information to develop a forest health and management plan for all Town and County managed properties in the Golden Horseshoe. This information will then be used to assist with the similar evaluation being performed by the USFS on National Forest lands. Hopefully, the two plans will be combined to work in consort to improve the overall forest health in the Golden Horseshoe. Any conclusions or recommended actions from these plans will not be implemented until the 2010 field season at the earliest. The Town/County Golden Horseshoe Forest Health evaluation and plan will likely be completed by fall, 2009.

Open Space and Trails

Joint BOSAC/Town Council meeting agenda items

- **Breckenridge as a regionally significant nordic and mountain bike destination area**

At the February retreat, BOSAC discussed various Town documents that set a goal of making Breckenridge a “regionally significant mountain bike and nordic destination,” including the Town of Breckenridge Comprehensive Plan (revised 2008) and the Upper Blue Nordic Master Plan (approved by Council in 2001). Some BOSAC members speculated that this goal has already been attained with regionally and nationally significant races, while others thought that “regionally significant” implied an overnight

stay and questioned whether this goal had really been attained. Most BOSAC members felt that the “regional destination” issue was a marketing policy and was generally a decision for the Town Council to make, whereas BOSAC was most interested in the affects of events, etc., on the open space and trail resources.

At the May 18th meeting, there was a general sentiment that it is BOSAC’s role to focus on the planning and sustainability of our trail system for summer and winter use. Some BOSAC members recommended improvements to trail signage and maintenance before the trail system was widely marketed. Several BOSAC members mentioned that they thought it was really the role of Town Council and the BRC to actively market either the nordic or the mountain bike resources, and that BOSAC’s role was largely ensuring that the trail system is well maintained and signed for all trail users.

Discussion items:

- 1. Does BOSAC believe that it is the Town’s responsibility to help promote or “brand” the Town’s winter and summer trail networks?*
- 2. Does BOSAC believe that the Town trail system is ready to be marketed, either through social networks (internet) or other means (e.g. articles in major magazines or newspapers)? Is there a different level of preparedness when comparing nordic skiing with mountain biking?*
- 3. Does the goal being a “nordic skiing and mountain biking destination” imply a greater level of trail management? If so, how?*
- 4. Should the Town consider marketing to other user groups (e.g. equestrian, trail running, hiking, etc.) to the same extent as nordic skiing and mountain biking?*
- 5. Does BOSAC believe that the documents outlining future summer and winter trail expansion already exist via the Town Trails Plan and the nordic expansion plan developed by Morton Trails?*

• **Acquisition Priorities**

BOSAC did not reach complete consensus during their May 18th discussion regarding the prioritization of open space acquisitions and determining the percentage of Town donation toward joint purchases with the County.

Some BOSAC members thought that a concept of concentric circles could be utilized, with the Town core being the center, where the Town would commit the greatest funds and decreasing according to the distance outward. Others thought that the Open Space Plan was clear enough in the geographic and open space value priorities and that most decisions could be based upon this information. Still other BOSAC members believed that every acquisition should be considered on a case-by-case basis, based on its own merits.

At the end of the discussion, BOSAC agreed that they should use the Open Space Plan for justifying purchases and the Town contributions. They thought that the assessment sheets that were done for BOSAC executive sessions based on the Acquisition Strategy document (included in the packet) should also be provided to Council when an acquisition was under consideration.

Discussion items:

1. *Would BOSAC like to continue utilizing the assessment sheets/Acquisition Strategy document as a way to prioritize purchases and funding?*
2. *Does this Strategy need to be revised to include other concepts, such a concentric circles from the core of Town?*
3. *If not, are there any other factors that need to be included in the evaluation that the assessment sheets and Strategy document do not cover?*

Joint BOSAC/OSAC meeting agenda items

The upcoming joint BOSAC/OSAC meeting is scheduled for 5:30 pm on Monday, July 13th at the BOCC Boardroom in the Summit County Courthouse. The topics on the agenda currently include the following:

- The Summit Huts proposal and the concept of huts on open space properties generally
- The Golden Horseshoe Plan and its approval process
- Forest management and other long-term stewardship of joint properties
- Presentation by Mike Claffey on the Swan River Restoration project

Discussion items:

1. *Does BOSAC agree with these topics for the joint BOSAC/OSAC meeting?*
2. *Are there any other topics that should be included?*

Roll Call

Dennis Kuhn called the May 18, 2009 BOSAC meeting to order at 5:40 pm. Other BOSAC members present included Erin Hunter, Ellen Hollinshead, Dennis Kuhn, Monique Merrill, John Warner (in place of Peter Joyce) and Scott Yule. Staff members present were Heide Andersen, Scott Reid, Peter Grosshuesch and Mark Truckey. Turk Montepare was also present.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes were approved as presented.

Approval of Agenda

An Executive Session was added to the agenda. Walkability was added as a discussion topic.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Staff Summary

Golden Horseshoe Management Plan

Ms. Hollinshead: Will BOSAC have a chance to review this document? How about the members of the GH task force?

Ms. Andersen: We will publically notice discussions with BOSAC regarding that document.

Open Space and Trails

Hiking Concessionaire Proposal

Ski Area Representative (Dale): We were hoping to start a hiking program in 2009 for the public through the ski area. We were requesting use of Cucumber Gulch and the Sawmill Trail on Town property. We understand the eight person limit in Cucumber Gulch. Ten people would use the Sawmill Trail. Funding has not come forth from the ski area (no budgeting) in 2009 but the plan is to operate this program in 2010. We will reapply to BOSAC for permission next year.

Tim Berry Presentation

Town Attorney Tim Berry presented important legal considerations for BOSAC and Town staff. He outlined the requirements of the Colorado Open Meeting Act (COMA). The critical principle is that no meetings should be conducted in secret. Three or more BOSAC members meeting to discuss public business must be publically noticed in advance and open to the public. Minutes must be kept. Executive Session is a secret meeting. There are rules to holding those meetings. There are specific reasons for holding an Executive Session and a process for holding them. Acquisition of property is one such reason, as are matters for formulating strategy for negotiation. BOSAC cannot hold actual negotiation in Executive Session, but can prepare for one. Consulting with an attorney is also allowable in an Executive Session. The process for entering into Executive Session is clear, and only the subject at hand may be discussed in Executive Session. I recommend that we record Executive Session in order to ensure you stay on topic. A member must move to go into Executive Session, a second must be stated, then voted on. The chairman should then inform the public that BOSAC is entering into Executive Session for what portion of the COMA law applies. I urge you to be specific in stating that you are discussing a property acquisition in a given area. You also need to have a two-thirds quorum,

then a motion and second to come out of Executive Session. What is said in Executive Session is confidential.

Email is also covered under open meeting law. If three members of BOSAC were discussing public business via email, then the email would be subject to public viewing and disclosure. Beware when you send emails regarding public business. Personal computers could be investigated if email correspondence was being brought into question.

Conflicts of interest: follow the money. If there is a financial connection for an individual (or any of their family members) on BOSAC, they should remove themselves. That decision rests with the group, not the individual. The Board, not the individual, dictates whether a conflict exists. These discussions and decisions must be public. Disclose. Abstain. Refrain from attempting to influence the Board on the issue in which you have a conflict. Physically leaving the room is my recommendation. It is inappropriate in my opinion to speak as a “member of the public” regarding a matter in which you have a conflict of interest. Disclosing the conflict at the beginning allows for a healthy resolution to the issue. The greatest risk is not disclosing your conflict of interest.

Mr. Kuhn: Working for the ski resort, Scott and I may have some potential conflicts. Should we just disclose it?

Mr. Berry: It would make sense to disclose, and the measure is to consider whether the action has a substantial financial impact on your employer.

Ms. Hollinshead: If we have an emotional issue, can we ask individuals to leave the audience to discuss the topic in Executive Session.

Mr. Berry: Public business should be discussed in public. You need to look at the three reasons for entering into Executive Session. I would recommend that discussion occur in public.

Meeting Date Change

BOSAC agreed to proceed with the meeting date change to the third Monday of each month.

Vice Chair

Jeff Cospolich was unanimously elected as the vice chair.

Joint Town Council/BOSAC meeting agenda items

Ms. Andersen: So far, we have two items on the joint agenda: Marketing of trails for Nordic skiing and mountain bike use. Splitting costs of acquisitions with the County and how we determine that split. The Open Space Plan outlines many of the open space qualities that we seek for acquisition and protection.

Dr. Warner: Should we go forward on a case-by-case basis or have some standards for acquisition and joint expenditures?

Mr. Kuhn: We have a great partner in Summit County. Perhaps a concentric circles concept works. In addition to that, we could also be flexible within that framework.

Mr. Grosshuesch: If it helps complete a project that we have already started, that would be grounds for increasing the percentage of cash infusion.

Mr. Montepare: The County is willing to always ask for the 50/50 split, but it is also cognizant of Town budget limitations and goals to protect portions of the Upper Blue Basin. There are no hard feelings here. Try to stay generic, but keep the qualifiers in there.

Ms. Hollinshead: I am slightly uncomfortable with the concentric circles. I think Breckenridge starts at Hoosier Pass. I'd be more comfortable with identified regions.

Dr. Warner: I would ask BOSAC come to the joint meeting with a plan in place and your thoughts in order. I will ask Council to think about ahead of time as well so we can reach a conclusion on June 9th at the joint meeting. Or, perhaps we move the date of the joint meeting to allow Council and BOSAC more time to consider this concept.

Mr. Montepare: I will also commit to having an OSAC representative there to discuss acquisitions.

Mr. Cospolich: I think it should be vaguer than concentric circles. It is clear in the plan which qualities we seek to protect.

Mr. Yule: Regions are defined in our plan already. Stick to the plan.

Ms. Hunter: The plan is clear enough.

Ms. Merrill: I like the regions, but I think it will still be a case-by-case basis.

Dr. Warner: It might help the process if BOSAC provided percentage share based on the values outlined in the Open Space Plan. It would help the process for BOSAC to justify the decision via the plan information.

Mr. Grosshuesch: The joint purchases have management implications that also need to be considered.

BOSAC agreed to use the Open Space plan for justifying purchases and to provide rationale to Council as to why the acquisition recommendation was made.

Marketing of Mountain Biking and Nordic Skiing

Ms. Hunter: I would defer to Council to determine the degree of marketing for mountain biking and Nordic skiing.

Dr. Warner: This version of the Council has never defined how they want to market the backcountry area. Once Council makes this determination, BOSAC needs to work within that

context. We are concerned about the sustainability of the trails. The Council needs to have a vision for preserving and marketing the backcountry trails.

Ms. Hunter: Our job is to take care of the trails.

Ms. Andersen: The Comprehensive Plan does set forth a goal of the Town being a regionally significant mountain bike and Nordic skiing destination.

Mr. Kuhn: I think BOSAC should give their opinion to Council to assist with the decision.

Dr. Warner: It applies to signage and maintenance. Congestion is also a consideration. Having a joint discussion will help us moving forward.

Mr. Cospolich: Marketing can be very cheap if done using social networking tools. The past discussion pertained to Golden Horseshoe, which is not ready for a large number of uses. There are many ways for us to market this place, and I think we should, but we need to be creative in how we get the word out. We are regionally significant. The races are just a small part of the audience.

Mr. Yule: I would like some definition on the building and financing of new trails: Nordic and mountain bike. We need to know if there is support for continuing to grow the network.

Dr. Warner: There are costs to increase use in terms of increased maintenance costs. What level of backcountry development is appropriate for our community? We need to make sure we can maintain the trails. What improvements can we make to get the biggest bang for our buck?

Ms. Merrill: What are we doing with what we have? The trails need to be better marked.

Ms. Hunter: Can we take care of what we already have? How will other user groups feel? We represent equestrians and hikers as well.

Mr. Zobbe: There is new energy and blood in the SFTS that will hopefully address some of the maintenance concerns.

Ms. Hollinshead: We don't have enough signs and we are too premature. Use will grow without the marketing.

Ms. Merrill: Our trail system is unique and excellent. If you market it, you have to meet a higher standard.

Ms. Andersen: IMBA is potentially interested in making Summit County a "Ride Center". Would BOSAC be supportive of this concept?

Mr. Cospolich: We should jump on this opportunity. We should use first person media. This place is marketing itself. We need to proactively craft the message and address our sustainability issues as needed.

BOSAC agreed to try to move the joint meeting date to June 23rd and be ready to discuss these two important topics with Council.

East Adams Trail

Mr. Reid outlined the East Adams Trail proposal.

Mr. Yule: I am skeptical about building a trail to connect to a social trail. We should keep it on the books for consideration in future years.

Mr. Cospolich: I think connections are important, but need to deal with this in the future. Not this year, though.

Ms. Hollinshead: The more trails, the better. I would like to look into legalizing the social trail. \$5000 seems a little high, though. Maybe look at this at the end of the season. I would like to look at it again in the fall to see if we have money left.

Ms. Hunter: It does not seem like the highest priority. Wait until fall.

Mr. Kuhn: We need to make the connection to Gold Flake to make it a real connection out of town. Postpone this until a better connection can be made. We already have two connections out of town.

Huts on Open Space Discussion

Ms. Andersen: BOSAC requested a philosophical discussion about the use of huts on open space.

Mr. Kuhn: It is identified in the open space plan as appropriate.

Dr. Warner: I am on the Summit Huts Board, as a full disclosure.

BOSAC agreed to let Dr. Warner remain and participate in this discussion.

Mr. Cospolich: This is an appropriate use of open space.

Ms. Hollinshead: We need to look at the open space values of the area, such as wildlife habitat and use. The site itself should be considered. Hut size should be small on open space.

Mr. Yule: I think the plan opens the door and dictates the use. Parking and external impacts should be considered.

Ms. Hunter: The plan speaks for itself. I think it might be more appropriate on National Forest lands, though.

Ms. Merrill: This may make more sense on National Forest. There are many considerations: wildlife, parking, etc. We need to think about impacts. I agree with Erin.

Dr. Warner: Social issues should be addressed and the hut should reflect open space values. It is an appropriate use on open space lands. I think this is the USFS putting this ball in our court.

Mr. Zobbe: A joint discussion with OSAC would be helpful.

Dr. Warner: Summit Huts is offering to help take care of the parking issues at Lincoln Townsite. This is a project that is out and in the open for the public.

Ms. Hollinshead: How was this site selected?

Mr. Zobbe: We went through a thorough examination of potential hut locations in the Upper Blue. The USFS told us to exhaust all other private options on private land first. If this gets denied by OSAC and BOSAC, we will move to plan D, which is undetermined at this point.

Mr. Kuhn: I have no problem conceptually with the hut location. However, I would recommend a joint discussion with OSAC first.

Workplan Revisions

Mr. Reid outlined potential changes to the work plan.

BOSAC was supportive of the workplan revisions, provided that the remainder of the workplan and trails projects can still get completed.

Commissioner Issues

Mr. Cospolich: What is staff's philosophy regarding repairing seasonal trail issues like the bridge on the Upper Flume Trail and the wet area on the Middle Flume. (Staff's philosophy is to repair things once and not have to return to repair it, even it is a seasonal issue.)

Ms. Hollinshead: The trail up from French Gulch clubhouse to Wellington Road: will it stay there? (That trail is within the Corkscrew subdivision and the trail in the utility easement will not be retained. Corkscrew is responsible for building and conveying the other trails in the area.)

Mr. Kuhn: I would prefer the packets to contain questions for BOSAC to consider. Also, can we improve the ventilation in this room?

Dr. Warner presented a plaque to Matt Stais for his service to BOSAC. BOSAC thanked Mr. Stais for his time and hard work dedicated to BOSAC.

Mr. Truckey presented on Dan Burden's walkability audit for the Town and requested that BOSAC members attend this important presentation on Jun 8th and 12th.

Executive Session

Ms. Hunter motioned to enter into Executive Session about a property acquisition in the Golden Horseshoe and Dr. Warner seconded the motion. BOSAC unanimously agreed to enter into Executive Session at 8:21 pm to discuss property acquisition and negotiations.

Mr. Cospolich motioned to come out of Executive Session and Dr. Warner seconded. BOSAC came out of Executive Session at 8:45 pm.

Next Meeting

The next regularly scheduled BOSAC meeting is scheduled for 5:30 pm on June 15, 2009 in the Administrative Conference Room. BOSAC has proposed to meet jointly with Town Council on June 23, 2009 at 6:00 pm in Council Chambers. BOSAC has also requested a site visit above Galena Gulch prior to the next BOSAC meeting.

Mr. Cospolich motioned to adjourn the meeting and Ms. Hollinshead seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Dennis Kuhn, Chair

Acquisition Strategy for the Town of Breckenridge Open Space Fund

- I. ***Prioritized values*** used to assess and select land for open space acquisition or other form of protection:
 - A. Natural Resources
 1. Environmentally sensitive areas
 - a. wetlands
 - b. perennial waterways, streams and drainages
 - c. riparian zones
 - d. alpine zones
 - e. view corridors or backdrops
 - f. steep slopes
 - g. buffers to above-described environmentally sensitive areas
 - h. unique landforms, which if developed would create adverse environmental impacts
 - i. threatened or endangered plant communities
 2. Wildlife habitat
 - a. protection of important habitat, for example, that which enhances the health of the animal community and promotes biodiversity
 - b. enlargement of important habitat areas through preservation of adjacent tracts
 - c. preservation of wetland and riparian corridors essential as wildlife habitat
 - d. protection of rare and unique landscape elements
 - e. connections between wildlife habitat parcels, including corridors for movement
 - f. maintenance of significant ecological processes
 - g. contributions to the regional survival of rare species through local habitat protection
 - h. balance of public recreation with wildlife habitat needs
 - i. identification of more critical wildlife habitat areas, and development of preservation goals to preserve
 - j. maintenance of large, intact patches of native vegetation by preventing fragmentation
 - B. Recreational Land
 1. Access points
 - a. Property that provides access to public lands and enhances the recreational experience
 - b. Property that enhances the public's opportunity to access waterways
 2. Trails
 - a. Land or easements providing for public use of existing trails (a priority in the Trails Plan)

- b. Land or easements providing for proposed trails listed as a priority in the Trails Plan
 - c. Land out of Town for trails deemed important to Town residents
 - d. Property providing access and linkage to existing and proposed trails
 - e. Property providing scenic buffers, corridors and view points for trail systems.
3. Trailheads
- C. Other Lands
1. Gateway (from Dillon Reservoir south and from south of Breckenridge to the Town of Blue River)
 - a. Open lands adjacent to the highway corridor that create buffers from development as well as boundaries separating communities
 - b. Hillsides and ridge lines highly visible from the highway and bike path
 - c. Land that permits views from the highway and repath of unique or scenic features, such as mountain views and views of the ski area
 - d. Land deemed significant for its scenic quality, such as views of rivers and unique geologic formations
 - e. Entry parcels that can be landscaped and otherwise improved to enhance the entrance to Town
 2. Scenic
 - a. Highly visible hillsides, ridgelines and valley floors providing definition to the valley
 - b. Unique geologic features
 - c. Outstanding and exemplary native vegetation
 - d. Mining remnants and related landforms
 - e. Lands allowing dramatic views of a higher mountain backdrop
 - f. Overlook parcels providing views of a scenic land and communities
 3. Backcountry areas that surround Breckenridge that represent the natural environment of the Upper Blue Basin
 4. Historical lands that meet other priority land values. Lands with historic values or resources may be candidates for open space acquisition, but only if they meet other priority land conservation values listed above.
 5. Urban buffer – recreational parcels.
 - a. Parcels located within or near development providing relief from development, which are both scenic and have potential to become small parks
 - b. Parcels that contain unique vegetation or scenery

- c. Parcels that provide destination, passive recreation close to homes or businesses
- d. Parcels adjacent to other open space or recreational parcels that enlarge and improve the existing values
- e. Development buffers.

II. ***Specific geographic areas*** and resource types that are priorities for the Open Space Program:

A. Golden Horseshoe Area

- 1. West of Gold Run Gulch/Gibson Gulch
 - a. Properties in Western Bench
 - b. Formalization of access for system routes
- 2. East of Gold Run Gulch/Gibson Gulch
 - a. Critical inholdings
 - b. Formalization of access for system routes
 - c. Outstanding partial interests

B. Cucumber Gulch Preserve – any additional parcels in the Cucumber Gulch area that further protect the sensitive wetland area

C. Highway 9 Scenic Corridor – the Highway 9 corridor should be kept as scenic as possible to protect important views. Another important part of the view from the highway is the Blue River.

D. Bald Mountain

- 1. Outstanding partial interests
- 2. Critical inholdings, with potential to exchange to USFS
- 3. Ridge line

E. Little Mountain – the scenic views and trails in this area should be protected.

F. River and stream habitat – land or easements to continue the Blue River restoration and enhance recreational use

G. Neighborhood Open Space – land for small passive recreational parcels and parks close to Town

H. Lands or easements that will implement the Trails Plan

I. Partnership lands

- 1. USFS trade parcels
- 2. Joint purchases with Summit County
- 3. Promotion of Upper Blue TDR Program

Summary of open space acquisition opportunities going to BOSAC on September 8, 2008:

Raven Lode

Acreage: 5.16 acres (1.46 acres in Summit County)
Cost/acre: \$3000
Total cost: \$15,480.00
Cost to TOB: \$7,740.00

Prioritized values:

- A. Natural Resources:
 - 1. Environmentally sensitive areas: d. alpine zones
 - 2. Wildlife: b. enlargement of important habitat areas through preservation of adjacent tracts (Canada lynx)

- C. Other lands:
 - 1. b. Hillsides and ridge lines highly visible from the highway and bike path (along Continental Divide, and Boreas Pass Road/Section House)
 - 3. Backcountry areas that surround Breckenridge that represent the natural environment of the Upper Blue Basin

Prioritized geographic areas:

- I. Partnership lands:
 - 1. Possible USFS trade parcel
 - 2. Joint purchases with Summit County
 - 3. TDR potential

Hardwick/Vanderbilt Claim

Acreage: 5.08 acres
Cost/acre: OSAC approved up to \$7000
Total cost: \$35,560
Cost to TOB: \$17,780

Prioritized values:

- A. Natural Resources:
 - 1. Environmentally sensitive areas: f. steep slopes
- B. Recreational Land:
 - 1. Property that provides access to public lands and enhances the recreational experience (*possibly* location of existing or future Wheeler Trail?)
- C. Other lands:
 - 1. b. Hillsides and ridge lines highly visible from the highway and bike path (along Continental Divide, and Boreas Pass Road/Section House)

- 3. Backcountry areas that surround Breckenridge that represent the natural environment of the Upper Blue Basin

Prioritized geographic areas:

- I. Partnership lands:
 - 1. Possible USFS trade parcel
 - 2. Joint purchases with Summit County
 - 3. TDR potential

McQuerary Parcels

Acreage: 10.2 acres
 Cost/acre: \$12,621 (OSAC offer: \$11,000)
 Total cost: \$128,734 (OSAC offer: \$112,200) ... most recent offer: \$120,000 (\$11,765/ac)
 Cost to TOB: \$64,367 (OSAC offer: \$56,100) ... TOB: \$60,000

Prioritized values:

- A. Natural Resources:
 - 1. Environmentally sensitive areas: e. view corridors or backdrops
- C. Other lands:
 - 1. b. Hillsides and ridge lines highly visible from the highway and bike path (Culbreath Road and site visible from Hwy 9)
 - 2. f. Overlook parcels providing views of scenic lands or communities
 - 3. Backcountry areas that surround Breckenridge that represent the natural environment of the Upper Blue Basin

Prioritized geographic areas:

- A. Golden Horseshoe: 2. a. critical inholdings east of Gold Run Gulch/Gibson Gulch