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A Preface from the Committee

Quality of life is a difficult thing to measure. In Superior, citizens have voted that Open Space is an important aspect of the quality of life desired. Unfortunately, too many towns on the Front Range waited until development took away that important quality. The value Open Space adds to Superior also includes intangible qualities such as the pleasure and satisfaction we have when we see mountains that have not been eclipsed by houses, condos, office buildings and retail stores. How do you measure the wonder we feel when we see the majesty of those mountains or the beauty of eagles and hawks surfing summer thermals over our homes here in Superior?

The 2004 survey results of our citizens completed by Greenplay showed a high concern for preserving open space, quality of life, and property values. Property values remain high in areas where open space is preserved. Through the survey, citizens rated the need for existing open spaces as well as purchasing additional parcels as one of the highest priorities of the Town. Sixty-seven percent (67%) of respondent households indicated a need for protecting wildlife and 68% of households indicated a need for observing wildlife. Preserving the environment/open space was found to be “very important” or “somewhat important” by 93%, and 91% gave the same ratings for providing natural areas for wildlife and plants. Forty percent (40%) of resident households placed preserving the environment/open space in their top three choices for most important functions for the Town to provide. As a result of the passage of the Open Space Tax, the Town of Superior now has the ability and duty to preserve those important qualities by protecting areas of undeveloped land for natural open space.

Superior’s economic prosperity and quality of life is directly tied to how well we manage growth and protect the environment. And there is nothing more important we can do in this regard than preserve and protect open space. The return on investment provided by open space is one that greatly exceeds the price paid, and it continues to add value to those who live, work and visit here. An active open space acquisition program would address all of these concerns.
Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide a review of currently undeveloped properties within the Town of Superior, and offer recommendations to the Mayor, Board of Trustees, and Planning Commission on those properties that have potential value to the Town as Undeveloped Open Space.

In addition, these recommendations are being provided in order to assist with the Town of Superior PROST Master Plan Recommendation process currently underway. The recommendations from the OSAC for all undeveloped properties can be found on page 22 of this report.

This Summary Report and Recommendations are meant as a living document. It provides a snapshot at this point in time and we recommend this document be updated on a regular basis.


The Committee is charged with the tasks of examining and making recommendations to the Board of Trustees for the preservation of lands in the Town for open space purposes considering the following factors:

A. The areas appropriate for open space designation as wildlife habitats, trails or other similar purposes;
B. The financial effect to the Town of removing lands from producing sales, use and property tax and other revenues to the Town;
C. The cost to purchase and maintain the lands;
D. Sources of funding of the purchase of such lands;
E. The community services and amenities that will be provided by the purchase by the Town of such lands; and
F. How the County and City of Boulder open space surrounding the Town can be accessed for the benefit of the public that purchased such open space.

This report addresses the above areas, with the exception of comprehensive financial information not yet available to the Town Board and Planning Commission, and actual costs of acquiring specific parcels. Additional information will be provided to the Mayor, Town Board, and Planning Commission by the Open Space Advisory Committee as such information becomes available, and as additional market research on specific parcels is completed.

In addition, this report offers recommendations on partial parcel acquisition of all currently undeveloped properties within the Town that have potential value as open space, as a guideline for meeting the required open space allotments for each of those properties, if developed.
History

In 2000 and 2001 the citizens of the Town of Superior put forth an effort to start an Open Space program. This effort ultimately led to the formation of the Open Space Advisory Committee in April of 2001.

In July of 2001 the OSAC completed the first draft of the Summary Report and Recommendations and presented the report to the Planning Commission and Town Board of Trustees. The report was revised in October of 2001. This report was not adopted.

In November of 2001 the citizens passed a Sales Tax ballot authorizing a 0.3% sales tax for the acquisition and maintenance of Open Space.

In early 2002 the definitions of Natural Open Space and Developed Open Space presented in the Open Space Summary Report and Recommendations were incorporated in the Comprehensive Plan Update. The definitions are included in Appendix A of this document.

In February 2003, the Town of Superior contracted with Smith Environmental, Inc. to perform a wildlife assessment of 18 of the undeveloped properties in Superior.

In mid 2003, in anticipation of the dissolution of the Superior Metropolitan Districts, the Town utilized and converted the Community Services Department to become the Town’s Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Department and hired its first director.

In February 2004 Resolution R-13, Series 2004 was passed by the Town Board of Trustees prioritizing the expenditures of the revenues from the Open Space sales tax. The resolution is included in its entirety in Appendix B of this document.

Approach and Methodology

Members of the Open Space Advisory Committee (OSAC or “the Committee”) were selected to represent all geographic areas within the Town of Superior. The Town Board felt that such representation on the Committee would maximize the opportunity for property review and recommendations that represent the views of all neighborhoods within the Town of Superior. Committee members have spent time walking and/or viewing each of the currently undeveloped parcels to become familiar with the landscape, topography, and attributes of each property as well as studied the Smith Environmental Wildlife Survey to understand the value each parcel holds as relates to wildlife and the overall environmental value to the town.

A map showing the location of these parcels is included in Appendix C. Nineteen of these parcels, as listed below, have been evaluated by OSAC and the results are presented in this report:
• 76th Street Parcel
• Arsenault
• Biella/Menkick Property
• Bolejack Property
• Horizon’s Parcel
• Lastoka Property
• Level 3 Property
• Madson
• Richmond Property
• Ridge II
• Roger’s Farm
• School Site
• Smith Property
• Spicer-Carlson Property
• Superior Village/Ochsner
• Town Nine
• Verhey Ranch
• Weinstein B Property
• Zaharias Property

Criteria for Evaluation of Properties

In February 2003, the Town of Superior contracted with Smith Environmental, Inc. to perform a wildlife assessment of 18 of the undeveloped properties in Superior. This report, referred to as the Smith Wildlife Survey, describes wildlife habitats, corridors, feeding and hunting areas, migration corridors and identification of species. The information from this survey was incorporated by OSAC in the evaluation process.

In addition to the Smith Environmental report, OSAC has looked at the preliminary findings from the BioBlitz which occurred on June 25 –26, 2004. One hundred scientists spent 24 hours spotting, catching and counting plants, animals and insects on 6,000 acres of open space adjacent to Superior’s southern and southwestern border. The grassland areas are owned by the city of Boulder, Boulder County, Jefferson County, and the U.S. Department of Energy. They found 1,342 different species of insects, plants, birds, mammals and others. The bat and moth teams were rained out, so they are not included in the totals. This additional data verifies the exceptional diversity of life in the high plain grasslands adjacent to land that we may consider for open space purchases.

A tiered approach was used to determine open space attributes and their locations within the Town. The first tier consists of a broad overview of the Town’s open space. The second tier represents a parcel specific analysis.
Tier One Analysis of Parcels

A Tier One analysis was done by Greenplay in conjunction with the Park, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails (PROST) Master Plan. The Tier One analysis of parcels includes two composite maps of the Town: A Tier One Analysis Map and a Geo-Referenced Amenities Standards Program (GRASP) Map. These maps are included in Appendix D.

The Tier One Analysis Map is a composite map derived from an analysis of existing features (attributes) with potential open space benefit within Town boundaries. Each attribute was assigned a numerical value and an area of location where that attribute was present. Attributes were identified and mapped as follows:

- Proximity to Surface Water
- Backdrop, Bluffs, Promontories
- Proximity to Wetlands
- Riparian Overstory
- Major Geologic Hazard Areas
- Coal Creek flood plain
- Nationally Significant Agricultural Lands
- Community Separators

A darker shade on the map indicates that more attributes are present at that location. A review of this map shows that lands with open space potential can be found throughout, although the highest potential is found along drainage ways and on ridge tops. This map does not reflect the relative quality of attributes, only the occurrence of attributes. The Tier Two analysis will be used to take a closer look at specific parcels to determine the quality of open space attributes within those parcels.

A composite GRASP map for the Tier One analysis was prepared showing the current levels of service provided by existing public open space and parks within the Town. Attributes were identified and a score was given to each attribute based upon its value as an open space amenity. A “buffer” was also assigned to each attribute that reflects the geographic area across which the attribute’s values occur. A composite map was produced using all of the attributes:

- trails buffer (1/3 mile either side of alignment)
- parks buffer (1/3 mile around the park parcels)
- city open space and parks property buffer (1/3 mile around the known city owned parcels)
- public schools property buffer (1/3 mile around known school owned parcels)
- proximity to surface water buffer (100’)
- proximity to mapped wetlands buffer (100’)
- proximity to other opportunities buffer (1/4 mile around public properties owned by other municipalities and parks/open space agencies)
- proximity to trailhead (1/3 mile buffer to existing trailheads)
The resulting map gives an indication of the relative benefit provided by the open space system for any given location in town. Darker shades indicate areas with a higher composite benefit from open space amenities. The map shows that open space benefits are distributed in a fairly equitable fashion across town, allowing all residents to receive some benefit within a reasonable proximity to their residence.

**Tier Two Analysis of Parcels**

The Tier Two analysis provides parcel specific information. OSAC determined that a Tier 2 analysis of the undeveloped parcels was needed to identify the attributes present on each parcel to assist in identifying desirable Open Space options for the Town.

Considerable time was spent over several meetings developing a list of Open Space attributes to be used in the Tier Two analysis. In addition Greenplay reviewed the attributes and provided a list of attributes they have used in other Tier Two Analysis’. Their list provided a few key attributes we had not considered, detailed definitions for the different ranking levels and categories to provide a logical grouping of the attributes. OSAC decided on a ranking scale from 0-10, with 10 being High Quality, 5 being Medium Quality and 0 being Low/No Quality. The attribute categories are as follows:

1. Aesthetics
2. Management
3. Passive Use
4. Vegetation
5. Water
6. Wildlife

The Committee worked together to develop the Open Space Advisory Committee Field Observation Workbook to be used for field observations by committee members. The Observation Worksheet which includes the list of categorized attributes is included in this report in Appendix E.

The Tier Two analysis included the recording of observations as well as the collection and recording of other pertinent data. The Committee worked with Town Staff to get current Parcel information. The data is stored in a database developed by Bob McCool to provide information for GIS to Greenplay as well as reports for PROSTAC and the Town of Superior.

OSAC members were assigned a minimum of five parcels to visit and were encouraged to visit as many parcels as possible and rank the relevant attributes. Most OSAC members visited and provided observations for the majority of the parcels.
Many factors were relied upon following the observation and rating of attributes for each of the parcels before making the final recommendations. The following factors were identified to weigh more heavily than others:

- aesthetics of the parcel, meaning the combination of many attributes that were "felt" as one stood on the parcel, or viewed the parcel
- findings of the Smith Environmental wildlife study
- waterways passing through Town providing connectivity and high quality riparian habitat
- cultural and historical areas of interest
- contiguity with existing open space parcels in and outside of Town
- geographic distribution of open space areas throughout the Town

Additionally, the OSAC pursued this task with the following in mind: some parcels that were looked at already have other defined purposes outside of open space purposes.

**Assignment of Attributes and Concerns: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches**

Over the course of a 3 month period 1200 individual observations were made by members of the OSAC. In addition, all OSAC members visited each parcel and recorded their observations, qualifying each attribute from the worksheet.

The Observation Worksheets were turned in to Bob McCool and John Nibarger and entered into the OSAC Parcel Database. Appendix F includes two tables summarizing the observations. The first provides an overview of the average parcel rating by category and the second an overview of the average parcel rating by attribute. Updates will be provided on an ongoing basis as additional observations are made.

Upon completion of the Observations the OSAC met on several occasions to discuss the findings and determine the best approach for presenting the information to the PROSTAC and Town Board. It was agreed that this report would include acquisition recommendations as follows:

- A list of undeveloped parcels that have a high Open Space value and are worthy of acquisition in their entirety
- Recommendations on all undeveloped parcels to include the portions of the parcel that carries the highest Open Space value for the purpose of negotiating the highest quality Open Space when Parcel development has been decided.

**PROST Citizen Survey Results Related to Open Space**

In addition to the observations undertaken by members of the OSAC, the results of the Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails (PROST) master plan process helped guide our process. The PROST master plan process included focus groups, a community meeting, and a statistically valid survey of citizens in the Town.
The focus groups identified the following as important issues with regard to Open Space:

- Need more undeveloped open space
- Need process for developers to follow open space requirements
- Need to follow recommendations from Smith Report and OSAC findings regarding purchases
- Level 3, Verhey, Lastoka, and Ochsner should be purchased for open space
- Spending open space dollars on developed open space
- Open space should be connected

Comments related to natural open space from the community meeting were summarized with the following statement:

Many people feel finding and acquiring open space is a priority within the Town and needs to be the priority of this plan. Partnering sounds like the big key and linking with Boulder County and adjoining areas. Need to clarify whether the Town should center on acquiring open space parcels when they come available, regardless of size, against acquiring large tracts when enough money has been earmarked and saved. Some people do not favor using open space monies for developing recreation purposes. The following survey results indicate a broad support for open space. For example:

- Six of the 10 identified Natural Open Space values had at least two-thirds of respondents rate them as being very important.
- The top most value respondents identified for Natural Open Space was to preserve the scenic views.
- Enhancing property values had the highest percentage of respondents select it as one most important values for the Town of Superior to provide.
- Over 90% of respondents indicated that protecting creek corridors and wetlands and protecting and preserving wildlife was of high importance.

The following represent the survey results in full with regards to the four natural open space questions:
### Q15. Importance of Various Values that Natural Open Space Provides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing scenic views</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing noise, traffic or light pollution</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting creek corridors &amp; wetlands</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving or enhancing wildlife habitat</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating buffers from developed areas</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing property values</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting ridgelines from development</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing for passive use</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing trail linkages</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing large tracts of protected areas</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (July 2004)

### Q16. Most Important Values for the Town’s Natural Open Space Program to Provide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>2nd Most Important</th>
<th>3rd Most Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing property values</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing noise, traffic or light pollution</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving or enhancing wildlife habitat</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting ridgelines from development</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting creek corridors &amp; wetlands</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating buffers from developed areas</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing scenic views</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing for passive use</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing trail linkages</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing large tracts of protected areas</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (July 2004)
Q17. Level of Support for Various Actions the Town of Superior Could Take to Improve the Natural Open Space Program

by percentage of respondents

- Preserve views of the front range: 76% Very Supportive, 19% Somewhat Supportive, 4% Not Sure, 3% Not Supportive
- Protect ridgelines from development: 70% Very Supportive, 22% Somewhat Supportive, 7% Not Sure, 1% Not Supportive
- Protect the Rock Creek & Coal Creek corridors: 66% Very Supportive, 22% Somewhat Supportive, 10% Not Sure, 2% Not Supportive
- Buffer homes from highways: 63% Very Supportive, 24% Somewhat Supportive, 9% Not Sure, 5% Not Supportive
- Buffer Original Town from additional development: 28% Very Supportive, 25% Somewhat Supportive, 28% Not Sure, 20% Not Supportive

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (July 2004)

Q18. Actions Respondents Are Most Willing to Support with Existing Funding Designated for Natural Open Space Program

by percentage of respondents (three choices could be made)

- Preserve views of the front range: 70% Most Supportive, 67% 2nd Most Supportive, 54% 3rd Most Supportive
- Protect ridgelines from development: 67% Most Supportive, 54% 2nd Most Supportive, 50% 3rd Most Supportive
- Buffer homes from highways: 54% Most Supportive, 50% 2nd Most Supportive, 18% 3rd Most Supportive
- Protect the Rock Creek & Coal Creek corridors: 50% Most Supportive, 44% 2nd Most Supportive, 6% 3rd Most Supportive
- Buffer Original Town from additional development: 18% Most Supportive, 14% 2nd Most Supportive, 4% 3rd Most Supportive

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (July 2004)
Furthermore, other survey questions reinforced the importance of Natural Open Space to the citizens of Superior. For example:

- 91% of households said providing natural areas for wildlife and plants space was either very important” or “somewhat important”
- 93% of households said preserving the environment/ open space was either very important” or “somewhat important”
- 95% of respondent households expressed a need for Walking/Biking Trails
Review of Properties

Location, Description, Parcel Status, OSAC Observations, & Smith Report

This section provides details of each undeveloped property within the Town and provides the location of each parcel, a physical description, the status, the notable attributes observed on each parcel by the members of the Open Space Advisory Committee, as well as a summary of information that is provided in great detail in the Smith Environmental, Inc. document titled *Wildlife Survey and Habitat Evaluation for the Town of Superior, Colorado*. This OSAC report is a living document and will be updated as information changes or new information becomes available. Photographs have been included when available. For more information on location and view direction for each photograph please refer to Appendix H: Parcel Photographs.
76th Street Parcel

Location: This property is located at the southwest corner of the intersection of 76th Street and Marshall Road in the northwest portion of town. It borders Boulder County Open Space to the west, and the CDOT property to the north. To the east is the Superior Marketplace and on the south is the development of Sagamore. Five parcels comprise the overall property and total approximately 30 acres.

Description: This property is generally covered by grassy/weedy fields interspersed with private residences, debris piles (the southern half Martinez and Turnbull parcels), and a pond with accompanying wetlands (on the Weihe parcel). There is a horse pasture on the Martinez parcel. The remnants of an old railroad grade are still present adjacent to the western edge of the overall property.

Parcel Status:
- O/S Requirement: 30 %
- Zoning: None
- Development: Sketch plan, Huntsman
- Annexed: No
- Sale Status: Some parcels on market

OSAC Observations: Field observations showed this parcel to have a fairly high buffering potential, fair views, medium air and noise quality, and considerable nighttime light pollution. It is likely to have a low compatibility with adjacent land uses and has little or no historic value. It is a medium sized tract with a small number of mature trees, no surface water, and it is not particularly pristine. It appears to be a somewhat diverse wildlife habitat. This property would probably provide some regional draw for passive use. The picture shown is NW 16; refer to Appendix H for more details.

Smith Wildlife Survey: This property was found to be 43 % mixed grass prairie, 43 % weedy/disturbed, with some urban forest and a few buildings. Many types of small birds were observed along with red tailed hawk. Also noted were prairie dogs and cottontail rabbits.
Arsenault Property

Location: This property is located at the southern terminus of 2nd Avenue and encompasses approximately 14 acres just south of Original Town.

Description: Boulder County Parks and Open Space subleases this property and allows cattle grazing on it. Farmer’s Reservoir Irrigation Company (FRICO) Community Ditch (a concrete-lined irrigation canal) runs along the south boundary of the property.

Parcel Status:
- O/S Requirement: 30%
- Zoning: None
- Development: None
- Annexed: No
- Sale Status: On the market
- Note: Early 2004, owner was offering to sell for open space at $4-$5 per s/f.
- This parcel received unanimous votes from OSAC for total parcel acquisition.

OSAC Observations: Observations showed this parcel to have a fairly high buffering potential, fair air quality, very good views, and medium noise quality and nighttime light pollution. There is good compatibility with adjacent land uses as it is adjacent to the Coal Creek Trail corridor. With its proximity to the mine it has a high historic value. It is a medium sized tract with a small number of mature trees, no surface water, but it is fairly pristine. It is a diverse wildlife habitat and could serve as a wildlife migration corridor. Raptors, coyotes and different types of fox have been observed here. This parcel should have a fair regional draw for passive uses. The picture shown is NW 7; refer to Appendix H for more details.

Smith Wildlife Survey: The survey found the property to be almost completely mixed grass prairie with a few scattered trees. Many types of small birds were observed and of course, prairie dogs and cottontail rabbits.
**Biella/Menkick Property**

**Location:** This property is located east of McCaslin Blvd. and south of US 36 bordering the Spicer-Carlson parcel to the east. This property encompasses approximately 82 acres and is part of the Coal Creek corridor and floodplain area.

**Description:** This property is generally vacant, except for the land south of the recreational trail, which is currently used for cattle grazing. Several irrigation ditches traverse the property. The Town maintains a recreational trail and an ice arena on the north side of the property. For these reasons, the parcel was divided into north and south on the compilation of attributes.

**Parcel Status:**
- O/S Requirement: 30%
- Zoning: PD
- Development: Concept plan pending
- Annexed: Yes
- Sale Status: Contract
- IGA: Staff IGA with Louisville requires 34 acres to be developed as commercial retail.
- Note: Add 6 acres for open space calculations for annexation agreement to preserve Coal Creek drainage.

**OSAC Observations:** Observations showed this parcel to have a fair buffering potential, fair views, poor air and noise quality, and considerable nighttime light pollution. It is adjacent to the Coal Creek Trail System and has historical value as it surrounds the site of the historical Superior Cemetery. It is a large tract with mature trees and surface water in the northern portion of the parcel. Due to the weeds and lack of natural grasses, in general the parcel is not very pristine. It appears to be a somewhat diverse wildlife habitat and it is most likely used as a wildlife migration corridor. This property would probably provide fair regional draw for passive use. The picture shown is NE 9; refer to Appendix H for more details.

**Smith Wildlife Survey:** Survey results found the property to be 92% weedy/disturbed and about 5% riparian forest from where Coal Creek runs through it. Many types of small birds were observed. Also noted were prairie dogs and cottontail rabbits,
**Bolejack Property**

*Location:* The Bolejack Property lies west of McCaslin Blvd. and southeast of the Verhey property. It encompasses approximately 25.5 acres in the southwestern portion of town.

*Description:* The primary uses of this property include private residential, horse pasture, and an industrial equipment repair business.

*Parcel Status:*
- O/S Requirement: 30%
- Zoning: County
- Development: None
- Annexed: No

*OSAC Observations:* Observations showed this parcel to have a fair buffering potential (depending on the status of the Verhey property), good views, and somewhat poor air and noise quality due to its proximity to McCaslin. Nighttime light pollution is moderate. This parcel has no known historic value. It is a medium sized tract with no mature trees. The parcel is primarily grass prairie so it is fairly pristine and a somewhat diverse wildlife habitat. It may be being used by wildlife as a migration corridor but probably would not have a very high regional draw.

*Smith Wildlife Survey:* found the property to be 83% grass prairie with the remainder being buildings, weedy/disturbed ground, and a pond. Many species of small birds were observed along with cottontail rabbits.
**Horizons Parcel**

*Location:* This property lies north of Coalton Road and is bordered to the east by the Flatiron Crossing Mall and to the north and west by the Horizons Apartments. It encompasses approximately 14.75 acres in the eastern portion of town.

*Description:* This site is a weedy vacant lot with a dirt access road, bordered on the north by the Coalton Recreational Trail. The pond on the east side of the property receives minimal fishing use.

*Parcel Status:*
- O/S Requirement: 20 %
- Zoning: PD retail
- Development: Undeveloped
- Annexed: Yes

*OSAC Observations:* Observations showed this parcel to have a fair buffering potential, very good views, but only fair air and noise quality due to its proximity to Coalton. Nighttime light pollution is better than many other parcels. This parcel has no known historic value. It is a medium sized tract. It does contain a couple of areas of surface water and is adjacent to a good-sized lake that is part of the Horizons complex. There are no mature trees and the majority of the parcel is weedy and not at all pristine. It appears to be a somewhat diverse wildlife habitat but is probably not used by wildlife as a migration corridor. It is not likely to have a very high regional draw. The picture shown is NE 8; refer to Appendix H for more details.

*Smith Wildlife Survey:* The Smith report found the property to be 94 % weedy/disturbed. Many species of small birds were observed along with some waterfowl and carp in the ponds. Prairie dogs and cottontail rabbits were noted as well.
Lastoka Property

Location: This property is also located west of McCaslin Blvd. at the southwest corner of the intersection of Coalton Rd. and McCaslin and lies in between the Verhey property and Boulder County Open Space, which includes the Coalton Trail. It encompasses approximately 30 acres in the southwestern portion of town.

Description: This property receives very little human use and retains natural mixed grass prairie characteristics. Rock Creek runs through the property.

Parcel Status:
- O/S Requirement: 25 %
- Zoning: BC
- Development: Several proposals
- Annexed: Unknown
- Sale Status: North 10 acres for sale
- This property received unanimous votes for total parcel acquisition.

OSAC Observations: Observations showed this parcel to have an excellent buffering potential, very good views, but only fair air and noise quality due to its proximity to McCaslin. Nighttime light pollution is better than many other parcels. This parcel has no known historic value. It is a medium sized tract with mature trees along Rock Creek but the majority of the parcel is pristine grass prairie. It has a diverse wildlife habitat and is definitely used by wildlife as a migration corridor. It should have a very high regional draw due to its proximity to Boulder County Open Space. The picture shown is SW 2; refer to Appendix H for more details.

Smith Wildlife Survey: This property is 95 % grass prairie with the remainder being riparian forest and riparian shrub land. Many types of small birds were observed along with great horned owls and red tailed hawks. Waterfowl were seen and cottontail rabbits were noted as well.
**Level 3 Property**

*Location:* This property lies at the southernmost edge of Superior, north of Hwy. 128. It lies between McCaslin Boulevard on the west and Eldorado Boulevard on the east. Its northern edge borders on the south edge of the town’s subdivisions. It encompasses approximately 195 acres.

*Description:* This property is an expanse of steep, gullied mixed grass prairie receiving little human use. A narrow drainage, containing a small cattail wetland (approximately 0.03 acres) trends through the eastern portion of the property. A primitive trail runs from the town’s trails in to the southeast portion of the parcel.

**Parcel Status:**
- O/S Requirement: 79 %
- Zoning: PD
- Development: None
- Annexed: Yes
- Sale Status: On the market
- Note: 116 acres designated open space per agreement with Level III plus 30 % of remaining.
- This parcel received unanimous votes for total parcel acquisition.

*OSAC Observations:* Observations showed this parcel to have a fair buffering potential and good air and noise quality. From this parcel there are excellent views including downtown Denver, Longs Peak, the Continental Divide and the Front Range. This ridgeline is visible throughout Superior. Nighttime light pollution is better than many other parcels. This parcel has no known historic value. It is a very large tract with a medium level of threat to existing resources. It contains no surface water but it does have a small wetland area. There are only a few mature trees and the majority of the parcel is mixed prairie grass and mostly pristine. It has a diverse wildlife habitat and it is very likely used by wildlife as a migration corridor. It has the potential to be a high regional draw and would be ideal for passive use for its ridgeline views. The picture shown is SW 14; refer to Appendix H for more details.

*Smith Wildlife Survey:* The survey found the property to be 96 % mixed grass prairie with some small weedy/disturbed areas and a cattail marsh. Smith Environmental performed the survey of this property on December 15th, 2003 and did not observe wildlife of any kind. However, that day was reported to be very cold with wind gusts on the ridge of 30 miles per hour. The survey noted that several species would normally inhabit this parcel, including prairie dogs, cottontail rabbits, and coyotes.
**Madson**

**Location:** This property is located just west of 405 South 3rd Avenue in Original Town and encompasses approximately 1.5 acres.

**Description:** While this property is currently vacant, a past history of horse boarding and intense grazing has resulted in the proliferation of weedy plant growth. Coal Creek flows past the northwest corner of the property.

**Parcel Status:**
- O/S Requirement: 25 %
- Zoning: Residential
- Development: Sketch
- Annexed: Yes

**OSAC Observations:** Observations showed this parcel to have a good potential for buffering Boulder County Open Space and Original Town. The parcel has little in the way of views, but good air and noise quality. Nighttime light pollution is better than many other parcels. This parcel is historically significant due to its proximity to the historic Well House dating from the 1800’s. It is a small tract with no lakes or ponds, but Coal Creek does flow by so there is riparian forest. The remainder of the property is weedy and not pristine. It has a diverse wildlife habitat but it is unlikely that it is used by wildlife as a migration corridor. It has a low potential to be a regional draw.

**Smith Wildlife Survey:** States the property to be 77 % weedy/disturbed areas with scattered deciduous trees and a riparian forest along Coal Creek. The only wildlife species actually observed on the property were swallows and sparrows.
Richmond Property

Location: This property begins at the northeast corner of the intersection of Coalton Drive and McCaslin Boulevard and encompasses approximately 15 acres in the south-central portion of town.

Description: This property is a weedy vacant lot, receiving intermittent human use.

Parcel Status:
- O/S Requirement: 30%
- Zoning: PD- CAC
- Development:
- Annexed: Yes
- Sale Status: On the market

OSAC Observations: Observations showed this parcel to have fair buffering potential, good views, but poor air and noise quality due to its proximity to McCaslin. Nighttime light pollution is fairly high. This parcel has no known historic value. It is a medium sized tract with a medium level of threat to existing resources. There are no mature trees and no wetlands or surface water and the majority of the parcel is weedy and not particularly pristine. It appears to be a somewhat diverse wildlife habitat and could be used by wildlife as a migration corridor. It should not have a very high regional draw for passive use. The picture shown is SW 9; refer to Appendix H for more details.

Smith Wildlife Survey: This property is 52 % weedy/disturbed and about 48 % grass prairie. Many types of small birds were observed along with great horned owls. Cottontail rabbits noted as well.
**Ridge II**

*Location:* This property is located just north of Rock View Drive in the Ridge II subdivision, on the west side of McCaslin Boulevard. It encompasses approximately 6 acres.

*Description:* This property is a largely weedy, vacant lot with a gated dirt access road, and receives minimal human use.

*Parcel Status:*
- O/S Requirement: 30 %
- Zoning: ??
- Development: PDP/FPD sketch
- Annexed: Yes

*OSAC Observations:* Observations showed this parcel to have a fair buffering potential, good views, and fair air and noise quality. Nighttime light pollution is considered to be fair. This parcel has no known historic value. It is a small tract with no surface water, but it does have a small wetland area. The ridgeline is observable from most of Superior. There are no mature trees and the parcel is not pristine. It has a diverse wildlife habitat and it has some potential to be used by wildlife as a migration corridor. It did not rate high for regional draw and has a low potential for passive use. The picture shown is NE 1; refer to Appendix H for more details.

*Smith Wildlife Survey:* The survey found the property to be 36 % mixed grass prairie with about 63 % weedy/disturbed areas and a very small cattail marsh. A few small species of birds and cottontail rabbits were observed on the parcel.
Roger’s Farm

Location: This property borders McCaslin Blvd. to the east and the Arsenault property to the west in Original Town. It encompasses approximately 24 acres.

Description: Current uses for this property are private residential, intensive livestock grazing pasture, commercial (real estate office), and idle pasture.

Parcel Status:
- O/S Requirement: 30%
- Zoning: R-M
- Development: Sketch plan
- Annexed: Yes
- Note: Receives open space credit for Floodplain.

OSAC Observations: Observations showed this parcel to have a fairly high buffering potential, good air quality, fair views, medium noise quality and nighttime light pollution. It is adjacent to the Historical Grasso Park as well as the Coal Creek Trail. This is a medium sized tract with small number of mature trees, no surface water, but it is fairly pristine. It maintains a diverse wildlife habitat and serves as a wildlife migration corridor. This parcel should have decent regional draw for passive uses. The picture shown is NW 3; refer to Appendix H for more details.

Smith Wildlife Survey: Smith found the property to be 26% mixed grass prairie, 52% pasture, 12% weedy/disturbed, with a few scattered trees. Many types of small birds were observed and of course, prairie dogs.
**School Site**

**Location:** Adjacent to the northern edge of Eldorado K-8. Comprised of 12 acres.

**Description:** Property has a steep slope and a large drainage area to the south.

**Parcel Status:**

- O/S Requirement:
- Zoning: N/A
- Development: none
- Annexed: Yes
- IGA Info: For school or public use.

*OSAC Observations:* This parcel provides some buffering for adjacent home and Eldorado K-8 from traffic. It has low potential for use for wildlife or as a corridor due to surrounding development. The picture shown is SW 5; refer to Appendix H for more details.

*Smith Wildlife Survey:* This property was not included in the Smith report.
Smith Property

Location: This property lies at the southeast corner of McCaslin Blvd. and Coalton Rd.

Description: This property is a weedy, vacant lot with little human use.

Parcel Status:
- O/S Requirement: 30 %
- Zoning: PD
- Development: FDP/ PDP
- Annexed: Yes

OSAC Observations: Observations showed this parcel to have fair buffering potential, very good views, but poor air and noise quality due to its proximity to McCaslin. Nighttime light pollution is not as bad as many of the other parcels. It is somewhat likely to have compatibility with adjacent land uses but has no known historic value. It is a small tract with a diverse wildlife habitat and may be used as a migration corridor, but will probably have very little regional draw for passive use. The picture shown is SW 6; refer to Appendix H for more details.

Smith Wildlife Survey: This parcel was not included in the Survey.
Spicer-Carlson Property

Location: The Spicer-Carlson property is located east of McCaslin Blvd. and along the southern edge of U.S. 36. It encompasses approximately 77 acres in the northern portion of town.

Description: Aside from periodic cattle grazing and irrigation ditches, this property currently receives little use. Prairie dog activity is prominent on this site. This site was divided into east and west on the compilation of attributes.

Parcel Status:
- O/S Requirement: 66 %
- Zoning: B-O
- Development:
- Annexed: Yes
- Sale Status: Option
- Note: 200ft buffer, US 36 setback, plus reservoir wildlife setbacks is 66 %.

OSAC Observations: Observations showed this parcel to have a fair buffering potential, fair views, somewhat poor air and noise quality, and considerable nighttime light pollution. It is likely to have compatibility with adjacent land uses and has some historic value. It is a large tract. There are some mature trees as well as a pond. However, the majority of the parcel is weedy and not particularly pristine. It appears to be a somewhat diverse wildlife habitat and it’s likely that it is used by wildlife as a migration corridor. It should have a fairly high regional draw for passive use. The picture shown is NE 8; refer to Appendix H for more details.

Smith Wildlife Survey: This parcel was found to be 92% weedy/disturbed and about 4% open water. Many types of small birds were observed along with bald eagles and red tailed hawks. Prairie dogs and cottontail rabbits were seen, and the ponds also support waterfowl, turtles, bass and bluegill fish.
**Superior Village/Oschner**

*Location:* This property is southeast of the intersection of 76th Street and Coal Creek Drive, to the west of Original Town, and encompasses approximately 37 acres.

*Description:* This property has historically experienced intensive cattle grazing, but has recovered dramatically in recent years due to the removal of cattle and irrigation, especially in the southern half of the property. Coal Creek flows along the eastern edge of the property. For the compilation of attributes, this parcel in divided north and south.

*Parcel Status:*
- O/S Requirement: 25 %
- Zoning: County
- Development: CP amendment sketch plan
- Annexed: No

*OSAC Observations:* Observations showed this parcel to have a high buffering potential, good air quality, fair views, and medium noise quality and nighttime light pollution. There should be some compatibility with adjacent land uses and has historical value due to the Hake Homestead. It is a large tract with a small number of mature trees, no surface water, but it is pristine. It appears to be a diverse wildlife habitat and serves as a wildlife migration corridor. This parcel should have decent regional draw for passive uses. The picture shown is NW 9; refer to Appendix H for more details.

*Smith Wildlife Survey:* This property is stated to be 30 % mixed grass prairie, 43 % weedy/disturbed, some wet meadow with cattails, and small areas of cottonwood grove and other riparian forest. Many types of small birds were observed along with bald eagle and red tailed hawk. Also noted were prairie dogs, cottontail rabbits, and red fox.
**Town of Superior 9**

*Location:* This is an approximately nine-acre parcel located south of the Target/Costco shopping center, and west of McCaslin Blvd. in Original Town.

*Description:* This property has been transferred to the Town for public purposes and planning for its future is currently in progress.

*Parcel Status:*
- **O/S Requirement:**
- **Zoning:** PD
- **Development:**
- **Annexed:** Yes
- **Sale Status:** Dedicated to the town.

*OSAC Observations:* Observations showed this parcel to have a buffering potential between the Superior MarketPlace and Sagamore, the Oschner property and the Original Town. It rated medium views, poor air and noise quality, considerable nighttime light pollution, and little or no historic value. It is a small tract. There are a small number of mature trees, no surface water, and it is not particularly pristine. It does not appear to be a diverse wildlife habitat and is populated primarily by prairie dogs. The picture shown is NW 14; refer to Appendix H for more details.

*Smith Wildlife Survey:* As the town already owns this parcel, Smith Environmental did not include it in their survey.
**Verhey Ranch**

*Location:* The Verhey property lies west of McCaslin Blvd. and south of Coalton Rd. It encompasses approximately 155 acres in the southwestern portion of town.

*Description:* This property is covered by a mixed grass prairie and is used as horse pasture.

*Parcel Status:*
- O/S Requirement: 30 %
- Zoning: AG-UR
- Development: Sketch plan
- Annexed: Yes
- Sale Status: Contract
- This property received unanimous votes for total parcel acquisition.

*OSAC Observations:* Observations showed this parcel to have an excellent buffering potential because of its proximity to Boulder County Open Space. It was rated strong for views, but there could be poor air and noise quality on the eastern edge due to its proximity to McCaslin. Nighttime light pollution is fairly high on much of the property due to city lights and Rocky Flats to the south. This parcel has no known historic value. It is a large tract with a few mature trees as well as a cattail marsh and a pond. There are few weedy or disturbed areas so, except for the buildings, the parcel is considered pristine. The ridgeline of this property can be seen throughout the southern edge of Superior. It has a diverse wildlife habitat and is definitely used by wildlife as a migration corridor. It should have a high regional draw and would be ideal for passive use. The picture shown is SW 4; refer to Appendix H for more details.

*Smith Wildlife Survey:* The Verhey property is described as 98 % grass prairie with a small pond, a cattail marsh, and several buildings. Numerous types of small birds were observed along with, red tailed hawks, several types of waterfowl, jackrabbits and cottontails, raccoons, and amphibians.
**Weinstein B Property**

*Location:* This property borders U.S. 36 on the south, and 88th St. on the west. The property is a narrow strip that adjoins the Spicer-Carlson property. It encompasses approximately 16 acres in the northeast portion of town.

*Description:* This property is a weedy, vacant lot with little human use. Prairie dog activity is prominent on this site.

*Parcel Status:*
- O/S Requirement: 20%
- Zoning: B-O
- Development: None
- Annexed: Yes

*OSAC Observations:* Observations showed this parcel to have a fair buffering potential, fair views, poor air and noise quality, and considerable nighttime light pollution. It is likely to have compatibility with adjacent land uses but has no known historic value. It is a medium sized tract a few mature trees as well as a small pond. However, the majority of the parcel is weedy and not particularly pristine. It has a diverse wildlife habitat and may be used as a migration corridor. It should have some regional draw for passive use. The picture shown is NE 13; refer to Appendix H for more details.

*Smith Wildlife Survey:* The property is stated to be 99.4 % weedy/disturbed. Very few animals were observed at this side aside from prairie dogs, turkey vultures, and grackles and starlings.
Zaharias Property

Location: The Zaharias property borders 88th St. to the west, and is located between U.S. 36 and the Saddlebrook Townhomes. It encompasses approximately 28 acres in the northeast portion of town.

Description: This property is a weedy vacant lot receiving little human use. A large drainage, dominated by a cattail wetland crosses the northern portion of the property. Prairie dog activity is prominent on the upland portion of this site.

Parcel Status:
- O/S Requirement: 20 %
- Zoning: B-O
- Development: None
- Annexed: Yes

OSAC Observations: Observations showed this parcel to have a fair buffering potential, fair views, poor air and noise quality, and considerable nighttime light pollution. It is not likely to have compatibility with adjacent land uses and has no known historic value. It is a medium sized tract. There are few mature trees and a cattail marsh, but no real surface water. However, the majority of the parcel is weedy and not particularly pristine. It has a diverse wildlife habitat and has an active avian and migratory population, as it is adjacent to the Hodgson-Harris Reservoir. This could be used by wildlife as a migration corridor and could have a fairly high regional draw for passive use. The picture shown is NE 3; refer to Appendix H for more details.

Smith Wildlife Survey: The survey describes this parcel as 94 % weedy/disturbed and about 5 % cattail marsh. Several types of small birds were observed primary near the cattail marsh. Also noted were prairie dogs and cottontail rabbits.
Financial Discussions

The Open Space Advisory Committee is of the opinion that the Town of Superior must aggressively pursue open space acquisition and preservation in the years to come. The voters approved a 0.3% Open Space sales tax fund to provide for this purpose. Sales taxes in Superior continue to increase as new retail operations open. The projected income in 2004 for the sales tax fund is $750,000 and the fund balance is projected to be $2,000,000 at the end of 2004.

The Committee wants to maximize the amount of acreage purchased with the sales tax fund by partnerships with other open space programs, such as the city of Boulder and Boulder County. Additionally, we would like to pursue grants available for acquisition programs like the Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) lottery funds. Many of these opportunities are associated with specific parcels and can be pursued when the acquisition is eminent. An example would be a parcel with some acreage in the flood plain being eligible for Urban Drainage funds.

Financing the purchase of open space land is limited by the approved open space sales tax ballot language, which did not request the ability to issue multi-year debt. Voter approval would be necessary in order to issue bonds. In a memo dated July 28, 2004 from the Finance Director with concurrence by the Town Attorney the following other financing options are possible:

- **Certificates of Participation** – These can be used as a financial vehicle with collateral (such as a building or park) typically necessary.
- **Cash financing**
- **Buying options on the land**
- **Conservation easements**
- **Donations** (with the property owners receiving a tax write-off in some circumstances)

In addition to the financing options presented by the Town Attorney, the PROST master plan identifies the following common acquisition and protection techniques which should be considered.

*Acquisition Techniques:*

- Fee simple purchase
- Conservation easement/purchase of development rights (partial interest)
- Joint purchase with other entity(s) (undivided interest)
- Leaseback or Lease
- Donations and gifts (full or partial)
- Non-profit acquisition and conveyance to the Town
Regulatory Protection Techniques:

- Zoning – large lot, performance, carrying capacity, cluster, preservation
- Exaction
- Phases Growth
- Moratorium
- Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)

Financial Incentives:

- Preferential Assessment
- Density Bonuses
- Grants and Loans

The price of land within the town of Superior’s planning area will continue to rise over time. It is important for the community to buy sooner rather than later because of the increasing prices and the diminishing amount of open land available. In order to acquire the desirable open parcels of land remaining, the town should be willing to assume a reasonable amount of debt that can be easily retired with the sales tax revenues that are already restricted to open space use.

Acquiring land for open space can have a direct financial benefit to the town’s budget. The revenues that the town receives from a parcel of land that is 100% residential development is inadequate to cover the cost of providing services. Therefore, the net of revenue from taxes less the cost of service is negative for residential development.

Included in Appendix G of this report is a fact sheet on the Cost of Community Services (COCS) from the American Farmland Trust (AFT). Their widely accepted methodology compares a community’s annual revenues and annual expenditures for each type of land use. A COCS study in Custer County, Colorado shows that residential land use demands $1.16 in service costs for every $1.00 generated in revenue. In contrast, for open space and agricultural land, every $1.00 generated in revenue required only $0.54 in expenditure. For commercial and industrial land, the revenue/expenditure ratio was $1.00 to $0.71. As detailed in the AFT fact sheet, very similar findings were reproduced in scores of communities across the nation.

Additional residential development will result in higher taxes or declining levels of public services as we try to balance future budgets. This trend of a net financial loss of residential development is the same in Superior. The Finance Director updated revenue and cost analysis for 10 undeveloped parcels in Superior. The parcel with a 100% residential development assumption, Oschner, showed an annual fiscal deficit of $82,656.

Many of the development assumptions on individual parcels of undeveloped land need a large percentage of office and retail to show a net annual fiscal surplus. Because economic conditions at this time do not favor more office and retail in these locations, more of the residential component will be built. This will increase the financial burden on the town for the near future.

For all of these reasons, we believe that it is in the town’s best interest to begin a serious open space acquisitions program immediately.
OSAC Recommendations

For

Acquisition and Protection

These recommendations were created and endorsed by OSAC for the consideration of the Town Board and Planning Commission with regard to any purchase, preservation or development of property in Superior. As a result of the passage of the Open Space Tax Fund by public vote in 2001, it is recommended that the Land Use Code and Comprehensive Plan be updated to reflect the importance of actively pursuing open space acquisition.

Parcel Acquisition

After reviewing all the undeveloped parcels, the following properties received a majority of votes of OSAC as having the highest value for acquisition of the total parcel:
(Those properties with the arrows received unanimous votes for total acquisition from the committee.)

- Arsenault
- Lastoka
- Level III
- Verhey
  - Bolejack
  - Ochsner
  - Smith
  - Zaharias

On all undeveloped parcels, there are areas that are suitable for open space acquisition. For best-suited areas, please refer to the following suggested guidelines, mapping and photography presented in Appendices C, D, and H, and the Smith Wildlife Survey.
Best Acquisition and Preservation Practices

1. **Actively pursue opportunities for acquisition of Open Space.**

   Only a small proportion of land in Superior remains undeveloped and much of that is at risk for imminent development. As more time passes, less land will be available and the cost of acquiring land will likely increase. The precious resource of undeveloped land is irretrievable once gone, and time does not favor open space.

2. **Preserve and/or acquire properties along the Coal Creek and Rock Creek corridors.**

   This will preserve the biological integrity and connectivity of these areas as wildlife corridors and allow wildlife species safe passage through and minimize potential conflicts. (Smith, pg. 93).

3. **Preserve and/or acquire existing floodplains and floodways.**

   The preservation of existing floodplains and floodways will be critical in light of current discussions and potential revisions to increase buildable areas within the 100-year floodplain. We recommend that the existing floodplains (to the greatest extent practical) and floodways be preserved as they are currently represented on maps used during the Comprehensive Plan Review Process, and as included in this document.

4. **Protect large tracts of contiguous, quality habitat.**

5. **No development near sensitive creek habitats and wetlands.**

   This will help protect wildlife from human impacts as well as buffer risk to humans from mosquito born illnesses. Development should follow guidelines established by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, in consultation with wildlife professionals, especially the Colorado Division of Wildlife and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to ensure compliance with all legal wildlife laws. (Smith, pg. 93/94).

6. **Maximize View corridors.**

   The Town of Superior has tremendous views to the south and west and preservation of these views is recommended

**Other Recommendations**

1. **Addition of Earthen Berm Along U.S. 36.**

   Construction of an earthen berm would protect the entire community from sight, sound, and air pollution. This could easily be made a part of the trail system that is currently proposed for connecting Boulder, Superior, Louisville and Broomfield. By landscaping the berm with evergreen and other native trees and
shrubs, the entire community would benefit year round from better air quality, and thus a better overall quality of life. We recommend working with the Colorado Department of Transportation, inquiring into the future widening of U.S. 36, and the potential for State funds to be used for construction of an earthen berm, in place of the typically constructed sound wall.

2. *Use of Resident and Native Trees, Plants, and Shrubs for Developed Open Space Areas.*

The selection of native and resident species of naturescaping materials has been proven to provide habitat to a greater variety of species of wildlife. The inclusion of plant species that bear fruit with seasonal variance can provide cover from predation and inclement conditions, and provide nesting structure, increasing species habitation by 50% to 700%, based on studies conducted by The National Wildlife Federation, Colorado State University, and Cornell Laboratory of Ornithology. These species can be provided without a financial burden to the Town, and may be comparatively less expensive than other plant species. Native plants require less maintenance than exotics.

3. *Consideration of Existing Prairie Dog Communities and Existing Nesting Sites*

The open space committee recommends that any prairie dog colonies first be preserved and protected. If an area is slated for development, then it is recommended that prairie dog colonies be relocated humanely at the expense of the builder as governed in the Town of Superior’s Prairie Dog Relocation Ordinance. We also recommend that any nests in existing trees be protected and not removed.

*Open Space Advisory Committee Opposition to Proposed Thoroughfares*

Roads as currently proposed to extend Coal Creek Dr. or 88th Street west are in opposition to the open space goals as recommended by the Committee for the affected parcels, as it is deemed that this would adversely affect existing wildlife habitat. Other road connection alternatives that do not affect wildlife habitat areas should be considered.
Future Areas of Work for the
Open Space Advisory Committee

The following areas of work are recommended as key functions in which OSAC can serve in order to further our commitment as a community to preserving the natural resources that contribute our quality of life in Superior. The Committee recommends that the Town Board review these areas of work, and consider integrating them into the tasks set out for an ongoing advisory committee to the Town on open space issues:

- Acquisition of open space.
- Research and assist funding sources and strategies for open space purchase and enhancements. Current ideas include working with developers to increase open space donations, partnering with other municipalities within the county, and pursuit of grant funding.
- Research and recommend areas for reclamation of natural open space to its natural short grass prairie or original status.
- Continue research in other Colorado communities and work with the Town to implement strategies to make Superior a showcase community with respect to its conservation, recreation, and cultural enrichment.
- Provide recommendations for use of native and resident plant materials in all developed open space and other landscaped areas.
- Assist with planning of trails and bike paths.
- Appropriate use/limitations of open space areas for parcels to be developed and potential undeveloped parcels, to insure protection of wildlife habitat and other resources.
- Prairie dog management plan.
- Assist with maintenance plans for designated open space areas.
Concluding Comments

The Town of Superior has been faced with great challenges, as it has become one of the fastest growing communities in the United States. The Town is meeting these challenges successfully, and has continued to demonstrate concern for its residents, both human and non-human, admirably. Our greatest challenges lie ahead as we continue to preserve and enhance the quality of life in our community. We must continue research in our community and other Colorado communities, and implement, where feasible, strategies to make Superior a showcase community with respect to its conservation, open space protection, historical preservation, and passive use recreation.

By continuing to seek community input, such as the Open Space Advisory Committee, PROSTAC, the Citizens’ Advisory Committee, and other public forums, the Town of Superior is demonstrating a commitment to the environment, wildlife, and open space advocacy. We recognize this commitment, and appreciate the opportunity to provide these recommendations to the Town of Superior.
Appendix A: Open Space Definitions
Prepared by the Open Space Advisory Committee June 11, 2001

Natural Open Space

Natural Open Space is defined as undeveloped land that is secured for the protection of habitat for native animals and plants, for limited recreational use, and for the preservation of archeological and topographical significance. Three types of Natural Open Space are defined below:

1. **Prairie**: Flat or rolling tracts of land dominated by a variety of grasses and inhabited by numerous species of animals.
2. **Aquatic**: Lakes, streams, ponds, and wetlands providing habitat for a variety of plants and animals living in water or at the water’s edge.
3. **Riparian**: Riparian habitat is land occurring along streams or ditches characterized by a variety of plant life, providing habitat, migratory corridors, and nesting and breeding sites for birds and mammals.

*(Natural buffers can consist of prairie, aquatic or riparian open space.)*

Functions:

1. Preservation of critical ecosystems and natural areas; scenic vistas and areas; ridgelines; fish and wildlife habitats; natural resources and landmarks; cultural, historic and archaeological areas; linkages and trails; limited access to public lakes, streams, and other useable open space lands; and scenic and stream corridors.
2. Conservation of natural resources including, but not limited to, forest lands, range lands, agricultural lands, aquifer recharge areas, and surface water.

Developed Open Space

Developed Open Space in Superior are developed lands that can be used for any or all of the following purposes:

1. **Parks**: Public recreational areas that can include playgrounds, ball fields, rinks, picnic area, etc.
2. **Landscaping around buildings or structures**: Trees, shrubs, flowers, manmade streams, and ponds that surround commercial, residential, or public areas; urban shaping between or around municipalities or community service areas and buffer zones between residential and non-residential development. In these areas, indigenous and xeric landscape materials and nursery stock are recommended, which provide food, shelter, and nesting places for wildlife.
3. **Trails**: Man-made pathways for recreational use.
4. **Berm**: Large or small mounds of earth that may be landscaped to help alleviate site, sound, and air pollution, as well as to create new habitat for birds and animals.
Functions:

1. Developed Open Space can provide areas of landscaping to soften a development’s visual appearance or to provide a buffer between conflicting land uses.
2. Developed Open Space can provide useable areas for such things as picnicking, plazas, gardens, parks and walkways.

(Developed buffers can be greenbelts consisting of parks, landscape, trails or berms.)

General Notes and Information:

These are working definitions. We recommend that the board review and adopt these definitions in lieu of the definitions currently defined in the Land Use section of the Town of Superior Municipal Code for the duration of the Comprehensive Plan Update process and urge all parties involved in the process to become familiar with and use the newly defined terms.
Appendix B:  
Expenditure Priorities

TOWN OF SUPERIOR

RESOLUTION NO. R-13
SERIES 2004

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE TOWN OF SUPERIOR ADOPTING PRIORITIES FOR SPENDING THE OPEN SPACE SALES TAX REVENUES

WHEREAS, the voters of the Town approved a .03% sales tax at the November 6, 2001 election to provide funds to acquire, obtain, and maintain open areas in the Town (the "Open Space Sale Tax").

WHEREAS, the Town has reviewed the priorities for expenditure of the Open Space priorities submitted by the Planning Commission, PROSTAC, OSAC and each of the trustees; and

WHEREAS, considering all information submitted, the Board desires to set forth guidelines for the priorities for expenditure of the Open Space Sales Tax funds; and

WHEREAS, the Board does not intend that the categorization of an item as a high, medium or low priority does not prevent the Town from expending a portion of the Sales Tax revenues for a medium or low priority item prior to all high priority items being completed if there is an opportunity for the Town to meet overall open space objectives by such expenditure.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE TOWN OF SUPERIOR, COLORADO as follows:

Section 1. The priorities for expenditure of the revenues from the Open Space Sales Tax are as follows:

A. Acquisition of natural open space is a high priority; and
B. Development and construction costs associated with natural open space areas such as prairie, aquatic, riparian, habitat protection and reclamation, including costs to revegetate over-grazed areas and mitigate or prevent prairie dogs or any other species from destroying any desired vegetation on natural open space or adjacent properties, are a high priority; and
C. Costs associated with the construction of soft trails and trail heads on Natural Open Space is a high priority; and
D. Acquisition and construction of buffers, and greenways, if left as, or reverted or reclaimed into, a natural state is a high priority; and
E. Acquisition of natural open space properties for historic preservation is a medium priority; and
F. Acquisition of properties in floodways and floodplains and reclamation of such properties as natural open space, including removing structures, is a high priority; and

G. Acquisition of floodways and floodplains in developed open space is a low priority; and

H. Expenditure of funds necessary to assist acquisition of natural open space, including maps and studies are a medium priority; and

I. Development and construction costs associated with a majority of structures on natural open space, including picnic shelters, restrooms, lightning shelters, parking lots, and hard trails is a low priority; and

J. Acquisition of developed open space which is a berm, buffer, greenway, or habitat protection area, other than recreation areas, is a high priority; and

K. Costs associated with developed open space trails and trail heads is a low priority; and

L. Costs associated with education programs and conferences and developed open space historic preservation is a low priority; and

M. Costs associated with structures and facilities, including picnic shelters, restrooms, parking lots, concession stands, playground equipment, lightning shelters and maintenance sheds, on developed open space has no priority and no open space money should be spent on them; and

N. Construction of developed open space that is landscaping around buildings, neighborhood parks, community parks, regional parks, mini or pocket parks, school parks, sports fields or special use parks has no priority and no open space money should be spent on them. This provision is not intended to apply to developed open space lands that serve primarily as a buffer which meet the requirements of J above.

Section 2. Anything built or acquired with Open Space funds can be maintained with Open Space funds.

Section 3. Lands purchased or developed with open space funds should not be retrofitted into uses listed with no priority.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 9th day of February, 2004.
Appendix C: Town of Superior Map with Parcel Locations
Appendix D: Tier One Analysis Map
Appendix D: Open Space GRASP Map
# Appendix E: OSAC Evaluation Worksheet

**Town of Superior - Open Space Advisory Committee**

**Observation Worksheet for 2004 Prostac report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Worksheet #:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map:</td>
<td>Parcel:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observer(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>High Quality (10)</th>
<th>Medium Quality (5)</th>
<th>Low / No Quality (0)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Buffer Potential</strong></td>
<td>Provides buffer to high quality habitat or well buffered by other OS</td>
<td>Provides buffer to low quality habitat, is marginally buffered by other OS</td>
<td>Does not provide habitat buffer nor buffered by other OS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Buffers and Greenbelts</strong></td>
<td>Protects or expands an existing buffer</td>
<td>Could potentially create a buffer</td>
<td>No buffer potential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Clean air</strong></td>
<td>Air is completely undisturbed, fresh and clean</td>
<td>Air is somewhat dirty by traffic or pollution</td>
<td>Air is very dirty by heavy traffic or pollution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Compatibility with Adjacent Land Uses</strong></td>
<td>High potential for compatibility with adjacent land uses</td>
<td>Manageable compatibility with adjacent land uses</td>
<td>Little or no compatibility with adjacent land uses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cultural and Historic Resource</strong></td>
<td>Protects existing historic features</td>
<td>Historic site, but no existing historic features</td>
<td>No historic or cultural significance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Light Pollution</strong></td>
<td>Dark with intense views of the night sky</td>
<td>Some light pollution with good views of the night sky</td>
<td>Very bright and no view of the night sky</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Quiet</strong></td>
<td>Area is very quiet and undisturbed by noise</td>
<td>Area is somewhat quiet with some noise</td>
<td>Area is very noisy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Visual Quality (Views)</strong></td>
<td>Highly scenic and / or provides scenic views</td>
<td>Moderately scenic or some scenic views</td>
<td>No potential scenic value</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td><strong>Large tract</strong></td>
<td>Parcel is a large land tract</td>
<td>Parcel is not a large land tract</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Level of threats to existing resources</strong></td>
<td>Imminently threatened by development not compatible with OS</td>
<td>Foreseeable, but not imminent, threat of development not compatible with OS</td>
<td>No foreseeable threat of development not compatible with OS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Partial usage / conservation easement</strong></td>
<td>Portions of the parcel would be highly desirable to being partially used as Open Space / Conservation Easement</td>
<td>Small portion(s) of this parcel may serve well being used as Open Space or a Conservation Easement</td>
<td>No parts of this parcel are conducive to being used as Open Space</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Restoration Potential</strong></td>
<td>Property can be easily restored to it's Natural state and would provide great value to town if restored</td>
<td>Property would require effort to be restored to it's Natural state and would provide great value to town if restored</td>
<td>Property would be difficult or cost prohibitive to restore to it's Natural state and may</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximity and Access</strong></td>
<td><strong>Easy access or close proximity to trails or other recreational opportunities</strong></td>
<td>Potential access or close proximity to trails or other recreational opportunities</td>
<td>No access or proximity to trails or other recreational opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Regional draw</strong></td>
<td>Physical environment intact, disturbance factor completely manageable</td>
<td>Physical environment moderately disturbed, partial management control</td>
<td>Physical environment severely disturbed, not under management control</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Suitability for Passive Use</strong></td>
<td>Suitable for several passive uses</td>
<td>Suitable for one or a few passive uses</td>
<td>Not suitable for any passive uses</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mature Tree Stands</strong></td>
<td>Extensive, diverse stands of mature vegetation</td>
<td>Few, small stands of mature vegetation</td>
<td>No stands of mature vegetation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Natural Communities</strong></td>
<td>Occupied by diverse native plant communities</td>
<td>Occupied by moderately diverse, native and non-native plant communities</td>
<td>Occupied by low diversity native plant communities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Noxious Weeds</strong></td>
<td>Not infested with noxious weeds</td>
<td>Small / few infestations of noxious weeds</td>
<td>Dominated by noxious weeds</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pristine Quality</strong></td>
<td>Overall the land appears to be in a natural state with no noxious weeds</td>
<td>Overall the land is in good condition with few weeds and many natural features</td>
<td>Overall the land is in poor condition, heavily grazed and / or lots of weeds</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Riparian Vegetation</strong></td>
<td>Diverse, high quality riparian vegetation present</td>
<td>Low quality, disturbed riparian vegetation</td>
<td>No riparian vegetation present</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Wetlands</strong></td>
<td>Diverse, high quality wetlands present</td>
<td>Low quality / few wetlands present</td>
<td>No wetlands present</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aquifer Recharge Area</strong></td>
<td>Provides important or extensive aquifer recharge</td>
<td>Provides unimportant or small aquifer recharge</td>
<td>Does not provide aquifer recharge areas</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Surface Water</strong></td>
<td>High quality surface waters present</td>
<td>Low quality surface waters present</td>
<td>No surface waters present</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wildlife</strong></td>
<td><strong>Habitat Diversity</strong></td>
<td>Provides a diverse set of wildlife habitats</td>
<td>Provides one or only a few types of wildlife habitats</td>
<td>Provides poor, non diverse wildlife habitats</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Migration Corridor / Connectivity</strong></td>
<td>Provides direct connectivity between parcels of wildlife habitat</td>
<td>Provides partial connectivity between nearby parcels of wildlife habitat</td>
<td>Does not provide wildlife habitat connectivity</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>T&amp;E / Species of Concern</strong></td>
<td>Occupied or high potential T&amp;E species habitat</td>
<td>Low quality potential T&amp;E species habitat</td>
<td>No potential T&amp;E species habitat</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix F: Parcel evaluation results

### Open Space Advisory Committee Observations Summary
- Average Parcel Rating By Category -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Section</th>
<th>Aesthetic</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Passive Use</th>
<th>Vegetation</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Wildlife</th>
<th>Grand Avg*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76th Street:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenault:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biella Menkick:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biella Menkick:North</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biella Menkick:South</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolejack:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lastoka:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madson:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge II:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers Farm:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Site:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spicer-Carlson:Eastern</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spicer-Carlson:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spicer-Carlson:Western</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Village:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Village:Northern</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Village:Southern</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town 9:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verhey:East</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verhey:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verhey:West</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinstein B:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaharias:Entire Parcel</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Grand Average is the average of all observations of a given parcel and not the average of the averages.
# Open Space Advisory Committee Observations Summary
- Average Parcel Rating By Attribute -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref #</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>76th Street</th>
<th>Arsenault</th>
<th>Biella Menkick</th>
<th>Biella Menkick South</th>
<th>Bolejack</th>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Lastoka</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Madson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aesthetic:Buffer Potential (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aesthetic:Buffers and Greenbelts (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aesthetic:Clean air (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aesthetic:Compatibility with Adjacent Land Uses (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aesthetic:Cultural and Historic Resource (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aesthetic:Light Pollution (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Aesthetic:Quiet (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aesthetic:Visual Quality (Views) (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Management:Large tract (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Management:Level of threats to existing resources (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Management:Partial usage / conservation easement (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Management:Restoration Potential (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Passive Use:Proximity and Access (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Passive Use:Regional draw (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Passive Use:Suitability for Passive Use (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Vegetation:Mature Tree Stands (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Vegetation:Natural Communities (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Vegetation:Noxious Weeds (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Vegetation:Pristine Quality (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Vegetation:Riparian Vegetation (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Vegetation:Wetlands (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Water:Surface Water (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Wildlife:Habitat Diversity (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Wildlife:Migration Corridor / Connectivity (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Wildlife:T&amp;E / Species of Concern (0-10 Range)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Open Space Advisory Committee Observations Summary

- **Average Parcel Rating By Attribute** -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref #</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Ridge II</th>
<th>Rogers Farm</th>
<th>School Site</th>
<th>Spicer Carlson</th>
<th>Spicer Carlson Eastern</th>
<th>Spicer Carlson Western</th>
<th>Superior Village Northern</th>
<th>Superior Village Southern</th>
<th>Superior Village</th>
<th>Town 9</th>
<th>Verhey</th>
<th>Verhey East</th>
<th>Verhey West</th>
<th>Weinstein B</th>
<th>Zaharias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>