

OPEN LANDS PLAN UPDATE, COMMUNITY RESPONSES: LAND ACQUISITIONS

DECEMBER 28, 2016

PROMPT 1:

Dating back to the purchase of the Anholtz Ranch in 1973 (that became Ford Park), and the adoption of the Real Estate Transfer Tax in 1979, the Town of Vail has a long history of acquiring land for a variety of public purposes.

- a. Have these efforts benefitted the community?
- b. Should they be continued?
- c. Should the Town continue efforts to implement Recommended Actions from the 1994 Open Lands Plan?

Responses

1. “The Town has done well acquiring land but at this point with so little land left in Town I think remaining parcels should remain in private hands. Zoning and deed restricting should be considered rather than public purchase. The exception would be parcels near Gore Creek and tributaries that impact the creek’s health.”
2. “The transfer tax seems to have given the Town a blank check that makes it so they are not judicious in how they spend public funds. The current budget is opaque and not clearly showing how public funds are spent outside of high level _____ with no eye towards the value of the projects undertaken.”
3. “a.) Yes. b.) Open lands – yes. Conversion of open lands to something else – no.”
4. “a.) Yes. b.) Yes. c.) Yes.”
5. “a.) Yes, they have greatly benefitted the community. b.) Yes, they should be continued. c.) Not sure what ‘Recommended Actions’ includes but all open space should remain such and more acquired.”
6. No response.
7. “Yes.”
8. No response.
9. No response sheet.
10. No response sheet.
11. No response sheet.

12. No response sheet.
13. No response sheet.
14. No response sheet.
15. No response sheet.
16. No response sheet.
17. No response sheet.
18. “Yes, the efforts have been a big benefit. As long as the efforts support a public purpose (recreational or aesthetic), they should continue.”
19. “The implementation of the RETT was good in its time to acquire open space. It appears all the open space has been acquired. The RETT was never intended to use for improvements to open space. Perhaps time to retire the RETT!!”
20. No response sheet.
21. No response sheet.
22. “a.) Yes. b.) Yes.”
23. “a.) Yes. b.) Yes. c.) Yes but there needs to be public input regarding these recommended actions. Have they changed? For example: the Vail Trail extension was originally described as a pedestrian path but it was abandoned because of topography. How did it come back as a mountain bike proposal with no input?”
24. “RETT acquired lands need to stay restricted to ‘open space, recreation, and similar uses.”
25. “a.) Yes! b.) Yes! c.) Yes! We certainly must maintain environmentally sensitive areas and wildlife corridors – as there are so few now!!! Animals need access to water.”
26. “a.) Yes. b.) Depends on public purpose. c.) Yes, in particular – finish trail from Golden Peak to East Vail.”

JANUARY 4, 2017

27. “a.) Yes, look at the facilities that have been done! b.) Yes, continue to look at areas for facilities.”
28. “a.) Yes.” b.) Have we reached our limit? c.) Absolutely.”

29. "Yes. Thank you."
30. "* (See below) A key capitalized word in the 1994 Open Lands introduction."
31. "a.) Yes. b.) Yes. c.) Yes. Although I do agree that the plan is outdated and needs to be revisited."
32. "The less giant mansions, the better. Use space for affordable multi zoned development or community benefit."
33. No response.
34. "a.) Yes. b.) Yes. c.) Continue acquiring and maintaining open space."
35. "a.) Yes. b.) Yes. c.) Not knowledgeable enough to answer."
36. "a.) Yes, the community has benefitted from the acquisition and preservation of land. b.) I believe the use of RETT should be continued for these purposes."
37. No response.
38. "a.) Yes. b.) Only within the 1994 Plan. c.) The 1994 Plan was OK."
39. "a.) Yes, initially it was very beneficial but things have changed dramatically. Ford Park has morphed into a very upscale, sophisticated, often expensive venue. Tighter parameters are needed as interpret our future 'needs' and what we are doing with RETT."
40. "a.) Mostly yes. b.) To be determined. c.) After 22 years shouldn't they either all be implemented by now, or considered outdated and need to be revisited?"
41. "Stop acquiring land for public or private housing."
42. No response.
77. "a.) These efforts not only benefitted the community, they gave life blood to the community. b.) They should be continued and c.) the Town should continue to implement the 1994 Open Lands Plan."

JANUARY 19, 2017

43. No response sheet.
44. No response.

45. No response.
46. "a.) Yes, Ford Park is a wonderful amenity to the community and using open space for more recreation. b.) Especially disc golf course would be a great asset to the town."
47. No response.
48. No response.
49. "a.) Yes, it has been a benefit. These places are great for the community to get together. c.) A disc golf course would make a great addition."
50. "b.) I agree that they should be continued. I believe Ford Park is underutilized."
51. "a.) Yes. b.) Carefully. c.) Do not know that plan."
52. "a.) Yes. b.) Yes. c.) Yes."
53. "a.) Yes. b.) Yes. c.) Yes, within reason and any plans should always be made available to the public."
54. "Yes, we must keep open space as a priority."
55. "b.) Yes."
56. "The ownership and stewardship of the land is extremely important. b.) Yes, they should be continued."
57. "a.) I think these efforts have benefitted the community and b.) should be continued."
58. "a.) Yes. b.) Yes. c.) Yes."
59. No response.
60. "a.) Of course. RETT is for keeping open spaces only. We should buy parcels in town in compatible locations with development rights for housing. We can not annex more land because we have exceeded our carrying capacity both environmentally and economically. Work with county with Vail as leader to look into Dowd Junction or similar parcel for a rental housing 'village / complex.'"
61. No response.
62. No response sheet.

81. "a.) Yes b.) RETT taxes should not used in violation of original intent. c.) Yes continue to retain open space for present and future citizens."

WEB SURVEY RESPONSES

63. "Yes, except for the provision, "provide land for other public uses". That is MUCH too broad!"

64. "Yes. Yes. Yes."

65. No response.

66. "Yes, these efforts have and should continue to better the valley."

67. No response.

68. "Yes to all."

69. "Yes theyve benefited, and more can still be done"

70. No response.

71. "Yes and a disc golf course would really set it off"

72. "I think these efforts have benefited the community. It is important, especially with the high land values in Vail, that the government acquires land for things deemed important to the community or else they will likely not become reality."

73. "Yes, the se purchases have benefited all of us."

74. "YES"

75. "Yes to all. Having lived in Vail since 1970, I can see the results of our careful stewardship of open lands within the Town."

76. "Yes, the have made for some excellent open space. The recommendations of 1994 remain relevant today. Perhaps more so than ever."

78. "a.) Yes the actions of purchasing land has benefited the community, and b.) the Town should continue to do so, especially for the purpose of open space preservation and environmental concerns."

79. "a.) Yes, these spaces are a great asset to the community."

80. “a.) Yes, these efforts have benefitted the community. Now few parcels are left & these are of little interest to developers or others profit-oriented, reducing the need for TOV use of funds to purchase them. b.) However, if any offer public housing sites or watershed protection, TOV should buy them. c.) I have seen no compelling other '94 recommendations still undone.”

PROMPT 2:

The 1994 Open Land Plan identifies four main reasons for the acquisition of lands – to protect environmentally sensitive lands from development, to establish open spaces and neighborhood buffers, for the development of recreation trails and to provide land for other public uses.

- a. Are these four reason valid today?
- b. Which of these reasons are most important to you?
- c. Are there other reasons for acquiring lands that the Town should consider?

Responses

1. “I believe protecting environmentally sensitive lands should be the top priority. I do not believe the other uses are still valid.”
2. “It does not seem that the plan conforms to any of these concepts except public uses. The Town must have a plan for what it wants to accomplish and hold this up to that. Is it to protect sensitive areas, then how’d you measure that?”
3. “a.) Yes. b.) 1, 2, and 3. c.) ‘Other public uses’ is an open-ended slippery slope. Employee housing is not a ‘public use.’ Expanding development sites into open space is not a ‘public use.’”
4. “a.) Yes. b.) Other public uses, specifically housing. c.) Housing.”
5. “The first three reasons are very positive. ‘Provide land for other public uses’ what does that mean? If it means converting open space and public parks to developed areas that would be a travesty!”
6. No response.
7. “Protect environmentally sensitive lands from development!”
8. No response.
9. No response sheet.
10. No response sheet.

11. No response sheet.
12. No response sheet.
13. No response sheet.
14. No response sheet.
15. No response sheet.
16. No response sheet.
17. No response sheet.
18. "Protecting environmentally sensitive areas is important. Using public lands for housing is not!"
19. "Establish open spaces and neighborhood buffers. RETT should be retired if all the open space and neighborhood buffers have been acquired. Town of Vail should commit to put all open space in conservation easements to protect the land in perpetuity!"
20. No response sheet.
21. No response sheet.
22. "The number one priority should remain protecting environmentally sensitive lands and to establish open spaces! Further development of recreational trails should be considered only after serious consideration, public input, and decisions as to "needs" vs. "wants." Please consider Vail resident input as a priority to other Eagle County residents and activists."
23. "a.) Yes. b.) #1 Protecting sensitive lands from development. c.) Strong consideration should be given to topography, rock fall, etc. before moving forward. Also, historical significance such as the Vail Trail and preserving areas for walking without the impact of mountain biking. In conclusion, it is perfectly acceptable to acquire land for just open space – no trail development, no buildings – and leave trails like the Vail Trail alone. Pushing the trail further east is unnecessary as there is already a paved bike path."
24. "Yes. With more development over time, the open lands have become even more desirable."
25. "a.) Yes. b.) One and two. c.) Acquiring land in Eagle County is a balanced need through all communities. We must not become an urban environment just for the sake of housing. We will lose what we now have beauty – scenery – greenery – atmosphere."

26. “a.) Yes. b.) One → Three. c.) No, purchasing land for public use must be approach extraordinarily carefully. Purchasing land for public housing in areas that are not adjacent to public transit and require reliance on cars is not an appropriate public use.”

JANUARY 4, 2017

27. “a.) Yes. b.) Trails benefit everyone. c.) The Town should acquire any land it can for open space / parks / employee housing.”

28. “a.) Yes. b.) All are important. c.) No.”

29. “Public parking under the mountain.”

30. “a.) No... “other” its to open ended. b.) Protect recreation and buffers. c.) No, but a missing bullet: Are these privately owned vacant lands that should be purchased?... Yes, 1602 Matterhorn Circle to complete the system* of wildlife corridor from Gore Creek to the ‘woods.’”

31. “a.) Yes, very valid and even more important these days. Vail is a much different place compared to 1994.”

32. “To connect and encourage non-motorized or mass transit.”

33. “a.) Yes. b.) Using buffers as connections.”

34. “a.) Sure. b.) All. c.) Public use – as this fire station. Library branch with parking.”

35. “a.) Yes. b.) All of them. c.) Can’t answer.”

36. “a.) Yes. b.) Protecting environmentally sensitive lands.”

37. “a.) Yes. b.) All. c.) No.”

38. “a.) Yes. b.) Neighborhood buffers → open space. c.) No.”

39. “a.) The first two are still valid. Much has changed since 1994 but protecting environmentally sensitive lands from development (and that includes trail building) is still the most important.”

40. “a.) Reasons 1 and 2 – valid; enough trails already; no more land for public use. b.) 1 and 2. c.) No.”

41. "The first 3 reasons are valid... but 'for other public uses' should not include housing... private or public."
42. "At this point I believe the first 2 reasons above are even more important now than in 1994."
77. "a.) Yes, yes, yes – these 4 reasons are valid today! b.) Protecting environmentally sensitive lands is most important to me."

JANUARY 19, 2017

43. No response sheet
44. No response.
45. No response.
46. "a.) Yes. b.) Recreation. c.) Affordable housing."
47. "Maintaining wildlife corridors' should almost be a fifth reason, its so important! For example, on the middle and upper benches of Donovan Park, we have foxes, deer, moose, and bobcat. The town should purchase the vacant lot 1602 (?) to complete the corridor to the river."
48. "Housing is not a public use."
49. "a.) Yes. b.) Establish open spaces. c.) Recreational activities like disc golf."
50. "a.) Yes. c.) To make affordable housing for the people that live and work here. As someone who works for a living housing is not even close to affordable."
51. "a.) Yes, I would say so. c.) You do not mention the value of open land to wildlife – we still do have deer, moose, foxes, all kinds of birds."
52. "a.) I think these reasons are still valid. c.) Like I said before I would like to see the town develop a parcel of land to be used for disc golf. As I stated before the town need a recreation center that would focus primarily on a town pool."
53. "a.) Yes. b.) To keep open space and not get too high density buildings. c.) To find a way to provide efficient parking to get cars off the frontage roads."
54. "Yes, the ___ has to be very carefully aproch."
55. "b.) The first three."

56. "b.) The most important to me are first two – to protect sensitive land and establish open spaces."
57. "a.) Yes. b.) Protecting the environment and development of recreation and land for public use."
58. "a.) Yes. b.) Recreation. c.) Developing parks / courses for younger crowds."
59. "Usage responsibly can make a difference, posting improved signage to make policies for preservation known would go a long way."
60. "Not about vacant lands. a.) It is clear that the plan is for open lands not 'public uses' that require dense development such as housing. b.) Protect land from development which at this point means overdevelopment in Vail. RETT was passed in large part to protect Vail from over development. Now is not the time to step away from that. c.) Taking better environmental care of town lands and streams negates the need to buy land to 'cool streams.' Buying land with development rights is too expensive."
61. No response.
62. No response sheet.
81. "a.) Yes – all with exception of housing b.) Open Space"

WEB SURVEY RESPONSES

63. "Yes, the 4 reasons are valid, EXCEPT for the provision, "provide land for other public uses". That is MUCH too broad! It could cover almost anything, including "housing" Definitely opposed to using open space for housing!!"
64. "a.) Yes to protect sensitive lands from development. No."
65. "Those reasons are very valid and expanding recreation (like a new disc golf course) are worthy goals."
66. "These reasons are certainly valuable today. Protecting the land and keeping places to recreate are most important to me."
67. No response.
68. "Reasons are valid, most important to me is the ability to provide land for recreational activities"
69. "Environmental concerns are always the main issue, such as using the land for say, a disc golf course, instead of building on it"

70. No response.
71. "There are and alot of people would love to see a disc golf course put up in the area"
72. "These four reasons are still valid today. For me, the most important reason is to protect environmentally sensitive land from development. There is both a purely environmental and an economic reason for maintaining environmentally sensitive open space. The environmental reason is a moral reason in that if we destroy the environment around us with destroy the lives of the many plants and animals that live here. In economic terms, much of Vail's economy is based on tourism that is derived from the natural environment that surrounds the town. This includes recreational activities such as skiing or hiking; and even just the visual beauty of the location of the Town. Damaging the surrounding environment could have devastating consequences on the local economy."
73. "Please protect environmentally sensitive lands! Please do not develop the Vail Trail!"
74. "Yes, recreation."
75. "Open space buffers and recreational opportunities."
76. "Yes, they are still valid. Neighborhood buffers/sensitive land. No other reasons from and open lands standpoint. Other reasons (affordable housing) would not be an open lands use."
78. "b.) To protect environmentally sensitive lands from development of any kind is my primary concern."
79. No response.
80. "c.) Workforce housing should be an added objective. a.) The others are still valid ones, but conversion of walking trails to mountain bike ones is not acceptable. If new mountain bike trails are built they should also not be in environmentally sensitive area. Build them elsewhere.

PROMPT 3:

Recommended Actions from the 1994 Open Lands Plan focused on the acquisition of vacant, privately-owned land. The Town has also acquired developed lands as well, the old Wendy's site, the Arose "A frame" and Timber Ridge to name a few. In all instances these lands were re-purposed with new development. Should the Town consider the acquisition of developed, privately-owned land in order to further implement all the goals of this Plan?

- If yes, what specific purposes do you feel would justify the purchase of developed land?

Responses

1. "I can not think of a reason to acquire private land except for environmental concerns."
2. No response.
3. No response.
4. "Yes. Housing."
5. "Yes – acquire developed land is perfect. If the new developments are significant upgrades then go for it. Also employee housing."
6. No response.
7. "Yes, but keep as open land. No more development."
8. "No justification to further develop!!!"
9. No response sheet.
10. No response sheet.
11. No response sheet.
12. No response sheet.
13. No response sheet.
14. No response sheet.
15. No response sheet.
16. No response sheet.
17. No response sheet.
18. "Yes, to develop a hotel or housing on land that fits the need and character of the area. The examples above fit. The new Marriott proposal does not. It is too big and doesn't fit in the neighborhood."
19. "If the Town of Vail has a specific need and the right parcel is available, buy it for that need. I don't think the Town of Vail can solve all its affordable housing problems – 1,000 units does not seem possible!!!"

20. No response sheet.
21. No response sheet.
22. “Yes. Employee housing but only with a public/private partnership. The Town of Vail cannot solve this problem on its own. For any use please utilize existing developed parcels for acquisition.”
23. “Employee housing with public / private partnerships.”
24. No response.
25. “Not if we sacrifice the beauty of our community!!!! Intense crowded housing should be developed down valley where there is flat space to do it.”
26. “Purchasing developed property for redevelopment for affordable housing is the most appropriate strategy for adding additional workforce housing. Ideally this effort would be done in a JV with employers in town.”

JANUARY 4, 2017

27. “I feel that the Town, along with other municipalities to acquire land outside of Town boundaries to address the housing issue the space in Avon between City Market and Wal-Mart is prime.”
28. “With very careful planning and purpose. Question Feasibility Study on numbers 8, 9, and 10. That soil is subject to flow or slide in torrential rain as global warming changes our weather patterns!!”
29. “Housing to own for professional. Who seem to leave the valley for better living.”
30. “Purchase developed land for the “other” that should be removed as one of four reasons for land acquisition.”
31. “Yes, affordable housing, community connection trail, open space parks.”
32. “Dorm / apartment style housing, EC mass transit (i.e. BRT).”
33. “Yes.”
34. “Building in west Vail above Highland Meadows is a stretch environmentally, steepness of slope, access.”
35. “Yes, depends on site and proposed use.”

36. "Yes – redevelopment for public use such as a rec-center, access to trailheads / parking."
37. "For the reasons expressed above."
38. "Depends where the land is located and how it would fit into the neighborhood. Property along I-70 can be used for housing or commercial."
39. "Yes, it makes more sense to re-develop and re-purpose land rather than going after virgin land."
40. "No!! Bottom line – purpose of all this is for 'employee housing.' What is the status of Timber Ridge? There is more than enough area to accommodate more employee housing here than you could ever need without adversely affecting anyone."
41. No response.
42. No response.
77. "I think the purchase of the old Wendy's site for a fire department facility was good and Timber Ridge very necessary for close to Vail housing. I wish the Town could acquire the former "Roost" property."

JANUARY 19, 2017

43. No response.
44. "Yes – affordable housing or recreation facilities."
45. "Simple, they aren't making open lands anymore! Further, actually purchasing land will reduce the 'mission creep' of using RETT funds for other purposes."
46. "Don't sell the Timber Ridge redevelopment part at half price."
47. "Affordable housing."
48. "Giving the use of land to people like Peter Knoble defeats the purpose of 'affordable housing.'"
49. "Mostly to enhance the quality of living in this beautiful valley – do not like to see 'urbanization.'"
50. "Yes, for reasons stated above."

51. "Only if it helps for employee housing."
52. "Yes, as long as we can provide a small pocket of housing but not subsidizing out of taxes. Employee housing."
53. "Yes, employee housing in that area."
54. "Possibly, if such land were ideally located and ideally situated for the purpose (e.g. employee housing) then it might make sense."
55. "Yes, affordable housing."
56. "Yes. Giving more opportunities to the population to use land for recreation."
57. "Yes, housing prices, good employees."
58. "Should not be part of Open Lands discussion." But buy land with development or development rights for development such as housing – seasonal rental."
59. No response.
60. No response sheet.
61. No response.
62. No response sheet.
81. "Create more open space"

WEB SURVEY RESPONSES

63. "Yes; a use could well be for housing."
64. "No"
65. "Increasing the desirability of Vail as a destination for year round recreation."
66. "A disc golf course is an inexpensive way to help keep the community mentally and physically healthy."
67. No response.
68. "Yes, a solid plan on what yo do with acquired land"

69. No response.
70. No response.
71. “Yes and i feel a disc golf course would justify these purchases”
72. “Yes, though I think it is important that each parcel is rigorously evaluated for its intended purpose. For example, it likely does not make sense to acquire a parcel way up on Buffehr Creek Road for a dense redevelopment of employee housing. Two purposes I think would be justified would be employee housing and recreational spaces (e.g., park space). These two purposes would fit in a already developed neighborhood.”
73. “Affordable housing”
74. “Yes, housing”
75. “Yes, being aware of the already dense development of our valley with dedication to the original 1994 tenets.”
76. “Yes, sensitive habitat such as wildlife migration routes. To create better neighborhood buffers.”
78. “Yes, infill development and redevelopment is appropriate for housing, not vacant land or land swaps.”
79. No response.
80. “Yes, particularly for workforce housing.”

PROMPT 4:

Is it appropriate for the Town to consider the acquisition of USFS or other lands outside of the existing Town boundary in order to further implement the goals of this Plan? If not, why? If so, under what conditions or parameters might this be appropriate?

Responses

1. “I would support this initiative if the intention was to then transfer it to private owners. The private sale should stipulate the land is used for projects that align with the Town’s goals, i.e. housing.”
2. “The Town must balance the acquisition and maintenance costs against the increase in revenue. All actions should result in an increase in annual collections.”

3. "No – sets a precedent for allowing it for any purpose."
4. "Yes."
5. "This would not affect me so I would defer to the homeowners in that area."
6. "Yes, in the Dowd Junction area, complete with an upscale, almost dial-a-ride bus program. Who could ask for anything more as a non-contentious idea!"
7. "Yes, for recreational purpose."
8. "No!!! I am strongly opposed to acquiring USFS land to construct housing of any sort."
9. No response sheet.
10. No response sheet.
11. No response sheet.
12. No response sheet.
13. No response sheet.
14. No response sheet.
15. No response sheet.
16. No response sheet.
17. No response sheet.
18. "The Town should NOT consider USFS lands for employee housing. Bad presidence and a slippery slope. USFS lands should be preserved for recreation / protection of wilderness and wildlife."
19. "I think it opens a can of worms as Town of Vail might be outbid by other developers."
20. No response sheet.
21. No response sheet.
22. "No – the Gore Valley is over-developed crowded and cannot support further land acquisition for development (see comment above)."

23. "No – it does not make economic sense to spend huge amounts of money on land to develop employee housing in Vail. And it certainly does not make sense to then make this housing available to all county employees. Vail Resorts needs a more active role as do individual business owners and homeowners with homes larger than 4,000 square feet (lock off housing).
24. "Keep forest service land open. No additional development. No purchase of forest service land."
25. "I really don't know – this needs to be a very thoughtful decision – it will impact Vail forever."
26. "The Town 94 Open Land Plan did not anticipate the potential use of acquired land for affordable housing. As per its title 'Open Lands Plan' its purpose are clearly stated in its four main reasons. Other public uses is an ambiguous term which should be defined during this update process."

JANUARY 4,2017

27. "If the Forest Service wants to 'unload' a property that is beneficial to the Town of Vail then yes buy it."
28. "I am not sure. This could be a questionable precedent for our beautiful forest lands."
29. "Housing."
30. "Simple. Purchase the land to ensure they are not sold off by the USFS in the future! The goals are: protect, recreation and buffer!"
31. "Appropriate for trails, affordable housing, preserved open space and park open space as long as not negatively impacting wildlife and environment."
32. "Beginner hiking/biking, connections and TH access, and housing, housing, housing."
33. "Yes."
34. "It's already open space. Why develop it? Why buy it? Town of Vail should make it easier for private developers to build housing."
35. "Not knowledgeable enough to answer."
36. "No, I do not support this. This would impact homeowners who bought their property with the expectation of USFS land / open space adjacent to them and / or to preserve view corridors."

37. "Spend Town resources to implement Open Lands Plan cited above."
38. "No not for housing – for open space and buffer zones yes. Isn't our Town big enough? We don't want to live in a city."
39. "Absolutely not. The land is too expensive. And of the parcels, near the Vail Mountain School, which is considered desirable, is the winter and spring home of hundreds of Big Horn sheep. Leave the USFS land alone."
40. "No; also no more land swaps within Town boundaries. Town should not be in the real estate business!! RE: Open Space and General Use District Document, Eliminate Employee Housing units from all open space and general use districts. No more structures of any kind in Open Space."
41. "Please... no acquisition of USFS or other lands for housing... private or public."
42. "Not! My sense is in doing so you are opening up Pandora's box to do 'more and more' – more land in Vail that could face pressures in the future to be developed. How much more can we reasonably expect to squeeze into this valley? How many more people to accommodate? Finally dislodge all of our wildlife? We do not need to build 'things' on all of our 'open land.'"
77. "I worry about acquiring USFS land because I feel it is so important that land be protected for use by animals, birds, plants, trees and also by humans. We all need wild places and lands, not just homes and developed places."

JANUARY 19, 2017

43. No response sheet.
44. No response.
45. No response.
46. "Only for low-impact recreation, but would prefer they work with USFS to create and keep as USFS land."
47. No response.
48. "Why bother, no net benefit."
49. "Yes, for more affordable housing and recreational activities like disc golf."
50. "?"

51. "I really don't know. We need to cherish USFS. It is our scenery."
52. "Yes."
53. "Land swaps with the USFS should be very carefully studied so as not to inconvenience existing neighborhoods and not great heavy traffic at the development."
54. "No, no, we have lived in Vail for 40 years and we do not more development of any kind, including employee housing. If Town of Vail start this program where is it going to stop! This is irresponsible thinking!"
55. "No! Only for environmental program, not for housing or new recreation facilities."
56. "Yes, as long as we preserve the natural beauty. Don't overbuild, etc."
57. "Not sure, probably not I don't want to start taking away anymore USFS. Now that I have thought about it no."
58. "Yes."
59. "Yes, the town needs a disc golf course."
60. "Can not consider USFS lands – Vail already exceeds its carrying capacity. We are on the verge of destroying our brand. Vail has a defensible boundary now and we must not compromise that. We can not set a precedent for trades open space outside of Vail (Public Lands) are part of our brand – our uniqueness and invaluable environment. We can only hope Trump doesn't mess with it."
61. No response.
62. No response sheet.
81. "NO"

WEB SURVEY RESPONSES

63. "No. Funds are for land within the Town limits."
64. "No, if you consider it for housing, first big business like VR and the Hospital need to step up"
65. No response.
66. No response.

67. No response.

68. "Yes"

69. No response.

70. No response.

71. "Yes only if they dont tare up the land todo so"

72. "Yes, though I think it is important that each parcel is rigorously evaluated for its intended purpose. If a parcel is less than ideal for the particular purpose I do not think the town should acquire the land."

73. "Please act not he issue of affordable housing. Vail is way beyond other resort communities because we have been slow to act on purchasing and developing housing projects for workers."

74. No response.

75. "Only with vote of Town electorate"

76. "No. Sprawl is sprawl. The line has been appropriately drawn. Stay within it."

78. "Yes, partnerships are appropriate."

79. No response.

80. "Yes, for environmental protections as of watershed and workforce housing."
