

tres birds

Date: 09.22.2025

Project: Red Mountain Ranch (RMR) – Parcel 1

Submittal: Major Development Permit (MDP) & Preliminary Plan Review (PPR) – R2 Submittal

Attention: Kyle Brotherton

R1 Comment Responses: Town of Eagle Planning Department

Kyle Brotherton,

Thank you for providing comments on the R1 MDP/PPR submittals for the Red Mountain Ranch (RMR) – Parcel 1. The following document contains the design team's responses to the comments dated **04.21.2025**. Your comments and our responses are written below in the following format:

Original comment; Rewritten in grey font.

Response: *written in black italics. Updated drawings will be noted here as applicable.*

Please feel free to reach out to me directly with any questions or concerns regarding our comment responses.

Thank You,



David Hoffman
Architect
561.386.5528
dh@tresbirds.com

tres birds

Comment Responses:

Preliminary Plan Document

1. Sheet G-03:
 - a. Site Acreage Table and Planning Area 1 Open Space Table have two different acreages for the residential development percentage (12.5% vs. 11.5%). The 12.5% is also referenced in the approved PUD under Section 4.1.A.1. Additionally, it appears that the percentages of development vs. buffer/open space are reversed in this section.
Response: *The tables on sheet G-03 have been revised to address this comment.*
 - b. Building 08 – Middle unit's driveway does not meet Town dimensional standards, which results in zero countable outdoor spaces.
Response: *Building 08 has been revised. The middle unit's driveway is now sized to accommodate an outdoor parking space.*
 - c. Outdoor parking space is missing for Building 12, creating a one space deficiency.
Response: *The revised submittal includes 3 parking spaces (2 garage, 1 exterior) for both units of Building 12.*
 - d. Buildings 24 & 25 – each building has only one outdoor space per Town dimensional standards, resulting in one less outdoor parking space for each building.
Response: *Buildings 24 and 25 have been revised to address this comment.*
2. Sheets AS-02 and C1.03 and C1.04: there appears to be a parking pad on Sheet AS-02 north/northeast of Building 15 that does not appear on Sheets C1.03 and C1.04.
Response: *This item has been updated and coordinated in the revised submittal.*
3. Sheets AS-03 and C1.04: there appears to be a parking pad north of Building 25 on Sheet AS-03 that does not appear on Sheet C1.04.
Response: *This item has been updated and coordinated in the revised submittal.*
4. Sheet C1.03:
 - a. The patio shown for Building 15 appears to be within the 75' stream setback. Would a patio be considered to fall within the "Supplementary setback requirements of 30 inches" found within the PUD Guide? Patio is greater than a 30 inch encroachment into this setback area, however.
Response: *Building 15 has been revised to address this comment.*
 - b. The pedestrian bridge appears to not cross over any significant landscaping or terrain. Would it be better suited to have the bridge (or additional bridges) to cross over the swales?
Response: *The grading within the swales has been refined and pedestrian bridges are included for both swale crossings along the Discovery Trail.*
5. Sheet C1.04:
 - a. The patios shown for Buildings 17, 21, and 22 appear to fall within the 75' stream setback.
Response: *Buildings 17, 21 and 22 have been revised to address this comment.*

tres birds

b. The pedestrian pathways are shown as going through the proposed swale; however, on Sheet C1.03, the pathway through the swale is denoted as stones. Confirm or revise as necessary.

Response: *The pedestrian pathways within the site use the stone crossings at the swale. Pedestrian bridges are included for both swale crossings along the Discovery Trail.*

c. There are trees shown to be over the existing septic field. Is this septic field being removed as part of construction?

Response: *The existing septic field will be removed during construction.*

6. The pedestrian bridge shown on Sheet L-106 of the MDP submittal package, between Buildings 20 and 21, does not appear on any of the sheets in the Preliminary Plan submittal package. Please update as needed.

Response: *Pedestrian bridges are included for both swale crossings along the Discovery Trail. Additional bridge information is available in the MDP #2 submittal.*

7. Sheets C1.13 and C1.14 seem to have an incorrect scale. Confirm or update as necessary.

Response: *Sheets C1.13 and C1.14 have been updated in the revised submittal to address this comment.*

8. Sheets C1.20, C1.21, and C1.22: Buildings 24, 25, and 26 are misnumbered as 23, 24, and 25.

Response: *Sheets C1.20, C1.21 and C1.22 have been updated in the revised submittal to address this comment.*

9. Compliance with the Annexation and Development Agreement:

a. Section 5.g; no approval shall be granted until access easements are granted by CDOT

Response: *Acknowledged.*

b. Section 6.a.i; states that the water extension shall be installed at the eastern end of the property (Planning Area 6)

Response: *Acknowledged.*

c. Section 10.a; Parcel OS1 to be conveyed to the Town by special warranty deed within 30 days after issuance of the first development permit for Planning Area 1.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

10. The 12ft public trail easement detailed in Section 4.1.A.1 of the approved PUD does not appear to be shown on any sheets in the Preliminary Plan set or the MDP submittal set. Please revise as necessary or detail when this easement is to be platted.

Response: *The revised submittal includes a Preliminary Plat Draft. This document identifies the easement referenced in this comment.*

PUD Design Guidelines

1. In the response to comments for the sketch plan, it was noted that ADUs are permitted within Planning Area 1 and that the design guidelines would be updated accordingly;

tres birds

however, section 3.3.1.A of the draft design guidelines say that ADUs are not permitted in Planning Area 1.

Response: *This section of the design guidelines has been updated to match the PUD.*

2. Side setbacks for the townhome units appear to be less than the required 10'. (Sheets AS-01, AS-02, and AS-03)

Response: *The design guidelines have been updated to reflect a 7'-6" minimum side setback. The townhomes all satisfy this requirement.*

3. Buildings 13 and 14 – front setbacks appear to be less than the required 2'6". (Sheet AS-03)

Response: *Please see the response to comment #9 below. The design guidelines have been updated to reflect a 2'-6" minimum front setback Buildings 13 and 14 satisfy this requirement.*

4. All single family buildings (Building 15 – 26) appear to have rear setbacks less than the required 10'. (Sheets AS-02 and AS-03)

Response: *The single-family buildings and associated property lines have been updated for this submittal. This revision includes property lines satisfying the required setbacks.*

5. Buildings 20 through 25 appear to be below the minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet. (Sheets AS-02 and AS-03)

Response: *The single-family buildings and associated property lines have been updated for this submittal. There are no buildings below the minimum lot size.*

6. Are the garage size requirements found in Section 3.4.5.B minimum requirements, or the size the garage needs to be per unit type? If the latter, the townhome garages will need to be amended since each townhome has a 2-car garage.

Response: *Section 3.4.5.B was intended to describe the minimum requirements. This section of the design guidelines has been updated to clarify this.*

7. Confirm the garage dimensions for the duplexes meet the 20' x 20' standard, as the measurement is showing they currently do not meet (Dup Overall Plans, A-14).

Response: *The DUP unit garages do meet the 20'x20' minimum standard. Explicit dimensions have been added to the DUP Overall Plans Sheet in the A-Series MDP Submittal.*

8. Lighting detailed in the lighting plan (Sheet PH-004) does not appear to meet the light requirements under 3.4.10. Revise or detail as necessary.

Response: *Section 3.4.10 has been updated to reflect our intended lighting design.*

9. The setbacks established in the draft Design Guidelines seem to not match the setbacks provided for in the PUD Guide for residential uses. Front setbacks in the PUD Guide are 10 feet, whereas the Draft Guidelines have zero feet for Townhomes and five feet for Duplexes. The side setbacks in the PUD Guide are set at 7.5 feet, whereas the side setbacks for Townhomes are 12.5 feet and 10 feet for single family. These differences appear to be for all residential planning areas.

Response: *The project team acknowledges a conflict between the design guidelines and the PUD. This is an important issue and as such we've prepared an exhibit to describe our position. Please refer to item "01a - ToEPlanning_SupplementalR1Response" included in the R1 comment response folder. We look forward to further discussion with Town of Eagle Planning on this item and potential options for moving forward.*



SUPPLEMENTAL EXHIBIT TO THIS
RESPONSE ATTACHED HERE.
CLICK PDF ICON FOR ACCESS

tres birds

10. Though not relevant for this project, the setbacks established in the draft Design Guidelines seem to not match the setbacks provided for in the PUD Guide for commercial uses. For Planning Area 2 in the PUD Guide, the side setbacks for commercial building is 12.5 feet, and the rear setback is 20 feet. For Planning Area 3 in the PUD Guide is 25 feet, the side is 12.5 feet, and the rear is 20 feet. However, in the draft Design Guidelines, the front, side, and rear setbacks are all set at 10 feet.

Response: *With the exception outlined in the response to comment #9 above, the design guidelines have been updated to reflect the setbacks established in the PUD.*

Development Impact Checklist

1. Item Number 2 is selected as “will not impact” as it relates to wildlife habitats, feeding, or nesting grounds. Staff disagrees that development of this property “will not impact” the above, and review of CPW datasets shows numerous species completely within, partially within, or within the vicinity of the parcel. A table is included at the end of this comment document, along with three sets of maps based on the table. Additionally, a Raptors Nest is shown on Sheet L-104 of the MDP set but is not depicted within the Preliminary Plan set or noted/accounted for within the impact checklist. Additional reporting will be required to detail mitigation measures on the property. Section 4.14.040 of the Town’s LUDC details wildlife habitat standards.

Tres Birds: *The Development Impact Checklist has been updated has been updated in both the MDP and PPR R2 submittals. Additionally, the R2 submittal includes a Wildlife Impact Report that details the anticipated impact on local species as well as mitigation efforts the development team has committed to.*

RAMP

1. Stream Setback, Section 3.1, states that the stream setback will be protected in its natural state, yet patios appear to be within this setback, and the PUD Guide allows for supplemental encroachments into the stream setback, seemingly going against the RAMP. Additionally, the RAMP states that no grading or removal of vegetation will be conducted within the setback, except for certain activities listed in the RAMP and the PUD Guide. Please provide additional details or revise plans as necessary.

Response: *Please refer to the RAMP Comment Response Memorandum included at the end of this document.*

2. The RAMP does not seem to name the Town as a beneficiary, as detailed in Section 8.b of the approved ADA.

Response: *Please refer to the RAMP Comment Response Memorandum included at the end of this document.*

3. The RAMP does not seem to have a snow storage plan, but more of a mention on snow storage areas. Does not seem to comply with Section 8.a.viii of the approved ADA; please update as necessary or detail compliance.

Response: *Please refer to the RAMP Comment Response Memorandum included at the end of this document.*

4. The RAMP does not seem to have an informational campaign, though one is mentioned with regards to fishing. Unsure if this meets the intent of Section 8.a.ix of the approved ADA or not.

tres birds

Response: Please refer to the RAMP Comment Response Memorandum included at the end of this document.

5. The RAMP does not appear to mention the protection and maintenance of utility easements as stated in the definitions included in the Draft Design Guidelines.

Response: Please refer to the RAMP Comment Response Memorandum included at the end of this document.

6. The RAMP does not appear to include a description of permitted uses as detailed in Section 8.a.ii of the approved ADA. Update as necessary or detail compliance.

Response: Please refer to the RAMP Comment Response Memorandum included at the end of this document.

7. The RAMP does not appear to identify specific areas in need of restoration, outside of within the Stream Buffer Area, as described in Section 8.a.iv of the approved ADA. Update as necessary or detail compliance.

Response: Please refer to the RAMP Comment Response Memorandum included at the end of this document.

8. Is the ecologist mentioned in Section 6.0 of the RAMP the main means of enforcement/management for removal of trash and debris, including dog waste bags and signage, as detailed in Section 8.a.vii of the approved ADA?

Response: Please refer to the RAMP Comment Response Memorandum included at the end of this document.

Miscellaneous

1. The MDP submittal does not include an addressing plan. This was noted as part of the subdivision sketch comments under the Building Department (page 15 of comments document).

Response: An addressing plan has been included in the resubmittal.

2. Section 11.0 of the adopted PUD Guide references Section 7 of the Red Mountain Ranch ADA for RAMP compliance, whereas Section 8 of the ADA Guide contains the RAMP information.

Response: Acknowledged.

3. How is this project planning to be officially subdivided? Overall site sheets appear to show the individual lots, while the majority of remaining sheets do not, nor does the subdivision plat that was submitted. Please detail how this project will be subdivided and note that additional application(s) may need to be submitted.

Response: The revised submittal includes a Preliminary Plat Draft. This document identifies the easement referenced in this comment.

4. Please note: CPW has had staff turnover during this review process and will be providing comments in approximately two weeks. Staff will forward those comments as soon as they're received.

Response: Acknowledged.

Landscape Plan

tres birds

1. The Plant Schedule (Sheet L-401, MDP Set) shows trees having a caliper of 2.5 inches, but does not show the caliper for the evergreen trees, whereas the minimum per Section 4.11.030B.2 of the LUDC requires a minimum caliper of 3 inches. This was also noted per the subdivision sketch plan, page 8. Please update accordingly.

Response: Accepted, 3" caliper trees are specified for deciduous trees and 10' height for evergreen/coniferous trees. Aspens or other similar ornamental and clump forming trees caliper at DBH uses the square root of the sum of each stem's diameter squared to reach the 3" caliper. Please note that 3" caliper trees in the quantities required for this project may be hard to find and substitutions may be requested.

2. Detail how the areas of existing vegetation that are shown to remain will remain if they overlap with swales, detentions, or the pedestrian pathways?

Response: Accepted. Trees to remain include a tree protection detail that includes hand digging and air spading for excavation. Existing shrub, grasses, and perennial areas are augmented through overseeding with a native seed. Additional information has been included in the submittal.

3. What is the difference between the areas denoted as 4.3 – existing vegetation to remain as compared to the outlined areas denoted as 4.10? Sheets L-401 through L-409.

Response: The outlined areas of vegetation to remain are identical, the different callout numbers are a result of the different items related to the Layout and Materials Plan and the Planting Plans.

4. There appear to be no trees within the required 10ft landscape buffer area per Section 4.11.030.C of the Town's LUDC. Please update or detail as necessary.

Response: The 10' setback includes an overhead electrical line. Due to the Holy Cross Energy requirements all trees need to be a minimum of 10' from the electrical line. Trees have been included where possible along the northwestern portion of the setback.

Lighting Plan

1. Please include the total lumens and total lumen per net acre to confirm conformance with Table 4.13-1 of the Town's LUDC, found in Section 4.13.040.

Response: The revised submittal has been updated to include this information.

MDP Plan Document

1. Sheet G-03:

- a. Site Acreage Table and Planning Area 1 Open Space Table have two different acreages for the residential development percentage (12.5% vs. 11.5%). The 12.5% is also referenced in the approved PUD under Section 4.1.A.1. Additionally, it appears that the percentages of development vs. buffer/open space are reversed in this section.

Response: The tables on sheet G-03 have been revised to address this comment.

- b. Building 08 – Middle unit's driveway does not meet Town dimensional standards, which results in zero countable outdoor spaces.

Response: Building 08 has been revised. The middle unit's driveway is now sized to accommodate an outdoor parking space.

- c. Outdoor parking space is missing for Building 12, creating a one space deficiency.

tres birds

Response: The revised submittal includes 3 parking spaces (2 garage, 1 exterior) for both units of Building 12.

- d. Buildings 24 & 25 – each building has only one outdoor space per Town dimensional standards, resulting in one less outdoor parking space for each building.

Response: Buildings 24 and 25 have been revised to address this comment.

2. Sheets AS-02 and C-04: there appears to be a parking pad on Sheet AS-02 north/northeast of Building 15 that does not appear on Sheet C-04.

Response: This item has been updated and coordinated in the revised submittal.

3. Sheets AS-03 and C-05: there appears to be a parking pad north of Building 25 on Sheet AS-03 that does not appear on Sheet C-05.

Response: This item has been updated and coordinated in the revised submittal.

4. Sheet C1-04: The patio shown for Building 15 appears to be within the 75' stream setback. Would a patio be considered to fall within the "Supplementary setback requirements of 30 inches" found within the PUD Guide? Patio is greater than a 30 inch encroachment into this setback area, however.

Response: Building 15 has been revised to address this comment.

5. Sheet C-05:

- a. The patios shown for Buildings 17, 21, and 22 appear to fall within the 75' stream setback.

Response: Buildings 17, 21 and 22 have been revised to address this comment.

- b. The pedestrian pathways are shown as going through the proposed swale; however, on Sheet C1.03, the pathway through the swale is denoted as stones. Confirm or revise as necessary.

Response: The pedestrian pathways within the site use the stone crossings at the swale. Pedestrian bridges are included for both swale crossings along the Discovery Trail.

6. The pedestrian bridge, between Buildings 20 and 21, shown on Sheet L-106 does not appear on any of the other sheets within this submittal package or on the Preliminary Plan submittal package. Please update as needed.

Response: Pedestrian bridges are included for both swale crossings along the Discovery Trail. Additional bridge information is available in the MDP #2 submittal. The bridge locations have been coordinated for the MDP #2 submittal.

7. The proposed pedestrian bridge on Sheet AS-01 does not appear to cross any terrain or swales. Would this bridge (or additional) be better suited to be located over the swales instead of using paths or rocks?

Response: Pedestrian bridges are included for both swale crossings along the Discovery Trail. Additional bridge information is available in the MDP #2 submittal. The bridge locations have been coordinated for the MDP #2 submittal.

8. Compliance with the Annexation and Development Agreement:

- a. Section 5.g; no approval shall be granted until access easements are granted by CDOT

Response: Acknowledged.

tres birds

- b. Section 6.a.i; states that the water extension shall be installed at the eastern end of the property (Planning Area 6)

Response: Acknowledged.

- c. Section 10.a; Parcel OS1 to be conveyed to the Town by special warranty deed within 30 days after issuance of the first development permit for Planning Area 1.

Response: Acknowledged.

9. Architectural variations:

- a. Townhome and duplex units have the same styles and materials throughout all units. Moreso with townhome units, some variation in materials (colors, styles, etc.) could help with breaking up the monotonous feel and look. While not specified or required, changes in materials can help create more interesting views and differentiate each unit as its own unit. Staggering of middle units forward/backward could also break up the continuous facades.

Response: *We've made two adjustments to address this comment. First, for the larger TH-A buildings, we've introduced multiple steps in the 2nd level north façade. This will help to break up the mass of our largest buildings. Second, we are proposing some variation in the masonry materials across the site. While the extents of masonry will remain consistent, the tone of the masonry will vary across the site. This move allows for some differentiation across units, while maintaining a cohesive feel across the development.*

The A-Series sheets included in the MDP Submittal describe the buildings in isolation. This makes it easy to ignore the role that site design and landscaping play in breaking up monotony, creating views and differentiating units. From the beginning, this project has been developed around maintaining and enhancing the natural aspects of this site. We've sacrificed density. We've placed buildings to best take advantage of natural grading and views. We've developed exterior spaces to work with the naïve ecology and designed open space around existing site features. We feel strongly that the net impact of site design, landscaping and the proposed buildings will be an exceptional and thoughtfully composed neighborhood.

- b. Both single family residences also have the same styles and materials for both units. Again, variations in these materials/colors can assist in providing individualism to the units and breaking up the monotonous feel and look throughout the development.

Response: *In addition to the items noted in the response above, we've replaced the SF-A type with a new type (SF-D). This new type allows for additional variations referenced in this comment.*

10. Balconies/Overhangs:

- a. The balconies shown in the elevations for TH-B, TH-C, and TH-D (Sheets A-21, A-22, and A-23) appear to fall outside of the exterior wall envelopes, which would not align with Section 3.6.4.A.1 of the Draft Design Guidelines. Please revise or detail as needed.

Response: *As we've continued to develop the project, our thinking on appendages has also continued to develop. Our initial position that appendages to building were inconsistent with the overall aesthetic of the project was too limiting and failed to account for the benefits that covered exterior spaces offer in this climate particularly. We've updated the Design Guidelines to remove this section.*

tres birds

- b. The balcony shown on the elevation for SF-B (Sheet A-26) appears to fall outside of the exterior wall envelope, which would not align with Section 3.6.4.A.1 of the Draft Design Guidelines. Please revise or detail as needed.

Response: See response to comment 10a above.

11. The 12ft public trail easement detailed in Section 4.1.A.1 of the approved PUD does not appear to be shown on any sheets in the MDP submittal set or the Preliminary Plan set. Please revise as necessary or detail when this easement is to be platted.

Response: The revised submittal includes a Preliminary Plat Draft. This document identifies the easement referenced in this comment.

12. Though not shown at this time, acknowledge that mechanical equipment for units/homes will meet Section 3.6.7 of the Draft Design Guidelines.

Response: The revised submittal identifies the location of mechanical equipment for all proposed units. These are screened in accordance with the Draft Design Guidelines.

13. Recognizing rounding errors through measuring with software, these are the measurements calculated for the building types, some of which vary by $100\pm$ square feet

Response: Generally, units of the same type should have similar GFAs. The only exception is units in TH-A (E1 and M1) where the 2nd level is stepped. The revised submittal includes updated GFA tables reflecting this condition.

Impact Fees

Providing the impact fees as an acknowledgement:

- Street Impact Fee per Single Family Residential Unit: \$1,016; total: \$67,056
- Fire Impact Fee per Single Family Residential Unit: \$2,712; total: \$178,992
- Public Safety Impact Fee per Single Family Residential Unit: \$1,638.74; total: \$108,156.84
- Total impact fees (excluding school district fees): \$354,204.84

The School Land Dedication fee is still being reviewed and requires going before council, and staff is anticipating this item going before council in late May. PIF fees will be calculated separately from the above by the Public Works Department.

Response: Acknowledged.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 2, 2025

TO: [Kyle Brotherton, Town of Eagle](#)

FROM: Heather Houston, Birch Ecology
[Griffin Development, LLC](#)

RE: Red Mountain Ranch, Parcel 1 Preliminary Plan and Major Development Permit
Response to Comments RE: Riparian Areas Management Plan

The following is a comment response summary for the April 21, 2025, Town of Eagle Planning Comments provided for the Red Mountain Ranch, Parcel 1 Preliminary Plan and Major Development Permit. Responses are provided below each comment related to the RAMP on Page 3 of the comment letter. The responses are provided in blue text. The second section of our memo responds to the Eagle County Open Space and Natural Resources Comments provided regarding the RAMP on April 7, 2025. Finally, we are submitting an updated [Riparian Areas Management Plan dated September 2025](#).

TOWN OF EAGLE RAMP COMMENTS:

1. Stream Setback, Section 3.1, states that the stream setback will be protected in its natural state, yet patios appear to be within this setback, and the PUD Guide allows for supplemental encroachments into the stream setback, seemingly going against the RAMP. Additionally, the RAMP states that no grading or removal of vegetation will be conducted within the setback, except for certain activities listed in the RAMP and the PUD Guide. Please provide additional details or revise plans as necessary.

[Design plans have been revised and updated to remove patios from the stream setback.](#)

2. The RAMP does not seem to name the Town as a beneficiary, as detailed in Section 8.b of the approved ADA.

[The RAMP has been updated to name the Town as a beneficiary. Please refer to Section 3.10, Town of Eagle Beneficiary Status, on Page 17.](#)

3. The RAMP does not seem to have a snow storage plan, but more of a mention on snow storage areas. Does not seem to comply with Section 8.a.viii of the approved ADA; please update as necessary or detail compliance.



Additional language regarding snow storage areas has been added to the RAMP in Section 3.2, Stormwater Management and Water Quality Protections. Specifically, "No snow storage areas will be located within the stream setback. The snow storage areas within the development will utilize either permeable paving or landscaped beds to promote infiltration and protect water quality".

4. The RAMP does not seem to have an informational campaign, though one is mentioned with regards to fishing. Unsure if this meets the intent of Section 8.a.ii of the approved ADA or not.

The informational campaign is a concept that is to be developed – the HOA will provide information and guidelines as a part of the package given to new residents at closing.

5. The RAMP does not appear to mention the protection and maintenance of utility easements as stated in the definitions included in the Draft Design Guidelines.

The RAMP has been updated in Section 3.1, page 10 to include the following language: "If any easements are to be located within the stream setback, the easement holders have the right to maintain the vegetation as necessary in accordance with the terms of the easement".

6. The RAMP does not appear to include a description of permitted uses as detailed in Section 8.a.ii of the approved ADA. Update as necessary or detail compliance.

The permitted uses were drawn from the PUD Guide and are outlined in the RAMP within Section 3.1, Stream Setback on Pages 8 & 10. In addition, language from the PUD guide is incorporated throughout Section 3. A discussion of Trails is on Page 12 and the provisions for fishing access and in-stream habitat restoration are discussed on Page 14 of the RAMP.

7. The RAMP does not appear to identify specific areas in need of restoration, outside of within the Stream Buffer Area, as described in Section 8.a.iv of the approved ADA. Update as necessary or detail compliance.

Section 2.0 of the RAMP, and Figure 4, Sheets 1 to 7 identify the weed-dominated areas in need of restoration, both within and adjacent to the riparian corridor and floodplain. This includes many upland areas that are a part of the future development as well as areas that will be maintained in a natural state within the stream setback. The mapping included in the RAMP will provide a basis for managing and restoring the native areas that will be preserved as a part of the development, with a particular focus on the riparian corridor.



8. Is the ecologist mentioned in Section 6.0 of the RAMP the main means of enforcement/management for removal of trash and debris, including dog waste bags and signage, as detailed in Section 8.a.vii of the approved ADA?

The HOA will be in charge of these maintenance related tasks and may consult with the ecologist as needed.

EAGLE COUNTY OPEN SPACE AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMENTS

1. Page 13 in the Riparian Area Management Plan states "Provisions for in-stream fish habitat restoration are also included in the PUD Guide." However, it does not appear the provision for in-stream fish habitat restoration is outlined therein. We recommend information be provided in the PUD Guide and in the Riparian Area Management Plan regarding the proposed in-stream fish habitat restoration.

This provision is intended to allow this use in the future if and when a project has been designed.