

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: Matt Yamashita

R1 Comment Responses: Colorado Parks and Wildlife

Matt Yamashita,

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 **05.01.2025**. Your comments and our responses are written below in the following format:

Original comment; Rewritten in grey font.

Tres Birds: 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:

General Comments and Recommendations

As mentioned in the application, CPW holds a perpetual public fishing easement along the Eagle River within the proposed development that also consists of three designated access points. CPW would like to discuss further regarding the future and scope of the fishing easement and how the three access points will be integrated into the planning areas, or what consensual adjustments or agreements need to be made. CPW understands that the existing public fishing easement extends across planning areas 2-6; CPW would like to recommend providing public fishing access in planning area 1 and permit fishing on the north side of the Eagle River on associated open spaces as well. CPW would also like to add that the proposed fly fishing only and catch and release only rules are not consistent with CPW's rules and regulations and are not necessary or enforceable.

Response: *We agree with the recommendation to provide public fishing access in Planning Area 1. This aligns with the intention of the OS-2 area identified in the PUD. See Section 4.6 of the Wildlife Conservation Plan Report included in the R2 submittal for additional feedback.*

An active bald eagle nest is located within the current proposed development (planning area 1), which has the potential to influence the current proposal and subsequent proposals with other associated planning areas. CPW's recommendations for active bald eagles nest are as follows:

- No Surface Occupancy and No Ground Disturbance (year-round) within 0.25-mile of an active nest. If an active nest is located within a highly developed area (10 daily occupied structures within 1/4 mile of nest), then surface occupancy and ground disturbance distance is reduced to within 660 feet of the active nest; No permitted or authorized human activities within 0.5-mile of an active nest from December 1 to July 31. If an active nest is located within a highly developed area, no permitted or authorized human activities distance is reduced to within 0.25-mile from December 1 to July 31.

Response: *Acknowledged. To address this comment, we have engaged a wildlife consultant to evaluate the site and provide recommendations. Their findings were documented in a report that has been included in this resubmittal (RMR – Wildlife Conservation Plan). Specifically, sections 4.3, 4.6, 5.0 and Appendix D describe our proposed mitigation measures and the USFWS Eagle Disturbance General Take Permit this development has received.*

CPW is aware of the East Eagle-Hardscrabble Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) on BLM land to the south of the proposed development. CPW does not recommend trail based recreational connectivity to the south, which has the potential to increase fragmentation of critical winter range and disturbance to deer and elk. If connectivity is provided to the BLM trail network, CPW would like consultation to ensure the alignment is as close to the Bluffs residential development as possible.

Response: *Acknowledged. We are not currently proposing any connections to trails or public lands south of Planning Area 1.*

CPW recommends regulations consistent with Eagle County and other local municipalities, such as Vail and Avon, regarding feeding wildlife and bear resistant container or enclosure requirements and proper use of such. CPW recommends trash enclosures are constructed of quality materials such as brick as opposed to wood, and completely enclosed

Response: *We've designed the dwelling units to accommodate trash bins within each garage. There are no exterior trash enclosures proposed at this time.*

tres birds

CPW recommends avoiding constructing fences where practicable, and following “fencing with wildlife in mind” principles when constructing fences.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

CPW recommends designating multiple or one sufficient sized dog park that is adequately fenced and implementing a leash requirement outside of the dog park to reduce potential for wildlife harassment and conflict.

Response: *The R2 submittal identifies a communal area intended for pets of residents. See updated drawings for additional information.*

With the potential for bear and lion conflict, other forms of human-wildlife conflict and disturbance to wildlife, and opportunities to provide general education regarding wildlife, fishing, etc.; CPW recommends there are mechanisms and infrastructure in place to properly provide signage and education to residents and visitors when necessary, throughout the development and open space.

Response: *We agree with this recommendation and intend to provide signage reflecting this comment and the recommendations noted in the Wildlife Impact Report included in the R2 submittal.*