

Kari Parsons

From: Holly Williams
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2019 11:37 AM
To: 'Peggy Escolopio'
Cc: Craig Dossey
Subject: RE: Citizens Against Overdevelopment Forest Lakes

Thank you for your comments, I have forwarded them to our planning department for their official file.

Commissioner Holly Williams

El Paso County Colorado
200 South Cascade, Suite 100
Colorado Springs, CO 80903-2202
(719) 374-0856 (mobile)
(719) 520-6411 (office)

From: Peggy Escolopio [<mailto:fescolopio@msn.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2019 9:45 AM
To: Holly Williams
Subject: Citizens Against Overdevelopment Forest Lakes

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.

Ms Williams

My husband & I have lived in Monument for almost 26 yrs, during that time there have been 3 major fires that affected us, Hayman, Waldo Canyon & Black Forest. We get that we chose to live in this area and it is a danger but allowing 180+ homes to be added with 1 access road is asking for disaster. Tragically next time there will be more loss of life if the additional houses are allowed. In addition there is the impact on water, wildlife, school district and quality of life for those of us who have lived here & enjoyed the rural aspect while still being close to a larger city. The effect on the national forest, road rage, traffic and crime is already very evident with the current building surge. Please vote against further growth in Forest Lake.

Frank & Margaret Escolopio
2965 Arnold Ave.
Monument, CO 80132

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy

Kari Parsons

From: Holly Williams
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2019 11:21 AM
To: Craig Dossey
Subject: FW: Forest Lakes Subdivision

For your file.

Commissioner Holly Williams

El Paso County Colorado
200 South Cascade, Suite 100
Colorado Springs, CO 80903-2202
(719) 374-0856 (mobile)
(719) 520-6411 (office)

From: Alicia Johnson [<mailto:chickenmama2@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2019 7:12 PM
To: Mark Waller; Cami Bremer; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams
Subject: Forest Lakes Subdivision

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.

Dear Commissioners,

We are unable to attend this weeks meeting on the Forest Lakes subdivision. We have been here for close to 25 years. It has been a wonderful, peaceful place to live. Back when we bought our property, we were assured that the joining 1000 acres was zoned for 5 acre lots, the same as ours. Well you know the story, Classic homes has come in and now we were looking at 130 some homes and at the last minute they are trying to squeeze in another 100 or so homes.

We are not against any building but we would like to maintain our lifestyle we have enjoyed since 1994.

We used to be kind of isolated up here but since they built the first phase of homes down by the lake and opened our road up, we have traffic up the ying yang now, lots of cars just driving around looking and now we have crime in our neighborhood. Cars have been broken into, a truck stolen, and a few incidents of people lurking around homes, at night as well as in the day time. We had to get a security camera. Besides all of that, we are on a well here and I am concerned about water? Classic homes has an answer for everything but they can't control the drought situation, all of these home will certainly take a toll on the aquifer that we and all of our neighbors are tapped into. If it dries up, they will still have water but what about when our well goes dry? We don't get city water here, nor do we want it. The area is pretty boxed in up against the mountain, We are concerned about fire danger. We have had at least 6 -8 fires around here since we have been here, one pretty significant one. There is really only one way out of that valley. We can get out ok for now but if people from that neighborhood chose to come up and use our roads to get out, that will be a problem.

The amount of wildlife that inhabits that property is amazing, bears, elk, deer, mountain lion, bobcats, bald eagle, raccoons, are all there making their way very nicely there. What will happen to all of that with so many homes?

We would just ask that you consider the people and wildlife who already live here and our way of life. Do we really have to be so greedy for money with all of those homes that it destroys everything that we love and enjoy, the reason that we all moved here in the first place. There are plenty of other places closer to the city to fill up will tons of homes. Please, please do not allow for over growth in our little piece of heaven.

Thanks for your time,
Brian & Alicia Johnson

Kari Parsons

From: Holly Williams
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2019 11:35 AM
To: 'john_gardner1@hotmail.com'
Cc: Craig Dossey
Subject: FW: Forest Lakes Phase II (agenda item for April 23rd meeting)

Thank you John for your comments. I have forwarded them to the planning department for the official file.

Commissioner Holly Williams

El Paso County Colorado
200 South Cascade, Suite 100
Colorado Springs, CO 80903-2202
(719) 374-0856 (mobile)
(719) 520-6411 (office)

From: John Gardner [mailto:john_gardner1@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2019 9:20 AM
To: Holly Williams
Subject: Forest Lakes Phase II (agenda item for April 23rd meeting)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.

Ms. Williams,

This email is to substantiate my position of being AGAINST the development of Forest Lakes Phase II and ask you to vote NO on its approval. **Based on the research presented below I will demonstrate that important topics have not been properly addressed. I will present information outlined in a 2007 study performed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the Forest Service that was not available for consideration when Phase II was approved in 2002.** This study was not considered in the decision process of the current Planning Commission.

As early as the 1990s, the Twin Valley Sub Area Plan discussed the importance of this unique and pristine area and recommended that it be purchased by the County for the Parks Department for preservation and future public parks and recreation. For thirty years that recommendation has not been heeded. Now we find ourselves on the brink of sacrificing one of the last and most beautiful landscapes that characterizes the Tri-Lakes area. I would ask that all of us take pause. Let's ask ourselves what will we all lose if Forest Lakes Phase II is approved? And, by lose, I mean lose forever: for those of us who live here, our children, and their children as well.

As a premise, let's remember that the citizens of El Paso County rely upon the discretion, interpretation, and wisdom of our County Commissioners when it comes to land development as well the best interest and welfare of our citizens. Since the 1980s, Forest Lakes has been one of the more controversial developments in the Tri-lakes area. It has been denied and resubmitted, bankrupted and resold, modified in its scope because of environmental concerns and the need to protect endangered species. Its ability to provide water has been argued since the beginning and now thirty years later, adequate water availability is a "presumption" backed with questionable documentation. The developers have demonstrated that increased density is their primary

goal. Their application today requests adding 50 homes to the original plan, going from 131 houses to 180, which is a 37% increase. As with their previous requests, there is no explanation or justification to support the "need" for the increase. The only reason they have given for this change is "to capture more market share." It is expected that developers seek to maximize profits but. However, the overall health and beauty of the Twin Lakes area should take precedence over that.

I would submit that there is a better and viable alternative. Going back to the previous recommendation. This acreage would better serve the County and Tri-Lakes community if it were purchased from the developer and converted into a park. It has all the unique qualities that would justify such a purchase. This would protect the natural beauty and integrity of the Twin Valley Sub Area as previously recommended. This would allow the developer an opportunity to recoup investment costs and move to a more suitable area. This is also a more prudent approach for the protection of the adjacent Pike National Forest. A study titled "**NATIONAL FORESTS ON THE EDGE**" was published by the USDA and Forest Service in 2007. According to this report, there are many risks associated with Planned Urban Developments adjacent to a National Forest. This report goes on to describe the many hazards incurred when subdivisions are built next to a National Forest. Listed below are important quotes from each of the implications cited in their research. Please read these convincing "impacts" and please vote NO to developing any part of the Forest Lakes Phase II project. As a citizen, I think this is extremely valuable information that should be included in the decision process of the Planning Commission. We have an opportunity to preserve a pristine landscape of the Tri-Lakes area. I encourage you to vote NO on any further development adjacent to national forests. **A petition with over a thousand signatures against this development is available for viewing at (www.Change.Org)**

Respectfully,
John Gardner

adjacent property owner

NATIONAL FORESTS ON THE EDGE

See (<https://www.fs.fed.us/openspace/fote/GTR728.pdf>) (page15-20)

<https://www.fs.fed.us/openspace/fote/GTR728.pdf>

IMPLICATIONS:(page 15)

"The following examples are among the specific consequences that may be associated with increased housing density on the peripheries of National Forest System lands."

Impacts on Native Fish and Wildlife Habitats and Populations: (page 15)

" For example, wildlife may be excluded from usable habitats outside the national forest or grassland boundary or be otherwise affected by the fragmentation"

Impacts From Invasive Plant Species: page (16)

"Invasives can compete with and replace native plants, reduce plant diversity, and cause other disruptions to ecosystem function. Diseases and insects can be introduced into wildland protected areas by nursery plants used in nearby landscaping; for example, widely used rhododendron (*Rhododendron* spp.) and camellia (*Camellia* spp.) plants can be hosts to the pathogen that causes sudden oak death in native oak"

Impacts on Recreation Access and Management: (page 16)

" with accompanying challenges for effective recreation management. Unmanaged recreation has been cited by the Chief of the Forest Service as one of the top four threats to the Nation's forests (USDA Forest Service 2006b)."

Impacts on Fire Management: (page 17)

"Potential for wildland fires is higher along the boundaries of forests where the human population has grown significantly (GAO 1999). Increased numbers of houses and people can be associated with more frequent ignitions"

Impacts on Water Quality and Hydrology: (page18)

" Increased housing density also creates more impervious surfaces, which lead to more runoff and increased risk of water pollution on both private and public lands (Zipperer 2002)."

Impacts on Boundary Management: (page 18)

" Increased housing density in areas adjoining National Forest System lands can enhance the potential for encroachment, trespass, and unauthorized use and occupation of the public's land and resources. Encroachments onto national forests and grasslands can transform publicly owned environments into privately claimed backyards, lawns, flower and vegetable gardens, playgrounds, garbage dumps, and personal storage sites—potentially destroying or significantly damaging a natural environment. Among the most significant impacts on National Forest System lands from development and urbanization on adjoining private lands include illegal private road building, timber harvest, and user-created off-highway-vehicle trails on national forests and grasslands. The Forest Service faces management challenges associated with control of property lines along the rapidly spreading wildland-urban interface. Limited funding, resources, and workforce have not kept pace with increased development on adjoining non-National Forest System lands. The Forest Service estimates that control of property lines for approximately 1 million acres of public land has been heavily compromised because of encroachment and trespass by adjoining landowners (Cunningham 2006)."

Social and Economic Considerations: (page18)

" The presence of increased housing development near National Forest System lands can reduce open space and alter aesthetic qualities that contribute to recreation experiences (Clark and Stankey 1979). Increased human populations have been associated with an increase in crime on public lands, such as vandalism, drug activity, assaults, and illegal garbage dumping (Tynon and Chavez 2006, Whittaker 2006). Increased public access and activities on public lands could also create heightened concerns and higher costs for management of cultural resources."

Impacts on Other Federal Land Use Planning and Administration: (page)

" Increased development activities on private lands in the vicinity of National Forest System boundaries can complicate resource planning on National Forest System lands and make land use planning and administration more expensive. Additional private landowners adjacent to national forests and grasslands means more neighbors with whom the Forest Service needs to coordinate in arranging access for fire management and recreation, managing ecosystems jointly across the landscape, and other management issues."

Summary and conclusions: (page 19)

"This report also helps to describe potential effects of development near National Forest System lands. Such an understanding can help scientists, resource managers, and communities anticipate potential impacts, plan for prudent growth, and implement policies that take into consideration the implications for national forests and grasslands on the edge of development while the windows of opportunity for effective conservation action remain open."

" Strategic, collaborative approaches are needed at local, state, regional, and national levels to help guide development in ways that reflect people's needs and values and are complementary to or consistent with the protection of resources and services on national forests and grasslands (USDA Forest Service 2006a)."

" Concentrating growth in existing towns and clustering development away from environmentally valuable land".