

1. Survey after survey has shown that people who get out into nature have a stronger desire to save the environment. Fostering this love of nature means finding ways to excite people with different backgrounds who may not simply want to slowly hike through our open spaces. But, we know that more users means more impact. Where do you draw the line in terms of increased access for groups who may want to enjoy our open spaces in different ways like picnic areas, biking trails, fishing, etc? Can we increase and improve the recreation opportunities on Boulder's open space and also save our more-wild places like designated wilderness areas?

Answer: Individuals and families are happiest when they are out in nature doing whatever it is that THEY love best. It's healthy for them, and as it shapes them into future stewards, it's also good for the land. Because of those two truths, we want to enable people to access lands in ways which suit them best. That likely means opening up some additional trails for access, where fragile habitat is not implicated, and as funds allow.

2. The North Sky Trail, a vital multi-use connector trail between Boulder City and open space areas to the north, was approved after lengthy discussion during the North Trail Study Area process but has been stalled for nearly five years. If elected to council, how would you un-stick this process and complete the trail within your first term?

Answer: I support completing the trail. My ability to unstick the process and accomplish much of anything will be largely dependent on who the other 8 city council members are! If others are like-minded, I would hope that we embrace data and defer to experts on the project. Of course, the environmentally sensitive nature of the area will require some mitigation of impacts (including avoidance) in relevant areas. A consistent adaptive management/monitoring program will be key to ensuring that environmentally sensitive areas continue to be protected into the future.

3. What is your position related to acquisition versus maintenance of our current OSMP land stock? On what grounds should we acquire new properties?

Answer: We should only acquire new properties if they offer significant OSMP value. I do not believe in acquisition in cases where the primary purpose is to halt development (rather than to add valuable OSMP lands). At this point, given our \$40 million backlog, and our robust OS holdings, I would put more resources to maintenance rather than acquisition.

4. How would you address increased visitation of OSMP?

Answer: we have an embarrassment of riches with our OSMP! But some trails are preferred and more frequently used than others (such as Chautauqua and Sanitas). We can make some additional trails equally accessible, to divert users. Moreover, we can

offer increased shuttle services, beyond what is present at Chautauqua, to encourage people to diversify the trail use choices.

5. What role does recreation play in a healthy society? How would you support that in future policy?

Answer: it is huge. Right now, the average Boulder County child spends 7 minutes a day outside, and 7 hours a day in front of screens! This leads to things like obesity and depression. We can work with schools to encourage more student trips to OSMP (my sister's Fit Lit class at Casey was a phenomenal example of creative thinking on this front). We can improve the ease of getting to trails, such as through the Chautauqua Shuttle. We can provide better funding for our Rec Centers and open space.

6. Where do you see yourself on the conservation vs. recreation spectrum with regards to Open Space? Specifically, as a council member would you likely vote against an OSMP-recommended new trail or other recreation facility because of conservation or environmental concerns, or would you support it if the research showed that those concerns were insignificant or could be mitigated?

Answer: We obviously have a duty to conserve our wondrous green space. That said, we also are here to enjoy the space. So I guess I'm right down the middle of the spectrum -- partly because, if we don't properly conserve, the land won't remain viable for recreation purposes. That would be a vicious cycle. I will follow data, hence will support recreation if the research shows environmental concerns are insignificant or mitigatable.

7. Do you feel that hikers, mountain bikers, trail runners, equestrians, and other trail users can all have a positive experience on a shared multi-use trail in OSMP?

Answer: Sometimes. I prefer having enough trails available that each use can have the freedom to experience OSMP without coming into conflict with the others. Mountain bikers going down obviously need paths that are safe for the hikers and trail runners going up! One good option is on/off days for biking. The County does this on some trails. As Betasso user, I am well-aware that on Wednesdays and Saturdays, I will not encounter bikes, and I find this to be a good balance.

8. Several multi-use regional trails have been proposed over the years (including the Front Range Trail, the Boulder-to-Erie Union Pacific Rail-Trail conversion, and others) but the connectivity stalls when there is a need to include OSMP land in the process. Would you support these regional trails, and why or why not?

Answer: Yes, potentially. I need to know how much OSMP land is involved (I assume we are talking about a negligible amount, but need to understand better). We know that for

our climate goals, we need to get people out of cars and onto bikes. It's an exciting time to be looking at ways to connect bike routes.

9. One of BATCO's initiatives is the Trail Around Boulder, a 34 mile multi-use trail encircling the City of Boulder, which would allow access to, and appreciation of, Boulder's amazing geographic setting. It would connect neighborhoods and would offer transportation alternatives to the car, encourage a healthy lifestyle, attract visitors to Boulder, and make trails fun again. It would link existing trails, 80% of which are already in place, and would require only about 7 miles of new trails all of which could be carefully designed to avoid sensitive habitats. Yet the City of Boulder (OSMP) has resisted all attempts to complete the Trail Around Boulder. Would you support this trail, and why or why not?

Answer: This sounds awesome! It is important to encourage alternative methods of transportation (as well as recreation). I am interested in learning more about exactly what hurdles are preventing its completion. This trail sounds "too good to be true" - if that's the case, why hasn't it been completed? I support the trail in theory, but I feel that I need more information on what the hurdles are, before committing to a full "yes.

10. Recent articles in the local media have spotlighted communication issues within several City departments, including Planning, Public Works, and Transportation. A consulting firm hired by the City found that arduous, slow, and unpredictable decision making, a lack of discipline in implementing procedures, and lack of support from Council, resulted in staff dissatisfaction. The same problems plague Open Space and Mountain Parks but the issue is much larger than staff dissatisfaction. Many members of the public have contributed thousands of hours of volunteer time, expertise, and effort to OSMP management -- only to experience similar frustration with Council overriding sensitive negotiations in seemingly arbitrary votes that promote a different preconceived agenda. As a Council member, how would you improve relations between the City and the public?

Answer: First, I would seek to ground decisions in facts and data, so that decisions are not seemingly arbitrary. Second, I would act with transparency. I believe that much of the current frustration with Council is that decisions are formulated before Public Comment even starts, and for reasons that are not aligned with the rationale offered to the public. Council needs to be more transparent around the WHY. Council also needs to be transparent and clear about the actual goals and objectives of any project, prioritizing public input that is focused on accomplishing those goals/objectives. Third, I would stick to timelines for public engagement. If we engage once, robustly, and give ample notice, then I do not believe we should re-open public engagement when new people move into the neighborhood or a rumor starts that leads to demand for new hearings. That circular process has us chasing our tails on myriad projects, and is surely one of the reasons for intense staff dissatisfaction.

11. Do you feel that recreation is adequately represented on the current OSBT?

Answer: No. We need a more diverse group of board members who are interested in the recreational aspects of OS / willing to consider them. The current OSBT appears skewed towards acquisition and conservation.