

## MEMORANDUM

To: City Council

From: Dan Burke, Interim Director, Open Space and Mountain Parks (OSMP)  
Steve Armstead, Interim Deputy Director  
Mark Davison, Community Connections and Partnerships Manager  
Mark Gershman, Planning and Design Supervisor  
Deryn Wagner, Senior Planner  
Juliet Bonnell, Associate Planner

CC: Open Space Board of Trustees (OSBT)

Date: March 4, 2019

**Subject: Statistically Valid Survey to Support the OSMP Master Plan**

---

OSMP staff are requesting final input and guidance from City Council regarding a survey instrument being designed to support the OSMP Master Plan process. The final draft is available in **Attachment A**. Pending final council direction, the survey is scheduled to be mailed out in the coming weeks, and results will be analyzed in time to support a joint study session on June 11 with City Council and the Open Space Board of Trustees (OSBT).

Further detail is available in a [memo](#) that staff previously submitted on February 7, 2019 to gather initial feedback from City Council and OSBT on a previous draft of the survey instrument. Since that time, staff received and addressed 117 written and verbal comments from both parties (see **Attachment B**) and held a study session with OSBT on February 20 to further discuss and revise the survey (notes are available [here](#)).

Staff subsequently revised the survey for final review by the OSMP Master Plan Process Committee on February 27. At that committee meeting, final refinements were suggested, which have been added to the comment log in **Attachment B** and incorporated into the final draft now under consideration by City Council. **Attachment C** has also been included to document guidance from the Process Committee on the methodology for sampling, weighting and analyzing data.

At the Process Committee meeting on February 27, committee members also confirmed their interest in having City Council review the final draft to ensure that the draft statistical survey accurately reflects input from the City Council and OSBT. The purpose of City Council review at this time is to provide guidance to staff so they can finalize the survey and send it out to selected households on March 15.

### NEXT STEPS

Results from the next engagement window, including the statistical survey, will inform the development of the draft OSMP Master Plan, which will be made available for public review in mid-May.

Date	Item
March 2019	Engagement Window 4, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- March 15: Statistical Survey goes out to sampled households</li><li>- March 18: Community workshop</li><li>- March 25: Survey goes out to the general public</li><li>- March-April: Micro-engagements with youth, those experiencing disabilities, the Spanish-speaking community and OSMP ranchers and farmers</li></ul>
April 2019	April 17: OSBT Study Session on Financial Sustainability and Funding Scenarios

May 2019	Draft OSMP Master Plan available for public review
June 2019	- Joint City Council/OSBT Study Session to Discuss Draft Plan ( <i>June 11</i> ) - Subsequent OSBT Study Session to Further Discuss Draft Plan ( <i>June 12</i> )
July/Aug 2019	Revised Draft Master Plan Released for Planning Board and OSBT review
Sept 2019	Final Plan Hearings, Recommendations and Approvals (City Council)

**Attachments:**

- Attachment A:** OSMP Master Plan Survey Instrument – FINAL DRAFT (Refined with input as of February 27 from OSBT, Council and Process Committee)
- Attachment B:** Written and verbal comments from OSBT, City Council and Process Committee
- Attachment C:** Methodology summary



## City of Boulder - Open Space and Mountain Parks 2019 Master Plan Survey

1. On average, how often have you visited Open Space and Mountain Parks (OSMP) areas during the past 12 months? (Please see the map on the front page to identify the areas owned and/or managed by OSMP. You can also see a map online at [bit.ly/mapXX](http://bit.ly/mapXX))

- Never → go to question #3     
  Once a month     
  Once a week     
  Daily/almost daily  
 1 to 3 times a year     
  2 to 3 times a month     
  2 to 3 times per week

2. Of the following activities, which **TWO** do you most frequently participate in when visiting OSMP areas?

- Hiking/walking     
  Climbing/bouldering  
 Dog walking     
  Fishing  
 Running     
  Picnicking  
 Biking     
  Skiing/snowshoeing  
 Observing nature/wildlife     
  Contemplation/meditation  
 Photography/painting     
  Social gathering  
 Horseback riding     
  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

3. What are the things that keep you from visiting OSMP areas more often? (Please check all that apply.)

- Nothing, I visit OSMP often → go to question #4     
  I don't know where OSMP lands are  
 Health or mobility issues     
  Lack of time in my life to visit  
 I don't feel welcome     
  The trails don't match the activities I like to do  
 I don't feel safe     
  The amenities aren't family-friendly  
 OSMP areas are too crowded     
  My family likes to do other things  
 Not sure how to find out about OSMP and how to access nature     
  Not easy to get there by bus, bike or walking  
 Other: \_\_\_\_\_

4. In July 2018, City Council approved five themes to focus OSMP management over the next decade. To what degree is each important for the future of Boulder's open space system? Which **TWO** are most important?

	Absolutely Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Not at all important	Highest importance (Choose only 2)
Ecosystem Health and Resilience .....	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Responsible Recreation, Stewardship and Enjoyment ...	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Agriculture Today and Tomorrow .....	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community Connection, Education and Inclusion .....	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Financial Sustainability .....	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. How much of a problem, if at all, do you think **crowding** or **parking congestion** are at each of the following locations? (Please see map on the front page to identify these locations, or see a map online at [bit.ly/mapXX](http://bit.ly/mapXX)) Please think about each separately. (For crowding, think about on or along trail corridors, while parking conditions are at or near the parking lot(s)/trailhead.)

	<b>Crowding</b>				<b>Parking congestion</b>			
	A large problem	A small problem	Not at all a problem	Don't know	A large problem	A small problem	Not at all a problem	Don't know
Chautauqua .....	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Sanitas .....	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Bobolink .....	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Doudy Draw/South Mesa .....	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Wonderland Lake .....	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Flatirons Vista .....	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Boulder Valley Ranch .....	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Gregory Canyon .....	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Marshall Mesa .....	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Other .....	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

**6. On a case-by case basis, OSMP is considering managing high visitation in certain areas through the following approaches. In these circumstances, to what extent would you support or oppose the following actions?**

	Strongly support	Support	Oppose	Strongly oppose	No opinion/ Don't know
Increasing education/outreach about trail etiquette.....	1	2	3	4	5
Requiring dogs to be leashed on more trails.....	1	2	3	4	5
Increasing enforcement and ranger patrols.....	1	2	3	4	5
Widening, hardening or redesigning trails to support high visitation levels.....	1	2	3	4	5
Charging for parking at more OSMP trailheads .....	1	2	3	4	5
Providing low- or no-cost shuttles to trailheads .....	1	2	3	4	5
Adding amenities to less frequented areas to disperse visitors across the system .....	1	2	3	4	5
Separating uses such as hiking, biking and horseback-riding by time and/or place .....	1	2	3	4	5
Closing trails for a period of time to protect wildlife and habitats....	1	2	3	4	5
Closing OSMP parking lots when full and only letting cars in when someone leaves.....	1	2	3	4	5
Requiring a reservation to access high demand areas during popular times.....	1	2	3	4	5

**7. New trails can be created when visitors try to reach destinations by going off trail or by using trails that are not officially managed by OSMP. In sensitive habitat areas, to what extent would you support or oppose OSMP closing unmanaged trails to better protect natural resources?**

Strongly support     Support     Oppose     Strongly oppose     Don't know

**8. In sensitive habitat areas, OSMP currently requires visitors to stay on trail or to seek a permit for allowable off-trail uses like educational research. To what extent would you support or oppose OSMP extending these requirements to stay on managed trails into targeted locations to better protect natural resources?**

Strongly support     Support     Oppose     Strongly oppose     Don't know

**9. City staff must consider competing priorities to develop a budget for OSMP management. What if it were up to you? With \$5 increments being the smallest amount you might use, if you had \$100 to spend, how would you allocate those funds across the 10 management activities below?**

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ Maintaining and improving trails and visitor amenities

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ Restoring degraded ecosystems and wildlife habitat

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ Preparing for extreme weather events like flooding, fire and drought

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ Providing education, outreach and volunteer programs

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ Engaging underserved communities, including the Latino community and those experiencing disabilities

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ Reducing visitor impacts to the natural environment in light of increased visitation trends

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ Developing youth opportunities to spend more time in nature

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ Maintaining and improving the condition of OSMP ranches and farms

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ Acquiring more open space

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ Researching and monitoring open space resources and trends

**10. After 120 years of open space acquisitions, there is less land left for OSMP to acquire and protect. The lands that are left are also becoming more expensive. Therefore, OSMP must prioritize its approach to future acquisitions. How important are each of the following reasons for acquiring and protecting available land and related resources?**

	Absolutely Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Not at all important
To protect and connect high-quality habitat for plants and animals.....	1	2	3	4
To protect waterways such as floodplains, rivers, streams and wetland areas.....	1	2	3	4
To preserve water rights for native ecosystems and local agriculture.....	1	2	3	4
To limit oil and gas development.....	1	2	3	4
To preserve scenic areas or vistas.....	1	2	3	4
To protect ranches and farms from development.....	1	2	3	4
To support future trails and connect existing ones.....	1	2	3	4
To further shape Boulder's urban boundary with open space.....	1	2	3	4
To acquire natural areas within city limits.....	1	2	3	4

As OSMP considers potential management strategies for the future, trade-offs will have to be made. Please indicate how strongly you lean one way or the other for each pair of statements. For example, if you feel strongly about the statement to the right, check the box closest to that statement. If you lean slightly toward the statement on the left, check a box closer to the middle.

**11. OSMP should focus more on...**

Improving ecosystem health on existing OSMP lands, including forests, grasslands, creeks, and wetlands	←————→ <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	→————← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Acquiring more lands for conservation
--	---	---	---------------------------------------

**12. OSMP should focus more on...**

Improving maintenance and design of existing trails	←————→ <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	→————← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Building new trails
---	---	---	---------------------

**13. Existing OSMP areas should provide more...**

Areas to visit with dogs off leash	←————→ <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	→————← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Areas where dogs are not allowed
------------------------------------	---	---	----------------------------------

**14. Existing OSMP areas should provide more...**

Areas and days of the week when biking is not allowed	←————→ <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	→————← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Targeted areas where opportunities for biking are improved
---	---	---	--

**15. OSMP should focus more on...**

Increasing horse trailer parking at trailheads	←————→ <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	→————← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Reducing horse trailer parking at trailheads
--	---	---	--

**16. OSMP should address increasing visitation by...**

Accommodating high use in certain locations with careful placement of amenities to focus use This means popular areas would be modified to accommodate high levels of use, including hardening or widening trails to reduce social trailing, and providing adequate signs, restrooms, parking and other services to limit other impacts to the environment.	←————→ <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	→————← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Spread out use and steer visitors to other trailheads by creating amenities that attract people to them This means that visitation would be encouraged in locations that currently receive less visitation by modifying trails, amenities and services to improve experiences and minimize resource impacts.
--	---	---	---

17. OSMP is interested in improving visitors' experiences, particularly in areas where visitors are more likely to experience conflicts with others. Thinking of your own personal preferences, what would you be more willing to do yourself?

Continue my preferred activities on all days of the week, even though a mix of different activities may lead to conflicts between visitors <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Limit my preferred activities to certain days of the week to reduce the number of activities happening at the same time, even though this means giving up some of my options on a given day <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--

18. Prairie dogs and invasive weeds present ongoing management challenges for OSMP grasslands, forests, farms and ranches. Please tell us your level of familiarity or knowledge about each of these topics, and check the box if you are interested in learning more about these subjects.

	Not at all familiar	Familiar	Very Familiar	Expert	Interested in learning more
Prairie dogs.....	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Invasive weeds.....	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>

Using best practices, OSMP manages prairie dogs and invasive weeds starting with the least aggressive or toxic approach. For example, prairie dogs can be moved to different locations to reduce the negative effects they have on irrigated farmland. Certain invasive weeds can be managed through techniques like grazing or prescribed burns, which often improves habitat for native plants and animals. However, in many locations or circumstances, these gentle approaches can be cost-prohibitive, infeasible and ineffective at addressing persistent problems. Please share your preferences in these situations.

19. When other management approaches have been unsuccessful at controlling PRAIRIE DOG POPULATIONS on or near irrigated farmland, how much would you support or oppose lethal control to remove prairie dog colonies from these areas?

Strongly support   
  Support   
  Oppose   
  Strongly oppose   
  Don't know

20. When other management approaches have been unsuccessful at controlling aggressive INVASIVE WEEDS that damage natural habitats, how much would you support or oppose integrating the targeted use of synthetic chemical sprays into the broader management approach?

Strongly support   
  Support   
  Oppose   
  Strongly oppose   
  Don't know

21. OSMP staff would like to improve the way they share data, trends, and information with the public about nature, recreation, agriculture, education, volunteering, and cultural resources. How likely would you be to use each of the following to educate yourself?

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not at all likely
Technical reports.....	1	2	3
Graphic materials like handouts, brochures and maps that summarize technical information.....	1	2	3
Website content, including interactive data dashboards and videos.....	1	2	3
On-site signs, including links to online content.....	1	2	3
Social media like Instagram.....	1	2	3
Public lectures, seminars and forums.....	1	2	3
Other in-person educational opportunities.....	1	2	3
Educational apps.....	1	2	3

22. In 2018, a Boulder sales taxes that supported OSMP expired. In 2019, another will expire. Together, these changes represent a 30 percent reduction in annual OSMP funding. How much would you support or oppose a tax measure to restore part or all of this funding for OSMP?

Strongly support   
  Support   
  Oppose   
  Strongly oppose   
  Don't know

23. Would you be more likely to vote for a dedicated tax for OSMP if...

The tax would expire in 10 or fewer years <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	The tax did not expire <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---

24. Is there anything else you would like to share with the OSMP Master Plan team?

---



---

**Our last questions are about you and your household. Again, all of your responses to this survey are completely anonymous and will be reported in group form only.**

25. Does your household own or normally have use of any of the following?

	yes	no
Passenger vehicles (cars, SUVs, vans, etc.) .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Motorcycles/scooters.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Regular bicycles .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Electric-assisted bicycles .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

26. About how often, if ever, do you take the bus for personal trips (such as shopping or recreation)?

- Never/once a year or less  
 2 to 11 times a year  
 1 to 3 times a month  
 1 to 2 times a week  
 3 times a week or more

27. Which best describes the building you live in?

- House detached from any other houses  
 House attached to one or more houses (e.g., a duplex or townhome)  
 Building with two or more apartments or condos  
 Manufactured or mobile home  
 Other

28. Do you rent or own your home?

- I rent       I own       Other

29. Which category contains your age?

- 18-24     35-44     55-64     75-84  
 25-34     45-54     65-74     85+

30. Do any of the following live in your household?

	yes	no
Children (ages 12 and under) .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teenagers (ages 13 to 19).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adults (ages 20 to 54, including yourself).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adults (ages 55 or older, including yourself)...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dogs.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

31. Which gender do you most identify with?

- Female  
 Male  
 I do not identify with either gender OR I do not identify with one gender more than the other

32. Which race or ethnicity do you most identify with? Please check all that apply.

- White  
 Hispanic or Latino  
 Black or African American  
 American Indian or Alaska Native  
 Asian  
 Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander  
 Other

33. How would you describe your annual household income:

- Less than \$25,000       \$100,000 to \$149,999  
 \$25,000 to \$49,999     \$150,000 or more  
 \$50,000 to \$99,999

**Thank you very much! Please return the completed survey in the postage-paid envelope to:  
National Research Center, Inc.; 2955 Valmont Road, #300; Boulder, CO 80301**

Original Question #	Survey Version	Commenter	Comment	Response
#1	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Kevin Bracyknight	Can you reorder these so that clearly "I never go here" is on the left and "I live in OSMP lands" is on the right? This is a confusing matrix presently.	re-ordered responses
#2	Process Committee Draft (Feb 27)	Process Committee	address the fact that this question addresses both activities and motivations, i.e. consider "check all that apply"	incorporated
#3	Process Committee Draft (Feb 27)	Process Committee	Remove the response option of "my income level and work routine are barriers to spending time in nature". A less sensitive and personal response of "lack of time in my life to visit" is already available and sufficient.	removed
#6	Process Committee Draft (Feb 27)	Process Committee	Remove the response option to this question of "limiting the number of people allowed in an area or on a trail at any one time". This option has already been replaced by the two final response options for this question "closing OSMP parking lots when full and only letting cars in when someone leaves" and "requiring a reservation to access high demand areas during popular times"	removed
#7	Process Committee Draft (Feb 27)	Process Committee	· Remove the reference to natural areas and habitat conservation areas, instead use words such as sensitive habitat areas · Instead of "unofficial social" trails refer to these as "undesignated or unmanaged"	incorporated
#8	Process Committee Draft (Feb 27)	Process Committee	· Preface this question with: "we currently require on trail use in sensitive habitat areas" because people may not know what current requirements are and what expanding those would mean. · make it clear this would only occur in targeted locations, not everywhere	incorporated
#9	Process Committee Draft (Feb 27)	Process Committee	· Noted that the open-ended "Other" response option should have been removed based on OSBT feedback. · Add the number of activities since there are 10 example activities into the question: (e.g. if you have \$100 to spend, how would you allocate those funds across the 10 management activities below?)	incorporated
#10	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown	Maybe "How would you address the increasing number (180 miles) of unmanaged social trails? I think most of these trails should be closed to reduce habitat impacts I think most of the trails should be kept open and officially maintained."	question and context revised
#10	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown	Alternative approach: "Would you support closing unofficial, social trails where they fragment important natural habitat?" Y/N	question and context revised
#10	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Karen Hollweg	AGREE WITH CURT'S RE-WORDING	question and context revised
#10	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Karen Hollweg	"10. If OSMP closed and restored unofficial, social trails where they fragment important natural habitat and asked you to stay on the official trails, would you do/support that?" Y/N"	question and context revised
#10	Process Committee Draft (Feb 27)	Process Committee	· Remove the second portion of the question "Which two are your highest priority?" · Consider removing or clarifying exactly what's meant by the response "To bring nature and agriculture into the city"	incorporated
#11	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Karen Hollweg	"More opportunities (places?) to visit".	incorporated
#11 - 12	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Kevin Bracyknight	I think that Questions 11 & 12 single out two user groups. This is prone to creating more fights within our community. I don't think it's appropriate. While I'm excited for data, I fear that this does nothing to really help our community heal from years of infighting. Worse, what this does is turn our visitation into a rule by majority system that doesn't adequately reflect the diversity of interests and values.	we have added questions to address the top 4 primary visitor activities - hiking, dog walking, running and biking
General Trade-off questions #11-17	Process Committee Draft (Feb 27)	Process Committee	· Add language to add emphasis to each of the trade-off questions with words such as "more" or "principally". E.g. #11 OSMP should focus more on... #12 OSMP should principally support opportunities to..., etc. · Be consistent in the way we ask dog, bike, and equestrian questions #13, 14, and 15, keeping the options parallel (e.g. asking whether we should offer more opportunities for this activity or fewer opportunities for this activity)	incorporated

Original Question #	Survey Version	Commenter	Comment	Response
#12	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	This question needs to include quality of the trails or the experience of new trails. In my BC years (Before Children) I rode mtn bikes quite a bit and I was never excited to ride on OSMP, and gravitated toward the County properties for a higher quality experience - differences in terrain, ecosystems, moving through beautiful settings and arriving at beautiful vistas. This type of experience is not well supported in OSMP, despite the trope that bikes are allowed on 50+ miles of OSMP trails ... very few of those trails go into the mountains. If OSMP added another 50 miles today onto the plains, the mtn bikers might not appreciate it. So to me, a useful question is not strictly about increasing trail miles, but needs to include a nod to increased opportunities having the correct flavor. I'm not sure how to accomplish this, but maybe it's as simple as modifying the left-hand element to state "Increased (More and/or higher-quality opportunities)" but maybe leave the "decreased" option alone.	revised to be "Increased and improved (more and better opportunities)"
#13	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	We need to decouple acquisition and new trails. We will get muddled responses as currently written - people can choose the right-hand option if they want more land for flora and fauna but not for trails, and if they simply want more trails but could give a hoot about flora/fauna/habitat/ecosystems. We cannot make clear management decisions if we cannot separate these two motivations.	broken out into two questions
#13	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Lisa Morzel	Question 13: this should be broken into two separate questions. And why do we need to assume to build new trails? We cannot build our way out of over use. How about a simple question about whether OSMP should build new trails?	broken out into two questions, one of which will provide data on how much or how little respondents are interested in building new trails versus maintaining existing ones
#14	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	Awesome, so glad this question is included.	question has been revised per discussion at OSBT study session
#14	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown	choice is not in conflict with the left, as written. The question is whether we should use more aggressive controls where colonies are NOT part of a large ecosystem and where they are damaging other important resources.	question has been revised per discussion at OSBT study session
#14	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Karen Hollweg	I agree with Curt's suggestion for replacing this one.	question has been revised per discussion at OSBT study session
#14	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Lisa Morzel	Question 14 should not be included as these are complex policies set by OSBT and City Council and have serious ramifications on survival of insect populations (our fastest and rapidly declining animal species on Earth). This is like asking 3-year-olds what they want on OSMP. Any answer is irrelevant as it would not be an informed answer.	question has been revised per discussion at OSBT study session, and another has been added to understand level of knowledge and interest in the subject
#14	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Suzanne Jones	I think another option should be managing them to better protect neighboring farmers/ranchers and leasees of open space. (That is one of the tricky tradeoffs in managing prairie dogs on open space lands, so I think we need to get at it more directly.)	question has been revised per discussion at OSBT study session
#15	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown	Similar quandary. I don't think that cost is one of the main issues. (?) Like prairie dogs, we are asking... " Where an invasive plant is damaging important habitats or natural communities, and where OSMP has not succeeded in limiting its expansion using natural means (grazing, controlled burning, etc.) would you support OSMP using more effective, synthetic herbicides in a targeted fashion?" y/n	question and context revised
#15	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Karen Hollweg	I'd like to suggest a bit of a revision to Curt's suggested replacement: Where an invasive weed is damaging important habitats or natural communities, and where OSMP has not succeeded in limiting its expansion using management strategies (grazing, controlled burning, etc.) would you support OSMP using the least toxic herbicide that has proven to be effective, in a targeted fashion?" y/n [aren't least toxic and most effective the criteria we use in making IPM decisions?]	question and context revised
#15	Process Committee Draft (Feb 27)	Process Committee	A trade-off for equestrians would be more about trailheads and where there is parking for equestrian activities. Consider asking this question as: - whether OSMP should increase or decrease equestrian opportunities and access such as parking and trailheads.	incorporated

Original Question #	Survey Version	Commenter	Comment	Response
#16	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	Super interesting, also glad this is here.	noted
#16	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown	(Suggested change) We are interested in reducing conflicts among different users of open space on certain trails. What is your preference in addressing the issue:  Assign different types of uses to different days in order to reduce conflict, even though it might mean giving up some of my options on a given day.  Continue allowing all uses every day, even though this may lead to increased conflict as visitation increases.	integrated while still honoring direction from process committee to frame this to understand what individuals are willing to do themselves
#16	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Karen Hollweg	I agree with Curt's rewrite of this, but change "uses" to "users" in his first sentence.	incorporated
#17	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Karen Hollweg	I like this item, but want to ask if staff wants to check support for digital links on signs??	incorporated, along with related staff suggestions
#17	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Karen Hollweg	"More or improved on-site signs, [perhaps with digital links?]"	incorporated
#17	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Karen Hollweg	Change this to opportunities [for me programs are organized/formal groups, I think opportunities includes more one-on-one opportunities to learn from on-trail volunteer "hosts"/"naturalists" or whatever you are calling them in addition to more organized group programs].	incorporated
#17	Process Committee Draft (Feb 27)	Process Committee	· Frame this question more around conflict than crowding and make the response options about temporal separation more clear (that this is about the activities people would be willing to take to reduce conflict). · Remove the negative, biased language from this question (e.g. the word frustrating)	incorporated
#18 - 19	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	Based on my experience as part of the working group for a Transportation Maintenance Fee (which council transmuted into repurposing the open space tax increment), there are multiple avenues for funding city efforts, but I believe all can be described as either a tax or a fee. Sales tax is inherently regressive and it is possible to design fees in a more equitable manner. Therefore I believe that the wording in both questions should be changed to "tax or fee" to cover our bases.	direction from Process Committee was to ask specifically about a sales tax - additional revenue streams will be explored in the planning process
General: Prairie Dog and Invasive Questions #18-20	Process Committee Draft (Feb 27)	Process Committee	· Hearing public opinion on these questions is important to City Council and OSBT as decision-makers so please include these questions · These questions provide valuable education and context around the issues of prairie dogs and invasives. · General public may not be familiar with the term "lethal control", but this is the most neutral term to use. · Consider not limiting these questions in relation to only "irrigated farmland"- consider including native grasslands/other high value ecological areas, too.	incorporated
#18	Process Committee Draft (Feb 27)	Process Committee	· Consider adding the term "cost-prohibitive" in the second to last sentence of the educational context setting paragraph.	incorporated
#20	Process Committee Draft (Feb 27)	Process Committee	· When referencing "related damage to natural habitats" in this question, consider making this less passive and describing the related damage invasive weeds can cause. · When referencing "synthetic chemicals", consider making it more specific to read "synthetic chemical sprays"	incorporated
General	Process Committee Draft (Feb 27)	Process Committee	Consider removing the word staff from numerous questions and responses. Instead just refer to OSMP (as a department) instead of OSMP staff throughout the survey.	incorporated

Original Question #	Survey Version	Commenter	Comment	Response
#2	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Cindy Carlisle	Connecting with nature IS seeing birds, wildlife, etc - redundant.	Per other comments, Q2 was removed and replaced with a question about primary activity while on OSMP, which includes "observing nature/wildlife"
#2	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	I AGREE WITH SAM WEAVER.	Q2 was removed and replaced with a question about primary activity while on OSMP
#2	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Lisa Morzel	After question 2, insert question "How do you usually access OSMP?" The assumption seems to be that everyone drives to OSMP, which is not the case for all.	These data are available through past OSMP surveys, including the 2016-2017 visitor survey. In addition, response options to Q3 include transportation behaviors, and demographic questions now address this as well
#2	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Sam Weaver	I think overall this survey looks excellent. I would only raise minor concerns with Question #2, and have the committee consider what decisions can be informed using the responses to Question #2. Other than that I thought the survey might uncover a lot of good information for setting up the OSMP Master Plan.	Q2 was removed and replaced with a question about primary activity while on OSMP
#21 - 27	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	We need an item that figures out the respondent's travel mode situation. As we heard at Promotoras presentation, being able to reach OSMP properties by bus is a determinant of usage and therefore engagement. I'm sure our colleagues in Transportation could come up with a good question to help us get at the transportation component of the person's life.	not owning a car was added to Q3 as a potential deterrant and a demographic question was also added
#24	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Lisa Morzel	Question 24. Need to include option: Have you raised children? (It doesn't matter if they still live at home or not).	considered to be included in other options
#3	OSBT and Council Draft	Andria Bilich	[Q3 items to add] No family-friendly opportunities (trying to get at parents w/ kids want to take their kids to OSMP but	incorporated
#3	OSBT and Council Draft	Andria Bilich	[Q3 items to add] My kids like to do other things (trying to get at youth not feeling connected to OSMP - if the survey	incorporated
#3	OSBT and Council Draft	Andria Bilich	[Q3 items to add] Trail type is not to my liking / preference (would be a catch-all for trails too steep for some hikers, or too	incorporated
#3	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Cindy Carlisle	Concerned about the fear; is "lack of variety of opportunities" – is this necessary? – focus on actual barriers, things we can do something about.	options have been revised and combined
#3	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	Can combine several of these. (Not for people like me AND Don't feel welcome.) (Difficult to get to AND Not easy to get to by bus) (Nervous AND Afraid AND Lonely + I'D INCLUDE LIONS, BEARS, ETC IN THIS ONE) AGREED. ALSO, ("I don't like dog restrictions" is ambiguous – does it mean I resent having to get a tag/have a leash? OR does it mean I don't think they work/are strong enough ... or what?) NEEDS TO BE DELETED OR REVISED, BASED ON WHAT YOU ARE TRYING TO GET AT.	options have been revised and combined
#3	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Lisa Morzel	Question 3 seems a bit odd and seems to have too many options.	options have been revised and combined
#4	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	In a sense, trails are an amenity, so I would like to include an option or two that gets to the quality of the trail experience. Potential options: trails that provide a quality experience; trails that take you where you want to be.	this question was removed to reduce redundancy with past surveys
#4	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	New option: nature play area for kids (this is more organic and free-ranging than "nature centers"; a 'nature center' evokes a building with a ranger inside it, not an area where kids are welcome to explore).	this question was removed to reduce redundancy with past surveys
#4	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Cindy Carlisle	What do we do with this data? historic structures – revise to be more clear (i.e. legacy facilities).	this question was removed to reduce redundancy with past surveys
#4	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	Need "managed"?	this question was removed to reduce redundancy with past surveys

Original Question #	Survey Version	Commenter	Comment	Response
#4	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	Drop "viewpoints" – YES, MAKE FIRST CHOICE JUST TRAILS WITH BENCHES.	this question was removed to reduce redundancy with past surveys
#4	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Kevin Bracyknight	This needs a "FUN TRAILS" option. For many users, the quality of the experience is, in part, how fun the trail is. Yes, fun means different things to different people, but for most active people fun has elements of good trail design - winding trails, a sense of exploration, etc.	this question was removed to reduce redundancy with past surveys
#4	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Lisa Morzel	Question 4 is also an odd question. Not sure it is the responsibility of OSMP to provide amenities such as nature centers, picnic tables, diaper-changing stations, and other park-type uses. How about just a nice trail that is not overcrowded with visitors?	this question was removed to reduce redundancy with past surveys
#5	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	Change the prompt to lead people to select "don't know" if they have no experience with an area. At first I didn't even notice the "don't know" option. "Please think about each separately, and select don't know if you are not familiar with an area".	considered to be included in language below
#5	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	DON'T WE ALREADY HAVE DATA ON PARKING LOTS ? ...AND WHICH AREAS PEOPLE NO LONGER USE BCSE THEY ARE TOO CROWDED? I THINK WE COULD DELETE THIS ONE WITHOUT LOSING INFORMATION.	question retained
#5	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	IF #5 IS KEPT, WHY IS MARSHALL MESA NOT INCLUDED?	added
#5 - 6	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Cindy Carlisle	Crowding, what do we do with it? Just interested in context.	noted
#6	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	On a fundamental level, I'm concerned about conflating two different issues - conflict and user volume. It is possible to carry high user conflict without volume. It is possible to have high conflict uses with next to no one on the trails. But for the sake of keeping the survey somewhat short, I'm ok with sticking with the question as currently framed for the general public, keeping in mind that it is dangerous to trap ourselves in this framing for the master plan itself when formulating management direction.	noted
#6	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	"Increasing education and outreach" needs to be more specific, "increasing education/outreach about trail etiquette / expected behavior".	incorporated
#6	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	"Modifying trail conditions to support high visitation levels" feels very management level, overly general and unspecific. Modifying trail conditions could mean widening and hardening trails, or even adding trails. I suggest making this item more specific e.g. "hardening and widening some trails to support high visitation levels".	revised to be "widening, hardening or redesigning trails to support high visitation levels"
#6	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	Building off of the above, we need to add a new item "add trails to disperse users". As with all questions, we are not obligated to do that action (add trails) if people strongly support this item, but strong support or strong opposition for this item would definitely tell us the will of the people in an interesting dimension - minimizing the number of trails in the system, or minimizing the number of people you see on the trail.	incorporated
#6	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	Replace "Modifying trail conditions" with "Making trails wider and/or more durable. I'D JUST SAY MAKING TRAILS WIDER TO SUPPORT HIGHER VISITATION LEVELS.	revised to be "widening, hardening or redesigning trails to support high visitation levels"
#6	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	Suggest instead ("fee programs"): "Charging for parking at OSMP Trailheads." AGREE.	incorporated
#6	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	"Limiting the number of people".... [does this link to ANY type of potential management strategies? If it does, suggest replacing it with the management strategy/action itself, e.g., restricted parking, parking reservations, etc..] AGREE	incorporated
#6	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	Add? "Increase fees for non-residents of Boulder County" AGREE AND ADD FOR COMMERCIAL USERS.	revised per other comments
#7	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	First off, thanks so much for including this question which gets people to trade priorities. It has the potential to be the most important question on the entire survey, as it forces people to weigh all of their competing interests at one time. So let's take some time and discussion to make sure the full range of management possibilities are represented in the responses.	noted

Original Question #	Survey Version	Commenter	Comment	Response
#7	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	The farm/ranch stuff doesn't make sense without understanding that ranching is required for soil health and plant communities. "Best stewardship practices" is too vague and jargony, maybe "providing financial incentives so that farming/ranching increases health of the land"?	option removed per discussion at OSBT study session
#7	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	I don't like "Managing increased visitation" based on my critique in the first bullet under Q6. I see two approaches: (a) make this item more of a catch-all e.g. "managing users"; (b) separate "managing user conflict" from "addressing higher user volume".	revised
#7	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	I think we need to include something about dogs. Half the current user group are walking dogs, and dog encounters are a big concern in the 'user conflict' zone. Maybe "managing user impacts, including dogs" because dogs are also users of the system?	revised per other comments
#7	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Cindy Carlisle	Interested in context behind "addressing climate change" re: what average person would understand – addressing climate change challenges.	revised to be "Preparing for extreme weather events like flooding, fire and drought"
#7	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	Stem: 2nd and 3rd sentences are redundant. And, really CANNOT do this type of response with more than 5-7 categories. Much too difficult. AGREED – THERE'S LOTS OF RESEARCH THAT SAYS PEOPLE CANNOT DEAL WITH THIS MANY/12! VARIABLES AT ONE TIME. I SUGGEST 7 BIGGER BUCKETS: E.G., (maintaining and improving trails; protecting ecosystems and restoring degraded wildlife habitat; providing a diverse range of education, outreach and volunteer programs; managing increased visitation and "nabbing scofflaws"(or however you want to say it); one about ag lands...; acquiring more open space; monitoring and doing research on the open space system and widely reporting trends found.	per discussion at OSBT study session, categories were reduced to 10 plus "other"
#7	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	Also, you DO NOT need to force \$\$ to add to \$100 – we can normalize them later. It's a BIG time waster for respondents to keep adjusting their numbers.	incorporated
#7	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Suzanne Jones	To avoid confusion (since everything costs way more than \$100), I would edit the question to say "If you had a hypothetical \$100, how would you spend it . . ."	instructions were revised
#8	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	Similar to my Q7 comment, the item "ranches and farms to protect agriculture, plant communities, and soil health" or the like to make it clearer that ag is not just about the agricultural products but about the soil health and native plants.	options were revised to respond to all comments - this option now reads "to protect ranches and farms from development"
#8	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	Last item needs to mention "trails", again because 'passive recreation' doesn't mean much to regular people.	incorporated
#8	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	I would drop the right column, especially since they would be picking 25% of the items. I don't think this is a "candy store" type of item where people will want to say all are critical. AGREED	incorporated
#8	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	Drop "scenic areas or vistas". Not sure what we would do with this. AGREED	this option was left in to ensure all charter purposes are reflected
#8	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	REVISE: PROTECTING RANCHES AND FARMLAND FROM DEVELOPMENT [WORDED SO IT CAN INCLUDE CONSERVATION EASEMENTS, & MEASURES THAT MAKE THEIR OPERATIONS SUSTAINABLE]	incorporated
#8	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Lisa Morzel	The basic premise of OSMP is to preserve and protect so why would questions that includes water rights and mineral rights be included since they should be acquired or pursued upon purchase of property? The second part of the question asking for the 2 highest priorities is skewed given obviously water and mineral rights should be secured but at the same time we should be acquiring properties that are natural areas with fragile ecosystems and high-quality habitat for animals and plants and acquiring floodplains etc as fast as possible so these areas are permanently preserved and not developed. Not sure this question should even be included as this should already be OSMP practice.	additional context has been added before the question to explain the need for prioritizing acquisitions in light of increasing property values and declining OSMP funding

Original Question #	Survey Version	Commenter	Comment	Response
#8	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Suzanne Jones	I think you should add two more options for why to acquire open space: 1) to help finish shaping Boulder's urban boundary; 2) to acquire connections between habitat parcels and/or recreational opportunities.	incorporated
#8 - 9	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Kevin Bracyknight	I would suggest more questions like #7. This gets at compromise. Question 8 should be rephrased using this system. Also, these response orders need to be randomized with several different versions of this survey.	question revised
#9	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	Right header suggest: "Steering visitors toward less crowded trailheads. " AGREED	incorporated
#9	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Karen Hollweg	AGREE WITH CURT'S RE-WORDING	incorporated
#9	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Karen Hollweg	"This [means] popular areas would be modified to accommodate high levels of use. . ."	incorporated
#9	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Kevin Bracyknight	Text of #9 seems a bit biased. Can it be "neutralized" a bit? I also think that this question presents a bit of a false dichotomy (this or that, when both are possible). Also, I think that this might get considerably different answers from people if you asked visitors vs residents.	incorporated
#9	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Lisa Morzel	Question 9: typo: mean should be means The question has a bias that assumes that OSMP keeps up with the demand for increased visitation. This is unsustainable.	question revised
Cover Letter Pg. 1	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	Shorten the material, turn it into bullets. As currently stands, only the most diligent of citizens will read it, and seeing the length of the front matter will likely turn off potential respondents	incorporated
Cover Letter Pg. 1	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	LINGO/REWORD: "acquired the protection" + spell out USFS	incorporated
Cover Letter Pg. 1	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	Add a couple locations in the east (e.g., Teller, White Rocks, Sawhill?) [to the map]	incorporated
Cover Letter Pg. 1	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	I think we could take two paragraphs out of the into. Right to .. "You have a chance to..... (this provides more room for the map and etc.) It just seems like a LOT to read. AGREED: 3RD PARAGR SHOULD BE DELETED; MAYBE KEEP SLIGHTLY REVISED 2ND PARAGRAPH.	incorporated
Cover Letter Pg. 1	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	I am very hesitant to put any restrictions on who can answer in a household. I fear we will lose more in response rate than we gain in perfectly probabilistic sampling. Can't we look at the demographics to check for serious respondent selection bias? What is our biggest fear?	incorporated
Cover Letter Pg. 2	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	Include "this survey is expected to take 15 minutes or less".	incorporated
Cover Letter Pg. 2	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	I think the Highlights can be dropped. Takes up too much space and doesn't really provide useful background except for the tax issue, which is already covered in the tax questions.	incorporated
Cover Letter Pg. 2	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	I WOULD KEEP HIGHLIGHTS, BUT THEY ARE ONLY FOR 5 YEARS; EDIT & CONDENSE 2ND & 3rd SENTENCE TO ONE.	incorporated
Cover Letter Pg. 2	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	REWORD 4TH QUICK FACT: With less land left to acquire, the City's open space system may only add another 10 to 15% more land.	incorporated
Cover Letter Pg. 2	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	6.25 million visits: I DON'T UNDERSTAND HOW HIGHER VISITATION CAN AFFECT PERCEPTIONS OF "MAINTENANCE BACKLOGS"?	incorporated
Cover Letter Pg. 2	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	IS "AGE IN PLACE" A COMMON TERM OR LINGO? I'D AT LEAST PUT IT IN QUOTES.	incorporated
Cover Letter Pg. 2	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	TRAIL MILES: NEEDS 2 PARAGs SO THAT BOTH OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL TRAILS CAN BE DESCRIBED – MY SUGGESTED WORDING: OSMP staff manage about 150 miles of official trails. Of those, 150 miles can be used by hikers and runners; ___miles can be used with dogs on or off leash and about ___miles require dogs on leash; 54 miles can be used with mountain bikes.	incorporated

Original Question #	Survey Version	Commenter	Comment	Response
Cover Letter Pg. 2	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	Change "more than 180 miles . . . of unofficial trails can result in unwanted changes . . . and fragmentation of habitat blocks" to "more than 180 . . . of unofficial trails result in unwanted . . . and fragmentation of habitat."	incorporated
Cover Letter Pg. 2	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	"cutting down" ☒ "thinning trees on ..." AGREE ...+ 1,400 ACRES OF OVERLY DENSE FORESTS.	incorporated
Cover Letter	OSBT and Council Draft	Andria Bilich	Include bold statement to motivate: "answers to this survey will directly affect how lands around Boulder are used,	incorporated
Cover Letter	OSBT and Council Draft	Andria Bilich	Include short URL to access online map of OSMP, so people can better relate their favorite trails to the trailhead/zones in	incorporated
Cover Letter Pg. 5	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	Map is great, thanks for including it!	noted
General	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Aaron Brockett	I think the survey came out very well, I have no recommended changes. I thought the page of overview and history was a good addition.	noted
General	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	One chief issue is that we don't get a sense of the respondent's core purpose for open space - habitat, climate change mitigation, viewshed, recreation, ag, development buffer - and how these core purposes might play against each other. Refined options on the \$100 question might allow us to better suss this out. Knowing the core purpose of open space to the majority of the community will provide better management direction.	added with question on FA impora=t
General	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	Recreation and trails (quality, number, importance to visitors) are not adequately represented across the questions throughout the survey. In my comments I make suggestions on where we could get more detailed data on how people feel about and want or do not want trails and recreation opportunities. If you go back to the 2016 Visitor Survey, the findings clearly indicate that quality trails are extremely important to users. And with the 2016 Community Survey, "aesthetic purposes' and recreation were considered the most important purposes for having Open Space Mountain Parks by the greatest proportion of residents". We need to manage OSMP for both the general public and the current user population, so it's important to keep responses in the mix which honor and are linked to past results regarding recreation and trails.	incorporated
General	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	In the overview we identify that youth spend less time connecting with nature and exploring the outdoors, but few of the question responses speak directly to youth experiences. The future of open space involves getting youth to care about OSMP now so they can steward it now and later. In my comments below I make suggestions on where we could include items on how to best support youth involvement, including supporting families (parents with kids).	added as an option to \$100 exercise
General	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	Methodology, where demographics to the "target population", so what is the target population? Census population, current OSMP users, desired OSMP users?	BVCP planning area, same as Resident Survey
General	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	Overall I like the idea of some background material, and staff did a pretty fine job of keeping this material unbiased.	noted
General	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	Possible missing question: What do you do most often? (I know this is a line of questioning from the Visitor Survey, but anticipating a crosswalk between activities on OS and responses to other questions, does there need to be parity between the samples?)	added
General	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Curt Brown & Karen Hollweg	AT THE STUDY SESSION, PLSE GIVE US A CONCISE OVERVIEW OF THE POPULATION TO BE SAMPLED INCLUDING GEOGRAPHY, VOTER REGISTRATION STATUS, AND ANALYSIS PLANS FOR DISAGREGATING DATA + CROSS-TABS + STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES.	noted
General	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Karen Hollweg	Get rid of "lingo" reduce # of variables/duplicate choices (I'm worried about respondent fatigue).	incorporated
General	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Karen Hollweg	We need to know who the Respondents are.	explained at OSBT study session - sampled from BVCP planning area

Original Question #	Survey Version	Commenter	Comment	Response
General	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Karen Hollweg	How results will be reported.?	explained at OSBT study session - full report, appendices and raw comments online (weighted and unweighted)
General	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Kevin Bracyknight	First, while it's been quite a bit of time since I was researching how to do surveys, one thing that stuck out to me about them, and also web content is randomizing the order of answers. I think it's imperative that in multiple choice questions (like question 7) you should have probably 3 or 4 versions of this survey with different ordering of the answers. This allows you to see how much bias might be associated with the order of the answers. Obviously, this takes a bit more work with versioning, but I think it could improve your statistical significance.	this will be part of our methodology
General	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Lisa Morzel	Prior to the survey under the "analysis" section, it is stated that the trade-off questions will help us better understand community preferences on complex topics such as unofficial social trails,.....and invasive weed management. I already included comments on invasive weed management above. This question should not be included as it is a policy and again like asking a 3-year-old who is not adequately informed. I do not note any questions in the survey about unofficial social trails so why include in statement. This is a policy regarding management and not something we ask for an opinion.	These have been revised per OSBT study session
General	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Lisa Morzel	The following sentence continues and mentions "perceived" crowded; I do not think in many places, this is a perception. Regarding methodology and who is "allowed" to complete survey, how is OSMP going to manage this? To how many households will this survey be mailed? Are they being mailed to just city of Boulder residents or will the survey also be mailed to outside of city of Boulder residents? How is it decided to whom the survey will be mailed?	6000 sampled households within the BVCP planning area
General	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Lisa Morzel	I am not a fan of these type of surveys as they don't adequately inform the general public of information they require to answer the questions. This survey asks too many questions that require more knowledge in order to provide an informed answer.	in some cases, additional context has been added before questions where this may be an issue - like invasive weeds or prairie dogs
Snapshot	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	State more clearly and boldly that visitation increase is in step with more people in the area. For example, since 2005, how has the population of Boulder County or Denver metroplex changed?	incorporated
Snapshot	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	"Passive recreation" is jargon and we want something accessible to the general public. I highly recommend simply using "trails" whenever possible. So for example: These lands host special plants, wildlife, ecosystems, farms, ranches, and trails.	incorporated
Snapshot	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	End of heading paragraph should be more motivational: "The last 10 years have seen rapid changes to visitation, impacts from flooding, and funding available to care for open space. What will the next 10 years bring? Tell us what you need and expect from open space!"	incorporated
Snapshot	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	The timeline feels strange to me, how about a linear and more graphic timeline then at the end a big, bold, large font sentence- What will the next 10 years bring? You will help decide! Again, to better motivate respondents to take the survey because they feel their responses will be important, be considered, and have the potential to affect the course of action.	per OSBT study session, timeline was removed
Snapshot	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Andria Bilich	Statement "... Boulder is experiencing shifts in demographics that will impact future open space visitation" should be changed to "that may impact" or "have the potential to impact". We don't know what the impacts will be, so need to add uncertainty to the statement.	incorporated
Snapshot	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Cindy Carlisle	Increased visitation <i>causes</i> impacts.	incorporated
Snapshot	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Cindy Carlisle	Aging in place—what does this mean for OSMP, not just baby boomers.	incorporated
Snapshot	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Cindy Carlisle	Show # of Hispanic residents not % increase—what it means for OSMP?	incorporated
Snapshot	OSBT and Council Draft (Feb 7)	Cindy Carlisle	Unofficial trails <i>causes</i> . . . impacts.	incorporated

## Attachment C: Methodology Summary

Based on feedback during Process Committee meeting discussions, below is an overview of the population to be sampled and the methodology to be used for the Master Plan statistically valid survey:

- a) The same geographic boundaries will be used for the survey sample as were used for the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) survey and the OSMP Resident Survey. This will include planning areas I, II, and III.
- b) Sampling and analysis will not be conducted in such a way as to understand potential variations in responses according to which BVCP subarea respondents live in.
- c) Households rather than voters will be targeted since this will provide a broader view of the population who uses OSMP lands.
- d) The sample size will be 6,000 survey recipients based on a request by the sub-committee in order to reduce the margin of error. Staff will also be coordinating with a survey consultant on oversampling that aligns with other survey instruments conducted for the City of Boulder (e.g., oversampling in multi-family units at a rate of 5:3 compared to single-family units as in other surveys).
- e) Survey data will be weighted to ensure a more representative pool (e.g. younger people and those of lower socioeconomic status are less likely to respond, so more weight will be given to responses from these populations to ensure the results are more representative of the community).
- f) In addition to a final report, raw data will also be released to show both weighted and unweighted results.

The survey consultant will select the sample from a list that includes as many of the target population members as possible. Since adults in households will be targeted, a list of addresses based on the United States Postal Service Delivery Sequence File will be purchased. This is the list used by postal carriers to deliver the mail and includes almost every household. This list will then be geocoded so only those within the study boundaries will be included in the sample.