

Please note that this meeting summary was partially generated using AI transcription technology and has been reviewed by the designated minute taker for accuracy and completeness.

I) CALL TO ORDER

Nikki LaRochelle called the January 12, 2026, regular meeting of BOSAC to order at 5:30 pm. Other members of BOSAC present were David Rossi, Krysten Joyce, Matt Powers, Chris Tennal, Bobbie Zanca, and Town Council liaison Jay Beckerman. Staff members present were Mark Truckey, Chris Kulick, Joel Dukes, Alex Stach, Duke Barlow, and Tony Overlock. Katherine King from Summit County Open Space was also present. Members of the public: Rae Moody and Evan Hrevus attended in-person, Kelly Ahern, Craig Cummings and Colin Stingley attended virtually.

II) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes were approved as presented.

III) PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Rae Moody spoke briefly on the proposed Tiger Road Rec Path expansion. Ms. Moody stated that she would be out of town for the next 4 months and just wanted to keep the topic on the commissioner's agenda. Ms. Moody was happy to share that the pathway to her local bus stop and pedestrian crossings have been cleared of snow on a regular basis and that she is attempting to organize a site visit with Summit County Open Space & Trails and staff this spring. Ms. Moody shared that she has also been researching grant funding opportunities, particularly the Colorado Department of Transportation's (CDOT) Transportation Alternative Program (TAP). Staff are aware of this grant opportunity and plan to apply for a TAP grant, dependent on funding.

IV) STAFF SUMMARY

A. Field Season Update

Mr. Barlow spoke briefly about all the tree removal efforts from OST staff and partners to address the large number of downed trees on our trail system and encouraged continued use of the trail reporting tool.

B. Bioacoustics

C. Forest Management Plan

D. McCain Open Space Final Report and Management Plan

Ms. Joyce asked about the progress of the Recpath alignment in the McCain Open Space. Mr. Barlow replied that the McCain section of the Recpath is on the February 10th Town Council agenda. Ms. Joyce then asked what the next steps for the McCain Open Space were at this time, to which Mr. Barlow replied that staff will be hiring someone to complete construction designs, followed by working with contractors to implement the first phase of the project this coming summer. Ms. Joyce also asked about the status of the naming process. Mr. Barlow

replied that subject will be one of the items discussed at the upcoming joint BOSAC-Town Council meeting, and Ms. Larissa O'Neil from Breck History will be able to provide an update/additional context from conversations with Ute Mountain Ute representatives.

E. Aspen Alley Seasonal Shuttle Service

Ms. Zanca inquired about staff's plan to promote the shuttle service and notify users of the Wakefield Lot closure. Mr. Barlow stated that staff will utilize standard outreach methods and emphasize alternative options, such as hiking from the Ice Rink Lot or parking at the Boreas Pass Trailhead. In response to Ms. Zanca's question regarding shuttle frequency, Mr. Barlow explained that the goal is a 10-minute turnaround, though actual times may vary based on the date and time of day.

F. Concessionaire Report

Mr. Beckerman asked about how the Summit County Open Space & Trails department runs their concessionaire system and if we have concessionaries in the wintertime. Mr. Overlock provided an overview of Town's concessionaire program and an update that the County's Open Space & Trails department is in the process of updating their concessionaire program to allow nonprofits. Mr. Overlock also stated that the County does not allow for-profit, commercial outfitters at this time. Mr. Overlock shared that there are a number of concessionaires who are active in the winter seasons, mentioning nonprofits like Keystone Science School, the Breckenridge Outdoor Education Center, and Breck History, with the only for-profit winter concessionaire being RIDDEN, who provide fat bike tours along the Recpath. Mr. Beckerman asked how large group sizes need to be to necessitate a permit, to which Mr. Overlock replied that if a group is less than 50 people and they're not charging a fee, they do not need a permit. However, if it is a group of 50 people or less that is charging a fee they'll need to go through the special permit process with the Town.

V) OPEN SPACE DISCUSSION

Dark Sky Initiative (0:13:00)

Ms. Ellie Muncy, Planner 1 with the Town of Breckenridge's Community Development department, provided an update on the Dark Sky Initiative. Ms. Muncy presented sky brightness data and explained that ongoing data collection and property surveys will help identify further areas for improvement. Ms. Muncy noted that while the Town has officially earned its Dark Sky Community Certification, current lighting compliance stands at approximately 68%.

Mr. Tennial asked about other mountain town communities pursuing the Dark Sky Initiative and if the Town was in a position to share best practices. Ms. Muncy shared a few examples and stated Frisco is working towards certification.

Mr. Rossi asked if this initiative had any impact on the town's lighting zones. Ms. Muncy clarified that lighting zones, which are part of the code, will not be eliminated. She explained that the primary difference between zones is the amount of incidental light allowed at the property line, with Zone 1 uniquely permitting semi-opaque lighting where the bulb's outline is not visible and that these distinctions are particularly relevant for new construction. Mr. Rossi also asked if there had been any new findings or tactics since the initial lighting code.

Ms. Muncy noted that the town's lighting code has remained largely consistent since 2007. She explained that recent updates focused on reorganizing language for clarity and implementing specific bulb requirements to better align with Dark Sky certification standards. Mr. Rossi also asked how interactions have been with the public, to which Ms. Muncy shared she tries to focus on the goal of the regulations, which doesn't eliminate light sources but directs light downward to illuminate the ground and walking paths. She noted that this type of fixture actually improves safety by reducing glare, using the analogy of blinding oncoming headlights to show how unshielded lights can obscure one's surroundings. Ms. Muncy added that many residents who have come into compliance found they preferred the new lighting.

Mr. Tennial was curious to know if staff had taken light readings (magnitudes per arcsecond) at any backcountry locations. Ms. Muncy stated that while a backcountry location is not included in the current study, the Town possesses permanent meters for continuous data collection. She noted that staff is evaluating potential locations for these meters and mentioned that the County Open Space Department has expressed interest in the town's reading process, suggesting a possibility for future monitoring or collaboration in those areas.

Mr. Beckerman commended the Community Development Department for their successful community engagement, noting that they effectively navigated initial public opposition to the initiative. He specifically praised staff for listening to residents and part-time homeowners to develop flexible, cost-effective compliance options, particularly for workforce neighborhoods, which addressed concerns regarding the high cost of new fixtures and electrical work.

BOSAC Field Trip (0:25:41)

Mr. Barlow briefly introduced the topic and asked commissioners to share their experience and key takeaways from the October 2025, BOSAC Field Trip to visit Jefferson County's Open Space program (JeffCo).

Mr. Powers shared his key takeaways from the Peaks to Plains project, emphasizing two main points for future planning. First, he stressed the importance of "doing a good job first," noting that initial design and correct execution are far more efficient than the significant challenges and costs associated with retrofitting or replanning later. Second, he advocated for providing adequate trailhead amenities from the outset, suggesting that the Town should strive for higher-quality facilities rather than relying on temporary solutions like portable toilets. Mr. Powers also pointed out that the JeffCo Open Space staff alone is the decision-making body for specific decisions, and that the advisory board's purview is limited, focusing exclusively on the budget and acquisitions.

Ms. Zanca emphasized the importance of investing in necessary trailhead infrastructure, while acknowledging the role of JeffCo's larger budget. Second, she highlighted the value of a proactive ranger program for community outreach and enforcement. She suggested that while the Town is smaller, a more consistent staff presence in problem areas, perhaps in uniform, could effectively encourage rule compliance, such as keeping dogs leashed and cleaning up after them. Finally, Ms. Zanca praised JeffCo's strong interdepartmental collaboration and early planning.

Mr. Beckerman shared that his primary takeaways were the importance of team cohesion, understanding a project's end goal before finishing the initial phases, and securing community buy-in. He noted the value of maintaining a unified team by keeping as many subcontractors as possible under a single contractor to ensure a cohesive project workflow. Furthermore, he stressed the necessity of understanding the ultimate desired outcome at each incremental step of any project and highlighted the critical role of having community advocates and ambassadors who can explain the project's vision and benefits to the public.

Mr. Tennal was unable to attend the BOSAC Field Trip but is quite familiar with the Peaks to Plains project and the area in general. He noted that despite significant upgrades and added amenities, the recreational and commuting experience in the canyon has remained positive and hasn't changed dramatically. He highlighted that even with increased activity the environment does not feel overloaded or negative. Mr. Tennal concluded that the project successfully found a way to balance new infrastructure while maintaining a high-quality user experience.

Ms. Joyce was also unfortunately unable to attend the BOASC Field Trip, but still provided some insight on the importance of long-term foresight in infrastructure planning. She noted the challenge of balancing the desire to "plan and do it right the first time" with the Town's current capacity and its ultimate goals for growth.

Ms. LaRochelle expressed her admiration for JeffCo's comprehensive planning and due diligence, particularly regarding the engagement of diverse user groups. She found the focus on regional connectivity, accessibility, and ambitious engineering highly inspiring, though she noted the scale was so vast it felt somewhat unrelatable to smaller local projects. Finally, Ms. LaRochelle was curious about the long-term sustainability of some of their projects, specifically inquiring about the arduous costs of ongoing maintenance and upkeep for the Peaks to Plains trail.

Mr. Barlow shared he was impressed by the effectiveness of JeffCo's large-scale survey system and expressed a desire to developing a more robust survey model, noting that reliable data serves as a critical guide for organizational decision-making.

Mr. Overlock observed that even JeffCo's planning for trail and trailhead capacity often lacks exact formulas or specific metrics. Instead, decisions are based on internal discussions and a qualitative assessment of whether plans "feel right" for current needs and future growth.

Ms. Joyce asked if JeffCo weighs conservation values against human population needs when making decisions, specifically in the context of trail planning. Staff replied that they couldn't recall specifics from the field trip regarding how conservation factored into the "big decision-making process." However, Mr. Barlow used the example of the organization having a dedicated "bat person" on staff to illustrate that specific ecological considerations are likely addressed internally by specialists.

Mr. Kulick stated his main takeaway was a cautionary lesson regarding "over management" of trail systems. He highlighted examples where management changes, such as alternating-

day usage schedules at Apex and Centennial Cone, were implemented perhaps too quickly or unnecessarily. Mr. Kulick emphasized the organization's candid advice to carefully evaluate the necessity of such restrictive measures before implementation, as trail usage intensity varies even within high-pressure networks.

2026 Trails Workplan (0:44:30)

Mr. Barlow introduced two-part discussion on the Trails Plan Matrix, focusing first on methods to ensure the plan remains permanently grounded in conservation values. While Mr. Barlow noted the current alignment between staff and the Open Space Advisory Committee, he also emphasized the need to memorialize these priorities to guide future leadership. Proposed strategies included adding formal language to the Workplan emphasizing conservation, weighting the conservation category more heavily within the decision-making matrix, and strictly utilizing the Master Plan's conservation overlay for new trail evaluations.

Ms. Joyce supported prioritizing conservation values as fundamental to the open space program, viewing BOSAC members as stewards accountable to these values and highlighting that mistakes in conservation carry greater consequences than in other planning areas. She backed including an introductory paragraph in the work plan to establish expectations for future members but was hesitant about a weighted scoring system, stating it needed more thought.

Ms. Zanca agreed, stating that conservation is the fundamental basis of the entire program and must be prioritized, asserting that the loss of conservation values would undermine all other program goals.

Mr. Rossi suggested that conservation should be weighed more heavily in the scoring matrix to reflect its importance, noting that currently, a high score in conservation carries the same weight as one in user experience. While reviewing the existing draft, Mr. Rossi acknowledged that the current scoring percentages (totaling up to 35% for certain categories) are structured to show different weights, but he remained open to further adjusting those values to ensure conservation takes priority.

Mr. Tennial noted that current numerical examples in the matrix lack sufficient variation to guide specific decisions on trail type or location. Instead, recent discussions have centered on the growing cost of maintaining existing trails and the collective need for a mechanism to decline new trail builds on certain parcels in favor of pure conservation. Balancing community demand for more trails with the capacity for quality maintenance presents a challenge, and Mr. Tennial advocated for weighting conservation more heavily in the decision-making tool to provide clear "go/no-go" criteria.

Ms. LaRochelle questioned how to define "how much is too much" regarding trail density, noting that the current approach tends to be reactive rather than based on established thresholds. Ms. Joyce replied, suggesting using a hypothetical "bad trail" scenario as a thought exercise to work backward and identify the specific reasons a project should be rejected. Mr. Tennial added that past decisions, such as building secondary uphill/downhill trails to resolve overcrowding on popular routes can create a "slippery slope." Mr. Tennial

stated he felt while these additions keep trails viable and safe, they represent a form of development that might have been avoided with better initial planning or stricter limits.

Mr. Kulick provided a counterpoint, comparing the Aspen Alley trail, where low trail density and limited connectivity necessitate specific management solutions, to areas like French Gulch that offer more alternatives. Mr. Kulick also stated that the context of the land and where the trail is going to be located is an important factor to consider.

Ms. LaRochelle advocated for increased scrutiny regarding any new trail construction, emphasizing the inherent value of leaving land undisturbed regardless of how well a project scores on a matrix. She noted that the current master plan is lacking a clear, cohesive vision and argued that the present "piecemeal" approach to adding trails is problematic. To address this, Ms. LaRochelle recommended developing a 20-year long-term vision that determines the system's full carrying capacity, allowing the committee to work backward to ensure every incremental addition is congruent with a comprehensive big-picture strategy.

Mr. Rossi acknowledged the limitations of the current master plan, noting that its heavy focus on objective scoring rubrics often fails to capture a broader long-term vision. He highlighted the "subjective" nature of such planning and pointed out that high-profile projects, like Aspen Alley, are frequently influenced more by political and policy pressures from user groups than by numerical scoring. To bridge the gap between "squishy" subjective views and rigid scoring, Mr. Rossi suggested incorporating more sophisticated objective measures—such as the Forest Service's trail density calculations—into a planning overlay. Mr. Rossi emphasized that a more effective vision should be based on this type of informed data to ensure it remains durable despite future changes in Council or committee membership.

Ms. Zanca stressed that while the current discussion is a great start, a crucial next step is to specifically evaluate every project from a conservation standpoint. Ms. Zanca feels that conservation hasn't been given enough weight previously, either as a percentage factor or a definitive "go-no-go" decision point.

Ms. LaRochelle argues that rather than simply processing a random queue of trail ideas through a scoring matrix, the organization should work backward from a 20-year general plan. She fears that without this long-term vision, building projects prematurely or in the wrong order could lead to "antithetical" outcomes, such as habitat fragmentation or wildlife displacement. Ms. Joyce agreed with Ms. LaRochelle's point of view, stating that the right approach was to identify missing components in the trail system, such as critical drainage connections or specific types of recreational opportunities like e-biking or cross-country skiing. However, she also acknowledges the difficulty of long-term planning due to unpredictable factors like the rise of new technologies (e-bikes) or future population changes.

Mr. Joel Dukes spoke briefly, sharing he felt he's lived through the trails network expansion phase into a more stewardship focused phase. Mr. Dukes shared that he feels that the program must transition away from "endless construction" and acquisitions toward restoring and maintaining the existing trail system to avoid a legacy of poor-quality infrastructure. Ms. LaRochelle asked Mr. Dukes about decommissioning trails and if it is something he thinks about in the field. Mr. Dukes replied that it can be a struggle to manage unauthorized "rogue"

trails, specifically downhill bike trails. Mr. Dukes also shared that he doesn't see an issue with decommissioning unused/repetitive trails.

Mr. Barlow wrapped up the first part of the 2026 Trails Plan conversation by expressing his appreciation for the conversation and that he agrees with the hybrid approach: using the scoring matrix to evaluate all new projects while simultaneously developing a flexible, "working" long-term plan. Mr. Barlow also acknowledged the plan must be a dynamic document that accounts for future uncertainties, like the rise of new recreational technologies beyond e-bikes. Mr. Barlow concluded by affirming that BOSAC has recently rejected specific trail proposals (e.g., ZL to Dry Gulch, Rock Island singletrack, Ranch at Breck trail through Australia Gulch, and the west side of the McCain Parcel) for conservation reasons.

Mr. Truckey proposed the addition of foundational guiding principles to the beginning of the Trails Workplan. Mr. Truckey believes clearly defining core priorities, specifically conservation and connectivity, is essential for driving decision-making.

Trail Development Matrix Feedback

The group refined the Trail Development Matrix introduced by Mr. Overlock by making several key decisions: they agreed to explore alternative scoring ranges for better differentiation of proposals; changing terminology from "low impact" to "conservation impact" for improved clarity; land ownership will now be a separate feasibility filter rather than a primary scoring criterion; connectivity will be separated into trail connectivity and neighborhood/ public access; and the team emphasized the necessity of integrating broader community context and acknowledging subjective factors in final decision-making.

Ms. Zanca had a question as to why a "Low" descriptor would receive the "Best" (highest) score. In her mind, "Low" usually implies a bad or weak rating. Mr. Overlock explained that "Low" refers specifically to environmental impact. In conservation, a low impact is the desired outcome, hence it receives a high score (a "4"). Conversely, a high impact project is undesirable and receives a low score (a "1"). Staff agreed to rename the category "Conservation Impact" to make the matrix more intuitive.

Ms. Joyce and Ms. LaRochelle had a discussion revolving around whether land ownership belongs in a "philosophical" scoring matrix or should be treated as a separate feasibility filter.

Mr. Beckerman proposed moving upfront costs and land ownership to a secondary tier of the matrix, treating them as feasibility filters rather than primary value scores. Under this approach, difficult ownership (like private land) or high costs would pause a project until conditions change—such as securing grants or an influx of cash—allowing the primary rating to focus solely on the trail's inherent merit. Mr. Beckerman also argued that connectivity needs a single "lane" within the matrix to remain effective, noting that the term currently appears in both the user experience and community context columns.

Mr. Overlock asked about the weighted percentages examples and how the commissioners felt about that approach. Mr. Rossi and Ms. Joyce noted that different weighting schemes

often result in nearly identical final scores (e.g., 21.8 vs 21.5). This "crowding" of numbers makes it difficult to distinguish which projects are truly superior and can lead to arbitrary arguments over minor decimal differences.

Ms. LaRochelle suggests that for every project, the board must ask: "What happens if we don't build this?" Using Copper Canyon as an example, Ms. LaRochelle note that a trail can score at the top of the matrix mathematically, yet its actual necessity or community "want" remains debatable. Ms. LaRochelle also points out that neighborhood opposition/support is currently absent from the scoring system, suggesting a need for a community impact or public sentiment component to complement the data.

Mr. Tennial proposed a change to the scoring methodology to fix the issue of "bunched" results that fail to provide clear direction for decision-making. Mr. Tennial and Mr. Rossi stated they both suspect that changing the point values themselves might be more effective at creating clarity than simply adjusting the percentage weight of different categories.

Mr. Barlow wrapped up the conversation by highlighting the need for a dynamic planning framework that balances a long-term vision with the flexibility to respond to emerging needs and rare opportunities. Using the Barton Connector as an example, Mr. Barlow notes that recent housing developments can create unexpected demand for trails that weren't previously necessary, requiring the plan to adapt to changing demographics. Mr. Barlow concludes that the process must be dynamic, allowing projects to be elevated to the top of the priority list when external factors (like federal NEPA processes) or land-use changes create a "now or never" window. Mr. Barlow also noted the importance of the upcoming check-in with Town Council to confirm that the collective strategic direction of the Trails Workplan aligns with Council priorities.

VI) OTHER MATTERS RELATED TO OPEN SPACE TOPICS

Mr. Barlow reminded commissioners of the upcoming joint BOSAC-Town Council work session scheduled for January 27th, 2026.

VII) COUNCIL MATTERS RELATED TO OPEN SPACE TOPICS

N/A

VIII) EXECUTIVE SESSION

Ms. LaRochelle moved that BOSAC go into executive session under C.R.S. § 24-6-402(4) for the purpose of determining positions relative to matters that may be subject to negotiations, developing strategies for negotiations, and/or instructing negotiators concerning a property that the Town may be interested in acquiring for open space purposes. Ms. Joyce seconded the motion. BOSAC went into an executive session at 7:36 PM.

The executive session of BOSAC concluded at 7:52 PM. The participants in the executive session were Nikki LaRochelle, Krysten Joyce, Matt Powers, David Rossi, Chris Tennial, Bobbie Zanca, and Council liaison Jay Beckerman. Staff present included Duke Barlow, Alex

Stach, Tony Overlock, Chris Kulick, and Mark Truckey. Katherine King from Summit County Open Space & Trails was present.

IX) ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn the BOSAC meeting was made by Ms. LaRochelle, with Mr. Rossi seconding the motion. The January 12, 2026, regular meeting of BOSAC concluded at 7:52 PM.

The next regular meeting of BOSAC is scheduled for February 16, 2026.

Nikki LaRochelle, Chair

DRAFT