



City of
Golden

CITY OF GOLDEN

CITY COUNCIL – COUNCIL COMMENTS EMAIL POSTING

City Council has requested the publication of emails sent to the CouncilComments@cityofgolden.net email address to be posted on the city's website. Emails will be compiled and posted on a weekly basis with the most recent emails shown at the beginning of this document. Emails will remain in the file for 30 days.

The City Clerk's Office will review emails submitted to the Council Comments email address for confidentiality concerns, personal information, and redacting, and will seek legal advice as needed before publishing those emails.

The City Clerk's Office may determine not to publish emails, in whole or in part, that address or contain the following matters or topics:

- ◆ Sales, events, and other promotions, whether or not for commercial purposes;
- ◆ work product;
- ◆ litigation, or matters that may be the subject of litigation, affecting the City;
- ◆ clearly implied expectation of privacy;
- ◆ personal and/or health information;
- ◆ confidential material or other material that federal, state, or local law or regulation prohibits the City from disclosing;
- ◆ other material that the City may determine does not preserve the purpose of publishing such emails or that violates federal, state, or local laws or regulations.

From: [Chadwick Wachs](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Broadband memo comments
Date: Friday, May 13, 2022 5:05:23 PM

I was asked by a council member to share these thoughts with the entire council, so I have included those below. This is in response to the broadband meeting taking place on Tuesday. If you are able to attend Mountain Connect in Keystone May 23 – 25, I think it would be beneficial – especially the sessions moderated by Christopher Mitchell from the Institute for Local Self Reliance.

I have several thoughts and am not sure an email will capture them all or even the spirit of the thoughts... These comments represent me as an educated citizen, not as a broadband company owner in Golden.

First is a question: On page 2, it is noted that a city-built fiber network will cost \$37 Million in pre-COVID dollars and take 8+ years to build. Then, in every example provided by a 3rd party (Allo, Ting, etc) – the cost to build a complete network is \$17 Million in post COVID dollars and does not take 8 years. Why is there a \$20 Million discrepancy between the Magellan estimate and the estimated cost provided by companies that do this every day? If it costs Ting \$17 Million to build a FTTx network in Golden, then it costs the city \$17 Million to build its own network. Let's stop inflating the cost by \$20 Million. And construction can begin in 2023. It will take far less than 8 years to build. Ting estimated a couple years to build out.

The “ring” that is being built now and is partially funded is not a “ring”. It is not really being built with a design allowing 3rd parties to use it in the future to provide fiber Internet in Golden. It is being built to connect city services together. Let's call a spade a spade. Are there above ground cabinets being installed at key locations throughout the city on this ring to allow the network to grow into the neighborhoods it passes? I've not seen a single one and I pay attention to this stuff. Was that even part of the design considerations? JeffCo schools owns and installed a large portion of this. Does the contract the city has with JeffCo Schools allow 3rd party commercial entities to join into that fiber? How and where will they do that? Do they have access to strands? How many? Or is there an open tube they can pull their own fiber into? What specifically does this agreement say? The devil is in the details but my guess is this is far from being a ring anyone can use but really is a city project designed to solve a city connectivity issue. There is nothing wrong with that but let's call it what it is. Otherwise, I'd love access to it tomorrow to reach neighborhoods I can't get to if it is being built for open access.

This memo, along with most of the other correspondence from city staff, is biased against running, building or funding a fiber network. It has been from the start. Fear of the unknown I think. If you were going to build a brand new water distribution network tomorrow as the city, would you farm it all out to a 3rd party and let them design, build and collect revenue from it? No, you would not. You would build your own water system just like you have in operation today. This is honestly no different at all. Broadband is a utility and is becoming more of one every day. Think of it as such.

This is a huge decision for Council. It will define what this city has for broadband for the next 30+ years at a minimum. This is not to be taken lightly. Remember, Ting, Allo, etc will consolidate, sell, whatever. They will likely become Comcast in the future. It's the nature of the business and capitalism. Then we are back right where we are today with a one provider option. No one is going to build a fiber network on top of a fiber network. For the same reason no one builds a cable TV network on top of another. It makes no financial sense. You will be left with one provider who makes the rules. But Council has the opportunity here to change that.

Talk to Utopia. They build and manage open access fiber networks for municipalities. I get that Golden does not know how to install fiber and this project may scare you. Find a partner that can help. I'd also talk to city staff at Centennial. The city manager's office there reached out to me a few weeks ago and we had a very interesting conversation about Ting, city owned fiber, etc. Same with Pulse – Loveland's municipal network. Get perspectives on both sides.

I think my thoughts boil down to this: Don't let city staff run the direction of this discussion. Have a study session with Centennial staff. Have a conversation with Utopia (<https://www.utopiafiber.com/>) about what they build in Utah, Nevada, California and Idaho. Have them educate Golden on what an open access fiber network can look like – they are the leading experts on open access networks in the US. Reach out to the Institute for Local Self Reliance (<https://ilsr.org/>) and ask them for guidance. That is what they do – advise local municipalities about exactly this.

This is too important of a discussion for the future of this city to be left to city staff to guide alone. I know of a few ISPs right now that would be interested in being a provider option on an open access network. Wouldn't it be great if you as a citizen or business had the choice of a half dozen or more Internet providers all on fiber? That is what drives down price and improves service. And it future proofs the city as well as creates a potential revenue source when you want to turn that on. Owning the network all the way to the home is the way to get there.

Hope this helps. Please call me if you want to chat more and feel free to share. These comments are open to anyone willing to listen.

Thanks for the opportunity.

Respectfully,
Chad Wachs

--

Chadwick Wachs

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [Liz Zukowski](#)
To: [Steve Glueck](#)
Cc: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Golden marijuana licensing application suggestions
Date: Thursday, May 12, 2022 12:19:30 PM

Good afternoon Steve,

I hope all is going well for you. I'm so impressed by the speed that which you and the City Council have moved through the marijuana business licensing discussions! You all may be setting a state record!

Since the licensing ordinance is well underway and is expected to be in front of the Council for a vote relatively soon, I wanted to pass along a few practical suggestions for putting together the application and other documents that may be used to help City staff and/or applicants complete the process.

Our company's primary licensing employee helped develop these administrative requests for the application based on experience writing and submitting applications to various municipalities across the state, including Broomfield, Winter Park, Longmont, Aurora, and most recently, Grand Junction.

Requests:

- Pose precise questions and identify the level of detail to be included
 - Example of a poorly worded application question: "Explain your security plan"
- Provide references to the ordinance sections/lines that pertain to each required item in the application
- Set parameters around the length of answers (page limit, word count, etc.)
- If the ordinance grants the Licensing Authority the discretion to require additional materials for consideration, we ask that any request for additional information not be considered a "strike" against the applicant.

These requests relate to the practicality of completing the application. Sharing as much detail with applicants about what the City wants to see in applications will cut down on questions from applicants and limit staff interruptions during the review period.

Additionally, setting parameters around the length of answers ensures the City is receiving the most vital information necessary to make a determination of license suitability and application completeness. Without these sorts of guidelines in place, the City may receive applications that are 200+ pages in length with duplicative information.

Thank you for listening to our suggestions. If these requests are implemented, we believe it will lead to a more efficient, effective, and equitable application and selection process.

If you'd like further details about any of the above requests, please don't hesitate to reach out.

Sincerely,
Liz

[Redacted signature block]



[Redacted footer text]

From: [Cross, Bryan](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Ordinance No. 2182 -- Regulation of Clear Creek Outfitters
Date: Thursday, May 12, 2022 3:38:14 PM

Council Members,

First, thank you for taking up, studying, and attempting to address the environmental, sustainability, safety, and enjoyment impacts posed by the increasing overuse of Clear Creek through downtown Golden. The traffic congestion, pedestrian injury risk, and liability exposure associated with the hordes of visitors who enjoy floating the creek on inflatables and then dragging their flotation devices haphazardly across Ford and Washington Streets and up the sidewalks that run parallel to the Creek have indeed become a nuisance and hazard to the residents of Golden. I was recently asked by several residents who have experienced these hazards to address the Council, and I appreciate the opportunity you afforded me to do so this past Tuesday evening.

I remain concerned that the new regulation is structured in such a way that it will drive users away from Outfitters and toward the use of personal devices purchased either by a covered Retailer or elsewhere, a concern expressed both by myself and by Mayor Weinberg. To the extent that happens, reduction in total number of users – a primary focus expressly stated in the Recitals of the Ordinance – will be diminished or lost. (As noted, I likewise remain concerned that this potential shift in user demographics will render the mandated operation of a shuttle by outfitters fiscally impractical or, alternatively, will lead to inefficient shuttle operations that many users will bypass, thereby negating the intended traffic and sidewalk congestion remedy.) In follow up communications with Councilor Bill Fisher, I was advised that local Outfitters were contacted and are generally in favor of the Ordinance and that “data” was examined to support the Ordinance. Although the latter point seems somewhat in conflict with the information provided at the meeting by Ms. Lorentz, I am hopeful that the Ordinance successfully reduces overall Creek use and related congestion as intended.

Since Outfitters will be required to clearly identify their equipment, see Ch. 5.20.040(d), I would suggest that random counts be conducted throughout this coming Summer (or possibly two) with the goal of at least anecdotally determining the percentages of Outfitter versus non-Outfitter users on the Creek so that the efficacy of the Ordinance may be weighed and that any future amendments may be guided thereby. Similarly, I believe random observations and surveys should be conducted along the Corridor sidewalks to both provide data that can inform Council about the effectiveness of the Ordinance in clearing sidewalk congestion and to likewise support any future amendments. Despite any doubts I may harbor, I sincerely hope the Ordinance proves successful in its purposes.

Separately, I'd like to raise a more general concern. In discussing passage of the Ordinance, Councilor Cameron implied that the presence of only a single public comment somehow demonstrated that Golden residents are not invested and/or don't really care about the Ordinance (and, by implication, management of Creek use). I would caution the Council against viewing lower volumes of public input on various issues as definitive evidence of public apathy as opposed to public ignorance of the matters under consideration. While I understand that the Guiding Golden website,

which I concede is very well structured, is the Council's preferred mechanism for providing information and soliciting public input, the bottom line is that many of your constituents are either not tech savvy or, alternatively, don't follow local politics until it personally affects them. (On this latter point, kudos again to the Council and to all City employees for taking on the heavy, and often times thankless, burden of keeping our City humming along smoothly.)

This point was most recently, and quite poignantly, demonstrated during the Heart of Golden project. Years of "input" solicited through Guiding Golden resulted in conceptual development maps that eliminated the Lions' Park ballfields without significant pushback. When the proposed maps were placed in the Golden Transcript and "discovered," however, a grass roots movement quickly developed that culminated in hundreds of residents attending a Heart of Golden meeting (as well as informing their Councilors) to voice strong opposition both to the proposed deletion of the ballfields as well as the proposed addition of parking along the Corridor that was viewed as encouraging greater Creek use. Numerous public comments were received at THAT meeting addressing the negative impacts of increased Creek usage by "tubers." When Steve Glueck noted that such issues were being separately studied by the Creek Commission subcommittee, one civic-involved, 50-year resident of Golden actually asked what that Committee was. The Council cannot receive accurate public input on issues if the public is not aware of those issues! As discussed at the Heart of Golden meeting, additional outreach should be considered to solicit public input on issues of major concern. A few ideas discussed include posting weatherproof notices at facilities potentially impacted by measures under consideration – e.g., if you want to know how residents feel about deleting ball fields/tennis courts, general Creek congestion, etc., then post Notices in those locations – direct solicitation of constituents potentially affected by action (e.g., residents of areas likely to be impacted) whether via mailings or emails, and any other method intended to *specifically target* stakeholders likely to be impacted. While certainly many Ordinances and other aspects of City government will not be a matter of concern to residents generally, special care should be taken when seeking input on matters with broad foreseeable impact – the character and use of the Clear Creek corridor definitely fits that bill.

Thank you again for your continuing service and for your consideration of these comments.

Bryan Cross
500 18th Street
East Street Historic District

From: [Joyce Laituri](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Pot Shop in North Golden
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 11:27:52 AM

Hello City Council,

In my neighborhood (Mesa Meadows) we have been hearing of the possibility of a Pot Shop, opening in north Golden? Please no!

North Golden is primarily residential with schools nearby within walking distance. Additionally, the increased traffic on the north side has restricted us from being able to exit our neighborhoods located off of Highway 93. Adding a recreational marijuana shop would only increase the severe grid lock we are already contending with.

Our neighborhood has experienced a noticeable uptick in crime: stolen vehicles, catalytic converters, bicycle thefts and burglaries. Pot shops traditionally bring more criminal activity around the business's location. In Arvada, just 10-minutes away, are several shops already open to serve this area.

We love our city. Golden is one of the few metro areas that still has a small-town feel. That is changing rapidly and adding medical marijuana retail outlets will make that happen more quickly and bring a negative outcome to the citizens. I understand Golden would like the revenue these businesses bring, but don't raise revenue on the backs of us who love our small town, pay our property taxes and send our kids to school down the street.

With Friendly Regard,
Joyce Laituri

From: [Travis Dungan](#)
To: [Council Comments](#); [Rick Muriby](#); [Laura Weinberg](#); [Steve Glueck](#); [JJTrout](#); [Casey Brown](#); [Rob Reed](#); [Paul Haseman](#); [Don Cameron](#); [Bill Fisher](#)
Cc: kmoore987@comcast.net
Subject: Retail Marijuana Sales near Canyon View
Date: Thursday, April 28, 2022 10:25:29 AM

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Thank you for your service as Golden City Council members and officials. I rarely attend council meetings, but follow meeting minutes on the City's website and understand it is difficult to represent all residents given the wide array of views on City issues.

My neighbor, Kevin Moore, shares the same views on retail marijuana locations as me, and many of the residents in our neighborhood. I respectfully ask that you consider the below points, with which I fully agree, in evaluating potential locations for retail marijuana in the City.

Regards,
Travis Dungan
1517 Jesse Ln

1. Since the retail marijuana ballot measure passed, the city is obligated to comply with the voter's decision. However, this measure is highly controversial, divisive, and only passed by a few votes. Given those factors, I think we should be implementing this initiative in "baby steps". It would be a different situation if 75% of the voters approved the measure, but this just barely passed. Honestly, I think we should start with only 1 location and assess the positive and negative impacts on the community after at least a year. I think it is a mistake to launch 3 or more locations when the margin of victory for this measure was so small. Why can't we start with 1 license, and reevaluate in the future?
2. In regards to the proposed location in the Canyon View business park, I'd like to point out that citizens make decisions on where to live, recreate, and work based on current zoning. Leaving the decision of putting a retail marijuana location should not be left to the planning and zoning commissions. Changes to zoning will affect all neighborhood businesses and residents, and the planning and zoning commissions may not have the same discretion or concerns that city council may have. If/when C-93 is realigned and the traffic patterns are changed, it may be appropriate to consider a retail marijuana location in Canyon View business park. However, right now there is no natural separation between the business park and the residential neighborhood and the location seems inappropriate.
3. I believe that a popular marijuana retail shop in Canyon View business park will exacerbate the traffic on C-93 and Pine Ridge. It is already very difficult to turn west onto Pine Ride from northbound C-93 during rush hours. Having a retail marijuana shop in that area will only make the traffic situation more unsafe. Again, Canyon View business park may be a viable location once C-93 is realigned, but not now.
4. The Canyon View subdivision has a park in the middle of Jesse Lane and Lou's Loop. Isn't the

intent to keep the retail marijuana locations away from places that families and kids would congregate? If so, why doesn't this park disqualify a portion of the Canyon View business park as a potential location? Why aren't all parks in the city (not just city owned parks) considered?

5. There was a comment / concern about servicing the north end of town with an appropriate level of marijuana stores. Honestly, there are much higher priorities than a marijuana store on the north end of town. The point is, a marijuana shop will not "service" the north end residents. If we are concerned at the north end services, then a grocery store would be the first thing to consider.

From: [Elizabeth & Mitchell Battilla](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: PFDs and state law
Date: Tuesday, April 26, 2022 9:35:00 PM

Good evening Council, Mayor, and Carly;

Mitch and I took a good look at this revised statute when it came out earlier this year. The rule for wearing a pfd seems to be related to objects being towed behind a boat or "vessel"- specifically listed are water skis, aquaplanes, and tubes. When Beth talked with Eric Krause (Jeffco Parks) he also interpreted it that way and so did DPW when Mitch called them previously. Just wanted to make sure that your legal dept talked with the state about the intent here. If it really does apply to rivers and creeks then that's great and makes it easier to get people to wear them :)

Here is the language so all of you can see for yourselves. If there is a different statute or set of language we are missing, please send that along as we have reached out to the state but never heard anything back on this.

Thanks,

Beth

[Statutes, codes, and regulations Colorado Revised St...](#) ... [Article 13 - Vessels](#)
[Section 33-13-110 - ...](#)

Colo. Rev. Stat. § 33-13-110

[Download PDF](#)

Current through Chapter 101 of the 2022 Legislative Session
Section 33-13-110 - Water skis, aquaplanes, surfboards, inner tubes, stand-up paddleboards, and similar devices - rules**(1)(a)** No person shall operate or manipulate any vessel, towrope, or other device by which the direction, speed, or location of water skis, an aquaplane, a surfboard, an inner tube, or any similar device may be affected or controlled in such a way as to cause such device or any person thereon to collide with or strike against any object or person.**(b)** No person shall operate, manipulate, or ride water skis, an aquaplane, a surfboard, an inner tube, or any similar device towed behind a vessel in a careless or imprudent manner without due regard for other traffic and all other attendant circumstances on the water.**(c)** Any person who violates this subsection (1) commits a civil infraction and, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine of two hundred dollars.**(2)(a)** Any person on water skis, an aquaplane, a surfboard, an inner

tube, or any similar device shall wear a personal flotation device.**(b)** The commission shall promulgate such rules as are necessary or desirable for the safe use of water skis, aquaplanes, surfboards, inner tubes, stand-up paddleboards, and other similar devices.**(c)** In addition, the commission may promulgate rules to prohibit recreational activities pertaining to the use of all single-chambered air-inflated devices, including inner tubes and air mattresses, on rivers and streams when water conditions are considered dangerous to such activities and when bodily injury may result to participants of those activities.**(c.5)** Any person on a stand-up paddleboard shall have readily accessible a personal flotation device that is of a type approved by the commandant of the United States Coast Guard and is in good and serviceable condition.**(d)** Any person who violates this subsection (2) commits a civil infraction and, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine of one hundred dollars.**(3)(a)** A person shall not operate, manipulate, or ride water skis, an aquaplane, a surfboard, an inner tube, a stand-up paddleboard, or any similar device while under the influence of alcohol, a controlled substance as defined in section 18-18-102 (5), or any other drug, or any combination thereof, that renders the person incapable of the safe operation of the device.**(b)** Any person who violates this subsection (3) commits a civil infraction.
C.R.S. § 33-13-110

Amended by 2021 Ch. 462, § 576, eff. 3/1/2022. Amended by 2019 Ch. 423, § 22, eff. 7/1/2019. L. 84: Entire article added, p. 903, § 2, effective January 1, 1985. L. 95: (1)(c) and (2)(d) amended, p. 972, § 21, effective July 1. L. 2003: (1)(c), (2)(d), and (3)(b) amended, p. 1948, § 23, effective May 22. L. 2012: (2)(b) and (2)(c) amended, (HB 12-1317), ch. 1227, p. 1227, § 61, effective June 4; (3)(a) amended, (HB 12-1311), ch. 1630, p. 1630, § 83, effective July 1. L. 2019: (1)(c), (2)(b), (2)(d), and (3)(a) amended and (2)(c.5) added, (HB 19-1026), ch. 3698, p. 3698, § 22, effective July 1. L. 2021: (1)(c), (2)(d), and (3)(b) amended, (SB 21-271), ch. 3267, p. 3267, § 576, effective March 1, 2022.

(1) This section is similar to former § 33-31-109 as it existed prior to 1984.

(2) Section 803(2) of chapter 462 (SB 21-271), Session Laws of Colorado 2021, provides that the act changing this section applies to offenses committed on or after March 1, 2022.

2021 Ch. 462, was passed without a safety clause. See Colo. Const. art. V, § 1(3).

For the short title ("Respect the Great Outdoors Act") and the legislative declaration in HB 19-1026, see sections 1 and 2 of chapter 423, Session Laws of Colorado 2019.

From: [Loretta Huff](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Heart of Golden Project input
Date: Tuesday, April 26, 2022 11:03:41 AM

Good morning, Councilors,

I understand that the Heart of Golden project will be presented in your meeting this evening. I believe I attended at least one meeting back in 2019 and I attended the March 2022 meeting and the meeting held last evening, April 25, 2022. I truly appreciate the work that has been done on a complicated project. It is a shame that much of the work was done during the pandemic when it was harder to ensure citizen input. Thus, it seems you are seeing quite a bit of conflicting feedback at the tail end of the project from folks who are not Guiding Golden users.

I have copied below the longer comments that I submitted to Guiding Golden this morning. I would just call out three items here.

First, the description on Guiding Golden includes a strong citizen desire for open space, parks, and nature. While some of that has remained, the concept maps without the ballfields seem to have lost much of the feel of true open space and instead fragments the space into more formal areas. In last night's meeting, there seemed to be strong support for keeping simple unstructured open space – like Lions Park and the grassy outfields of the existing ballfields.

Second, we were assured last night that these were just concept maps and not final decisions. Therefore, we shouldn't worry about what was shown – for example, no map shows keeping both ballfields. That answer did not sit well with me nor with at least several others in attendance. I encourage you to spend the extra money to end up with a concept map that reflects the repeated desire to keep more open space rather than one that ignores that feedback.

Thank you for your time.

Loretta Huff

Golden Resident

GUIDING GOLDEN SUBMITTAL

The description of the project on Guiding Golden includes these two statements.

“When respondents were asked what their dream corridor would look like, the overwhelming main theme was centered around parks, green and open space, and keeping the Clear Creek corridor as the “Heart of Golden””

“Individuals were asked to rank their four most important criteria that should be considered for concept plan development. Results were as follows:

1. **Open space and natural features/habitats are protected and enhanced.”**

It seems the request for simple parks and open space was lost in the design process. The designs as put forth remove most of the open space. Once it is lost, it will be virtually impossible to get it back. I suggest the following.

1. Keep both baseball fields. If you just count the number of hours a baseball game or practice is happening, it probably doesn't seem like a good use of space. If you count how often the fields are used for frisbee, families kicking soccer balls, spike ball games, formal and informal workouts, etc, the fields are busy. Add signs like at other parks to let people know the grassy area is available when a game is not being played. This also avoids the cost of tearing down

the only bathrooms currently along the entire middle and west stretch.

2. Try to keep Lions Park as intact as possible. It is also a frequently used green space. I would leave the playground where it is as opposed to moving it closer to the back-in parking. With the fences that are in place, I have never seen an issue with kids venturing into the street. If the space is to be expanded, expand toward the current pavilion or the sand volleyball court. As shown in the current drawing, there seems more risk for kids to dart toward the parking unless you fence all along that sidewalk. It would also be nice to see a bathroom planned near the playground. Port-a-potties for 3-and 4-year-olds never seem hygienic.
3. The courts are very busy. Perhaps we need to keep the existing ones and add two more tennis courts in Lions Park, striped for pickle ball as well. If you leave the play area where it is in Lions Park, can you put the tennis courts closer to Maple Street to leave the middle of the park as open space? It would also be nice to see a bathroom planned near the playground. Port-a-potties for 3-and 4-year-olds never seem hygienic.
4. Seriously rethink the need for moving all of City Hall. If most city employees are working a hybrid schedule, is it still true the current building can't accommodate the city? If more space is needed, can a new police headquarters be built at the east end of the project? This would allow the current police space to be repurposed for city activities. As the police department doesn't have many options for work-at-home and will likely grow as the city grows, that may be the department that most needs more future space.
5. Consider moving the library to the location where the amphitheater is planned. An amphitheater will be used far less than the baseball fields but is slated to take up as much space as Vanover Park. Either put the library there or expand Vanover. If folks currently walk from the community center or playground to the library, they should be able to make it another 3 blocks. If they currently drive between those locations, there is no impact. This also could reduce the need for the library to hire a "parking guard" to ensure there are spaces for library patrons.
6. I looked up Nature Play to see what that meant. It appears in most pictures to be a playground with artificial logs, etc. It seems like the river and the ballfields provide quite a bit of space to play in nature. If a second playground is needed in addition to the one in Lions Park, why not incorporate this more natural looking one into the History Park buildings?
7. The view with the ball fields retained does two additional positive things. It does not expand Water Sports Parking and it eliminates the formal gardens. I think both of those are beneficial long-term changes.
8. If you still want to move the museum (which I think will reduce their visitor volume), use that area for the open space described by the consultants – walkways with tables scattered around. It would be small and intimate for people who don't like big open spaces.

From: kmoore987@comcast.net
To: [Council Comments](#); [Rick Muriby](#); [Laura Weinberg](#); [Steve Glueck](#); [JJTrout](#); [Casey Brown](#); [Rob Reed](#); [Paul Haseman](#); [Don Cameron](#); [Bill Fisher](#)
Subject: RE: April 12 City Council discussion on retail marijuana sales
Date: Tuesday, April 26, 2022 8:38:41 AM

After reading all the negative comments regarding retail marijuana locations posted here: [Council Comments Weekly Email Postings \(cityofgolden.net\)](#), I have no idea why the city isn't just considering 1 location. I would like to re-emphasize my point #1 below.

Thank you.

Kevin Moore

From: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: April 12 City Council discussion on retail marijuana sales

City of Golden Mayor, Staff and Council Members,

I am writing in regards to the April 12, 2022 city council meeting regarding recreational marijuana sales in Golden. After listening to the discussion, I have the following comments:

1. Since the retail marijuana ballot measure passed, the city is obligated to comply with the voter's decision. However, this measure is highly controversial, divisive, and only passed by a few votes. Given those factors, I think we should be implementing this initiative in "baby steps". It would be a different situation if 75% of the voters approved the measure, but this just barely passed. Honestly, I think we should start with only 1 location and assess the positive and negative impacts on the community after at least a year. I think it is a mistake to launch 3 or more locations when the margin of victory for this measure was so small. Why cant we start with 1 license, and reevaluate in the future?
2. In regards to the proposed location in the Canyon View business park, I'd like to point out that citizens make decisions on where to live, recreate, and work based on current zoning. Leaving the decision of putting a retail marijuana location should not be left to the planning and zoning commissions. Changes to zoning will affect all neighborhood businesses and residents, and the planning and zoning commissions may not have the same discretion or concerns that city council may have. If/when C-93 is realigned and the traffic patterns are changed, it may be appropriate to consider a retail marijuana location in Canyon View business park.

However, right now there is no natural separation between the business park and the residential neighborhood and the location seems inappropriate.

3. I believe that a popular marijuana retail shop in Canyon View business park will exacerbate the traffic on C-93 and Pine Ridge. It is already very difficult to turn west onto Pine Ridge from northbound C-93 during rush hours. Having a retail marijuana shop in that area will only make the traffic situation more unsafe. Again, Canyon View business park may be a viable location once C-93 is realigned, but not now.
4. The Canyon View subdivision has a park in the middle of Jesse Lane and Lou's Loop. Isn't the intent to keep the retail marijuana locations away from places that families and kids would congregate? If so, why doesn't this park disqualify a portion of the Canyon View business park as a potential location? Why aren't all parks in the city (not just city owned parks) considered?
5. There was a comment / concern about servicing the north end of town with an appropriate level of marijuana stores. Honestly, there are much higher priorities than a marijuana store on the north end of town. The point is, a marijuana shop will not "service" the north end residents. If we are concerned at the north end services, then a grocery store would be the first thing to consider.

All of your websites and communications ask for community input. Although I feel like a broken record, I am trying to communicate that many of the residents of Canyon View do not want a retail marijuana shop nearby, and we hope you will listen to our input.

Thank you for your consideration,

Kevin Moore

From: jennifer.woodard1@gmail.com
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Take care of your constituents
Date: Monday, April 25, 2022 7:01:05 PM

Don't forget your constituents as Golden is making all these plans for the future. Pickleball is the fastest growing sport in the county and removing the six courts that you worked with us to make available on 10th Street without a solid plan for replacing them is short sighted. There are so many places that this could be done: 1) convert the roller hockey rink on South Golden Road to 4 courts (like Lakewood did at Whitlock Rec. Center), 2) rather than convertint the current creek side courts, playground and grassy area near the RecCenter to parking, build new tennis and pickleball courts which will attract people from around Jefferson county 3) there was a proposal to put courts next to the Community Center....

Golden does not need more cars driving and parking in our town. Put parking outside of the main activity areas. People can walk a few blocks into town and pass by businesses rather than parking along the creek. Jamming more parking down the dead end of 10th street is not consistent with healthier environments. Walking is good and cars just bring congestion and air pollution. Weekends are already crowded with vehicles and the current plan will make getting through the light at 10th and Washington an even greater frustrating challenge than it is now.

Golden's government has successfully made Golden a desirable and popular destination for visitors. All of that success is making Golden less desirable for its residents. We need a good outdoor Pickleball/Tennis Facility. Take Care of your Constituents.

From: [Leocadio José Barroso Bravo](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Change makes a community stronger
Date: Monday, April 25, 2022 7:11:13 PM

Dear Laura,

I read your article about change in the Golden Informer.

I find that many of the changes that are planned, do not represent impactful changes in our community other than moving money from the taxpayer to the developers. Moving a few buildings from one side of the river to the other side of the river, such as moving the museum from the north to the south side of the creek does not represent change, other than spending money.

Building a trail through the middle of the golden community gardens, when there already exists a road, does not represent a good change, the opposite, you are taking away a form of many to socialize, grow and donate fruits, vegetables, flowers, etc., The garden is a safe space for many to belong and you are taking it away from us by building an unnecessary trail, when there are already many trails in the garden for people to use. Many of us do not think that the change you are asking us to embrace is the best change for our community.

This project seems to be very costly. I would be interested in knowing how many billions or trillions moving buildings is going to cost us the taxpayer. I am not sure if this project was in the program when you presented for mayor of the city of Golden. If this was not in the program, I would recommend for you to propose these changes before an election and let the community decide whether your government is the best option to lead our future. For sure, you DO NOT count with my vote.

I think that it should be your government who should embrace change, by not spending our money on unnecessary projects. You are thinking of moving the city hall and police station to the east part of the creek and building a three story building, but I remind you that there was already a three story building that was just demolished in that part of the city... Why didn't you use that space that already existed?

I think it is very egoistic that we citizens must adhere to these changes, of filling up the pockets of the developers, but you cannot make changes on the way you spend our money.


From: [dennis van valkenburgh](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Relief From An Un Responsible Neighbor
Date: Sunday, April 24, 2022 5:23:05 PM

Greetings Council, I'm Dennis Van Valkenburgh, 811 Illinois St., writing you, not for the first time seeking relief from the condition of the property at 1013 9th St. You might recall my contacting you folks some time back asking if there were steps you could take to enforce the applicable city codes relative to abandoned and decrepit properties.

A section of what is left of the picket fence in front of that house has now fallen down. I have been in contact with code enforcement and asked them to contact the owner in hopes of having the downed portion and, hopefully the rest of the remaining fence hauled away.

I would appreciate it if you folks could connect with the owner and persuade him to take responsible action when, as is the case now, portions of his abandoned home fall down and lie in rot.

Your help would be greatly appreciated,

Dennis Van Valkenburgh


From: [Andrew Keefer](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Lions Park Redevelopment
Date: Saturday, April 23, 2022 8:36:38 AM

Good Morning,

My name is Drew Keefer. I have owned and lived in a home just north of downtown Golden for 11 years. I wanted to ask that you please not go through with the current plans to remove the football field/baseball diamonds at Lions Park. This has been a very special recreation area for my 2 children for their entire lives. They will not utilize a garden or pavilion put in its place. The prospect of losing this special area makes me very sad. I just wanted to make my opinion known. Thank you for your time.

Drew Keefer

From: [Collier, Stephen J.](#)
Cc: [Collier, Stephen J.](#)
Subject: 2022 National Small Business Week proclamation for your municipality's consideration and adoption
Date: Friday, April 22, 2022 9:03:15 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[NSBW 2022 Local Proclamation\(Mayoral Template\).docx](#)

Good morning from the SBA Colorado District Office!

This year, May 2-6, is National Small Business Week. Working in tandem with our local and state government partners, our small business communities have come along away, especially since the early days of COVID in 2020.

As part of our push to highlight NSBW, we are requesting local governments to showcase their support for NSBW in the form of proclamations. We have attached a draft proclamation for your use/incorporation here.

Please let us know if we can be of further assistance in this endeavor. Thank you again for all your municipalities do to support our state's more than 600,000 small businesses.

v/r

-S

Stephen J. Collier

[Redacted signature block]



first thing to consider.

All of your websites and communications ask for community input. Although I feel like a broken record, I am trying to communicate that many of the residents of Canyon View do not want a retail marijuana shop nearby, and we hope you will listen to our input.

Thank you for your consideration,

Kevin Moore

From: [Ted Scarbrough](#)
To: [Laura Weinberg](#); [Rob Reed](#); [JJTrout](#); [Don Cameron](#); [Casey Brown](#); [Council Comments](#)
Subject: City Council discussion on retail marijuana sales
Date: Friday, April 22, 2022 2:51:00 PM

I am writing in regards to the City Council meeting and discussions regarding recreational marijuana sales in Golden. First of all I must admit that I voted against the general retail marijuana ballot measure which was closely passed by the voters. Now I would like to express my thoughts on the marijuana retail shop in Canyon View Business Park.

- My first thought is I would guess that the citizens who live in the north part of Golden, especially near the Canyon View Business Park, would have been among those who mostly voted against the marijuana retail measure. This area is very much a residential environment with many children playing in our neighborhood parks.
- Also, the additional traffic on highway 93 to a Canyon View location is not needed. It would seem to make sense to have marijuana retail shops in locations with more public transportation or walkable locations.

Thank you considering my and our neighbor's opinions.

Respectably,

Ted & Joanne Scarbrough
1485 Jesse Ln



Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [HENRY&ROBERTA NIETO](#)
To: [Council](#) [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: FW: April 12 City Council discussion on retail marijuana sales
Date: Friday, April 22, 2022 7:57:14 AM

City Council Members-

I fully agree with the comments contained in Kevin Moore's email sent on April 20, 2022. I hope each of you will give these comments careful consideration.

Henry and Roberta Nieto

[REDACTED]

Date: 04/20/2022 7:54 AM

Subject: FW: April 12 City Council discussion on retail marijuana sales

I met with Casey Brown and Don Cameron last week to discuss my concerns over the retail marijuana ordinances the city is drafting right now. They mentioned that the city would like to hear from numerous people, so can you please write to city council and provide your input? Feel free to just forward my email and say: "This is exactly how I feel" if you don't have time to write your own email. You can also forward this email to anyone else in the area if you know they are against a retail marijuana shop right down the street.

Thanks

From: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: April 12 City Council discussion on retail marijuana sales

City of Golden Mayor, Staff and Council Members,

I am writing in regards to the April 12, 2022 city council meeting regarding recreational marijuana sales in Golden. After listening to the discussion, I have the following comments:

1. Since the retail marijuana ballot measure passed, the city is obligated to comply with the voter's decision. However, this measure is highly controversial, divisive, and only passed by a few votes. Given those factors, I think we should be implementing this initiative in "baby steps". It would be a different situation if 75% of the voters approved the measure, but this just barely passed. Honestly, I think we should start with only 1 location and assess the positive and negative impacts on the community after at least a year. I think it is a mistake to launch 3 or more locations when the margin of victory for this measure was so small. Why can't we start with 1 license, and reevaluate in the future?
2. In regards to the proposed location in the Canyon View business park, I'd like to point out that citizens make decisions on where to live, recreate, and work based on current zoning. Leaving the decision of putting a retail marijuana location should not be left to the planning and zoning commissions. Changes to zoning will affect all neighborhood businesses and residents, and the planning and zoning commissions may not have the same discretion or concerns that city council may have. If/when C-93 is realigned and the traffic patterns are changed, it may be appropriate to consider a retail marijuana location in Canyon View business park. However, right now there is no natural separation between the business park and the residential neighborhood and the location seems inappropriate.
3. I believe that a popular marijuana retail shop in Canyon View business park will exacerbate the traffic on C-93 and Pine Ridge. It is already very difficult to turn west onto Pine Ride from northbound C-93 during rush hours. Having a retail marijuana shop in that area will only make the traffic situation more unsafe. Again, Canyon View business park may be a viable location once C-93 is realigned, but not now.
4. The Canyon View subdivision has a park in the middle of Jesse Lane and Lou's Loop. Isn't the intent to keep the retail marijuana locations away from places that families and kids would congregate? If so, why doesn't this park disqualify a portion of the Canyon View business park as a potential location? Why aren't all parks in the city (not just city owned parks) considered?

5. There was a comment / concern about servicing the north end of town with an appropriate level of marijuana stores. Honestly, there are much higher priorities than a marijuana store on the north end of town. The point is, a marijuana shop will not “service” the north end residents. If we are concerned at the north end services, then a grocery store would be the first thing to consider.

All of your websites and communications ask for community input. Although I feel like a broken record, I am trying to communicate that many of the residents of Canyon View do not want a retail marijuana shop nearby, and we hope you will listen to our input.

Thank you for your consideration,

Kevin Moore

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Council Comments](#); [Steve Glueck](#)
Subject: MJ process study sessions etc.
Date: Thursday, April 21, 2022 10:50:57 AM

Greetings City Council! Let me introduce myself, my name is Sandy Beddor and I am in a family business that has had a retail marijuana shop in Wheatridge for close to 10 years! Our store is Chronic Therapy and is located at 10030 W 27th Ave, Wheat Ridge CO, We are located just off of 27th and Kipling.

I have been following the process that City Council has been going through and thought it might be worth it to bring in a perspective I have not heard yet and that is from someone who has been through many local processes and who has been in business for a long time and succeeding. Especially as a small family owned and operated business. Our family does not have deep pockets, we have grown organically since the beginning. I am proud to say that we are in 3 jurisdictions with 6 licenses. We have retail and cultivation licenses in Wheat Ridge CO, we have manufacturing and cultivation licenses in Aurora CO and we have retail and a brand new State of the Art Cultivation Center in Cortez CO. All done without normal loans, mostly through blood, sweat and tears!

Saying all of that is to give you a little background on our successes and when I make the following observations of the process in Golden it is in light of what my family has overcome and what I am not seeing being represented at City Council meetings and study sessions. I believe our small family business would be a great fit with the Golden area but because we are not a large corporation, we are being priced out of the market before it even opens up,

The process that is being discussed is extremely expensive for the businesses who would want to compete to obtain one of the very limited licenses being discussed. It is so expensive that groups like ours will have a hard time even attempting to compete with the chance of winning a lottery. Here are some examples:

1. We must have possession of property prior to going through the process. That means we have to negotiate leases, contingent on winning a license...in the meantime, paying monthly rent during the process, generally having to put down a non refundable deposit, sometimes equally 3-6 months worth of rent. Rents are generally much higher for a retail store in our industry than its neighbors. It is not far-fetched to have to pay upwards of \$50-75K just to get to the lottery stage and then rolling the dice. I don't know about you but I do not know many small businesses that can put that type of money out on a project that relies on the roll of the dice!
2. The amount of emphasis the City Council seems to want to put on the business plan and community involvement is very burdensome. These types of plans do cost small businesses a lot of money. Since filling out these applications we generally need to hire attorneys to assist. Most if not all the applications you will receive will be with those of us that have been in the business since its inception. Since we are a part of creating an entire industry, we all have made mistakes along the way...we all have had to work with community pushback and we all have had to learn how to work within the extensive rules and regulations of our industry. All of the early mistakes have made most of us much better business people and much better community citizens. We all go through annual renewals, we all go through background checks...These reviews for our business alone are 6 reviews each year, 1 per license for both the State and the Local jurisdictions. In other words, the local employees who will have the burden to sift through all the information that will be required can be reduced dramatically if you only rely on what the State has approved year in and year out for most of us pioneers. In addition the local communities we are currently in can provide you with input as to how we operate in their local jurisdictions.
3. After looking at the current map that has been produced (knowing it is still in discussion) I would like to let you know my findings so far. With the two northern sections needing additional permit changes or zoning changes, again a much longer process with no guarantees AND with no properties currently available to even attempt to get any type of possession, those areas of the map seem to be unattainable at this time. I understand that there might be the possibility of purchasing the car wash at 44th and McIntyre but I have not been able to reach those owners to see if this is indeed true OR just a possibility that someone is hypothesizing. The parcels by the dinosaur lots would need new builds and the current buildings currently being leased, I have chatted with each business owner and they all have long term leases. This is the same with the group of potential sites off of Indiana and 6th Ave. As

much as I would love to find something on S Golden Road, the one where there are some vacancies are less than 1000 ft from schools. Even though you are not discussing distances, the State rules and regulations, although they allow for this, it is frowned upon. As the map stands today, I would be surprised if you were to receive more than 1 application simply because there are not the available sites for people to even attempt to gain possession of a potential property.

I know this has been lengthy but really thought you would want to hear from a current business owner of a marijuana company. I encourage each of you to reach out to me for further discussions and if you would like, a tour of our beautiful facility in Wheat Ridge. You will be surprised at how well we fit into our local community. At this time we probably will not be able to join the competition of going after one of the coveted licenses in Golden, not because we don't want to but knowing what is involved, not having the resources to risk \$50-75K just for the chance at winning a lottery. One can expect to pay an additional \$75-100K just to get the doors open with purchasing inventory, setting up the store, providing all the security and cameras, hiring staff, IF they are successful at winning a lottery. And just to be sure you understand, we are extremely successful and we are looked upon as a leader in our industry. That initial \$50-75K will be better spent providing investment into our current 65-70 families now working for our organization through competitive and living wages, increasing benefits for our people etc,

I hope you are able to take this feedback, relook at what you are asking potential applicants to spend just to get to the lottery position and hopefully reduce the burden for both staff and applicants while still getting a "good fit" for the Golden community. Please feel free to contact me with any additional questions or comments or just conversation. We wish you well and hope that the process can change enough for us to reduce the cost of applying and become part of the pool of applicants.

I sincerely thank you for taking on this very complicated task of allowing Cannabis retail stores into the City of Golden.

Sincerely,

Sandy Beddor

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

From: [Hassan Najjar](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Reminder: CBCA Economic Activity Study at Miners Alley Performing Art Center
Date: Thursday, April 21, 2022 12:04:02 PM

Hi City Council and City Staff -

Just a reminder that Golden Cultural Alliance and Golden Civic Foundation will be co-hosting the Colorado Business Committee for the Arts to discuss their Economic Impact Study. This is a great opportunity to learn how arts and cultural organizations impact the SCFD region and ask questions about trends and how other municipalities are interacting with arts and culture organizations.

Hope to see you there at 4pm. [Details are here.](#)

Hassan

Hassan Najjar / Executive Director
Foothills Art Center • Golden, CO

Admission at Foothills Art Center is FREE
[Visit our website](#) for the latest hours, programs, and exhibits.

From:



Subject:

April 12 City Council discussion on retail marijuana sales

Date:

Wednesday, April 20, 2022 7:51:44 AM

City of Golden Mayor, Staff and Council Members,

I am writing in regards to the April 12, 2022 city council meeting regarding recreational marijuana sales in Golden. After listening to the discussion, I have the following comments:

1. Since the retail marijuana ballot measure passed, the city is obligated to comply with the voter's decision. However, this measure is highly controversial, divisive, and only passed by a few votes. Given those factors, I think we should be implementing this initiative in "baby steps". It would be a different situation if 75% of the voters approved the measure, but this just barely passed. Honestly, I think we should start with only 1 location and assess the positive and negative impacts on the community after at least a year. I think it is a mistake to launch 3 or more locations when the margin of victory for this measure was so small. Why cant we start with 1 license, and reevaluate in the future?
2. In regards to the proposed location in the Canyon View business park, I'd like to point out that citizens make decisions on where to live, recreate, and work based on current zoning. Leaving the decision of putting a retail marijuana location should not be left to the planning and zoning commissions. Changes to zoning will affect all neighborhood businesses and residents, and the planning and zoning commissions may not have the same discretion or concerns that city council may have. If/when C-93 is realigned and the traffic patterns are changed, it may be appropriate to consider a retail marijuana location in Canyon View business park. However, right now there is no natural separation between the business park and the residential neighborhood and the location seems inappropriate.
3. I believe that a popular marijuana retail shop in Canyon View business park will exacerbate the traffic on C-93 and Pine Ridge. It is already very difficult to turn west onto Pine Ride from northbound C-93 during rush hours. Having a retail marijuana shop in that area will only make the traffic situation more unsafe. Again, Canyon View business park may be a viable location once C-93 is realigned, but not now.
4. The Canyon View subdivision has a park in the middle of Jesse Lane and Lou's Loop. Isn't the intent to keep the retail marijuana locations away from places that families and kids would congregate? If so, why doesn't this park disqualify a portion of the Canyon View business park as a potential location? Why aren't all parks in the city (not just city owned parks) considered?
5. There was a comment / concern about servicing the north end of town with an appropriate level of marijuana stores. Honestly, there are much higher priorities than a marijuana store on the north end of town. The point is, a marijuana shop will not "service" the north end residents. If we are concerned at the north end services, then a grocery store would be the

From: [Christopher Allred](#)

To:

April 23rd - Symposium on Rocky Flats: Impacts on the Environment and Health

Date:

Monday, April 18, 2022 8:04:56 AM

Dear Golden City Council,

I'm reaching out as a member of the front range community to share an invitation to an important educational event for our region. Please see the following event announcement:

Symposium on Rocky Flats: Impacts on the Environment and Health

April 23, 2022 8:00am - 5:00pm

Virtual Event with in-person option in Superior, CO CME credits available for Physicians

- [Registration/ Program/ Information packet here](#)
- [Register for Virtual event via Zoom here](#)
- [Register for in-person event here](#)

From 1952 until 1989 the Rocky Flats Nuclear Weapons Plant in Colorado produced 70,000 plutonium triggers for atomic weapons. After closing in 1992, a cleanup of the production area was undertaken and it is now a Superfund Site. The surrounding buffer zone, not remediated, is now a Wildlife Refuge with trails open to the public.

This Symposium will feature a panel of 15 expert speakers presenting on topics ranging from the history of Rocky Flats, contamination issues still plaguing the area, legal issues, critical analyses of epidemiological studies, and effects of radiation on the genome and epigenome.

I hope you will join us for this important educational event.

RF Symposium Promo Graphic.png



Sincerely,

Chris Allred

On behalf of the Colorado Coalition for Prevention of Nuclear War

From: [Carol Cameron](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Waterway garbage
Date: Sunday, April 17, 2022 3:29:43 PM
Attachments: [Drainage fromThevillage.png](#)


Dear City of Golden,

I'm concerned with the garbage that washes out of "The Village" parking lot and into the Kinney Creek drainage (Kinko's, Goodwill, Dollar Tree, Golden Liquors etc.). For location see attached Google satellite image. Could we please hold the businesses or the property owner PNS RAINBOW SHOPPES LLC accountable? Perhaps have them install a bar screen on the south side of the culvert under Johnson Rd.? Then require them clean and dispose of the garbage in a more environmentally friendly way.

One good summer time thunderstorm and all this debris will be in the newly uncovered Kinney Run and into Clear Creek. Let's be good stewards of our watershed and hold people accountable.

Sincerely,
Carol

Carol Cameron



From: [Simon Maybury](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Retail Marjuana
Date: Wednesday, April 13, 2022 1:22:13 PM

Dear Council,

Against a background of actively encouraging the use of psychoactive drugs, unless the City has also taken explicit action to enforce The Law concerning operation of a motor vehicle while not competent to do so owing to incapacity from psychoactive drug use, the City will be partly responsible for any injuries, death and property damage caused by such drivers.

It is pretty easy to reduce driving while incapacitated by alcohol, THC or other contraindicated substances and make a profit while doing so. Simply monitor individual consumption at congregations and nail the offenders when they start to drive. If “privacy” is a problem, then tell willing residents that it is legal for them to record video of the intoxication process followed by driving and then to submit such videos to the police for later enforcement. And in parallel declare that any misuse or publication of such material by government will be penalised to a suitable extent. This last misuse issue has been incorporated into law by the UK Data Protection Act and similar statutes in Western Europe for decades; simply adapt the terminology.

How about an annual report with an estimate of vehicle-miles travelled within Golden by intoxicated drivers as a fraction of total vehicle miles ? And how many of these were caught and prosecuted ?

BTW: On a related item, PLEASE use all cost-effective technologies as much as possible to catch and prosecute drivers who consistently drive dangerously. Once you have enough cameras in place, it is easy to ignore the occasional California Stops and jump on the drivers who make several unsignalled lane changes, significantly exceed the speed limit and dangerously tailgate all in a short interval, suggesting that these drivers will eventually kill someone. From observation, I would guess that these Very Dangerous Drivers constitute between 1 and 10% of all drivers and should be removed from the road to protect the rest of us. All without wasting police time until evidence review time. Let the data describe itself and with a few simple guidelines (eg 30% speed limit excession is four times as dangerous as 20% at this particular camera), identify the worst (say) 5% of offending vehicles and flag them for more scrutiny (once they have clearly (eg 80 mph with 65 mph limit) broken the law, they are fair game for targetted observation). This automated approach will result in demonstrably fairer and more complete enforcement with less effort. And, of course, nail anyone in authority who misuses such data.

Yours faithfully,

Simon Maybury

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Comments from a Golden citizen
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 3:36:17 PM

I wish Golden would not allow retail marijuana sales to be in lots of locations. I also think that rents are too high and it is hurting downtown locations - why should someone have to close their business after 30 years because they are suddenly confronted with a much higher rent due to a new building owner. Do you want to retain Golden's Old West feel or do you want to discard it? If discarding it is your answer, what is the new goal? Also the plans for the Coors Tek location seem to not tie in with the rest of downtown. There is not enough parking in Golden now. We also need solar to reduce our energy consumption - what is the city's plan to fight climate change? We have solar on our home and love it. I think we have to reduce our energy footprint if we want to have Golden remain a desirable place to live and visit. My family lives in Mesa Meadows.

Fran Loft

From: [Emeline Paulson](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Expansion of marijuana retail location zones
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 9:18:21 AM

Mayor and Council Members,

I very strongly am opposed to locating a marijuana retail store in the South Golden Road area, in close proximity to Bell Middle School, Golden High School and the Ulysses Park Complex!

Keep marijuana stores out of central Golden and at a distance from our centers of youth activities (ie schools and parks)!

Thank you,

Emeline Paulson

221 Lookout View Court

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Location of retail marijuana stores
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 7:18:34 AM

Council,

In the 5+ years I have lived in Golden I have never felt the need to make my voice heard to the Council and very much appreciate your continued and ongoing hard work for the community. But, I am writing today because I am extremely disturbed that the proposed location of retail marijuana stores in Golden include locations in close proximity to schools. I am an attorney working in downtown Denver and have seen first hand the terrible effects that legalization has had on the city center (even before the pandemic, which has brought different and more problems). Furthermore, it is near constant to drive in Colorado and see someone vaping while driving. I voted for legalization in the state back when that was on the ballot and now regret doing so. With rising middle schoolers in my home (and then high schoolers), the legalization and now the proposed location and proximity to the schools is highly concerning. I urge you to find a different and better location that is further from the schools. Wherever you put it, consumers will find it and Golden will reap the tax revenue. It doesn't need to be near the schools. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,
Martine Wells
324 White Ash Drive
Golden CO [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

From: [Henry Holsing](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Marijauna in South Golden RD Area
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 7:15:40 PM

Dear council members,

I am a freshman at Golden High School, and I have recently learned of the addition of a 7th area in which Marijuana can be sold. Although the income of Retail Marijuana is obviously welcome, I believe that the sale of it is best kept at the outskirts of Golden, and far away from schools. The addition of the South Golden Corridor is an affront to the ideals and values of our community. It is not only far too close to the downtown area (<1.5 miles), it is also positioned directly between GHS on one side, and Bell Middle School and the skate park on the other. Already, there is too much access to drugs for youth, and adding Marijuana along South Golden Road will compound and exacerbate this problem in a big way. With the health and welfare of the youth in Golden and the community as a whole, I implore you to reconsider the retail of Marijuana in the South Golden Corridor.

Thank you,
Henry Holsing
Concerned Student at GHS

From: [Camden Lyon](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Marijuana in South Golden Road Area
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 6:57:15 PM

Dear Council Members,

I am a freshman at Golden High School, and I have recently learned of the addition of a 7th area in which Marijuana can be sold. Although the income of Retail Marijuana is obviously welcome, I believe that the sale of it is best kept at the outskirts of Golden, and far away from schools. The addition of the South Golden Corridor is an affront to the ideals and values of our community. It is not only far too close to the downtown area (<1.5 miles), it is also positioned directly between GHS on one side, and Bell Middle School and the skate park on the other. Already, there is too much access to drugs for youth, and adding Marijuana along South Golden Road will compound and exacerbate this problem in a big way. With the health and welfare of the youth in Golden and the community as a whole, I implore you to reconsider the retail of Marijuana in the South Golden Corridor.

Thank you,
Camden Lyon
Concerned student at GHS

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Marijuana sales in Golden
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 8:42:20 AM

Golden City Council members,

Regarding plans to allow marijuana sales retail locations in Golden, I think it's disparaging to put revenue opportunities ahead of social responsibility for the citizens of Golden.

Isn't it enough that there are bars and restaurants and social events attracting tourists, creating crowds and limited parking, squeezing out what was the town for its inhabitants to become an amusement park for the sake of increased revenue and a destination spot on the map?

I think the direction of your efforts will cause additional crime for our already stressed police and fire department, destroying entirely what was the character of a small town in a beautiful mountainside setting.

I'm all for progress, innovation and restoration. But I see exploitation in the direction of your planning efforts, particularly to include this source of revenue and as I understand, not two or three but seven retail locations?

Whose interests are being served here? Who stands to benefit from this "progress"? Who's voices are being heard?

Thanks in advance for your reply,
A concerned citizen

From: [Steph Singer](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Marijuana sales on South Golden Road
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 6:51:45 AM

I am opposed to marijuana sales on South Golden Road. That is not what we voted for. Too close to schools and not good for the neighborhood!
Stephanie Singer

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Dottie Massaro](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: New Business Locations
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 6:33:26 PM

I concur with Tim Waters that the projected location of the store selling cannabis products needs more work. "At the edge of Golden" is tricky because Pleasant View is a Golden suburb that blends right into the city and feels very much like Golden. Old Golden Road seems a part of Golden. I have no moral problems with marijuana for adults and have no children but concur that the location of the store could unduly influence the perceptions of kids as it being an OK thing since it is in their back yard --access to be viewed every day, so to speak.

From: [Jeremy Hakes](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Opposition to retail marijuana locations
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 10:18:25 AM

Good morning, Council.

Thank you for your work!

As I have shared with council before, I wanted to share my family's opposition to retail marijuana in general in Golden, and in particular along South Golden Road. These potential locations are exceedingly inappropriate in juxtaposition to Golden High School, Bell Middle School, the skate park, 5280 Daycare Center, and the Golden Municipal park area.

In addition to our general opposition, I sincerely hope that any approval for any business is temporary and to be reviewed in the future for compliance, and any increase in complaints and misuse along Clear Creek. I hope somehow that the number of complaints and incidents are documented and counted year over year to quantify any increase in complaints (as well as any decrease, which seems unlikely). I suspect a direct line of correlation will be observed from an increase in the number of retail outlets and a parallel increase in the number of complaints logged.

Thanks for the opportunity to provide input.

Jeremy Hakes
686 Entrada Dr.
Golden, CO 80401

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Opposition to selling marijuana in South Golden Road area
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 12:40:36 PM

Dear City Council,

I am adamantly opposed to including the South Golden Road area as venue for marijuana sales. It is too close to two adjacent parks in the Southridge neighborhood, Golden High School, and Bell Middle School, even though those may be outside some "magic" buffer zone on a GIS map. The area is frequented by under-age children and teenagers. The South Golden Road area is not on the "fringe" of Golden, either. In many ways it is in the heart of south Golden, and certainly is in the heart of southeast Golden.

Confine marijuana sales to the true fringes of Golden, and keep it completely award from areas where the under-18 crowd frequents. Leave out the South Golden Road area from marijuana sales, please.

Regards,
Donna

Donna Anderson
841 Shelton Rd
Golden, CO 80401
[REDACTED]

From: [Torsten Lyon](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed retail marijuana locations in Golden
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 2:25:24 PM

Dear Council Members.

I am extremely concerned about the recent addition of South Golden Road as a potential location for retail marijuana sales in Golden city limits. This location is very close to both the Ulysses Skate Park and Southbridge Park, and right between (and and far too close) to Golden High School and Bell Junior High. Marijuana sales next to our schools and city parks does not align with our community values.

Please do not permit the sale of retail marijuana in the South Golden Road corridor. Sales locations should be limited to the outskirts of town and kept to a very limited number.

Thank you.
Torsten Lyon
Golden resident and parent of high schooler

Inline image



From: [SALLY MAUGHAN](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Re: Retail Pot shops on Golden Rd
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 8:24:28 AM

Thank you for the confirmation.

From: Council Comments <CouncilComments@cityofgolden.net>
Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 8:23 AM
To: SALLY MAUGHAN <SALLYMAUGHAN@msn.com>
Subject: Automatic reply: Retail Pot shops on Golden Rd

Thank you for your comments to City Council. Please be aware this is a public email address and all emails received will be compiled and posted on the City of Golden website. If you do not want your email posted on the City website, please contact the City Clerk's Office to advise at 303-384-8014 or clerks@cityofgolden.net.

From: [David Camille](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Retail Marijuana
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 5:29:09 PM

City Council,

Yes I have made it perfectly clear in previous correspondence that I do not support retail marijuana stores in the great city of Golden. My opinion is based on medical science and personal (family/friends) tragic experiences with the "recreational" use of the drug. This is the wrong path for Golden.

Since allowing retail marijuana was barely approved (50.4%) by voters, I would expect City Council to take a conservative and responsible approach to where retail sales would be allowed. However, today I found out that an area along South Golden Road not far from schools and a park is now being considered?

Previous councilmembers told me that the whole goal of allowing a vote on retail marijuana stores in Golden was so that we would not be sued by the industry and we could proactively control the number and locations of stores. If that's the case, then **DO NOT ALLOW** stores in the newly designated area along South Golden Road between Johnson and roughly Ulysses. I'd also like to see the area north of Pine Ridge road excluded - at least from the 93 frontage area. Furthermore, I ask that where you do allow these stores that their signage and storefront presence is minimal. High neon colors/lights and big signs on stores in other cities are a true eyesore.

Disappointed,

David Camille

From: [Allyn Stoecker](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Retail marijuana
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 8:08:14 AM

Sent from my iPad

Dear City Council,

As a resident of Golden I want you to be aware of my concern about the number of retail marijuana businesses you are considering for our community. When the information was made available to us, before the election, I believe it stated that there would be something less than five spaces considered for business. Now I hear that you are considering 7 and that some could be in a fairly close proximity to our schools. I want you to know that I think that number of retail marijuana businesses in our small community is excessive. There are many places available for the purchase of retail marijuana that are in communities that are close to Golden. Will having up to 7 more really enhance our tax base to a large degree?

One of the reasons we moved to Golden was its small town charm. But, in the few years that we have lived here I feel that is being allowed to quickly change - and not for the better.

I am asking that you, please, reconsider allowing that many retail marijuana businesses in our small community.

Please put your efforts on keeping Golden a community with small town charm.

Most Sincerely,
Allyn Stoecker
400 23rd St
Golden

From: [Barb Warden](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Retail Marijuana
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 1:37:42 AM

I did not welcome retail marijuana to Golden. I did not find “everyone else is doing it” to be a compelling argument.

During the lead-up to the election, the roll-out was described as a small number of stores, probably near the Interstate. The implication was that we would give people a place to stock up before heading to Red Rocks or the mountains.

Now we’re seeing scope creep, with proposed locations on the north end of town and in the center of the city, between the junior high and the high school, and marvelously convenient to the skateboard park.

Please return to the pre-election vision—a limited number of stores, close to I-70. Keep the stores away from the schools.

Thank you.

Barb Warden

From: [Edward Smyth](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Retail Marijuana Dispensaries on South Golden Road????
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 2:30:49 PM

Please tell me this is a belated April Fools' joke! Golden is banning sugary drinks in children's meals, but allowing retail marijuana businesses on an area of South Golden Road between two parks (Southridge & Ulysses) within easy walking distance of Bell Middle School & Golden High School? This is just insane!

Of course, this should liven up the holiday atmosphere surrounding the Super Cruise festivities in the summer as well, so bring it on. That monthly traffic bottleneck isn't nuisance enough? Here's a suggestion: Let's bring in a few brothels & peep shows to that area, too, to round out the wholesome education opportunities we'll be providing our young people.

Well done, City Council.

Edward B Smyth
17421 Rimrock Dr


From:

Subject:

Date:

retail marijuana location proposal

Tuesday, April 12, 2022 8:11:55 AM

City Council-

Under no circumstances should a marijuana facility be located on South Golden road between GHS and Bell Middle School and the skate park. Marijuana was voted down once the first time, the second time it was voted in with the provision of being on the outskirts of town, and somehow, this is considered on the outskirts, directly along the MAIN thoroughfare through town and between schools? This is a complete bait and switch, which does not support our community values or Golden's image.

Tim Waters
629 Idaho St

From: [Rick Grubin](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Retail Marijuana Ordinance Continued Discussion
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 7:49:51 AM

Council Members:

Please reconsider the possibility of allowing retail marijuana sales location(s) in the "South Golden Road" location, adjacent to two schools and a park -- this is not an appropriate location for such businesses.

Thank you.

--

Rick Grubin
9th St., Golden

From: [Deb Goeldner](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Retail marijuana
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 10:19:04 PM

I was very disappointed to see that City Council is going to allow retail marijuana on South Golden road. When I spoke to my city counselor he assured me that the retail shops would be on the south end of town closer to Red Rocks and nowhere near parks and schools. I'm opposed to pot shops of any kind in Golden.

How many of you have children and are aware of the problems that have occurred with young people since marijuana was legalized? It has many adverse affects particularly for those under 25 years of age whose brains are still developing. Kids think it's safe because it's legal. Please do more research before allowing this negative impact to our city. It's not worth the additional revenue.

Sincerely,
Deb Goeldner

[Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS](#)

From: [SALLY MAUGHAN](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Retail Pot shops on Golden Rd
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 8:23:13 AM

I'm writing to voice my opinion against this. What happened to keeping it on the outskirts of town like near the fairgrounds where the medical shop is located now?

The map I saw shows right in between GHS, Bell and the ball/skate park. That's insane!!! And yet kids can't get a soda or juice box with their meals at fast food stores.

Please reconsider

Thank you

From: [Dixie McInroy](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: South Golden Road Addition
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 4:43:19 PM

I am strongly opposed to the addition of the South Golden Road location for the sale of legal marijuana. This area is walkable to educational, recreational, jail and youth services. Council members have made it quite clear that residents are not important when it comes to making city decisions. I do hope that they will take this matter quite seriously.

From: [Sandra Knecht](#)
To: [Council Comments](#)
Subject: Study Session Agenda - Retail Marijuana Licensing Ordinance Discussion
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 2:29:15 PM

Hello Councilors!

Sandra Knecht here, north Golden resident (District 2, Ward 4) in Mountain Ridge.

I'm glad to see that the draft retail marijuana ordinance language included utilizing the Code of Colorado ([1 CCR 212-3](#)) for the definition and state determination of eligibility to be considered as a "Social Equity Licensee". Thank you all very much for considering and directing that for this next draft.

Because one license is already designated in this draft for the existing medical marijuana business, there are only realistically 3 potential licenses available for the social equity designation. When considering the business boom observed in other nearby municipalities who legalized retail sales earlier than Golden, and the ongoing harms from the war on drugs experienced by predominately lower income folks and people of color, what leads to the decision to reserve only one of the licenses potentially available? There could be an opportunity for a lottery of social equity license applicants for all 3 remaining potential licenses, or at least 2 to represent half of the business opportunities in Golden.

When *1 CCR 212-3* was passed last year, Governor Polis stated at the signing press conference that "Our war on marijuana falls disproportionately on people of color effectively reducing access to an industry that's fully legal and regulated in our state". Far from being political, this disproportionate harm is well researched, [documented](#), and [understood](#). We can also see it today in the predominately white and affluent ownership of existing cannabis business in our own state, and the state legislation is an attempt to mitigate and even repair some of the damage done.

I understand that there was some additional discussion in opposition to the use of social equity criteria in licensing decisions. As part of the staff research in other communities for lessons learned, has anyone reached out yet to the [Black Brown and Red Badged organization](#) for their perspective on the cannabis industry in Colorado? They not only are partnered with the Governor's office, but also local governments in Denver, Aurora, Boulder, Pueblo, Colorado Springs, and in more rural Colorado communities.

I'd like to reiterate that because this new to Golden I think we have a very real opportunity to align the other DEI and REDI goals as part of the business license criteria. Please consider this opportunity in contributing to wealth generation for folks excessively harmed with prior legislation and increasing the diversity of voices within our community.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sandra Knecht