

Exhibit 20

**Eagle River Fire Protection District,
Berlaimont Estates Road Alternatives 2 and 3
Memorandum**



M E M O R A N D U M

November 6, 2020

To: Dominic Mauriello, Mauriello Planning Group
Fm: Karl Bauer, Fire Chief
Cc: Michael Woodworth, Division Chief/ Fire Marshal; Tracy LeClair, Community Risk Manager; United States Forest Service
Re: Berlaimont Estates Road Alternatives 2 and 3

The Eagle River Fire Protection District was asked to provide its assessment of the two proposed access routes to the Berlaimont Estates development, known as Alternative 2 and Alternative 3. This memorandum summarizes the Fire District's assessment.

Fire District staff understand that Alternative 2 denotes the eastern route to Berlaimont Estates, while Alternative 3 means the western route. The Fire District's assessment derives from this understanding.

Of principal concern to the Fire District, Alternative 2 adds 35%-50% more travel time for emergency response and evacuation.¹ Extending travel time delays the arrival of fire suppression resources, allowing for fire growth to continue unabated, potentially complicating initial attack. Also, increased travel time impedes the timely intervention of emergency medical services.

Alternative 3 takes into consideration Fire Adapted or FireWise Community concepts.² These concepts were discussed extensively throughout early phases of the development's design; and were included with the goal of enhancing the community's wildfire resilience. Only

¹ Hays, S. (2020, October 29). Feasibility of Berlaimont Estates Access Roads Alternatives 2 and 3. Denver, CO, United States.

² Anchor Point Team. (2020, October 22). Berlaimont Estates Access Review. Boulder, CO, United States.

demonstrable improvements to the community's wildfire resilience should prompt changes to components of these Fire Adapted and FireWise considerations.

Additionally, Alternative 2 locates the community's roadway within an area comprised of more volatile fuel and severe slopes.³ The combination of greater fuel volatility in alignment with steeper slopes creates the potential for fire activity that prevents access by responding fire resources, and egress by evacuating community members.

I also note several additional concerns:

- The proposed alignment of Alternative 2 limits the number and location of pullouts and increases the possibility of head-on collisions (noted as "conflict points" by Hays). For a variety of reasons, pullouts enhance motor vehicle safety, and their numbers should not be reduced.
- Alternative 2 includes more roadway at maximum allowable grade. A higher percentage of steep grades may lead to more vehicles leaving the roadway, particularly when icy conditions exist, resulting in a greater number of rescues. Limited site distances would likely require complete road closure during emergency operations.
- Shadowed corners increase the likelihood of ice build-up. Given its switchbacks, Alternative 2 may lead to a greater number of icy areas that remain on the roadway for longer periods of time.
- Alternative 2's length and complexity may necessitate a more complicated snow removal plan, as will be required.

Lastly, the original design of Alternative 3 included a number of roadway specifications required by Eagle County. While a review with Eagle County and the Fire District's Fire Marshal should be conducted to confirm Alternative 3's compliance with such design requirements, this assessment calls attention to numerous concerns with regard to Alternative 2, as previously explicated.

For these reasons, the Eagle River Fire Protection District prefers Alternative 3.

³ ibid