

Study Group
February 20, 2008

Those present included: Don Batchelder, Ken Lipton, Ted Collins, Connie Hunt, Heidi Albritton, Lynn Connaughton, Sarah Coulter, Doug Canright, Linda Ingo, Keith Meinert, Alan Staehle, and Chris Pike (Rene and John were absent but had notified the group prior to the meeting of their illnesses) Craig Fetterolf and Bill Fugazzi were absent.

Ken called the meeting to order at 4:08. He asked if there were any additions or comments to the minutes, there were none. Sarah made the motion to approve the minutes, Lynn seconded, and the motion carried. Connie passed out a code of conduct or "Ground Rules" paper for the group (from the R&B committee) to use as a model for the study group. Some discussion ensued with some comments on the issues of confidentiality and minority opinion. It was agreed that some of the items on the R&B paper were not applicable to the study group. The group agreed that bullet #8 could be stricken from the form or else modified. Don suggested keeping the first 5 bullets on the main part, and then the 4 bullets on the second portion, removing the other bullets. The group agreed, and also agreed to make any changes that would reflect the fact that this is the Theobald/RPI study group. Further discussion ensued about the name of the group, it was agreed that for purposes of the minutes that the term "study group" would be used. For the official title, the group agreed that "Theobald/RPI Study Group" would be utilized.

Ken asked to move onto the Master Plan, not wanting to go into the document in depth, but rather to make sure that the document had been reviewed by the group, and that everyone was prepared to discuss its relevance to the process at hand. Lynn brought up that if there is the possibility that a Master Plan review may be in the near future, what role do these discussions play? Heidi answered that it was the BOCC's intention that as the study group goes through the process, that any discussion and/or comments regarding the Master Plan will be noted in the minutes, and preserved for a further discussion/review of the Master Plan. While the BOCC did not want to task the study group with a Master Plan revision, it did acknowledge that there would be relevant discussion within the group that needed to be followed up on if and when there is a Master Plan revision process.

Ken asked that the group proceed to the Theobald study. He asked that the group start with the indicators and then go to the assumptions to see how the group felt about these two benchmarks. He felt that once those 2 had been vetted that it would be easier to assess the rest of the study. Sarah clarified that the indicators in black at the top of the chart were taken from the Master Plan; the vertical elements on the side are ways in which those are implemented or affect certain indicators. It is not telling us which scenario is best for any one scenarios, it is just telling us which elements will be affected by the various indicators. Ken asked the group to comment as to whether or not the group was in agreement with what the study was saying, or if there were other perspectives that we needed to take into account. Keith asked about the stockholder's group and the discussions that had taken place at that time. Sarah pointed out that the top indicators in black were not subjective, but rather were taken from the Master Plan; the vertical

column represents the discussion of the stakeholders and was more subjective in nature. Ken reminded the group that one of the end goals was to provide a synopsis of the report, and to point out any shortcomings or agreements that the groups finds with respect to the Theobald study. Lynn commented that the table in question is difficult to understand; she suggested that the table could be cleaned up to be more easily understood. As to whether or not she agrees with the table, she felt that there might be additional impacts than are indicated by the table. For example, the # of housing units she felt did indeed affect the natural resources, and yet that is not indicated on the chart. The group essentially agreed, and felt that this could be an area for further discussion with Theobald. There was some confusion as to what the thresholds were that would trigger the primary and secondary indicators. Sarah will follow up with Theobald to find out. Ted and Keith felt that this chart should be revisited after some further discussion on the rest of the chart. This discussion will inform the other, and vice versa. Relative to Master Plan goals, there are inadequate indicators spelled out. More information is needed to determine the context used for this chart, and whether or not it should be amended.

Accessory dwelling units were discussed Sarah clarified that out of all possible sights for accessory dwelling units, Theobald estimated that 1/3 of those were being utilized for that purpose. Doug clarified that people are exploiting the “caretaker” provision in the LUC to build additional dwelling units. He felt that “accessory dwelling units” per se were not being exploited thus far. Alan suggested that rather than 30% on the accessory dwelling units that it be lowered to 10%. Doug agreed, and stated that the trends are support this. Doug discussed the need for the County to refine how it tracks/keeps land use information. Mining was discussed as an example. Lynn stressed that the group needed to be aware that the present might not necessarily be the best indicator of the future. If we lower the percentages to accommodate immediate trends, we may be shortsighted and limit the usefulness of the study. We need to be cautious as to changing the indicators, as they may limit the scope of the study’s usefulness. Doug agreed that the county’s focus should be on improving its recording methods and data collection.

As to the irrigated and ag lands, Don suggested that perhaps a phone conference with Theobald would be useful in terms of assessing the prioritization of indicators. Ted voiced a concern about water and water rights, and how those concerns relate to irrigated fields and irrigation in general. He stressed that those water rights are subject to the market. He feels that there needs to be some system in place that could help to keep those water rights here. Alan brought up the fact that mining claims were also neglected. Ken discussed the fact that at the time of the study, mining claims were not looked at as being a priority (at least according to staff at that time). Linda voiced that the indicators were drafted to reflect the Master Plan as drafted at the time, and that those indicators should be given strong credence, as they were made priorities for very definite reasons. The group agreed, but also acknowledged that there are items such as water and mining which were not a focus at either the time of the Master Plan, or the Theobald study and need to be taken into account. Sarah brought up the fact that the mining claim data was fairly inadequate. Alan felt that that between the forest service and the county that there were ample data out there. Keith and Heidi discussed the various issues that the County was dealing with in terms of the Assessor’s office and getting all these antiquated sources of information into a form that is both accessible and usable. Lynn discussed her experience

using the BLM system to track this information, and felt that while it is time-consuming, it does exist, and much of it can be done online. She said that it took approximately 2 hours for 20 parcels. Don figured that we had about 1400 mining claims. Sarah and Lynn will follow up with both Theobald and Western State in terms of the possibility of a grad student to help look at these. Alan stressed how important it is to follow up on the mining claim issue, and that the study is essentially incomplete without this data and perspective. Lynn discussed the fact that many other groups and jurisdictions could benefit from this information. The BOCC may need to contact some of these other groups in order to get some cooperative effort going. Also, in light of the various issues concerning mining claims having a solid baseline of information would feed into all of these discussions. The County's current site development plan was discussed, and Doug suggested that the County communicate with the real estate community in terms of what is on the books right now (issues of access, septic, etc.). Don discussed the fact that as much work could potentially go into the mining claim issue alone, as went into the entire study as a whole. The group agreed that it needs to be pursued, even if it cannot be completely dealt with in this venue.

Lynn went back to Ted's comments regarding water. Ted felt that the issue is potentially quite broad in that there could be the development of storage sights, and that this stored water could be sold. He did not feel that Theobald could do much to address this, but that the group could begin to tackle this in the form of their recommendations to the BOCC. He stressed that we are in pretty good shape in terms of domestic water in the County (not necessarily the municipalities), and the areas serviced by tri-county water seems to have enough water for full build-out. Many agricultural water interests have been bought up by municipal interests. There is a lot of pressure on water interests in Colorado, and those looking for investment opportunities are out there looking as we speak. Sarah mentioned that the State was looking at mechanisms to lease rather than sell water rights. Keith felt that the water issues should be considered, but was concerned about how that consideration would affect the land use process. Don said that the biggest potential impact will be if ag interests begin to see their rights outside the County. Keith wanted to somehow tie these issues into the Theobald study, or the study group. Don stressed that this tie will have to come in the form of recommendations to the BOCC, not necessarily in the form of pushing further Theobald input on the subject.

Going back to the table, the table was derived as a result of the computations, not prior to the computations. Sarah will double-check with Theobald. Vehicle miles traveled are something that Theobald is re-looking at. He had made the assumption that Ridgway was the commercial center of Ouray County, when in fact Montrose is the commercial center of this area. Lynn stressed the need for certain finesse on this issue. For her personal situation, the fact that much of her routine has evolved around the school districts, as have many other peoples'. She stressed the need to take into account the school districts in these computations.

Connie felt that it might be useful to bring Theobald back to discuss the study, especially given the amount of time that has passed. The group agreed that this would be very useful, and while it would involve the County incurring some costs, those costs would be minimal.

As to the acreage in wildfire hazard areas, that was not computed, as the County did not have that complete data at the time. Alan will provide Sarah with the contact

information so that this can be completed. Trailheads were also not computed, and yet were rated highly. Sarah showed the group her use of transparencies to visually see the overlay of the indicators and factors. She and Lynn had discussed how to incorporate this overlay into more useful tools for the groups. Lynn felt that these could be put together on the computer, and made into pdf's that the group could use. Lynn offered to pull this information together, she will need Theobald's data files in order to do so.

The group went over the action items so far, and agreed upon those listed below:

ACTION ITEMS:

- 1. Sarah will follow up with Theobald to determine his thresholds for the primary and secondary indicators listed on the chart, and find out which came first.....the chicken or the egg?**
- 2. Sarah and Lynn will follow up with Theobald and Western State to see if there is any possibility of the help of graduate students or research assistants to tackle the mining claim project.**
- 3. Incorporate issues/comments regarding water issues into the final recommendations**
- 4. Follow-up on furthering understanding/data regarding mining claims and incorporate this info into final recommendation**
- 5. Alan will provide Sarah with information regarding the wildfire hazard information that the County now has so that Theobald may utilize this data**
- 6. The County may invite Theobald to a future meeting for further study discussion**
- 7. The County or Theobald will provide Lynn the data needed to create the overlays for the group.**
- 8. The group will incorporate the methodology used in this process into the final recommendations so that it can be clear how/why this study group is doing what it is doing.**
- 9. The group will make sure that a more clear and streamlined version of the table discussed will be incorporated into the final recommendations.**
- 10. Info/ data dealing with mining claims will be added to the baseline data, and will to be taken into account in the various scenarios.**
- 11. Keith will contact Bob Risch about possibly participating as a member for the City of Ouray**

Ken asked that the group move onto the scenarios on page 6. Items A-H indicate the scenarios that were examined by the group. He pointed out that there are some

scenarios that are missing from the list, and others that clearly are no longer relevant. He suggested that we make note of those missing, and those not relevant. Doug discussed item D (urban growth boundaries) and the housing authority's impact on this, and pointed to the fact that some of these may very well change significantly. Some scenarios are easily changed, others may require additional work. Lynn felt that it would be beneficial to see how an increased density in the UGB would affect the results. She also stressed the need to retain some of the info and scenarios that are not felt to be as relevant. The perspective and historical info alone is useful, and should be left in. Heidi agreed that this information is valuable.

Ken asked that for the next meeting that the group begin where we are leaving off. Connie contacted Patrick Rondinelli and asked for a representative from the City of Ouray. Don suggested that Bob Risch be contacted and asked to join. Keith will contact him. Ken asked that if anyone cannot participate that they contact him and advise him of their absence. He stressed the need for committed members, and the fact that there is a great deal of work to be done, we need everyone to be present! Thanks to Lynn for the great job on the web site! Ken encouraged everyone to look at the 'assumptions' from the study for the next meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 6:01pm.

NEXT MEETING:

March 5, 2008 at 4:00pm at the Land Use building