

Ouray County Study Group

Minutes

October 29, 2008

4:00PM

Land Use Office

(Draft)

Minutes of Ouray County Study Group meeting, October 29, 2008

Meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. by Chairman Ken Lipton

In attendance: Keith Meinert, Ken Lipton, Sara Coulter, Karen Risch, Ted Collin and John Clark. Lynn Padget arrived at 4:40 p.m.

Heidi Albritton and Don Batchelder were absent.

Minutes of the August 22nd meeting were approved as submitted.

I. Theobald Synopsis

More discussion took place on the Theobald study synopsis. Sara explained that she has distributed a revised copy of her synopsis today, with the addition of a projected growth rate chart, as well as a revised set of recommendations, based on the discussion from last week.

Sara passed around a couple of articles relevant to the discussion, from the standpoint of the property-rights advocate debate as well as some of the most current thinking on the benefits of cluster development.

Finally Sara has put together an compilation of some of the data inconsistencies that have been found in the study, in hopes of being able to deflect any criticism that may come about when the public starts dissecting our findings. Keith pointed out that one approach may be to round down the data figures in order to minimize the possibility of controversies around the interpretation of the data. One example is that Theobald states that there are approximately 143 miles of road in the county, and Keith stated that County uses a figure closer to 290 miles.

Ted stated that he has a big concern around the fact that the Theobald study has been revised as many as four times during the Study Group's process, and that there continue to be some major discrepancies in some of the data. There was a lot of discussion about the level and nature of these discrepancies, and how to deal with them. Keith pointed out that anyone can quibble with any given number in a report like this, but that the Study Group's stance approach should be to focus on the conclusions that are forthcoming, based on the study as a whole, and not let the process get bogged down in arguments over the finer points in the data.

When Lynn arrived, Ken pointed out that there are two parts of the synopsis that need more work, and possible help from her in crunching the numbers: the issue of VMT and the mining claims. Lynn agreed to put some time into that after the election, so Ken suggested that we had done all we could do with Theobald for today, so we should move on to his RPI synopsis.

II. RPI Synopsis

Ken gave some brief comments about the differences between the base assumptions in the Theobald study versus the RPI study. There was a fair amount of discussion about this, and the dangers of looking at the two studies as if they are connected. Ken pointed out that one example of the discrepancies between the two reports: that Theobald used 7 ADT and RPI used 9 ADT (average daily trips). He added that it's possible to find validation for either number.

Keith pointed out some basic issues he had with the synopsis. For example, on page 4, he pointed out that the data in the synopsis isn't as accurately detailed as it is in the actual report itself, and is missing the details of what the numbers mean. It was suggested that some of the raw number detail be removed from the synopsis, and instead say something like "...based on data in the RPI study, the entire county residential ADT would be 25,220..."

There was much discussion about how best to present the information in the synopsis. Lynn suggested that it might be worthwhile to present more of a short summary of conclusions at the beginning of the synopsis, and then present some level of detail to support the conclusions. Ken responded that it might be best to simply use the Executive Summary presented by RPI, and not use his synopsis at all. There was further discussion about the process of distilling the synopsis. Lynn stated that it should be a much more condensed approach.

Sara suggested, as a way to get around the difference of opinion, that the group discuss Ken's draft synopsis titled "Implications of RPI and Theobald". First, under the heading Road & Bridge:

No change in #1.

#2 should read: "Any new residential units will cause a serious decline in the level of service".

Then make a new #3 (changing the existing #s 3 & 4 to be #s 4 & 5): "Any increase in density over existing county zoning will only exacerbate the problem."

The discussion had to end there to due to time constraints. It was agreed that the group would meet next on Nov. 12th, and continue from this point.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, October 29, 2008, by John Clark