

Ouray County Study Group
Minutes
January 28, 2009
4:00PM
Land Use Office

Those present included Heidi Albritton, Ken Lipton, John Clark, Craig Fetterolf, Keith Meinert, Ted Collins and Lynn Padgett. Sara Coulter and Karen Risch were absent.

1. Approve minutes of previous meeting

Ken called the meeting to order. Minutes from the prior meeting were approved.

2. Powerpoint presentations for RPI

Keith asked about the length of the presentation. Ken and John believe that both RPI and Theobald should be done at once rather than to break them into two separate presentations. Ken stressed editing and format. Heidi suggested that the County's GIS and Land Use departments be tapped to help provide larger or poster-sized maps or charts. Black and white slides of the Powerpoints should be made available to the public at the presentations. Lynn brought up the fact that once this presentation is made, the PowerPoint stands alone, and should make sense to someone who didn't attend the meeting could understand the material.

Ted asked about the use of the "Theobald" title, rather than 'build-out' study. Previously the group had agreed to try and be consistent throughout the presentation, and Ken and John had worked on that in the PowerPoint. Craig discussed the presentation itself and whether the group should have more than 2 people doing the presentations so as to prevent the public from associating the data with that individual or their perceptions rather than the group as a whole. He doesn't want policies or personality to detract from the presentations. Ted discussed the other factors involved in increased costs of LOS, and Ken agreed that in the presentation he would clarify that while the group is aware of other factors (i.e. Inflation), that we are only looking at a straight-line projection based on growth. John questioned whether or not the "incremental costs" slide is necessary to understanding the presentation. He and Lynn both made some suggestions to clarify the slide.

On the Road and Bridge segment, the concept of "Capital Improvement" and whether or not it was necessary to explain was discussed. Several of the charts were confusing in terms of titles and numbers, and some changes were made to make them easier to digest. Discussion of photos and graphics, John will try to add some elements where he can. Ken will make the clarification that the RPI study only looks at 3 County departments, and does not take into account other County functions and services. The group discussed rounding numbers for purposes of presentation, and Ken will do that verbally during the presentation, but the actual numbers will remain in the slides.

On the law enforcement slide, the clarification will be made that RPI was only looking at County Law enforcement data (and not municipal police forces), so the clarification will be made that we are talking about Sheriff's deputies and not all law enforcement employees. There will be a note on the bottom of the slide that states something to the affect that the RPI study does not take into account both municipal police departments.

On the Revenue projections slides, it was agreed to simplify and only use the Total revenues slide. This will build into a 'shortfall' analysis. John will also add another slide to indicate the transition from the department specific data to the conclusion portion. He will also add specification that all the charts are pulled from the study. Ken suggested a summary slide of the data.

3. Public Comment

No members of the public attended the meeting.

4. Next Meeting

Heidi will work with Connie to find a date in the first two weeks in March for the presentation at the 4H Event Center. Next meeting will be Wednesday, February 11th at 1pm at the Ridgway Town Hall.