

Ouray County Study Group
Minutes
December 3, 2008
3:30 pm
Land Use Office

Those present included Heidi Albritton, Ken Lipton, Keith Meinert, Ted Collin, Sara Coulter, Craig Fetterolf, and John Clark

1. Approve minutes of previous meeting

This is an issue of the difference between the incorporated vs. unincorporated population.” (change to minutes per John) The minutes were accepted with this minor change.

2. Discussion of implications

Ken discussed Sara’s revisions that she had sent to everyone, and the group will need to Go over the final changes and additions because there have been so many drafts that there is some confusion as to what the ‘final’ version is! Keith discussed the NASA escalator that the group is using as a reference, and voiced concern that the inflation used in this reference were quite low compared to national/state CPI’s. He suggested that the NASA escalator will understate the inflation, and he referred to the Governor’s Blue Ribbon panel on transportation, which is projecting Road and Bridge costs increases of at least 6% per anum. Keith calculates that we have had a 7.7% rate of inflation in R&B costs for the past three years due to the fuel specific costs in that department. He is concerned that the NASA escalator might do more harm than good, especially in specific departments. Ken had selected the NASA escalator because it was the only one he could find that went out to the 2015 date. RPI did not use any inflationary rate, and as the group had discussed it was important to include some sort of reference point in terms of inflation. Ken brought up the point that no financial projections can be trusted at this point, and until the recession issues are more settled each of these is speculative in nature. Craig wondered how appropriate it really is for the group to try and account for inflationary factors? The group just wanted to point out that RPI did not utilize any sort of inflationary factor, and wanted the public to be aware of that fact. Ken removed the NASA reference from the paper, and Keith agreed that it probably wasn’t necessary to try and cover this point in an appendix.

Ken went thru the document and pointed out the other changes that had been both suggested and made. Several minor changes were suggested, and the group agreed. Several references were removed, as they were used more for the group to understand the studies, than for as a piece of the final product. There was discussion about the various studies that the group had referenced in the research process, and how to incorporate these studies or not within the final recommendations and implications. Several items were removed for lack of relevance for the final product. Discussion of the VMT’s ensued, and whether or not actual traffic counts have been or should be more thoroughly vetted or utilized. Ted wondered about the impact fees section, and brought up the fact that the group had discussed the ‘non-uniformity’ of impact fees and their collection and applicability. The section was modified to account for the intent for the County to be more equitable in its application of impact fees.

The RPI study does not account for the fact that there are two municipal police departments operating within Ouray County, in addition to the County’s Sheriff’s department. The RPI number of officers per capita of residents is inaccurate if that is the case. The City of Ouray and Town of Ridgway currently budget as much as the county, and have officers that cover each municipality. The three entities are duplicating efforts, and it is not efficient for either effort or resources. A sentence will be added stating that the RPI study did not account for two municipal police forces. It would make fiscal sense to combine law enforcement efforts into one

department to be able to take advantage. Recommendations will include a recommendation to integrate and collaborate law enforcement efforts.

The group agreed on the changes and told Ken to go ahead with the final on this section based on these changes.

4. The RPI/Theobald synopsis

Ken took the group through the changes and additions that he had incorporated into the study. Again in the Law Enforcement section, the increase in the number of new residents used for the recommendations are countywide, and that includes municipalities. The recommendation for an increase in staff is based on the numbers countywide, and as such affect municipal budgets in addition to the County's budget. Ken modified the statement to account for that. Discussion ensued about the fact that RPI did not make efforts to separate out the costs and Level of Service for the County vs. the municipalities. The figures seem to indicate that the study switches back and forth between the inclusion and exclusion of the municipal numbers, making it difficult to compare apples to apples. All the more reason to encourage the BOCC to consider the possibilities of consolidation of law enforcement efforts countywide into one department.

On the Conclusions section several distinctions were made and accepted by the group. Impact fees were again discussed. The need to readdress impact fees at the County level is significant, and the current fees are probably falling short of keeping pace with the costs of growth. A new study could help justify a distance-based system of impact fees.

The group agreed on the changes and told Ken to go ahead with the final on this section based on these changes.

5. The Foreward

There have been a number of versions, and by the time the group got to this portion, they were locked out of the office, so couldn't make copies of the two current versions. Ken instead read the draft for the group for discussion. He also read Sara's suggested changes at the same time.

"The RPI study was commissioned by the BOCC and the study was done by Rural Planning Institute of Durango, Colorado." – add to final draft 1st paragraph

2nd paragraph- accepted Sara's changes "The parameters of the build-out study were developed by a citizen stakeholder group appointed by the BOCC..."

3rd paragraph- The materials will be available and maintained on the County's website.

4th paragraph- accept Sara's change

5th paragraph- accept Sara's change

6th paragraph- this paragraph was changed and accepted at the Nov. 19th paragraph. Ted suggested that the word 'overall' be added before the word 'validity'.

Craig wondered if the group should include the passage of the sales tax question for the road and bridge budget? Keith stressed that it is not the loss of federal and state revenues that is truly the obstacle to local budgeting, but rather than the huge inflationary factor being experienced by road and bridge departments.

6. Discuss date for presentation

Sara asked that the journals and reference materials that she had provided be made available with the report. She had not yet sent them to Lynn to post on the website, but would like to. Ken thought it was ok, but wanted to stress that the group had not researched or studied these other reference materials, so they should be included as 'additional reading'.

The next step is to develop the PowerPoint presentation. Ken and Heidi will work on RPI, and Sara will work on Theobald. Sara stressed how important visual information is in a PowerPoint presentation, and not to rely on

text to convey the points. Ken suggested that once a basic outline of the information is ready, then the group should reconvene to look at the distillation of the information before the final presentations are put together.

Heidi suggested that the group not rush to get the final product finished, as there is just no need. The group has done some really good work, and there is no rush to get it out before its ready.

The individual members will continue to work on their parts to bring back to the group with the anticipation of meeting again in February to finalize the presentation to be done some time.

7. Public Comment

No members of the public attended the meeting.

8. Next Meeting TBD