



## Master Plan Update

### Update and Organizational Discussion on the Master Plan- Phase One with Planning Commission

#### Recent Discussion

A Master Plan report was presented at a joint meeting on March 7, 2019 to discuss the status of the Master Plan and to provide staff comments regarding the need for a Plan update. Minutes from that discussion are attached.

#### Phase One:

This item was scheduled as an organizational discussion on a Master Plan Update. The intent of Phase One is to gather input from Planning Commission and the public, to help guide the creation of the scope of work. The second part of this discussion will be focused on process. This will identify audiences and timing for public engagement.

The goal of Phase One is to discuss expectations and identify the organization process of a Plan update in the following format.

- Review and status of 2003 action items
- Discussion on the update list presented at the joint meeting
- Next steps
- Examples of Master Plans from other mountain/resort towns

#### Review of 2003 Action Items

The following list identifies that status of the Action Items listed in the Master Plan. Of the forty-seven action items in the plan, only twelve have not been accomplished and justification for this is detailed next to each item. Staff will provide a summary at the hearing.

#### Chapter 3 – Development

3.4.A Revise the County’s zoning and subdivision regulations to support the policies and goals of this Master Plan.

**Staff Comment: Accomplished/ongoing. Numerous amendments to the regulations have taken place over the years. This is also an ongoing effort to make changes when issues are identified by staff, Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners.**

3.4.B Create a system to establish and implement impact fees.

**Staff Comment: N/A. In 2004, the County hired a consultant to prepare an Impact Fee Feasibility Study. Through that process, it was determined that the benefit of collecting impact fees would not generate enough revenue to justify its implementation.**

#### **Chapter 4 – Rural Development**

4.4.A Routt County will establish incentives that address development on large parcels (greater than 160 acres).

**Staff Comment: Not accomplished. The County adopted the creation of the Agricultural Conservation (AC) zone district. However, no land was ever rezoned to the AC district, mainly because of the lack of incentives.**

4.4.B Draft and approve new Zoning and Subdivision Regulation language that protects the owners/operators of productive agricultural land from complaints associated with common agricultural practices made by neighbors.

**Staff Comment: Not accomplished. The County adopted several resolutions in 1995, including the “Right to Farm and Ranch” policy, which establish the importance of maintain a working agricultural landscape and protecting the rights and practices of ranchers. Planning staff has not received complaints about common agricultural practices affecting neighbors. Due to the lack of complaints, the County has not deemed creating new regulations a priority.**

4.4.C Routt County will continue to pursue agricultural land and wildlife habitat preservation measures such as Purchase of Development Right (PDR) and Transfer of Development Right (TDR) programs, agricultural districts, the Land Preservation Subdivision Exemption, and others.

**Staff Comment: Ongoing. The County continues to use the LPS process to preserve land from development. As a part of this, there is a non-contiguous remainder parcel option that allows land in other areas of the County to be preserved as part of a LPS project. The County explored creation of a TDR program but it was not deemed feasible. County voters have repeatedly authorized a mill levy to fund a PDR program which has conserved approximately 56,000 acres throughout the County.**

#### **Chapter 5 – Environmental Impacts**

5.4.A The County will pursue the adoption of new regulations or enhance existing regulations that preserve the natural landscape and prevent overlot grading.

**Staff Comment: Accomplished.**

5.4.B The County will require BMP’s for erosion and sedimentation control and grading plans.

**Staff Comment: Accomplished.**

5.4.C Pursue the incorporation of lighting standards in the Zoning Regulations to limit the amount of light pollution from exterior lighting.

**Staff Comment: Accomplished.**

5.4.D The County will pursue the incorporation of skyline/ridgeline mapping and standards and/or guidelines into the Zoning Regulations to limit or mitigate the placement of structures on skyline ridges.

**Staff Comment: Accomplished.**

## **Chapter 6 – Recreation and Tourism**

6.4.A Create a map of “Recreation Influence Zones” throughout the County to be used by the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners for evaluating appropriate locations and operations.

**Staff Comment: Not accomplished.**

6.4.B Review/update the County’s regulations to support the “Recreation Influence Zones” and the impacts of recreation opportunities.

**Staff Comment: Not accomplished.**

## **Chapter 7 – Mineral Resources**

7.4.A Routt County will update its maps using the best available maps in order to accurately reflect all gravel resources.

**Staff Comment: Not accomplished. It has been the practice of the County to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis. With this approach to applications, there was little need for a comprehensive analysis of gravel deposits.**

7.4.B Routt County will continually strive to accurately assess gravel supply and demand of wet and alluvial deposits and dry terrace deposits.

**Staff Comment: Not accomplished. Same comment as above.**

7.4.C The County will research the functionality of administering a process where applications for new gravel operations are accepted only during a certain month (or other timeframe).

**Staff Comment: N/A. The County researched this idea and discussed with the community and eventually decided to accept applications year round.**

7.4.D Routt County will continue to refine the gravel matrix.

**Staff Comment: N/A. After a few years of utilizing the Gravel Matrix, its accuracy and usefulness began to be questioned. Keeping the matrix up-to-date involved a large amount of staff hours and County expenses. As a result, use of the matrix was discontinued.**

## **Chapter 8 – Hazards to Development; Environmental Constraints**

8.19.A Routt County shall evaluate the need for mitigation regulations for development in high wildland fire areas.

**Staff Comment: Ongoing. For all new subdivision applications, Planning staff consults with the State Forester to determine if wildfire mitigation is necessary for the particular development. Due to the lack of wildland fires in high development potential areas, the County has not identified the need for creating new regulations to address this.**

8.19.B The County will update its Floodplain Resolution upon completion of the FEMA map revisions and additions.

**Staff Comment: Accomplished.**

## **Chapter 9 – Wildlife Resources**

- 9.4.A Assemble all current tools available, including maps, web sites, the Wildlife Species Matrix from the CO Div. of Wildlife, to analyze properties proposed for development for wildlife habitat and associated wildlife species.  
**Staff Comment: Ongoing. Planning staff utilizes mapping available from Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) in evaluating applications. Referrals are also sent to CPW for comment and recommendations.**
- 9.4.B Amend the Routt County Zoning Resolution to add current mitigation techniques, including requirements for a Wildlife Mitigation Plan.  
**Staff Comment: Accomplished. Section 6 of the Zoning Regulations contains mitigation techniques for development within critical wildlife areas.**
- 9.4.C Amend the Routt County Subdivision Regulations to require mitigation of impacts to wildlife and to set criteria for submittal of a Wildlife Mitigation Plan.  
**Staff Comment: Accomplished. The Subdivision Regulations state that compliance with Section 6 of the Zoning Regulations is required.**
- 9.4.D Publicly support and make the public aware of Routt County’s goal of establishing larger remainder parcels or conservation easements.  
**Staff Comment: Ongoing.**
- 9.4.E Develop and implement standards as part of any residential or recreational development approval, to reduce attractiveness of such development to certain species of wildlife that could become nuisances.  
**Staff Comment: Ongoing. CPW regularly provides feedback identifying issues concerning nuisance wildlife and how developments can prevent this from happening.**
- 9.4.F Develop design guidelines which address building siting, lighting, vegetation, and fencing to minimize the impacts of development.  
**Staff Comment: Accomplished. Section 6 of Zoning Regulations.**
- 9.4.G Create educational programs for recreation users and home buyers on the effect that their activities have on wildlife.  
**Staff Comment: Ongoing. When reviewing applications that involve uses that may conflict with wildlife, it is a common condition of approval to include an educational component.**
- 9.4.H Identify calving and nesting areas.  
**Staff Comment: Accomplished. CPW mapping data is utilized and referrals to CPW identify these areas.**
- 9.4.I Address timing and phasing of temporary construction activities to avoid impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat.  
**Staff Comment: Accomplished/ongoing. Conditions of approval restricting timing of construction and activity are regularly used.**
- 9.4.J Develop a program to limit the impacts of dogs and cats on wildlife.  
**Staff Comment: Not accomplished. However such restrictions are often included as a condition of approval that support Section 6 of the Zoning Regulations.**

9.4.K Develop a land use review process that includes the Colorado Division of Wildlife as Routt County's wildlife and wildlife habitat advisor. Other information sources should be included as deemed necessary by Planning Commission.

**Staff Comment: Accomplished.**

9.4.L Identify, protect, and improve tracts of land and movement corridors necessary to maintain free-roaming wildlife populations.

**Staff Comment: Not accomplished. However the migration of species is considered by the CPW when evaluating County development applications.**

## **Chapter 10 – Agricultural Lands**

10.4.A Revise Zoning and Subdivision regulations to support Agricultural Zones.

**Staff Comment: Accomplished/ongoing. LPS regulations, Value Added Ag Processing, Agritourism, and Farm Stands.**

10.4.B Support the Community Agriculture Alliance efforts.

**Staff Comment: Accomplished/ongoing. Creation of Value Added Ag Processing and Poultry Processing regulations. Creation of a Local Food Worksheet and participation in review of worksheet participants.**

10.4.C Provide incentives for preservation of wetlands, scenic areas and other sensitive lands.

**Staff Comment: Accomplished. LPS standards contain language for the preservation of the areas and inclusion in the remainder parcel. The incentive for doing this is the ability to obtain additional buildable lots.**

10.4.D Encourage cluster development and use of Land Preservation Subdivision Exemptions by discouraging and reducing the desirability of 35 acre subdivisions.

**Staff Comment: Accomplished/ongoing. Staff actively encourages the LPS process to help discourage 35 acre subdivisions.**

10.4.E Encourage innovative planning techniques for preservation of irrigated hay meadows, hay production and agriculture operations. Promote the education and use of programs such as conservation easements, Purchase of Development Rights (PDR's) and pursue a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program.

**Staff Comment: Accomplished/ongoing.**

10.4.F Develop requirements for buffer areas between urban development, non-agricultural uses and agricultural lands.

**Accomplished. Evaluated as part of our four (4) municipality's comprehensive plans.**

10.4.G Encourage outreach programs to new residents to educate them to activities associated with ranching and their responsibilities to maintain rural lands.

**Staff Comment: Accomplished/ongoing. Participation in creation and updating of the Guide to Rural Living.**

10.4.H Actively support a policy statement to assist the smooth interaction of people in the agriculture community. This support should refer to or be a part of the Right-to-Farm legislation, the Routt County Open Lands Plan, A Guide to Rural Living and Small-scale Agriculture, Land Preservation Subdivision and PDR program.

**Staff Comment: Not accomplished.**

## **Chapter 11 – Transportation**

11.4.A Update County road access standards to provide minimum road standards for all types of subdivision in the County including: Land Preservation Subdivision, 5 acre consolidations, 35 acre subdivisions, high density development in designated growth areas (Stagecoach etc.). Provide alternatives for reducing standards where appropriate with input from emergency response agencies.

**Staff Comment: Accomplished/ongoing. The County has utilized standards for driveway and shared driveway in certain development situations to address incremental development and have adopted fair share reimbursement standards. The uniform fire code provides flexibility in road access standards provided certain other mitigation measures are employed.**

11.4.B Amend Zoning Resolution to create standard threshold of car/truck trips at which a comprehensive traffic study and road improvements will be required.

**Staff Comment: Not accomplished. Although Oil and Gas extraction operations must provide a road study prior to staff deeming an application complete.**

11.4.C Update the Zoning Resolution and Subdivision Regulations to include mitigation measures for dust abatement and revegetation.

**Staff Comment: Accomplished. Included as a condition of approval based on Section 6 of the Zoning Regulations.**

11.4.D Educate the public and development community on the benefits of a multi-modal transportation system and transit-oriented development.

**Staff Comment: Not accomplished.**

11.4.E Create a system to establish and implement impact fees.

**Staff Comment: N/A. In 2004, the County hired a consultant to prepare an Impact Fee Feasibility Study. Through that process, it was determined that the benefit of collecting impact fees would not generate enough revenue to justify its implementation.**

## **Chapter 12 – Housing**

12.4.A Work with the incorporated municipalities to achieve a diverse housing inventory by developing long-term housing policies and occupancy guidelines to guarantee the production and maintenance of affordable housing as part of each new development. At a minimum, all such affordable housing should be restricted to the full-time residents by appropriate lease/deed restrictions.

**Staff Comment: Ongoing. Through participation with the Yampa Valley Housing Authority and the Steamboat Springs Area Plan Coordinating Committee.**

12.4.B Work with the incorporated municipalities to create options stating different types of deed restrictions that limit occupancy, income, and other categories.

**Staff Comment: Ongoing. Through participation with the Yampa Valley Housing Authority and the Steamboat Springs Area Plan Coordinating Committee.**

12.4.C Create affordable housing impact mitigation criteria so that future commercial, industrial, and lodging projects provide affordable and/or employee housing proportionate to the housing need generated.

**Staff Comment: Ongoing. Addressed through the comprehensive plan amendment processes.**

12.4.D Amend the Zoning Regulations to allow for mixed use residential and commercial uses in certain zone districts.

**Staff Comment: Accomplished. Through the review process for certain Residential, Commercial, and Industrial applications.**

12.4.E Amend non-Agricultural zone districts to explicitly prohibit short-term rentals in rural subdivision.

**Staff Comment: Accomplished.**

### **Discussion of possible amendment items:**

The following list was compiled by staff and Planning Commission. It summarizes the items either not currently addressed in the Master Plan or that should be revisited to ensure an accurate reflection of community values. Staff suggests that this list be considered the starting point for possible amendments.

After Phase One input from the community, Planning Commission, and the Board of County Commissioners, the goal is to refine this list.

1. Modernize the language, maps, and pictures.

**Staff Comment: The Master Plan is over 16 years old. Since adoption of the Plan, names of agencies and information such as sub-area plans have changed. Maps and pictures should be modernized as well.**

2. Review action items and modify as necessary.

**Staff Comment: Staff provided an overview of the action items and status of each above. This information should be included in the Plan update.**

3. Analyze policies that guide locals and workforce housing in the unincorporated County.

**Staff Comment: These policies should be reviewed every five years to evaluate existing community goals, assess current programs and resources, and identify needs and gaps in provisions for affordable housing. The goals and objectives should accurately reflect the community vision and align with strategic initiatives set by the County.**

4. Consider goals and policies that address climate change.

**Staff Comment: Policies regarding climate change are addressed throughout the plan indirectly with their emphasis on limiting urban sprawl, and protecting our natural resources with development that limits impact on the environment. A more modern plan considers this reality in a comprehensive and direct manner in response to climate change concerns.**

5. Address the current expectations associated with the telecommunication industry.

**Staff Comment: Telecommunication Standards are addressed in the Routt County Zoning Regulations but not in the Master Plan. Most new applications for telecommunication facilities are not compatible with visual impact policies in the plan. Policies should be considered that support broadband expansion efforts in rural areas of the County while addressing the community's stance on maintaining rural character.**

6. Include guidance for making variance decisions (Board of Adjustment).

**Staff Comment: Section 3.4 of the Zoning Regulations establishes guidelines, duties and Standards for Variance decisions. There are currently no policies in the Master Plan that provide support for these land use decisions.**

7. Include demographics and growth trends.  
**Staff Comment:** While such information is available on the State Demographer's website, currently there is no demographic information or growth trend information in the plan used to support the goals, policies or action items. Staff acknowledges that current demographics and growth trends need to be assessed to answer the questions: Where is the appropriate location for future growth and development in the County? Is development within the designated Growth Centers and Stagecoach enough to support current trends? Are there other areas such as the Steamboat II Metro District area, Phippsburg, and Milner that may be good options to consider for growth?
8. Address recreation and tourism pressures.  
**Staff Comment:** Increasing pressures from a growing population and tourism industry may challenge the applicability of certain policies in the plan. The County has identified certain land uses outlined in the regulations on the Uses by Zone District Chart that may be considered appropriate outside of Growth Centers through use permits. Staff acknowledges the important role that recreation and tourism play in the economic viability of the County and as a tool in helping to preserve its agricultural operations. Staff also recognizes that balancing these operations at sustainable levels, while supporting the local economy, is challenging. There are some new land use trends in recreation and tourism that could be considered under an updated Plan that are in sync with a changing community while continuing to maintain rural character.
9. Describe appropriate intensity of use to avoid the commercialization of the A/F zone.  
**Staff Comment:** Historically, land uses such as short-term rentals, workforce housing, and some recreational operations have been viewed as the commercialization of land in the Agricultural/Forestry zone district, and not consistent with the adopted Master Plan. Over the past few years, staff has heard community comments that the County should do more to address certain problems while maintaining the Plan's overall vision of protecting the rural character.
10. Include parameters to address the cumulative impacts of development and multiple land uses.  
**Staff Comment:** The 2003 Plan offers little mention of the cumulative impacts associated with the increasing number of approved permits in rural Routt County. Policies that ensure a more consistent evaluation of acceptable intensities and cumulative impacts of all land uses could be given more emphasis.
11. Update wildlife information to reflect the current conditions.  
**Staff Comment:** Routt County's open lands and critical wildlife habitats are paramount to the health and identity of the County. Policies that protect and manage our resources are addressed in the Plan but should be reviewed for effectiveness, as development pressures potentially threaten these resources.
12. Ensure oil & gas policies are compatible with COGCC standards.  
**Staff Comment:** Policies should be reviewed so that they associate the current community expectations with the latest COGCC standards and changes in State law.
13. Address transportation and connectivity between Growth Centers.  
**Staff Comment:** Although policies supporting transportation and connectivity are identified in Plan, they should also be reviewed to determine if they remain appropriate and reflect changes in our community over the past 20 years.

14. Reformat to make the Plan more user-friendly on the internet.

**Staff Comment: This is recommended and can be done in sync with the county-wide website improvements and update.**

### **Master Plan Examples from other Mountain/Resort Towns**

Staff conducted research on other communities' master plans. One recurring theme that staff noticed was that these plans were 'Comprehensive Plans,' not just master plans. These included items that went beyond land use, which is the sole task of Planning Commission. Certain elements of these plans can be utilized by Routt County but the main focus of our plan is land use and topics not related to land use should be avoided.

Some elements of these plans are already utilized by our plan. These, and others, that should be considered for inclusion in our plan include:

- Demographic information – This could be included in the body of the plan or within an appendix. Different categories this information falls into include historical, current, and future predictions.
- The format of the body of the text could be presented in two columns or straight across the page.
- Hotlinks to the sub-area plans and the zoning and subdivision regulations.
- Inclusion of a section explaining the history of planning in Routt County which identifies the various County, City, and community lead planning efforts.
- Use the policies in the plan to support specific goals and objectives. This format can be seen in La Plata's plan and Kootenai County, Idaho's plan. Links to these plans are located on the agenda.
- One other plan that staff wanted to bring to your attention for review of the format is Park County's plan. A link to this plan is available on the agenda as well.

### **Next Steps**

Staff anticipates a kick-off for the Plan amendment to begin in the summer of 2019 with completion depending upon the scope of necessary revisions. Staff and Planning Commission will discuss next steps at the hearing.

although more research is needed, taking this approach might simplify enforcement of short-term rentals.

**Public Comment - short term rentals**

Mr. Ben Beall stated that he agrees with the general consensus that prohibiting short-term rentals will help to minimize commercialization and keep the County rural.

Mr. Charles Mobley, a second home owner, stated that he rents out his house near Lynx Pass when they are not here. He said that they were just recently informed that this is not allowed. He said that they had started renting the house in about 2000. He said that renting is a necessity because they do not have any other way to take care of the house. He said that it was not about the income. He said that there is a demand for rentals in rural areas. Mr. Mobley added that a real estate broker had told him that short-term rentals were allowed when he purchased his property.

Mr. Dave Moloney, a real estate broker, said that he has clients on both sides of the issue, but that he currently has a client that wants to purchase a place that could be rented out. He said that he had a very difficult time identifying where short-term rentals are allowed and where they are not. He said that the regulations are unclear and that a map would be useful. Regarding the Master Plan update, he said that it was time for a review.

Mr. Phillips urged Mr. Moloney to check in with the Planning Department when he encounters questions regarding land use, as it offers a free service to educate the community. He said that nightly rentals are listed on the Land Use Chart, and are only allowed in the C zone district in unincorporated Routt County.

Ms. Elizabeth Mobley asked if the rental of her property would be grandfathered in. She said that the property was purchased around 1998.

Mr. Phillips stated that the current Master Plan was adopted in 2003. He said that the Zoning and Subdivision Regulations were adopted in 1972, and although they have evolved over the years, it is the regulations that prohibit short-term rentals, not the Master Plan.

Ms. Mobley stated that they had been misguided by their realtor regarding short-term rentals. Commissioner Brookshire stated that a purchaser has a lot of recourse against a broker when they misrepresent what is allowed on a particular property.

Seeing no further comment, Chairman Warnke closed public comment.

**MASTER PLAN UPDATE DISCUSSION**

Ms. Winser reviewed the handout regarding the Master Plan Update. She discussed the Master Plan policies that staff has identified for possible review

and the list of 14 items that are either not currently addressed in the Master Plan or that may need to be revisited to ensure that the Plan accurately reflects the community's values. She noted that enhancing the wildlife chapter and addressing transportation issues had been identified by Planning Commission as topics that needed to be updated in the Plan.

Ms. Winser stated that the next step would be to schedule some public meetings to gather additional information from the community. The kick-off for the update process would be this summer, with a schedule for the review and planned completion date to be determined after the scope of the update is defined through the community outreach discussions. Mr. Phillips stated that the final scope of the work is contingent on the outcome of the work sessions with the public. He noted that after the outreach in 2017 Planning Commission determined that no update was needed, even if there were areas of the Plan that could be improved. Mr. Phillips noted that although the existing Plan is old, it is an active document that is used and referred to on a daily basis. He added that the public often provides feedback on the document as it is used in the planning process. Mr. Phillips said that if there were to be any major disagreements about the vision of Plan, they would most likely concern the philosophies section. He said that in order to ensure that Planning Commission remains in support of the Plan he has, over the years, periodically added a discussion of the Master Plan philosophies to Planning Commission meeting agendas.

County Commissioner Melton stated that she would support reviewing the Master Plan every five years, as stated in the document. She said that a more robust public outreach and engagement process is needed. She said that she would not assume that a consultant would not be hired to do some of the work of the update, including the community outreach. County Commissioner Melton said that a review and update of the Master Plan does not mean that the document is broken or is not functioning as it should; it is simply a best practice to update it.

Commissioner Marshall asked if staff believes that the topics for review can be limited, or whether when the Plan is opened up for review the entire Plan would be subject to revision. Mr. Phillips discussed how the updates to the West of Steamboat Springs Area Plan and the Steamboat Springs Area Community Plan had gone, but said that ultimately the decision about what to review is up to Planning Commission. County Commissioner Monger confirmed that the Master Plan "belongs" to Planning Commission, and the scope and process of the update will be driven by Planning Commission rather than by staff. He said that if a consultant is engaged, he would like to limit the cost. He agreed that a reaffirmation of the Plan is needed. He said that following the process, even if it results in little or no change, the Master Plan should be readopted.

Commissioner Petis asked about the budget for the update, adding that if the update is to be done properly, staff should be given the resources it needs. County Commissioner Corrigan offered that staff can research the cost range as the scope of work is decided, and then the budget can be discussed.

**Public Comment - Master Plan Update**

Mr. Ben Beall stated his support for some level of update and reaffirmation by the community, followed by a re-adoption by the County. Regarding the process, he asked whether the whole document should be opened up to the public, or whether Planning Commission should review, revise and present the draft revision to the public. He suggested that the latter process, in which Planning Commission sets the parameters of the revision, was a better process. Mr. Beall said that this would be much more effective and efficient.

Seeing no further comment, Chairman Warnke closed public comment.

County Commissioner Monger noted that nothing had been budgeted for this project for 2019. County Commissioner Corrigan offered that after Planning Commission had discussed the scope of the project, staff could present the project proposal to the County Manager. Deputy County Manager Dan Weinheimer said that the update could be included in the 2020 budget, or a supplemental budget could be approved for 2019. In response to a question from Mr. Phillips, County Commissioners Melton and Corrigan stated that they would be willing to discuss the role of staff in the update.

**PLANNING COMMISSION REAPPOINTMENTS**

County Commissioner Corrigan discussed the importance of new voices and perspectives on Planning Commission. He said that Planning Commissioners should not take it personally if they are not reappointed at the end of their terms. Commissioner Petis attested to the value of having experience and institutional knowledge on Planning Commission. He urged the Board not to clear out all of the members with experience. Commissioner Benjamin noted that there are many relatively new members on Planning Commission at this time.

**ZONING AND SUBDIVISION REGULATION AMENDMENTS****• Value-Added Agriculture Processing**

Mr. Goldich reviewed the changes in the state regulations regarding the processing of poultry. He said that in response to discussion with the CSU Extension Office and the Agricultural Alliance, staff is proposing amendments to the County regulations such that small scale poultry processing could be allowed through the Value-Added Agriculture regulations. All meat processing is currently excluded from the County's definition of Value-Added Agriculture. Mr. Goldich reviewed the proposed standards, which would vary with the number of birds processed per year. He noted that all sales of poultry through this process would be private sales. He stated that farm stands are considered accessory to the Value-Added Agriculture use.

In response to a comment from Commissioner Petis, Mr. Goldich agreed that the table included in the meeting materials was incorrect, in that 100% of the poultry produced and sold through this process would be grown/raised on site. All agreed