

ROUTT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

FINAL MINUTES

June 6, 2019

The regular meeting of the Routt County Planning Commission was called to order at 6:00 p.m. with the following members present: Acting Chairman Troy Brookshire and Commissioners Roberta Marshall, Brian Kelly, Bill Norris, Andrew Benjamin, John Merrill, Peter Flint, Greg Jaeger and Geoff Petis. Commissioners Karl Koehler and Steve Warnke were absent. Planning Director Chad Phillips and Assistant Planning Director Kristy Winsler also attended. Sarah Katherman recorded the meeting and prepared the minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

MINUTES - April 18, 2019

Commissioner Benjamin moved to approve the minutes of the Routt County Planning Commission meeting held on the above stated date. Commissioner Kelly seconded the motion. **The motion carried , 9 - 0.**

MINUTES - May 2, 2019

Commissioner Kelly moved to approve the minutes of the Routt County Planning Commission meeting held on the above stated date. Commissioner Jaeger seconded the motion. **The motion carried, 9 - 0.**

ACTIVITY: PL-18-143

PETITIONER: Butch Dougherty, represented by Peter Patten

**PETITION: 1) Final Planned Unit Development (PUD); and
2) Lot Line Adjustment to allow limited commercial use and other uses on two parcels totaling 9.3 acres**

LOCATION: 753 Dougherty Road, Steamboat Springs, CO; located adjacent to the City limit

Mr. Peter Patten of Patten Associates, representing the petitioner, reviewed the petition for a Final PUD and lot line adjustment. He stated that the proposed development would also require a Flood Plain Development Permit, which would be processed administratively. He stated that the PUD process was begun many years ago but was never completed. No uses were ever defined for existing Lot 1, although the zoning on this lot was changed to PUD. The goal of this petition is to define the uses for this lot. Mr. Patten stated that the current uses on Lot 2 (a nursery and a residence that is used as an office, as well as a balloon tour launch site) will not change. He added that the proposal includes the public benefit of providing a 20 ft. easement for the extension of the core trail and for a raw water pipe line for Mount Werner Water (MWW).

Mr. Patten reviewed the current lot configuration and the proposed lot line adjustment that would incorporate all of the land area on the west side of the river into a single lot (Lot 1). On an aerial photograph of the site, Mr. Patten indicated the location of the nursery, the existing residence and the balloon launch site. He also indicated the location of the bridge on Lot 1. He presented a site plan and indicated the proposed layout of storage units on both sides of the river on Lot 1 and the proposed caretaker unit. Mr. Patten stated that 37% of the property would be designated open space. This includes the easement for the core trail and water line.

Mr. Patten noted that the property is down gradient from the MWW water supply wells. He said that a robust water protection system is being proposed to ensure that the MWW water supply is protected. Mr. Patten indicated on a site plan the locations of the drainage pipes that would flow into the river from the filtration system. He also noted that the existing leach field that serves the residence on Lot 2 would be removed. The residence would be connected to the sewer line that serves the Steamboat Springs Christian Center (SSCC). Mr. Patten also indicated the location of a proposed emergency access easement for Lot 2 across Lot 1.

Mr. Patten stated that Routt County Regulations require that the road surface near the bridge must be paved. The City, however, has stated that it would prefer these surfaces to be graveled, to reduce the run-off from impermeable surfaces. Mr. Patten noted that a Watershed Protection Permit must be approved by City Council for this project. The Public Works Department makes a recommendation to the Council regarding the permit application.

Mr. Patten presented a chart indicating the acreages of the existing and proposed lots. He said that the only re-zoning that would occur is a zone change from Agriculture/Forestry (A/F) on Lot 2 to PUD. Lot 1 would remain PUD, but would have defined uses. Mr. Patten presented a chart of the proposed building heights for the existing residence, the proposed caretaker unit and the storage units.

Mr. Joe Wiedemeier of Four Points Surveying and Engineering, representing the petitioner, stated that in response to comments received from the City, a revised water quality protection plan is being proposed. He stressed that the petitioner is taking the protection of the watershed very seriously. The proposed robust system is designed to contain and filter out any potential pollutants or contaminants. Mr. Wiedemeier stated that the D Bar K storage units, located 2600 ft. from the water wells, had received a Watershed Protection Permit from the City employing a similar system to the one now proposed for the Dougherty property. He described the system, which includes five sand filter drainage units. He stated that all surface run-off would be collected and filtered through the system prior to being discharged into the Yampa River. The sand filters would be lined with an impermeable membrane. Mr. Wiedemeier also reviewed the spill containment system that would protect the ground water from any potential

hazardous spill that might occur within a storage unit. He noted, however, that no storage of hazardous materials, chemical liquids or vehicles will be allowed in the units.

Mr. Patten stated that Jon Snyder, the Steamboat Springs Public Works Director, had responded to the original application for a Watershed Protection Permit recommending denial. A new and significantly more robust water protection plan has now been developed and a revised application has been submitted to the City.

Mr. Patten stated that the petitioner is fine with all of the suggested conditions of approval (COAs) with the exception of COA #10. He stated that because there are no changes to the use of Lot 2, noting has triggered the change to the future planned right-in, right-out only access to Lot 2 that is included in the CDOT Access Control Plan. He offered that because the proposal is not in compliance with the plan, which also states that all access should run via Dougherty Road in the long run, COA #10 is inappropriate. Mr. Patten said that for security reasons, the petitioner would like to limit access to the storage unit facility, but that if changes occur in the future that trigger the implementation of the Access Control Plan, the owner of Lot 1 will work with the owner of Lot 2 to provide access to Dougherty Road. Mr. Patten requested the deletion of COA #10.

Commissioner Kelly asked when a response from the City regarding the revised Watershed Protection Permit application could be expected. Mr. Wiedemeier estimated that a response would be received within approximately four weeks.

Commissioner Flint asked if there would be any inspection to ensure that hazardous materials are not stored in the units. Mr. Wiedemeier stated that the storage unit lease would include a prohibition on hazardous materials and vehicles, but that the spill containment system is intended to serve as a safeguard. Commissioner Marshall asked about monitoring and maintenance of the filtration system. Mr. Wiedemeier stated that a maintenance schedule would be developed, and that it would be the responsibility of the caretaker to perform inspections and maintenance.

In response to a question from Commissioner Marshall, Mr. Frank Alfone, General Manager of MWW, stated that water and sewer service was originally denied to the property because it is outside the MWW district boundary. He said that service is only provided to properties outside the district if an agreement is in place. He confirmed that MWW had considered purchasing the Dougherty property at some point in the past.

Commissioner Brookshire asked about the engineering of the bridge. Mr. Jim Stegmaier with Yampa Valley Engineering, representing the petitioner, said that the railroad car-based bridge had been engineered by Greg Hermann. He said that the bridge meets fire department load standards.

In response to a question from Commissioner Norris, Mr. Patten stated that the proposal does not include a fire suppression plan, but that the installation of hydrants will be required. Mr. Wiedemeier stated that a low pressure sewer line and a water line would be installed under the bridge. The pipes will be outfitted with heat tape to prevent freezing.

Commissioner Benjamin asked why the property was subdivided into two parcels. Mr. Patten stated the nursery is a separate business, and that the petitioner wanted each business entity to operate on separate parcels.

Mr. Patten stated that the alignment of the core trail and water line had been altered slightly since the site plan included in the staff report was developed. He reviewed the change that was made to accommodate a small wetland area. This change caused the designated open space to increase from 27% (as stated in the staff report) to 37% of the total acreage.

Ms. Winser reviewed the elements of the application. She noted that the process for PUD applications had been changed since the original application was submitted years ago. Now, the PUD and the zone change are processed together through the Conceptual approval. Formerly, the zone change occurred as a separate action. She explained also that although Lot 1 is currently zoned PUD, uses were never defined. As part of this review, defined uses will be considered. .. Ms. Winser added that in addition to the approval of the PUD, the proposal must obtain a Watershed Protection Permit from the City, and a Flood Plain Development Permit from the County, which is processed administratively. Those requirements are included in the suggested conditions of approval. She stated that the applicant has submitted revised applications for these permits that include the sand filtration system. Ms. Winser reviewed what had been approved through the Conceptual PUD process and the changes that had been made to the layout for the Final PUD application, noting that the plan is site specific, and that only the defined uses would be allowed. She noted that the revised lot layout eliminates the need for an additional access for Lot 2. She suggested that COA #10 could be amended to state that in the event CDOT closes the existing access for Lot 2, Lot 1 shall provide an access easement for the purposed of ingress and egress for Lot 2. She referred to the comments provided by Mr. Dan Roussin of CDOT.

Ms. Winser stated that the proposal would provide for the elimination of the existing leach field on Lot 2, a caretaker unit for Lot 1 to be served by central water and sewer, an easement for the core trail and a raw water line, and a robust system for protecting water quality. She said that the applicant is **proposing an architectural façade for storage unit building #7. She stated that staff recommends that similar treatment be provided for buildings #8 & #9.**

Ms. Winser reviewed the comments received from the City, and noted the limitations on the uses of this property. She reviewed the request from the City that the approaches to the bridge be surfaced with gravel instead of asphalt, and

stated that if this request is granted, it would need to be addressed specifically in the approval.

Ms. Winser noted that because the application is site specific, any changes to the uses of the property in the future would need to go through a major or minor amendment process, depending on the nature of the changes.

Chairman Brookshire asked if the western portion of Lot 1 could be seen from Hwy 40. Mr. Patten stated that it could not, and said that for that reason no **landscaping is being proposed. Mr. Stegmaier added that the façade on building #7** would be 17 ft. in height, the other storage buildings will be 12 ft. in height. All the buildings will be colored to blend in with the landscape.

Commissioner Flint asked about the comments from Mr. Snyder. Ms. Michelle Carr, Distribution and Collection Manager for City of Steamboat Springs, stated that the City has concerns regarding the compatibility of the proposed uses with the location of the parcel immediately adjacent to the MWW water wells. She said that while the proposed water filtration system would be considered great for any other location, the City continues to have concerns due to the sensitivity of this location, which is within the one-year contribution zone for the City's water supply. She said that an absolute fail-safe control is needed. Ms. Carr expressed concern that over time and with changing ownership and management of the property and turn-over of City staff, the sand filter system would not be properly inspected or maintained in the future. She said that the City has contracted with an independent consultant to determine if these concerns are warranted, given the absolutely critical location of this property. She confirmed that if the consultant confirms that there are significant concerns with the proposal, the City will deny the Watershed Protection Permit.

In response to a question from Commissioner Benjamin, Ms. Carr stated that the City would consider residential use, with the necessary permits, to be of less concern than storage units.

Commissioner Norris asked about the proposal to surface the approaches to the bridge with gravel. Ms. Winser stated that this could be addressed through a COA. She noted that the fire department would be responsible for assessing the safety of the bridge, and that if they found it wanting, they would not sign off on the building permit.

Public Comment

Mr. Ed McArthur indicated the location of his property and stated that he had sold the parcel to the south of the subject parcel to MWW. He described the City's proposal to route the extension of the core trail across the back (western) portion of his property in order to access the City owned parcel and on to the Legacy Ranch. He stated that he had agreed to provide an easement for this trail alignment, but would not grant an easement for the trail across the middle or front of this property. He said that the proposed location of the easement across the

Dougherty parcel would not line up with the easement that he had agreed to grant for the core trail.

Mr. Frank Alfone of MWW stated that water and sewer for the proposed caretaker unit and a tap into the sewer connection for the existing residence were contingent upon 1) written consent by the City of Steamboat Springs and 2) Mr. Dougherty obtaining all necessary local, state and federal permits for the proposed uses. He stated that MWW has water protection agreements with all property owners to which it provides water, and that these are enforced with the leverage of being able to turn off water service. He stated that MWW would not assume the responsibility for inspection and maintenance of the run-off filtration system.

In response to a question from Commissioner Benjamin, Mr. Alfone stated that he did not know if MWW would have an obligation to provide water and sewer service to lot if it were annexed into the City.

Mr. Will Kenrish asked if MWW would also provide water to the existing residence on Lot 2. Mr. Alfone stated that it would not. The residence is served by an existing water well. He stated that agreement to connect the residence to the sewer line that serves SSCC is based on the desire to eliminate the existing leach field.

Mr. David Randles, a resident of Dougherty Road (in the River Place subdivision), expressed concern with the use of Dougherty Road, and cited increased traffic and parking by the SSCC congregation. He also expressed concern with illegal access to the river from Dougherty Road. He asked whether the facility would be accessible 24/7 by storage unit renters and whether there would be gates to the facility. Mr. Randles also asked why the proposed caretaker unit is located at the back of the lot rather than in front, where those entering the facility could be observed. Mr. Randles suggested that the City should purchase the portion of the lot on the west side of the river to allow for the extension of the core trail. He cited City documents that discuss this option. He also noted that MWW had purchased the former Shop & Hop parcel to protect its water wells. He expressed concern regarding the bald eagle and heron nests, the impact on water quality, the potential for toxic spills, and the impact on the river corridor and riparian areas. Mr. Randles also noted that the nursery property had flooded in 2011.

Ms. Leighann McLaughlin, a resident of Dougherty Road, noted that neither Mr. Dougherty nor MWW have ever assisted with plowing or other road maintenance. She expressed concern with traffic on the road and stated that it was often difficult to turn onto US 40 from Dougherty Road. She expressed concern with illegal activity on the Dougherty property. Regarding the proposed development, she expressed concern with the visual impact from her neighborhood and River Road, lighting from the facility and from cars, potential chemical spills, the bridge, and the hours of operation. She also noted she had been required to install

sprinklers for fire suppression in her home and stated that the proposed development should also have to install fire suppression. She added that she would want the road over the bridge to be paved.

Mr. Scott Cowman, Routt County Environmental Health Director, noted that he had provided comments in the referral letter, mostly regarding the abandonment of the leach field on Lot 2. He noted that there are some regulations regarding the abandonment, and asked the petitioner to consult with him on the proper procedure. Mr. Cowman stated that the Army Corps of Engineers should be consulted regarding the installation of a sewer line across the river. He also noted that the development is clearly in flood plain and that the Master Plan does provide direction regarding activities in the flood plain. He urged Planning Commission to fully understand the issues regarding building in the flood plain. Mr. Cowman stated that he is a proponent of the core trail, and stated his support for efforts to extend it.

Mr. Barry Kaplan, a resident of the Townhomes at Walton Pond, also stated his support for extending the core trail. He stated that he does, however, have concerns regarding the proposal, and cited the narrowness of the bridge, light pollution, traffic, visual impacts and impact on the eagle nests and heron rookery. He expressed his concern with the potential for negative impacts on water quality and stated that monitoring and reporting requirements should be included in any approval.

Mr. Peter Parsons, a resident of Weiss Circle, asked about snow storage and the impact of snow on the filtration system. He said that his main concerns are with water quality and the impact on the river, in addition to the other issues already cited.

Seeing no further comment, Chairman Brookshire closed public comment.

In response to a question from Commissioner Benjamin, Mr. Phillips stated that SSCC is located within the City limit. He confirmed that the Dougherty property is eligible for annexation.

Commissioner Benjamin noted that in the CDOT Access Control Plan, a traffic light is planned for the Dougherty Road intersection at some point in the future. He asked what triggers the implementation of elements in the Access Control Plan. Ms. Winser stated that a change of use on the properties using the access points would trigger changes. She said that a change of use on Lot 2 would first trigger a right-in/right-out only access. Additional development in the area would eventually trigger the use of Dougherty Road only, and the installation of a traffic signal at US 40.

Ms. Winser stated that if Planning Commission would like to include additional mitigations for visual impacts, those could be added to COA #14. Regarding the location of the easement for the core trail extension, she stated that City Trails

and Open Space Director Craig Robinson had been sent a referral and had not changed his comments of support regarding the easement and its location that he had made at the Conceptual PUD review.

Ms. Winser noted that COA #12 addresses the need for a shared sewer maintenance agreement in conjunction with the abandonment of the leach field on Lot 2. She added that COA #13a addresses the need for proper leach field abandonment procedures. COA #9 requires the petitioner to obtain a Floodplain Development Permit. COA #15 addresses lighting. All exterior lighting on development in Routt County that requires a permit must be downcast and opaquely shielded. Ms. Winser stated that areas designated for snow storage are shown on the site plan. Regarding traffic, she stated that the Access Control Plan was jointly adopted by the City and the County at the recommendation of CDOT, and that the proposed storage facility is in compliance with the Plan.

Roundtable Discussion

Commissioner Merrill stated that he has no problem with lot line adjustment. Regarding the Final PUD, he noted that there are several required permits pending, including the Watershed Protection Permit. He also noted the no business plan with hours of operation and other matters was submitted. He suggested that consideration of the petition was premature.

Commissioner Jaeger stated that he thought the proposed use would be more compatible with the site than residential development. He stated that landscaping should be required on the west side of the lot, and that hours of operation for the facility should be considered.

Commissioner Petis stated that he has no concern with finding of fact #4, and that he was okay with COA #10, as written. He agreed, however, that there are many things pending that could derail the project and that it might be appropriate to table the petition. He cited Master Plan policy 5.3.B regarding the degradation of the environment and added that many agencies have expressed concerns with the potential impacts on the water quality, in particular.

Commissioner Norris stated that he thought it was unlikely that the City would annex the property. He expressed concern with the potential impact on water and agreed that the necessary permits would need to be obtained.

Commissioner Flint stated that although the containment system is good, it would not be sufficient to contain a catastrophic event. He discussed the impacts of a meth lab explosion and the fire suppression that followed on surrounding waterbodies. He noted that the water from such an event could not be handled by the drains in the storage units. He cited the concerns listed in the letter from Jon Snyder and stated that the work of the consultant should be completed prior to any consideration of the petition. He agreed with the suggestion to table the petition.

Commissioner Kelly agreed with the comments of Commissioner Flint. He stated that he also agrees with the concerns expressed by Ms. Carr regarding the degradation of monitoring, inspecting and maintenance over time. He stated that the petition should not be considered without the approval and support of the City and MWW. He also expressed concern with a trail easement that would not extend the core trail beyond this property. He stated that his main concern is with the potential for water contamination.

Commissioner Benjamin offered that the core trail could access the City property through the MWW parcel. He said that although he understands the concerns that have been expressed, he does not feel that it is appropriate to deny a project when the operator has stated that the activities causing the concern (storage of hazardous materials) will be prohibited. He said that he could appreciate both sides of the argument. He offered that the site would not be visible from US 40. He said that he would support tabling the petition, but that in general he supports the project.

Commissioner Marshall stated the proposed development had no architectural character and would be an eye sore. She said that a landscape plan was needed. She said that her main concern was the potential threat to water quality, and expressed concern with the lack of monitoring. Commissioner Marshall said that in addition to Master Plan policy 5.3.B, the proposal was also not in conformance with Section NS 2.2 of the Steamboat Springs Area Community Plan regarding the protection of ground and surface water quality. She also cited Routt County Zoning Regulations under Mitigation Techniques to Reduce Water Quality and Quantity Impacts, item G. She said that although she would be okay with tabling the petition, she did not think she could support the proposal in this location.

Chairman Brookshire agreed that tabling was appropriate, citing the number of unanswered questions and the pending Watershed Protection Permit. He also expressed concern with the visual impact of the project from CR 14. He agreed that a landscaping plan and additional architectural mitigations were needed. He said that he agreed with most of the previously stated comments. Chairman Brookshire said that the project might be acceptable, and that he was uncertain what other uses would be appropriate on this property. He suggested that as a public benefit the applicant should consider moving the easement over the bridge to access the City property. He also agreed with a previous comment regarding the location of the proposed caretaker unit. He offered that it would be better located near the bridge. Chairman Brookshire also suggested that the layout of the storage unit buildings could be improved.

Mr. Phillips asked if the outreach to the consultant would include an analysis of what uses might be appropriate on the property adjacent to the water well field. Ms. Carr said that the consultant was asked to review the project and evaluate whether the filtration and containment systems could be considered fail safe, and whether there was anything that could be done to make it so. She added that the Public Works Department looks to the City Ordinance for guidance for

appropriate uses in such areas. She offered that low-impact uses such as very low-density residential might be acceptable.

Commissioner Flint asked Ms. Carr to have the consultant address the possibility of fire and what would happen to the resulting large quantity of contaminated water.

Commissioner Benjamin expressed concern regarding the process of how proposals for lands within the UGB are evaluated.

Regarding the reasons for tabling the petition, Mr. Phillips reviewed the following list:

- Results of the watershed consultant
- Lack of business plan
- Lack of information regarding gates and security
- Landscaping plan and exterior finishes
- Agency referrals
- Impacts of firefighting and toxic chemicals
- Alignment of the core trail easement
- Relocation of the caretaker unit on Lot 1
- Secondary access for Lot 2 (through Lot 1)

Commissioner Benjamin requested that the rationale for granting a Watershed Protection Permit to the D Bar K storage facility be made available for review.

Mr. Patten noted that the issue regarding the alignment of the core trail across the McArthur property was new information. He noted that the easement for the core trail had been included in the proposal at the request of Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners.

MOTION

Commissioner Petis moved to table the petition until such time as the work of the consultant contracted by the City has completed its report and the petitioner has had the opportunity to address the following outstanding issues:

- Results of the watershed consultant
- Lack of business plan
- Lack of information regarding gates and security
- Landscaping plan and exterior finishes
- Agency referrals
- Impacts of firefighting and toxic chemicals
- Alignment of the core trail easement
- Relocation of the caretaker unit on Lot 1
- Secondary access for Lot 2 (through Lot 1)

Commissioner Kelly seconded the motion.

The motion carried 9 - 0, with the Chair voting yes.

MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Ms. Winser reviewed that this discussion is a follow-up to the previous discussion regarding elements of the Master Plan that are in need of an update. She noted that the two items identified by Planning Commission were wildlife and connectivity between growth centers. The other suggested items in the list were provided by staff or by the public. Ms. Winser stated that the goal of this discussion is to finalize the list of elements that will be presented to the community for input. She noted that this list should be considered a starting point in the community outreach process. She added that the list will help to define the scope of services needed for the update.

Ms. Winser reviewed the list included in the memorandum. Only the items that merited discussion are listed below.

2. Mr. Cowman offered that action items in the Master Plan should be reviewed, identified, deleted or updated on a regular basis. Ms. Winser noted that the Plan calls for a review every five years. Commissioner Benjamin asked if the possible annexation of the West Steamboat Neighborhoods would impact the Master Plan. Mr. Phillips said that the outcome of the vote would have an impact on the future of the West Steamboat Springs Area Plan, but not on the Master Plan.

3. Following discussion, it was decided that this item should refer to “diverse” housing.

4. Ms. Winser noted that this item was suggested by Bob Woodmansee. There was a discussion of how broadly to interpret the impacts of climate change in the Master Plan. Chairman Brookshire noted the impacts on wildland fire, water, snowpack, etc. Mr. Cowman cited the Colorado Climate Change Vulnerability Study.

6. Commissioner Petis offered that this is inappropriate for the Master Plan, as it is statutory. Mr. Phillips noted the criteria for a variance that states it is in conformance with the Master Plan. Chairman Brookshire suggested delegating this item to staff.

7. Chairman Brookshire asked about the scope of demographic data to be included. Mr. Phillips stated that local and state data and trends should be included. He noted that the Department of Local Affairs (DOLA), as well as the Building Department, can provide good data.

8. Chairman Brookshire asked if the County should not be more involved in permitted activities on state, BLM and Forest Service lands in Routt County, citing the increased pressure on roads, wildlife, etc. caused by more and more use. Mr. Phillips stated that off-site impacts are reviewed. Chairman Brookshire offered that more robust language was needed to guide the evaluation of these uses.

9. & 10. There was agreement on the need to create language in the Master Plan that would provide a more consistent means of evaluating intensity of use and cumulative impacts.

11. Regarding the effectiveness and accuracy of mapping, Mr. Phillips stated that Colorado Parks and Wildlife maintains the mapping used by the County. Mr. Cowman offered that all of the natural resources information should be updated.

12. Mr. Cowman noted that new legislation may require more oversight by the County.

13. Commissioner Benjamin expressed concern that Steamboat Springs considers the outlying communities to be no more than bedroom communities.

15. In response to a question from Chairman Brookshire, Mr. Cowman explained that the County has recently reorganized its management teams. He reviewed the team structure and added that Planning Commission should be made more aware of the County's strategic planning. He said that he would make a presentation to Planning Commission on what has been done so far. He stated that trails, parks, etc. should be considered as public health amenities. Mr. Phillips agreed that the Master Plan should address public health as it pertains to land use.

Commissioner Flint noted the increasing importance of location neutral employment and the associated importance of the availability of broadband across the County to support it. Mr. Phillips added that the number of retirees living here has also increased.

Mr. Cowman offered that the list reviewed here may have just scratched the surface of the full scope of the Master Plan update. He suggested that technical assistance and financing may be available through DOLA. Ms. Winser stated that the list is just phase I of the process. The next step will be to take the list out to the community before assessing the size and scope of the process and the level of assistance that may be needed. Mr. Phillips added that other department heads in the County will also be involved and asked for input. Mr. Cowman said that his concern is that there may be topics that have not been considered that should be, and that outside assistance might be useful in answering this question. Mr. Phillips stated that Ms. Winser would be scheduling meetings around the County. Mr. Cowman offered that meetings with various existing groups around the community might also be useful.

APCC UPDATE

Commissioner Benjamin reported on his first APCC meeting. He noted that the group would be meeting monthly now instead of quarterly. He questioned the validity of the SSACP depending on the outcome of the annexation vote. He also noted that the issues discussed at the APCC seem to focus solely on Steamboat and its immediate surroundings and not on the impacts of decisions regarding

those areas on the outlying communities. Commissioner Benjamin cited the example of funding for roads. He offered that the SSACP needs to be revisited in its entirety.

ADMINISTRATOR 'S REPORT

Mr. Phillips reviewed the upcoming agendas.

Mr. Phillips reported that the Board of County Commissioners had discussed the Gravel Matrix and had directed staff not to update it until an application for a new gravel pit is submitted.

The meeting was adjourned at 9 :30 p.m.