

MINUTES OF C4 BOARD MEETING, JULY 16, 2007
1:30 p.m., Library Community Room

Present: Joe Arbuckle, Kirk Charbonneau, John Brandenburg, Lockett and Sue Pitman, Carol and Wiley Larson, Patty O'Brien, and Margaret Karsten.

Joe opened the meeting at 1:30 p.m.

1. Purpose of the meeting: to develop and agree upon C4 positions regarding Planned Unit Developments (PUDs), Minor Subdivisions (MSDs), and Cluster Developments (CDs) in Custer County (CC) so that committee heads can draft position papers; draft an initial water position paper that includes areas of concern, future research direction, and focal areas with water.

Discussion began with

2. Other areas for discussion:

- Rural land use policy. Joe suggested that C4 should carefully watch for any ad hoc action at the county level that preempts full policy analysis on water, density increases, etc. The County should write the Rural Land Use policy as a stand alone document and not simply modify the PUD policy and procedure as is being proposed from the Planning Commission
- Ranches used as "401(k)s" emotion vs reality (John). Presented a breakdown on ranching operations in the county. All data is estimated and not based on direct polling:
 - Number of operating ranches over 35 acres: approx 70
 - Number of operating ranches over 35 acres that depend on agriculture as primary income: approx 27.
 - Of those 27,
 - operating ranches on 1,000 acres or more: approx 10
 - operating ranches on 500-599 acres: approx 8
 - operating ranches on 80-499 acres: approx 7
 - Number of large ranch landowners NOT dependent on agriculture as primary income: approx 7
 - Number of medium-sized ranch operations: approx 26
 - Number of "lease-only" ranch properties: approx 5
 - Number of ranch landowners interested in speculation or developing their acreage: approx 10
 - Number of ranch landowners interested in "passing down" their ranches to heirs: approx 42. Of that, perhaps 10 may be interested in divesting the property (estimate number that has not been verified).

Lockett asked how many of the operating 27 ranches have primary water rights, and John offered to do some research to get the figure. John's conclusion: The rewards from ranching land that is sold for speculation go out of the county. CC should introduce impact fees or transfer fees to help recap some of that county loss. (Joe reminded the Board that Don Paul is working on the idea.)

- Learn about Tabor and Gallagher amendments (Joe). Proposed looking into having County Assessor J.D. Henrich speak to the C4 Board on the subject.

- Learn about the Colorado Office of Smart Growth (Patty). Explained they have useful information to share on how different counties are dealing with growth. Mentioned a Land Use Growth Model is available in draft form and that there is a website. Lockett will share the information with County Extension Agent Karen Crumbaker, who is heading the county's economic development initiatives.
- Define "low density" as used in county documents. Lockett recommended using the term "normal" in place of "low" as it relates to density per acreage.
- "County" vs. "valley" terms. Joe reminded the Board the C4 should remember to use "county" when referring to all its land and population.
- County building codes (Joe). Hank Bruser has suggested C4 might consider taking a position on this county issue. Board members felt that ranching costs and "green" and "sustainable" aspects should be included in the overall equation. Joe asked for Kirk, along with Bob Dreher, to prepare some information to help the board discuss the topic at a later date.
- Master Plan. Joe suggested that the Commissioners do not seem very interested in changing anything. Patty stated that Larimer and Routt counties set goals and objectives in a kind of 5-year plan that had served well in promoting regulations. Routt now refers to open space as "residual lands." Joe emphasized that C4 must focus now on immediate activities, which deal with subdivision regulations. County Attorney Naylor has been asked to write wording on CDs and MSDs.
- Next C4 general membership meeting. Due to other activities on Wednesday evenings, the Board agreed to change membership meetings to Thursday evenings. Tentative dates for the next meeting are August 30 or August 23. Joe asked for Bob Dreher to check and notify C4 of the best date.
- Colorado Citizens for Ethics in Government (Joe). Plans to contact this non-profit organization and discuss experiences with the Freedom of Information Act.
- Commissioner elections in 2008. Will have an important effect on CC.
- Tape recording of Board of Commissioner (BOCC) meetings (Joe). Both lawyers who informally advise C4 support having BOCC and PC meetings taped for historical record purposes. C4 could put forward the recommendation to the BOCC. Margaret suggested taking it to the general membership meeting for approval.

Joe thanked the Board and Committee Heads for their work and said C4 is receiving compliments and making a positive influence.

3. Position papers on PUDs, MSDs, and CDs:

- Timing. C4 needs to have papers ready for the Commissioners to read, analyse, and consider as they review subdivision regulations. The objective is to finalize them by the August C4 general membership meeting or perhaps sooner, if necessary. Joe asked for Kirk, along with Bob Dreher, to check for anything related to subdivision regulations in the upcoming agendas for the BOCC and the Planning Commission. The papers will be given focus in the *Trib* and also the C4 website,

which is being prepared. (Joe reported the cost for website management will be only \$50 per year.)

- **Format.** Joe presented a sample position paper* (using MSDs as the topic) to propose a style for all papers:
 1. length - 1 to 2 pages;
 2. procedure - follow the Public Policy Formulation recommendations given to the BOCC;
 3. format – break down by
 - a. Subject;
 - b. Problem statement;
 - b. Points to Consider;
 - c. Decision Criteria and Management Analysis Table;
 - d. Discussion; and
 - e. C4 Position.

Other ideas:

- Word the decision criteria to clarify the issues each committee wants to put across.
- Rank each criterion in a scale according to importance.
- Use a more flexible technique than “Yes/No” in the Analysis Required column to allow for different land use options that could apply (e.g., numerical values, with 5 being the highest value). Consider using red-green-amber ratings.
- “Humanize” the presentation of position papers to help invite membership feedback.

4. Interim position paper on water (Wiley). Presented an interim Position Paper on the Upper Arkansas Water Conservation District’s Proposed Water Augmentation Plan for Custer County *, following the format as proposed by Joe. It included a description of the plans and focus of the Water Committee as it continues its work.

5. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

*** Copy attached to the official minutes.**

Respectfully submitted,
Margaret Karsten, Secretary