

**GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
PRELIMINARY AGENDA: Friday, December 2, 2011**

- 8:45 a.m.**
- **Call to order; determine quorum**
 - **Approval of Minutes**
 - **Election of Vice-Chair**
 - **Unscheduled citizens:** A brief period in which the public is invited to make general comments or ask questions of the Commission or Planning Staff about items which are not scheduled on the day's agenda.
- 9:00 a.m.** **Gunnison Energy Corporation**, work session/no action, request for the construction of a 5-acre drilling pad to accommodate multiple wells. Two wells, the Federal 1289 HL1 & HL2, are proposed to be drilled in 2012, located west of Highway 133 on the Hotchkiss Ranch, in the SWNE Section 18, Township 12 South, Range 89 West, 6th P.M., northwest of Paonia Reservoir.
- 10:00 a.m.** **Persons Subdivision**, work session/possible action, discussion and direction to staff regarding recommendation; request for the resubdivision of Lot 1, Creekwood Subdivision into three single-family lots; located approximately 6.5 miles northeast of Almont, 1.5 miles north of County Road 742 (Taylor River Road), west of County Road 744 (Spring Creek Road)

Adjourn

**GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
December 2, 2011**

The Gunnison County Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting, in the Commissioners' Meeting Room in the Blackstocks Government Center, Planning Commission meeting room.

Present were:

Chairperson- Ramon Reed	Director of Community Development Joanne Williams
Commissioner-Kent Fulton	Assistant Director of Community Development Neal Starkebaum
Commissioner-Jim Seitz	Planner-Cathie Pagano
Commissioner-Susan Eskew	Community Development Services Manager Beth Baker
Alternate Commissioner-AJ Cattles	
Alternate Commissioner-Warren Wilcox	
	Other present as listed in text

With a quorum present Chairman Ramon Reed opened the regular meeting of the Planning Commission.

MOVED by Seitz seconded by Cattles to approve the minutes of November 4, 2011 as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

GUNNISON ENERGY-DRILLING PAD AND WELLS: The Planning Commission (Commission) conducted a work session to discuss a request for the construction of a five-acre drilling pad to accommodate multiple wells. Two wells, the Federal 1289 HL1, & HL2, are proposed to be drilled in 2012, located west of Highway 133 on the Hotchkiss Ranch, in the SWNE Section 18, Township 12 So., Range 89 West, 6th P.M., northwest of Paonia Reservoir.

With a quorum present Chairman Ramon Reed opened the work session.

Gunnison Energy representative Lee Fyock and Neil Allen explained the application. Fyock submitted a copy of his power-point presentation to the Commission. This pad location is not included in the comprehensive drilling plan at this time; although it is in the same area. The entire parcel is on private land, including the access road. The site is approximately 4,000 ft. from the highway, up on the ridge. The horizontal wells will use a larger pad which can be used for several wells. The five-acre pad could possibly accommodate 12 wells. Everything for the operation is currently in place, except the pad. The entire pad will be bermed. During operations Waddles will be placed below the pad. The road will be altered to access the new pad. The entire pad will be graveled, and fabric will be placed underneath the gravel. This will be a closed loop system. The pits will be lined; the liners will be tested before being taken out and buried. They will use approximately 15,000 ft. of pipe; going vertically 7,500 ft and horizontally 5,200 ft. They have secured leases from the BLM. The pipe will be going about 7,000 ft. under Highway 133. Water sampling will be done both above and below the operation. There are no water bodies within 500 ft. of the operation. There is a man made stock pond within several hundred ft.; it could be backfilled, they are not sure yet.

Fyock reviewed the *Gunnison County Land Use Resolution* (LUR) standards, which apply to oil and gas operations, and Gunnison Energy's application. He explained how the LUR standards have been met, as follows:

Standard A. Drainage and Erosion Control

The proposed drill site has been designed and engineered with erosion control to include:

- Storm water diversion around the entire facility
- Collection basins to collect and filter storm water within the perimeter of the site

- Storm water collected in the basin and filtered through gravel and excelsior logs prior to discharge

Trees and shrubs removed from the site for construction will be utilized as mulch during final reclamation.

- Reclamation is considered final when 70% original vegetation cover is achieved and compared to reference plot.
- Topsoil will be stripped from the surface prior to construction, segregated until needed for interim and / or final reclamation.
- The surface utilized for operations will be surfaced with gravel
- Upon completion of construction the perimeter of the facility will be reclaimed and seeded

GEC's Storm water Management Plan (SWMP) specifies;

- Weekly inspections during construction
- Inspections following heavy precipitation
- Monthly inspections until released
- Refer to SWMP and layout drawings for specific details
- The site has been engineered by a professional engineer and construction will be overseen by a professional engineer.
- Three Gunnison Energy employees have been trained and certified as CDPHE Storm water inspectors through the CETC151 Storm water Compliance Inspector Course.
- Two Gunnison Energy employees have been trained and certified CDOT Erosion and Sediment Control Program

Standard B. Access Roads

- Access to the site is from a private ranch road directly off State Highway 133. No Gunnison County road will be impacted.

Standard C- Public Roadway and Traffic Impacts

- **#1 Ingress & Egress**
- No Gunnison County road will be utilized to access the project.
- **#2 Maintenance Agreement & Financial Assurance**
- No Gunnison County road will be utilized to access the project.

Standard D. Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat

- An on-site was held with the BLM staff on, October 17, 2011, to evaluate the proposed site.
- Site specific NEPA is currently underway for the site by the BLM.
- Colorado Parks and Wildlife SW Region Assistant Manager attended the on-site.
- Three environmental assessments have been conducted within the area in 2005, 2006 & 2008.
- Wildlife restrictions in place prohibit drilling, completion and construction December 1 through April 30.
- **Threatened and Endangered Species**
- There are no designated critical habitats on or within the immediate area of influence.
- The area is not within a Lynx Analysis Unit (LAU).
- The project area is 55 miles upstream of critical or occupied habitat of razorback suckers and Colorado Pike minnows.
- Raptor Surveys will be conducted in the spring prior to construction. Presence of active nests would result in a delay of construction until fledgling occurs.
- No endangered or sensitive or plant species was found present on the proposed location.

Standard E. Livestock and Grazing

- No Prime or Unique Farmlands have been identified in the Project Area (BLM, 2006).
- The well site is on private surface.
- A Surface Use Agreement (SUA) has been reached with the surface owner.
- The site will be fenced stock tight and a cattle guard will be installed.
- Upon termination and reclamation the site will be returned to ranch use as prescribed by the surface owner.

Standard F. Recreation Impacts

- The pad is located on private property.

- No general public recreation is allowed by the surface owner.
- All recreation within the area is controlled by the surface owner.
- An agreement with the surface owner concerning hunting impacts has been reached.

Standard G. Water Quality

No Significant Degradation-Surface Waters

- The facility will be included in GEC's Storm Water Management Plan.
- **Best Management Practices to be implemented Include:**
- The pad has been designed with Run-on Diversion & Run Off Collection perimeter ditches which flow to catchment basins for filtration and evaporation.
- Graveled pad
- Seeding of outer perimeter
- Utilization of excelsior logs, straw bales, straw mulch and matting
- Implementation of Spill Prevention Control and Counter Measure Plan (SPCC) as applicable

Water Wells

- Water wells within three miles of the project have been identified; all occur within the upper 500 ft. of geologic strata.
- Baseline water samples were collected from all domestic water wells within one mile of the project area prior to drilling in 2005. Additional sampling will be completed prior to 2012 drilling.
- **Three strings of casing will be cemented to the surface**
- Surface Conductor will be set a 102' below ground level
- Surface casing will be 822' below ground level
- Intermediate casing will be set at 4,322' below ground level
- Water utilized for drilling will be obtained from DWR and BLM approved sources, primarily GECs non-tributary designate CBM wells.

Standard H. Water body Setbacks

- The Well pad is not within 500 ft. of a defined water body thus no setback required.

Standard I. Cultural and Historical Resources

- A Class III cultural and archaeology survey was completed by a registered archaeological firm and submitted to the BLM and the State Historical Preservation Office.
- No artifacts of historical significance were found.
- All artifacts found on private surface belong to the surface owner.

Standard J. Wildfire Hazard

- A copy of Gunnison Energy Corporation's Fire/ Emergency / Health and Safety Plan has been submitted to Gunnison County. This plan has been in use on GEC's Gunnison County project since 2004 and has been updated accordingly.
- Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission Rule 600, Safety Regulations, and Rule 606A Fire Prevention and Protection are strictly followed.
- All GEC company employees and contractors receive training on fire and reporting procedures.
- All GEC and contractor equipment carry fire extinguishers and other firefighting equipment.
- A water pump is kept on site while drilling.

Standard K. Geologic Hazards

- **The location is not within a geologic hazard area nor will it cause a geologic hazard.**
- A geologic hazard evaluation was completed for the Hotchkiss Federal Project area of which this well site is within.

Standard N. Emergency Response

- A copy of Gunnison Energy Corporation's Fire/Emergency / Health and Safety Plan has been submitted to Gunnison County Emergency Response Coordinator.
- GEC will update the Spill Prevention Control and Counter measure Plan prior to preparation and drilling at the location.
- GEC employees and contractors receive annual emergency response training.

- Emergency response training is given to the drilling crews on the first day of drilling for each well.

Standard O. Financial Guarantees

Not applicable

Standard N. Technical Infeasibility Waiver

No Waiver Requested

Seitz asked if completion includes fracking, and if these wells will use the new flow back pits; Fyock confirmed fracking will take place and the flowback pits will be used.

Eskew asked what CBM is; Fyock said coal bed methane.

There was a brief discussion concerning the State application, being part of the County application. Fyock noted Gunnison Energy had submitted their State application after they had submitted their County application. Fyock agreed to submit a copy to the County.

The Commission discussed a closed loop system: they requested an explanation. Fyock explained a closed loop system uses dewatering equipment. They remove the drilling mud and cuttings from the system. Cuttings are placed into the pits if needed. The pits will remain in place and the cuttings will be tested and then buried. The pit liner must be removed before the pit can be closed. Reed noted his concerns with open pits, particularly open pits with water in them.

Wilcox asked if the cuttings are analyzed to help determine the type of fracking fluid to be used; Neil Alled said yes to a certain extent. Fyock added that from past drilling in the area they are aware of much of the consistency.

Reed asked if the local government designee had responded; Assistant Director of Community Development Neal Starkebaum said there had been no comments from the COGCC.

The Commission discussed conducting a site visit. It was stated the weather could make a site visit problematic this time of year. Fyock said the Commission has been on site, but not to this specific location. Reed suggested viewing it in operation, during completion, when all the different factors are going on. Fyock explained the public is not allowed on site during completion-but it could be viewed from a safe distance. He added that the timing is far from accurate and always in flux, making it hard to schedule. Starkebaum will work with GEC to setup a summer site visit.

Starkebaum noted the public hearing has been scheduled for January 20, 2012, at 9 A.M., in the Blackstocks Government Center.

The Commission directed staff to prepare a draft decision of approval, based upon information submitted and information that may be added, for review following the public hearing, on January 20, 2012.

PERSONS SUBDIVISION: The Planning Commission (Commission) conducted a work session to discuss and give direction staff regarding recommendation of the request for the resubdivision of Lot 1, Creekwood Subdivision into three single-family lots; located approximately 6.5 miles northeast of Almont, 1.5 miles north of County Road 742 (Taylor River Road), west of County Road 744 (Spring Creek Road.)

With a quorum present Chairman Ramon Reed opened the work session.

Reed explained an updated staff report had been prepared and submitted to the Commission; it will be reviewed by the Commission today. They can approve, approve with conditions, or deny this application.

The Commission reviewed the most recent staff report. They did not have any additional comments except for the following;

LUR Section 10-102 Locational standards for residential development- The proposed subdivision does meet the alternative locational standard, as the cumulative impacts of the proposed development and existing development will result in no significant net adverse impact to adjacent lands or land uses. The Commission was directed not to consider the possible cumulative impacts of the ISDS. Director of Community Development Joanne Williams clarified-look at the potential only based upon the data submitted for this record, there is no data that proves negative cumulative impacts form ISDS at this time.

LUR Section 10-103 Residential Density-A-3 the proposed density is one unit per 1.5 acres, the average parcel size is 2.42 acres, excluding National Forest. The Commission considered the actual individual lots surrounding this parcel, which go from approximately one-acre to five-acres.

LUR Section 10-104 Development in geologic hazard areas-Reed identified this section as one of the Commission's major concerns. He noted according to comments from the Colorado Geologic Survey (CGS) this parcel has significant geo-hazards. He added there had been multiple applicant submittals which provided mitigation, the final one was submitted July 15, 2010. It deals with all the rockfall issues. The CGS comments dated February 22, 2010, note that the proposed mitigation satisfactorily addresses the constructability, debris flow and erosion concerns. There were remaining concerns for ongoing maintenance, which resulted in CGS recommending no bedrooms on the west side of the residence. The Commission requested the subdivision covenants restrict bedrooms on the west side. The applicants decided to to put that restriction in the covenants. It was resubmitted to CGS and they withdrew their concerns and allowed bedrooms on the west side of the structure on the second floor.

Following a brief discussion the rockfall hazards in this area. Wilcox said any decision made must be tied back to the evidence in the record. Seitz agreed but added this should be something that is looked at in the LUR and discussed at a later date.

Eskew asked if the ongoing maintenance requirement will be identified on the plat; Assistant Director of Community Development Neal Starkebaum explained the covenants will be recorded and referred to on the recorded plat.

Starkebaum said the rockfall study will also be recorded, and it is referred to in the subdivision covenants. Reed added that when applying for a building permit the Communiyt Development Department will enforce the mitigation requirements.

Reed requested a motion to either accept the draft recommendation, to consider additional requirements, or deny the application.

Reed seated Wilcox for the vote on the application.

Bratton thanked the Commission for their professionalism.

MOVED; by Wilcox seconded by Fulton to approve LUC-2008-60 as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

PROJECT SUMMARY:

Kevin and Rebecca Persons, represented by Dick Bratton, have submitted a land use change application for the resubdivision of Lot 1, Creekwood Subdivision (3.81-acres) into three single-family residential lots, each served by an individual sewage disposal system and individual well. An existing well is located on the existing parcel (proposed Lot 3). The subdivision will consist of Lot 1 - 1.25 acres, Lot 2 - 1.26 acres and Lot 3 - 1.3 acres.

The applicant has submitted protective covenants, titled *Declaration of Protective Covenants of Persons Minor Subdivision*, final revised set received September 8, 2011 , which identify specific design standards and limitations on each lot.

PREVIOUS LAND USE APPROVALS:

11 December 02 PC Minutes

12 January 06 PC Approved

Creekwood Subdivision is a previously approved three lot subdivision, comprised of Lot 1 – 3.81 acres, Lot 2 – 5.54 acres and the Spear Remainder Tract – 4.79 acres, which was approved by the Board of County Commissioners on October 4, 1986 and is recorded at Reception No. 398525, December 30, 1986, with the Office of the Gunnison County Clerk and Recorder.

LOCATION:

The property is located approximately 6.5 miles northeast of Almont, 1.5 miles north of County Road 742 (Taylor River Road), west of County Road 744 (Spring Creek Road), legally described as Lot 1, Creekwood Subdivision, consisting of 3.2-acres.

SURROUNDING LAND USES:

West – National Forest

North/Northeast – Residential Lots within Spring Creek Estates Subdivision, existing residences

East (across CR 744) – Spear Remainder Tract – Creekwood Subdivision – Residential lot, existing residence

South – Thornworth Estates Subdivision, residential lots with existing residences

IMPACT CLASSIFICATION:

Minor Impact Project, based upon the impact classification found in *Section 6-102: Projects Classified as Minor Impact Projects A. 2-4 Units.*

PLANS/REPORTS/SUBMITTALS:

Plans, reports, and other submittal documents informing this Decision include, but are not limited to:

- Minor Impact Land Use Change Application – Persons Subdivision, July 17, 2009
- *Site Plan – Persons Minor Subdivision*, prepared by Mesa Surveying Associates, Inc., dated October 7, 2008, revision May 4, 2009
- *Subdivision Plat – Persons Minor Subdivision*, prepared by Mesa Surveying Associates, Inc., dated October 7, 2008, revision April 30, 2009
- Creekwood Subdivision Plat, approved by the BOCC on October 4, 1986; and recorded December 30, 1986 at Reception No. 398525
- *Persons Minor Subdivision – Minor Impact Land Use Change Application*
- *Declaration of Protective Covenants of Persons Minor Subdivision*, Draft Covenants – prepared by Dick Bratton
- Creekwood Subdivision – Declaration of Protective Covenants, recorded December 30, 1986, Book 637, Page 694
- *Rockfall Hazard Analysis – Lot 1, Creekwood Subdivision, Gunnison County, Colorado*, report prepared by Thomas E. Griepentrog, P.E., Buckhorn Geotech, July 20, 2008
- *Rockfall Mitigation – Persons Subdivision, Gunnison County, Colorado*, report prepared by Thomas E. Griepentrog, P.E., Buckhorn Geotech, March 12, 2009
- UGRWCD, letter from Frank Kugel, Manager, November 19, 2008, noting availability of augmentation water
- Upper Gunnison River Water Conservancy District (UGRWCD), Contract No. MLR07- 83, August 1, 2007 for one base unit of augmentation water
- *Slope Stability Study Analysis - Persons Minor Subdivision*, Thomas Griepentrog, P.E., Buckhorn Geotech, September 4, 2009
- *Persons Minor Subdivision Plat* – prepared by Mesa Surveying Associates, Inc., dated July 17, 2009
- *Site Plan –Persons Minor Subdivision - prepared by Mesa Surveying Associates, Inc., dated July 17, 2009*
- *Declaration of Protective Covenants of Creekside*, undated, submitted with application

SUBMITTALS RECEIVED AFTER INITIAL APPLICATION:

- *Water Resources Study - Persons Minor Subdivision* Thomas Griepentrog, P.E., Buckhorn Geotech, September 3, 2009
- Revisions to *Article 5: Design Requirements and Article 7: Animals Declaration of Protective Covenants of Creekside*, dated November 24, 2009
- *Slope Stability Study Analysis - Persons Minor Subdivision*, Thomas Griepentrog, P.E., Buckhorn Geotech, September 4, 2009

- *Rockfall and Debris Flow Mitigation Site Plan*, Thomas Griepentrog, P.E., Buckhorn Geotech, December 10, 2010
- Letter from Dick Bratton, "Ongoing Issues" dated January 7, 2010
- Letter from Thomas Griepentrog, P.E., Buckhorn Geotech, to Jill Carlson, Colorado Geologic Survey, February 19, 2010, response to comments; including berm constructability, inspections, debris flows and erosion/drainage, and *Drainage Map*
- Buckhorn Geotech, *Rockfall Mitigation*, Persons Minor Subdivision, Thomas Griepentrog, P.E., letter dated March 12, 2009
- Revised Covenants *Declaration of Protective Covenants of Persons Minor Subdivision*, dated March 12, 2010, Dick Bratton
- *Persons Minor Subdivision Plat* – prepared by Mesa Surveying Associates, Inc., dated July 17, 2009
- *Revised Site Plan* –Persons Minor Subdivision - prepared by Mesa Surveying Associates, Inc., dated July 17, 2009
- *Driveways and Seepage Areas Site Plan* - prepared by Mesa Surveying Associates, Inc., dated July 16, 2009
- Buckhorn Geotech, *Rockfall Mitigation*, Persons Minor Subdivision, Thomas Griepentrog, P.E., letter dated April 15, 2009
- Dick Bratton letter, May 25, 2010, regarding EH Office issues
- Buckhorn Geotech, letter addressing drainage, wastewater disposal, driveway access, and well locations; Persons Minor Subdivision, Thomas Griepentrog, P.E., unsigned letter dated July 17, 2009
- Dick Bratton letter, June 29, 2010 regarding ISDS percolation tests
- Revised Site Plan – *Rockfall and Debris Flow Mitigation Persons Subdivision* - prepared by Buckhorn Geotech, dated July 15, 2010
- Revised Covenants *Declaration of Protective Covenants of Persons Minor Subdivision*, dated July 21, 2010, prepared by Dick Bratton
- Memo from Dick Bratton, July 15, 2011
- Email from Jill Carlson, Colorado Geological Survey, August 5, 2011
- Final *Declaration of Protective Covenants of Persons Minor Subdivision*, received September 8, 2011

MEETING DATES:

The Planning Commission held work sessions on the following dates:

- September 4, 2009 Work Session
- February 19, 21010 Work Session
- May 7, 2010 Work Session
- July 16, 2010 Joint Public Hearing
- July 16, 2010 Work Session
- September 17, 2010 Work Session
- July 15, 2011 Work Session
- September 16, 2011 Work Session

SITE VISIT:

The Planning Commission conducted a site visit on September 18, 2009, and on September 16, 2011, at which time the Commission viewed the site and the location of the driveways, rockfall mitigation, lot lines and building envelopes.

PUBLIC HEARING:

The Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners conducted a joint public hearing on July 16, 2010. Mr. Harcher, adjacent landowner, asked about the impact of new wells to his existing well. Written comments were received from Elaine M. Dodson, for the Elaine M. Dodson Trust, objecting to the subdivision based upon the impact of new sewage treatment systems on the watershed and the precedent that may be set. David Folks and Jayne Underwood questioned the setbacks from the County road, in relation to location of a new house, due to the rockfall hazard. Greg Harscher noted concerns related to the small size of the lots, geologic hazards, a "cookie cutter" look to the subdivision, leach fields, and impacts to wildlife. All

testimony, both written and oral, is hereby incorporated as part of this record of review and evaluation.

REVIEW AGENCY REFERRAL COMMENTS:

Comments were received from the following agencies:

Colorado Division of Wildlife:

Comments from J Wenum, Gunnison Area Wildlife Manager, Colorado Division of Wildlife, letter of August 10, 2009, notes that:

“The location of this project is not within mapped significant wildlife habitat. The relatively small scope of the project (division of 3.81 acres into three equal lots), combined with the already existing development in the area will not result in significant additional impact to wildlife.”

Gunnison County Environmental Health Office:

Comments were received from Richard Stenson, Environmental Health Official, memo of September 2, 2009, noting that:

“The Environmental Health Department has conducted a site inspection for LUC 08-60, the Persons-three lot proposal, on Spring Creek. The application consists of 3 planned lots to be served by individual sewage disposal systems, and individual wells for their potable water systems.

During the inspection I found that it may be feasible to develop ISDS on the lots if geological hazard risk studies can be reviewed and approved by Gunnison County. Each of the lots had significant risks from slope stability, rock fall and debris flow. I met with Buckhorn Geotech Engineering during the inspection and, as presented, the proposal appeared feasible.

However, I have noted that the Colorado Geological Survey, in their comments, had concerns regarding mitigation of the hazards. It appears to me that there is need for further risk analysis of the proposal. **After the review of the record, the Environmental Health Office requires reconsideration of feasibility once the concerns raised by the CGS have been resolved.**

Comments were received from Richard Stenson, Environmental Health Official, memo of March 25, 2010, noting that:

“During the inspection I found that it may be feasible to develop ISDS on the lots if geological hazard risk studies can be reviewed and approved by Gunnison County. Each of the lots had significant risks from slope stability, rock fall and debris flow. I met with Buckhorn Geotech Engineering during the inspection and, as presented, the proposal appeared feasible.

However, I have noted that the Colorado Geological Survey, in their comments, had concerns regarding mitigation of the hazards. It appears to me that there is need for further risk analysis of the proposal. **After the review of the record, the Environmental Health Office requires reconsideration of feasibility once the concerns raised by the CGS have been resolved.”**

Comments were received from Richard Stenson, Environmental Health Official, memo of September 3, 2010, noting that:

“It has been determined that the design proposals can meet the Gunnison County Standards for ISDS, and the design analysis suggests that it is feasible to construct ISDS on the properties. Consider that actual installation of these systems may require changes to the site locations of the ISDS.

After review by the Community Development Department, it has been determined that in order to establish a baseline for water quality, studies should be conducted in the lower Spring Creek drainage. We are cooperating with the Upper Gunnison Water Quality Monitoring Program to begin water quality monitoring in the Spring Creek drainage. It is the consensus of the Department, for this subdivision, cumulative impacts related to wastewater disposal should not be used as a basis for determining subdivision feasibility.”

Gunnison County Public Works Department:

Comments from Allen Moores, Public Works Department, September 1, 2009, noted that the shared driveway access between Lots 1 & 2 should be recorded (with the Office of the Gunnison County Clerk and Recorder).

Colorado Geological Survey:

Comments from Jill Carlson, C.E.G., Engineering Geologist, Colorado Geological Survey, were received in a series of responses.

Letter of August 28, 2009:

“The site contains significant geologic hazards, including rockfall, debris flows and potential slope instability. Regardless of whether one home or three homes are constructed on the property, careful siting, mitigation design and construction, and regular, ongoing maintenance will be required to protect life and property from geologic hazards.

Rockfall hazard. Buckhorn Geotech provides a good description of surface conditions and makes appropriate inferences to characterize the rockfall hazard. Their CRSP (Colorado Rockfall Simulation Program) analysis appears to be valid. CGS agrees that earthen berms are a suitable mitigation strategy. The proposed berm locations (upslope of all structures, with the full berm height extending 10 feet beyond the structures' sides before tapering toward the ground surface, 4 feet high on the proposed northern and southern lots, and 6 feet high on the middle lot), are likely to catch most rocks. However, several aspects of the mitigation require clarification and/or emphasis:

Berm constructability and slope stability. I am concerned that Buckhorn Geotech's berm cross-section drawing (Drawing 2 of the March 12 Rockfall Hazard Mitigation letter) shows several feet of excavation into the toe of the existing slope above the berm. It appears that the intent is to use material from upslope as borrow material to construct the berms, and also to lower the existing grade above the berm, thereby achieving the required berm height with a smaller quantity of fill. This may be problematic for several reasons. From a constructability perspective, the slope is quite rocky and bedrock is likely fairly shallow. It may be difficult to achieve the depth of excavation shown on the drawing. Also, there are several risks associated with construction on and near slopes:

- a. Slopes that appear to be currently stable can be destabilized if modifications are made through excavation of cuts, and modifications to existing drainage patterns.
- b. Presently stable slopes may become unstable, as a result of reduced soil strengths, if the existing drainage pattern is altered, allowing water to pond in areas that were previously drier. If the berm design is to involve any excavation into the slope, then slope stability analysis is required. The berms must be designed to allow water to drain off the slope quickly and not allow water to pond anywhere on the slope.

Ongoing inspection and maintenance responsibilities. Constructed rockfall and debris flow hazard mitigation features such as berms and catchments require ongoing inspection and maintenance to preserve their effectiveness. They tend to fill with debris that ravel off of the slopes above; this can significantly reduce or eliminate their ability to retain or divert the material from which they were designed to protect structures and people.

The entity or entities, whether it is an HOA or one or more individual homeowners, responsible for scheduling, performing, and paying for required, ongoing inspection and maintenance of any hazard mitigation features, should be clearly identified and specific responsibilities should be clearly assigned on the plat and/or in any covenant documents.

If each lot is to have its own hazard mitigation structure (berm), care must be taken to ensure that such features do not exacerbate the hazard on any adjacent lots, and individual homeowners MUST be made aware of the critical importance of timely inspection and maintenance of all mitigation structures. A design-build contractor experienced with rockfall protection features should be consulted to determine the cost and constructability of the

proposed rockfall catchment berms at this location. Buckhorn should verify that the slope profiles used in their rockfall simulation modeling are accurate and representative of actual site conditions. Specific construction details such as gradation and compaction requirements should be determined.

CGS would like to review any additional rockfall analysis and/or rockfall mitigation design(s) submitted by the applicant.

Buckhorn's recommendations regarding upslope wall framing, reinforced windows, solid-core, outward swinging doors, and low-occupancy spaces along the upslope sides of the structures (this means no bedrooms with outside walls on the western side of the homes) are appropriate and should be strictly adhered to.

Debris flow hazard. I observed evidence of small debris flows and recent slopewash deposits at the site. Although the rockfall berms may also serve as effective deflection berms to mitigate debris flow and slope runoff hazards on the site, it would be prudent to have a qualified geotechnical consultant evaluate the debris flow hazard on this site and verify that the berms are properly designed and constructed to reduce risks associated with debris flows. Obviously, building envelopes should be located outside of any debris flow hazard areas, or additional mitigation may be required. Again, proper maintenance is critical to the performance of all mitigation features."

Comments from Jill Carlson, C.E.G., Engineering Geologist, Colorado Geological Survey.
Letter of January 28, 2010:

"Rockfall mitigation. The rockfall mitigation berms shown on Buckhorn Geotech's December 10, 2009 drawing appear to be consistent with the CRSP analysis and design recommendations reviewed previously. Buckhorn's slope stability analysis indicates that the proposed slopes will be stable, but Buckhorn has not addressed my concern regarding constructability and whether the proposed depth of excavation into the rock slope above the berms is achievable.

However, constructability issues aside, my primary outstanding concern is **assignment of ongoing inspection and maintenance responsibilities**. As discussed in my August 28, 2009 letter, constructed rockfall and debris flow hazard mitigation features such as berms and catchments require ongoing inspection and maintenance to preserve their effectiveness. The catchments behind berms tend to fill with debris that ravel off of the slopes above; this can significantly reduce or eliminate their ability to retain or divert the material from which they were designed to protect structures and people. The county should require the applicant to specify who will be responsible for scheduling and paying for necessary inspections, maintenance and repairs to the rockfall catchments and deflection berms. The entity or entities, whether it is an HOA or one or more individual homeowners, responsible for scheduling, performing, and paying for required, ongoing inspection and maintenance of any hazard mitigation features, should be clearly identified and specific responsibilities should be clearly assigned on the plat and/or in any covenant documents. **The typical homeowner will not appreciate the importance of correctly maintaining the berm behind their home, nor the potential consequences of neglect. Individual homeowners and/or the HOA (if one is proposed) MUST be made aware of the critical importance of all hazard mitigation structures.**

Debris flows and drainage calculations. Due to their high sediment content, ability to entrain and transport gravel-, cobble-, and boulder-size rocks and debris, and unpredictable rheology (flow characteristics), debris flows pose hazards that are very different from sheetflow or channelized water flow hazards. Debris flow hazard increases as a result of events that reduce hillside vegetation, such as avalanche, disease, wildfire, grading and other disturbances. The applicant has not provided a rigorous debris flow hazard analysis or mitigation plan. It is possible that the proposed rockfall mitigation berms and drainage channels are adequate to protect the proposed homes from mudslides or debris flows, but a good hazard analysis and mitigation/drainage plan would include drainage calculations that incorporate debris bulking factors, hydraulic analyses using bulked flows, and appropriate

sizing of channels and culverts such as the 15" CMP culvert beneath the Lot 2 driveway to accommodate bulked, high sediment yield flows.

OWS setbacks. I understand the Gunnison County Environmental Health Office is concerned about the close, 10-ft proximity of the drainage swale between proposed Lots 2 and 3 to the leach fields on those lots. I agree that concentrated runoff from such a large upslope area is likely to result in flows with sufficient energy to cause erosion, and that erosion along the drainage swales and encroaching into the leach fields is a potential concern. If a greater setback (e.g. 20-ft) is not feasible, a possible solution may be to armor the drainage swales with riprap to reduce erodibility."

Comments from Jill Carlson, C.E.G., Engineering Geologist, Colorado Geological Survey.

Email of February 22, 2010:

"Last week, Tom Griepentrog sent me additional hazard mitigation information. Tom's letter satisfactorily addresses my constructability, debris flow and erosion concerns. This leaves as my only outstanding issue the mechanism for hazard disclosure and an explanation of how responsibility for scheduling and paying for required inspection, maintenance and repairs of hazard mitigation structures will be assigned."

Email of August 5, 2011:

"I have reviewed the Persons Subdivision applicant's memo to the Gunnison County Planning Commission dated July 15, 2011. As you are aware, the applicant's geotechnical consultant, Buckhorn Geotech, recommended in their July 20, 2008 Rockfall Hazard Analysis report (page 4), Residences should be designed with closets, stairwells, or other low occupancy uses on their west (uphill) sides." However, further analysis and rockfall modeling of launch distances and bounce heights by Mr. Tom Griepentrog of Buckhorn Geotech appear to indicate that 2nd story bedrooms on the uphill (west) side of the proposed homes would be acceptable, provided the 2nd story floor level is located "at least six feet above the exterior (west side) ground level on Lot 2 and four feet above the exterior (west side) ground level on Lots 1 and 3" (email correspondence from Tom Griepentrog, July 7, 2011). Mr. Griepentrog states that the height recommendation is "ultra conservative."

Provided the 2nd story floor height recommendations are strictly adhered to, I withdraw my objection to bedrooms on the upslope (western) side of the homes on the three proposed lots. However, I recommend that the phrase "in front of" in paragraph 4.26.3 of the proposed draft covenants be replaced with "on the upslope (western) side of".

COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF THE GUNNISON COUNTY LAND USE RESOLUTION:

Section 10-102: Locational Standards for Residential Development.

The proposed subdivision does not meet the primary locational standard, as it is not located adjacent to an existing population center or within a municipal three mile plan. The proposed subdivision does meet the alternative locational standard, as the cumulative impacts of the proposed development and existing development will result in no significant net adverse impact to adjacent lands or land uses.

Section 10-103: Residential Density.

The proposed subdivision meets the density standard as the lot sizes and lot density are substantially similar to adjacent parcels. The subdivision will consist of Lot 1 - 1.25 acres, Lot 2 - 1.26 acres and Lot 3 - 1.3 acres. Adjacent lots are 1.02 to 4.1 acres in size.

Section 11-103: Development in Areas Subject to Flood Hazards.

Not applicable. The property is not within the 100-year flood plain of Spring Creek, according to FEMA mapping.

Section 11-104: Development in Areas Subject to Geologic Hazards.

The site is identified as having geologic hazards present that may present constraints to development of the property for single-family lots. According to comments from Jill Carlson, C.E.G., Engineering Geologist, Colorado Geological Survey the property contains significant

geologic hazards, including rockfall, debris flows and potential slope instability. Thomas Griepentrog, P.E., Buckhorn Geotech, provided analysis of the geologic hazards and proposed mitigation, including the construction of engineered rockfall berms, construction techniques, and provisions for drainage associated with the mitigation. Multiple submittals identified mitigation, including the final set of plans in a Revised Site Plan – *Rockfall and Debris Flow Mitigation Persons Subdivision* - prepared by Buckhorn Geotech, dated July 15, 2010.

The geologic hazards, site design and proposed mitigation were reviewed by the Colorado Geological Survey. Comments from Jill Carlson, C.E.G., Engineering Geologist, Colorado Geological Survey, were received in a series of responses, letters of August 28, 2009, January 28, 2010, February 22, 2010 and August 5, 2011. The February 22, 2010 comments note that the mitigation satisfactorily addresses the constructability, debris flow and erosion concerns.

Requirements for inspections and maintenance of the mitigation berms are identified in the conditions of approval, as well as identified in the *Declaration of Protective Covenants of Persons Minor Subdivision*. Notice of the hazard conditions, reference to the Buckhorn Geotech reports and County indemnification are also contained within the covenants. Please refer to Sections 4.26, 4.26.1, 4.26.2, 4.26.3 and 4.26.4 within the *Declaration of Protective Covenants of Persons Minor Subdivision*, as revised by the applicant's representative, submitted September 8, 2011.

Section 11-105: *Development in Areas Subject to Wildfire Hazards.*

The subject property is within an area with low wildfire hazard, as identified by County mapping.

Section 11-106: *Protection of Wildlife Habitat Areas.*

The property is not within Gunnison Sage-grouse habitat. Comments from J Wenum, Area WL Manager, Colorado Division of Wildlife, indicate that the proposal will not result in significant additional impact to wildlife.

Section 11-107: *Protection of Water Quality.*

Not applicable. The property is not located within 125 feet of any identified wetlands or the high water mark of Spring Creek.

Section 11-108: *Standards for Development on Ridgelines.*

The property is not located on a ridgeline.

Section 11-109: *Development that Affects Agricultural Lands.*

Not applicable. The site is not adjacent to agricultural land or within proximity to agricultural lands.

Section 11-110: *Development of Land Beyond Snowplowed Access.*

Not applicable, the site is not located beyond snowplowed access.

Section 11-111: *Development on Inholdings in the National Wilderness.*

Not applicable, the site is not located on a National Wilderness inholding.

Section 11-112: *Development on Property Above Timberline.*

Not applicable, the site is not located above timberline.

Section 12-103: *Road System.*

The proposed lots will be served by new driveways from County Road 744 (Spring Creek Road). Lots 1 & 2 will share a driveway access. See comments from Allen Moores, Public Works Department. The easement for common driveway access for Lots 1 & 2 is required to be identified on the plat of *Persons Minor Subdivision*.

Covenants – Article 4 Section 4.27 Maintenance of Driveways. The owner of Lot 3 shall be solely responsible for the maintenance and repair of the driveway from County Road 744 onto said Lot 3, including dust control, snow removal and snow storage and the owners of Lots 1 and 2 shall be jointly and equally responsible for the maintenance and repair of the

shared driveway from County Road 744 onto said Lots 1 and 2, including dust control, snow removal and snow storage.

Section 12-104: *Public Trails.*

There is no public trail existing or proposed.

Section 12-105: *Water Supply.*

The lots will be served by individual wells. An existing well is located on proposed Lot 3 Persons Subdivision. The well was drilled on Lot 1, Creekwood Subdivision, Well Permit 218947, issued by the Division of Water Resources August 8, 1998. One base unit of augmentation water has been purchased from the Upper Gunnison River Water Conservancy District (UGRWCD), Contract No. MLR-F-04-68, November 30, 2006. Additional augmentation water is available from the UGRWCD, as noted in a letter from Frank Kugel, Manager, November 19, 2008. A *Water Resources Study - Persons Minor Subdivision* Thomas Griepentrog, P.E., Buckhorn Geotech, attesting to the physical adequacy of the water supply was submitted on September 3, 2009. Issuance of individual well permits is under the authority of the Colorado Division of Water Resources and subject to the requirements of the Division.

Section 12-106: *Sewage Disposal/Wastewater Treatment.*

An Individual Sewage Disposal System is proposed for each individual residence, on each lot. The minimum lot size is 1.25-acres, which meets the minimum parcel size of one acre for installation of ISDS. Comments have been received from Richard Stenson, Environmental Health Official, memos of September 3, 2009, March 25, 2010 and September 3, 2010. The issues cited by the Environmental Health Office concerned the setback requirements for the drainage swales, referred to as "dry gulches", from the leachfields and concerns with the additional increased wastewater flows within the Spring Creek Drainage. Design modifications were implemented, identified on the Revised Site Plan – *Rockfall and Debris Flow Mitigation Persons Subdivision* - prepared by Buckhorn Geotech, dated July 15, 2010. Review and comments from Richard Stenson, memo of September 2, 2010 regarding review of the amended plans indicate that the installation of the septic systems is feasible, and due to the lack of baseline water quality information, that for this subdivision, cumulative impacts related to wastewater disposal should not be used as a basis as a determining factor in the subdivision feasibility. Installation of ISDS on the lots has been determined to be feasible.

Section 12-107: *Fire Protection.*

The property is within and will be served by the Gunnison Fire Protection District. No comments were received from the District.

Section 13-103: *General Site Plan Standards and Lot Measurements.*

The site plan for this subdivision complies with the standards of this Section.

Section 13-104: *Setbacks from Property Lines and Road Rights-of-Way.*

This section applies; the proposed improvements, except for landscaping, fencing and necessary crossings by access drives and underground utility lines, located within the building envelopes, meet the setback requirements.

Section 13-105: *Residential Building Sizes and Lot Coverages.*

Building envelopes have been delineated on all of the lots. All improvements except for driveways and ISDS shall be located within the building envelopes.

Section 13-106: *Energy and Resource Conservation.*

All structures to be constructed within the development will be subject to the standards of this Section at the time of building permit application.

Section 13-107: *Installation of Solid Fuel-Burning Devices*

This section applies and installation of solid fuel-burning devices will be subject to the standards of this Section at the time of building permit application.

Covenants – Article 4 Section 4.17 Solid Fuel Burning Devices. requires compliance with this Section.

Section 13-108: *Open Space and Recreation Areas*

Not applicable. Open space dedication is not required for minor impact projects.

Section 13-109: *Signs.*

There are no signs proposed as part of the submitted application.

Section 13-110: *Off-Road Parking and Loading.*

A minimum of two parking spaces is required for each single-family residence.

Section 13-111: *Landscaping and Buffering.*

Landscaping is not required for minor impact projects; however, the applicant has incorporated language in the covenants to provide buffering of the development from the County Road. Existing trees are required to remain, unless dead or diseased.

Covenants – Article 4 Section 4.5 Landscaping Requirement. In order to reduce the visual impact of the development, the density of existing trees and shrubs shall be maintained between the property and the County road. Except as necessary for building purposes, existing trees shall not be removed from the property unless they are diseased and likely to die, or are dead.

Additionally, landscaping has been incorporated into the rockfall mitigation berms, shown on the Revised Site Plan – *Rockfall and Debris Flow Mitigation Persons Subdivision* - prepared by Buckhorn Geotech, dated July 15, 2010.

Section 13-112: *Snow storage.*

Design elements have been included within the site layout Revised Site Plan – *Rockfall and Debris Flow Mitigation Persons Subdivision* - prepared by Buckhorn Geotech, dated July 15, 2010.

Covenants – Article 4 Section 4.25. Snow Removal. requires compliance with this Section.

Section 13-113: *Fencing*

Applicable. Any new fencing shall comply with this Section.

Section 13-114: *Exterior Lighting.*

Applicable, any new structures that are proposed will be required to comply with this section.

Covenants – Article 4 4.11 Exterior Lighting. requires compliance with this Section.

Section 13-115: *Reclamation and Noxious Weed Control.*

A reclamation permit is required for road cutting and/or construction, homesite clearing and berm construction.

Covenants – Article 4 Section 4.24. Reclamation and Noxious Weed Control. requires compliance with this Section.

Section 13-116: *Grading and Erosion Control.*

Grading activities are required to secure a Reclamation Permit from the Public Works Department, pursuant to Section 13-115: *Reclamation and Noxious Weed Control.*

Section 13-117: *Drainage, Construction and Post-Construction Stormwater Runoff.*

A drainage analysis and plan for the subdivision was prepared by Thomas Griepentrog, P.E., Buckhorn Geotech, letter of February 16, 2010 and a revised Site Plan, titled *Rockfall and Debris Flow Mitigation Persons Subdivision* - prepared by Buckhorn Geotech, dated July 15, 2010.

Section 13-118: *Water Impoundments.*

Not applicable, this project does not propose a water impoundment.

Section 13-119: *Standards to Ensure Compatible Uses.*

Specific design standards and limitations on the uses on each lot are identified in the protective covenants, *Covenants Declaration of Protective Covenants of Persons Minor Subdivision*, dated September 8, 2011, prepared by Dick Bratton.

Section 15-103: Right-to-Ranch Policy.

This Section is applicable to all land use change permits. The applicant shall be provided a copy the *Right to Ranch Policy* and the *Code of the West*.

FINDINGS:

The Commission finds that:

1. The Planning Commission has classified the application as a Minor Impact Project, based upon the impact classification found in *Section 6-102: Projects Classified as Minor Impact Projects A. 2-4 Units*.
2. Concerns regarding the installation of additional proposed septic systems, in relationship to the cumulative impacts to ground and surface waters, within this geographic area, have been raised. The Commission finds that while there is a valid concern regarding the increase of septic systems within the Spring Creek drainage, there is insufficient evidence regarding negative impacts to water quality to determine the impacts in the review of this application.
3. The Colorado Geological Survey has reviewed the geologic hazards on the property and the proposed mitigation, as designed by the applicant's consultant, Buckhorn Geotech, and has affirmatively stated that the mitigation satisfactorily addresses the hazards present on the property.)
4. The applicant has provided for site specific mitigation of the geologic hazards present on the property, in compliance with *Section 11-104: Development in Areas Subject to Geologic Hazards*. Specific performance of the mitigation measures and responsibilities of the future lot owners for inspection and maintenance of the geologic hazard mitigation structures and drainages is identified within the *Declaration of Protective Covenants of Persons Minor Subdivision* covenants and as a condition of this recommendation.
5. The land use change complies with all applicable requirements of the *Gunnison County Land Use Resolution* and *Section 6-10: Standards of Approval for Minor Impact Projects*.
6. This review and decision incorporates, but is not limited to, all the documentation submitted to the County and included within the Planning Office file relative to this application; including all exhibits, references and documents as included therein.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Gunnison County Planning Commission, having considered the submitted plans, exhibits, site specific mitigation, site observations and public testimony, has reached the above Findings and recommends to the Board of County Commissioners that LUC No. 2008-60 Persons Subdivision, be approved with the following conditions:

1. This permit is limited to activities described within the "Project Summary" of this application, and as depicted on the Site Plan submitted as part of this application. Expansion or change of this use will require either an application for amendment of this permit, or submittal of an application for a new permit, in compliance with applicable requirements of the *Gunnison County Land Use Resolution*.
2. A mylar subdivision plat, in compliance with Section 6-105, *Gunnison County Land Use Resolution*, shall be provided to the Community Development Department, for signature by the Board of County Commissioners. Approval shall not be effective until the plat is signed by the Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners and is recorded with the office of the Gunnison County Clerk and Recorder.

3. The approval shall be memorialized by Board Resolution/Certificate of Minor Impact. Approval shall not be effective until the Resolution is recorded with the Gunnison County Clerk and Recorder.
4. No building or septic permits shall be issued on the individual lots, until such time that the rockfall mitigation berm has been constructed and certification of the construction of the berm, by a licensed professional engineer, in compliance with the design identified on plans prepared by Buckhorn Geotech, *Persons Subdivision, Rockfall and Debris Flow Mitigation* dated July 15, 2010 is provided to the Community Development Department.
5. An inspection shall be made each year for five years (commencing from the date of the completion of the earth berms) by a licensed professional engineer, who shall inspect the earthen berms, drainage ditches and seepage beds on each lot and submit a report to the Community Development Department on or before October 15th of each year. The written report thereof shall utilize the following guidelines: The report shall contain a description of any changes to the berms, drainage ditches and seepage beds during the prior 12 months and shall contain photographs of the entirety of each of the berms and drainage ditches. The reports shall include photo documentation, which shall include an assessment of the stability/functionality of the berms, catchments and drainage ditches, and recommendations by such professional for any work needed to restore or maintain mitigation effectiveness. If maintenance or repairs are recommended by the professional, the recommended work, if it has not already been completed, shall be completed no later than 60 days after such report is given to the County. If after five years of such inspections and reports discloses that the berms, catchments and drainages have remained in a stable, effective condition, the annual inspections by each landowner shall be scaled back to biennial inspections, reports and photo documentation.
6. If at any time a lot owner discovers, or the inspection noted in Condition No. 5 reveals, that debris has accumulated to a depth of six inches or more on the west side of a berm or in any drainage ditch, such material shall be removed no later than 60 days after such determination and its removal reported to the County and documented by photographs in the annual report. In addition, if at any time during the year a debris flow event occurs that causes deposition of one foot or more of debris in front of a berm or in any drainage ditch, or if a rockfall event should occur which results in a rock of one cubic foot or larger impacting a berm, a licensed professional engineer shall be contacted to inspect the integrity of the affected structure and recommend repairs or modifications as deemed appropriate. In such event, as a minimum, the debris and rock material shall be removed to restore the full capacity of the berm or drainage ditch no later than 60 days after such determination. In addition, the engineer shall prepare a written report describing what has occurred, along with his recommendations and a description of the work completed, which report shall be delivered to the County with the annual report.
7. Prior to scheduling the application before the Board of County Commissioners, the applicant shall provide evidence of the purchase of augmentation water from the Upper Gunnison River Water Conservancy District (UGRWCD), for two additional base units of augmentation water, to the Community Development Department.
8. The applicant shall provide three copies of the recorded subdivision plat, fourteen (14) by seventeen (17) inches in size, to the Building Official, for inclusion into the rural addressing system.
9. The following shall be completed upon recordation of the Plat:
 - 1) The applicant shall provide two copies of the final plat designating County addresses for each lot, to the appropriate office of Qwest.
 - 2) The applicant shall provide one copy of the final plat, designating County addresses for each lot, to the U.S. Postal Service.

10. This permit may be revoked or suspended if Gunnison County determines that any material fact set forth herein or represented by the applicant was false or misleading, or that the applicant failed to disclose facts necessary to make any such fact not misleading.
11. The removal or material alteration of any physical feature of the property (geological, topographical or vegetative) relied on herein to mitigate a possible conflict shall require a new or amended land use change permit.
12. Approval of this use is based upon the facts presented and implies no approval of similar use in the same or different location and/or with different impacts on the environment and community. Any such future application shall be reviewed and evaluated, subject to its compliance with current regulations, and its impact to the County.

END OF DAY DISCUSSION:

The Commission will not meet December 16, 2011. The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting will be conducted, January 6, 2012.

Reed adjourned the meeting at 12:05 P.M.

/S/ Beth Baker
Community Development Department Services Manager
Gunnison County Community Development Department