

**STATE OF COLORADO  
COUNTY OF ROUTT**

**OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
March 27, 2006**

County Commissioner Douglas B. Monger called the joint Routt County Board of County Commissioners'/Steamboat Springs City Council meeting to order. County Commissioner Nancy J. Stahoviak; City Council members Ken Brenner, Kevin Kaminski, Loui Antonicci, Steve Ivancie, Paul Strong, and Towny Anderson; Diane Mitsch Bush, Routt County Planning Commission; Tom Leeson and Brian Berndt, City Planning; Caryn Fox, County Planning; County Manager Tom Sullivan; Wendy DuBord, Jim Weber, Julie Franklin, Winnie DelliQuadri, City of Steamboat Springs; Don Taylor, City Finance; George Krawzoff and Jonathan Flint, Steamboat Springs Transit; Mary Brown and Marj Wilcox, citizens; Jean Ray, Routt County Conservation District consultant; Michael Zopf, Environmental Health; and Dana Strongin, Steamboat Today, were present. Commissioner Daniel R. Ellison arrived after the meeting had begun. Diana Bolton recorded the meeting and prepared the minutes.

**EN RE: INTRODUCTIONS**

Those present introduced themselves and stated their affiliations.

**EN RE: URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY / CARYN FOX**

Commissioner Monger stated that the agenda item was to consider the adoption of a resolution to change the criteria for adding properties to the Urban Growth Boundary.

Ms. Fox stated that the County Planning Commission was the County's adopting body for master plans, sub-area plans, and amendments to those plans. Changes to the Urban Growth Boundary criteria had been scheduled for consideration at the Planning Commission's March 16, 2006 meeting. The agenda item had been tabled until the Planning Commission's April 6, 2006 meeting to allow the Planning Commissioners time to review the proposed changes. Ms. Fox suggested that the adoption of the resolution to amend the Urban Growth Boundary criteria be tabled this day until the joint City/County West of Steamboat Springs Area Plan adoption hearing slated for April 18, 2006.

**MOTION—AMENDMENT TO THE URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY RESOLUTION**

Commissioner Stahoviak moved to table consideration to adopt a resolution changing the criteria for adding properties to the Urban Growth Boundary until the April 18, 2006 joint meeting of the County Commissioners, the Steamboat Springs City Council, and the County and the City Planning Commissions.

City Councilman Ken Brenner seconded.

Under discussion, it was determined by consensus of both governing entities that the motion would be a joint City/County motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

**EN RE: STEAMBOAT SPRINGS AREA COMMUNITY PLAN ACTION ITEM  
UPDATE: YAMPA RIVER BASIN 208 WATER QUALITY PLAN / MICHAEL ZOPF AND  
JEAN RAY**

Mr. Zopf said that in 1972 Congress passed the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, commonly known as the Clean Water Act. Section 208 of the Act requires that water quality plans, commonly called 208 Plans, be developed. Routt and Moffat Counties, the Cities of Steamboat Springs and Craig, and the State partnered to fund a study to revise the 208 Plan that Routt County had adopted several years prior. He said that Ms. Ray was the consulting engineer who had authored and directed the study project. The 208 Plan, adopted by Routt and Moffat Counties, the Cities of Steamboat Springs and Craig, and the Towns of Yampa and Oak Creek a few years ago, established provisions for assessing surface water quality and facility needs. Within Routt County, actions that have been taken to protect water quality included the enactment of local regulations such as control of erosion and sediment at construction sites; the publishing of a document pertaining to best management practices, for erosion control, and the adoption of hazardous waste programs by the County. The assessments of the streams and lakes in our region indicate that they are of high quality: 97% of the surface water in the Yampa Basin provides for all of the designated uses of water bodies, including drinking water, agriculture, recreation, and aquatic life. One area of concern was nutrient-loading into the Yampa River due to increased development. That concern was addressed in the plan but warrants additional monitoring and assessment.

Ms. Ray discussed the Upper Yampa River Basin Implementation Plan. Eighteen months ago, the Routt County Conservation District received a \$10,000 grant from the Colorado Watershed Protection Fund to study Routt County's portion of the upper Yampa River basin in terms of augmenting the 208 Plan, which reviewed the entire basin and associated issues. The major issue was nutrients, often associated with large construction activities. Policies and long-term recommendations were developed, but the Conservation District wanted to partner with government and other agencies to investigate two of the larger projects not addressed due to time and funding: nutrient-loading in some water bodies and routine monitoring of the Yampa River Basin that would include the development of a central data base. Four projects in the Implementation Plan that address water quality issues were identified as the evaluation and upgrading of the headgates of the Yampa River Basin; development of a brochure for large landowners regarding agricultural practices that would be similar to the erosion control brochure; conducting annual conservation tours related to such concerns as stream stabilization, best agricultural management practices, and headgate repair; and working with various agencies and conservation groups to ensure that the aspects of the 208 Plan were monitored and encouraged high involvement. Copies of the 208 Plan and the Conservation District's study were available from the County's Environmental Health Office.

Commissioner Stahoviak said that an Action Item in the Steamboat Springs Area Community Plan (SSACP) identified as a priority was the establishment of water quality baselines for several of the streams in Routt County. She asked whether that baseline existed. Mr. Zopf said that a lot of data had been collected, but it was not well organized and needed to be compiled into a usable format. Ms. Ray said that no systematic approach to compiling data had been used; a strict quality control collection protocol had not been followed in the past; and funding for the monitoring of some sites had been eliminated. Other districts had formed coalitions to compile data and establish an on-going monitoring program, which was a recommendation in the Conservation District's 208 Plan in order to establish a unified data base.

Mr. Zopf said that the trend of water quality was of prime interest, but funding for routine, on-going monitoring needed to be provided. He noted that the City had a water quality monitoring program that included the study of aquatic life habitat value. The program was the first significant monitoring program occurring in the Steamboat Springs area and included the Yampa River and some of its tributaries. Conducted by Hydro-environmental Solutions, the study could provide a current baseline, but it only represented one time period. He thought that grants would not fund such a program because the monitoring would have to be on-going. Ms. Ray added that monthly sample collection was ideal; at minimum, samples should be taken quarterly. Mr. Weber stated that the study was a multi-year project funded by the City's Parks and Recreation Department that looked at habitat but focused on maintenance and sustainability of the current quality of water in the Yampa River.

Mr. Zopf said that the State Health Department monitored water quality every three-to-four years. One station was in Steamboat Springs, the next was at the Milner Bridge. To establish a successful monitoring program required a consistent, dependable funding source. Eagle County had created a coalition that included representatives of recreational interests and wastewater treatment operators. The program cost \$250,000 annually. To institute such a program in Routt County would cost a minimum of \$100,000 per year. Ms. Ray added that a consolidated group of cities, counties, towns, ski areas, and environmental groups were also part of Grand and Eagle County's programs.

Commissioner Stahoviak said that the SSACP Action Item necessitated a report as to the resources and staff time that would be required to develop a monitoring program. She asked whether staff should be directed to develop a scope of information report so that the City and the County could decide how to move forward with the Plan's Action Item. Mr. Brenner agreed and thought that a coalition was a good idea. Mr. Strong asked whether the multi-year study being conducted at present would serve that purpose. Mr. Weber said that the study was two-pronged: the health of the Yampa River was being evaluated, and the federally-mandated on-going stormwater program was being complied with. The five-year program was currently in its third year and was slated this year for revision. Ms. Ray noted that the study was not regional in scope. Commissioner Stahoviak said that the Steamboat Springs Area Community Plan included the Yampa River, Soda Creek, Walton Creek, Burgess Creek, Butcher Knife Creek, Fish Creek, and Spring Creek as the water bodies that were important in terms of water quality maintenance. Mr. Weber said that Steamboat Springs had grown in population and was at the highest rating, a Phase II Community, so no

grants were available to fund an on-going program. He said that a tax or fee assessment could be levied. He added that he did not know the County threshold in connection to the 208 Plan, but if urban density increased in the County, new compliance regulations might apply.

Mr. Anderson asked what the ultimate objective of the discussion was. Mr. Brenner said that the goal was to work with the State on compliance with water quality issues. Mr. Zopf said that the issue was whether to protect the Basin at existing water quality levels, whether improved quality was the goal, or whether a degree of decline would be acceptable. He said that every new development, spring run-off, and paving a new road, all affected stream quality. To date, no significant impact was apparent, but long-term effects were unknown. The target at the State and federal level was to avoid violation of the Clean Water Act. Monitoring would also define the community's goal. Mr. Anderson asked whether monitoring was necessary to achieve a higher standard. Mr. Kaminski suggested that the thrust of Mr. Anderson's question was whether funds could be spent in prevention strategies rather than on studies. Mr. Anderson said that an annual monitoring report could be submitted and shelved.

Ms. DuBord asked whether the Basin currently had any violations. Mr. Zopf said that little information existed, but to his knowledge, there were no current non-compliance issues, but concerns included nutrient violations in the Stagecoach area, algae in the Yampa River, and water temperature. Ms. Ray added that the State maintained a list of impaired streams, and several exist in the Yampa Basin due to previous mining activities and natural sources. Mr. Sullivan said that more information was needed to understand what was entailed in compiling the necessary data and maintaining an on-going analysis. Mr. Brenner said that Steamboat Springs and Routt County were the core, but Hayden, Craig, and other entities should evaluate the scope of monitoring and potential funding sources to conduct a monitoring program. Commissioner Monger felt that since population density affected water quality, the scope of monitoring should concentrate on the Steamboat Springs area and not the County. Mr. Anderson asked whether agricultural land uses in the County had an impact on water quality. Mr. Zopf said that nutrients, irrigation practices, grazing, or land disturbance could impact the Yampa River. Commissioner Stahoviak suggested that the exploration begin with the Steamboat Springs area since that was the area designated in the Community Plan. Expansion of that scope could be discussed at a later time.

Mr. Zopf was directed to work with the County Manager, Jean Ray and others to provide the two governing bodies with more information on developing a water quality monitoring system.

**EN RE: RE-EVALUATION OF THE STEAMBOAT SPRINGS AREA  
COMMUNITY PLAN PRIORITY ITEMS / CARYN FOX**

Ms. Fox said that meetings were held in March, April, and October of 2005 to prioritize the Action Items that were identified in the Steamboat Springs Area Community Plan (SSACP). Lists from those priorities were categorized by chapter as priorities to accomplish in one, two, or three years, and those that were within the purview of the City, the County, or

both governing bodies. The highest priorities agreed upon by both bodies were the development of a Health and Human Services Plan, the establishment of a water quality baseline, the protection of existing mobile home parks, an evaluation of the financing strategies for capital facilities, and the amendments to the IGA that dealt with the roles of the City and the County within the SSACP boundaries. Ms. Fox reviewed her March 20, 2006 memorandum that provided an update on each of those priority items as well as a report on the Action Items that were in the process of being completed or had been completed. In regard to the development of a Health and Human Services Plan, she said that Planning staff would work this month on converting the information from the current matrix into a narrative plan. The update on the establishment of a water quality baseline had just been provided. Ms. Fox said that the Yampa Valley Housing Authority would address the protection of existing mobile home parks through possible acquisition of existing parks or development of new parks. Strategies that had previously been proposed were to rezone mobile home parks to Mobile Home or PUD and a right of first refusal requirement, both of which were City decisions. Funding sources and additional strategies might be forthcoming. Pertaining to financing strategies, Paul Hughes and Tom Sullivan had met and determined that there was little revenue to be shared, and statutory restraints made revenue sharing unfeasible. Special districts within the West of Steamboat area were still being discussed. Finally, a first draft of the IGA had been presented to the Area Plan Coordinating Committee, which was reviewing the document and would provide input.

In relation to the 'joint funding of a portion of the road entering the West of Steamboat area' Item #4, Commissioner Stahoviak noted that there was little potential for joint funding of the New Victory Highway, but the County was willing to continue discussing ways in which to assist the construction of the road to encourage development in the area.

Ms. Fox noted that the prioritized list of Action Items, dated March 10, 2005, was attached to her handout packet. She asked whether the entire list of Action Items should be re-evaluated or whether the Board and the Council wished to continue working from the existing priority list. Commissioner Stahoviak suggested that the on-going or completed items should be removed from the list, then the original Action Item list could be checked to ensure that no new items needed to be added to the list. She noted that some of the items on the list had been discussed by the Board and deemed to have been adequately addressed unless landowners participated. For example, Chapter 7, NS-3.1 a/b, 'Prepare inventory and develop wetlands protection standards.'

Commissioner Stahoviak asked what 'Prepare Wildlife Habitat Overlay District' meant. Ms. Fox said that wildlife guidelines were in the Master Plan. This priority item would be the next step, which would be both City and County generated and involve the establishment of wildlife habitat areas that would entail regulations and included working with the Division of Wildlife.

Commissioner Stahoviak stated that the Yampa Valley Housing Authority was considering all of the action items listed in Chapter 9, Housing Strategies, except H-1.2 b, c, and d.

Mr. Strong agreed that the in-progress and completed items should be removed from the list. As to the remaining #1 priority items, the steps to accomplish the action, a timeline, and potential funding sources should be provided to determine how reasonable it would be to accomplish the Action Item list. Also, the list should be sorted by #1, #2, and #3 priority to provide a sense of direction. Mr. Brenner suggested that the items should be categorized into City issues, County issues, and issues that required joint City/County discussion. Mr. Strong said that the entire list should be looked at since some issues, although under the purview of either the City or the County, were also inter-related with other items on the list. Commissioner Stahoviak thought that the entire list of action items should be reviewed since some of the City Council members had not been on the Council when the first priority lists were devised. Mr. Anderson said that prioritization should be based on what was doable, and any revision to the list should be consistent with the recommendations provided at the most recent City Council retreat and in the Growth Management Advisory Group's Report. He said that the City and the County should compile new priority lists and the lists should be compared at the June joint City/County meeting. He asked that the list be comprehensive and color-coded to indicate the completed and on-going items and the City and the County-driven items so that the items to be removed would be evident.

Mr. Anderson asked why the Board of County Commissioners, as one of the adopting bodies of the Plan, had decided not to consider items such as wetlands protection and setbacks. Commissioner Stahoviak said that every item had been considered, and those that made sense would be acted upon. It did not make sense to increase the waterbody setback from its current 50-foot minimum. She had no problem with an inventory and mapping of wetlands being done as long as the activity was landowner-driven and landowners willingly participated. Commissioner Monger said that the Board had determined that the setback issue would not create a better scenario if it were increased. Ms. Fox said that that action item was directed more toward properties within the City limits where the setback was 25 feet. Mr. Leeson said that the issue had been discussed at great length by the Natural, Scenic, and Environmentally Sensitive Work Group. The intent was that the County would consider the issue after additional information had been provided, which had not yet occurred.

Ms. Fox will meet with Mr. Leeson to develop a list by priority, to remove the on-going and completed items, and to develop a list of steps and funding possibilities for the #1 priorities. The list would be presented at the June joint City/County meeting.

#### **EN RE: REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION / GEORGE KRAWZOFF**

Mr. Krawzoff discussed the regional transportation system. He said that two new buses that will provide transportation to Craig had been purchased through the 5309 Bus Discretionary Program of the Federal Transit Administration grant fund. He noted that the buses, which could be in service for perhaps twenty years, had excellent heating systems and comfortable seating. Mr. Krawzoff reviewed the Colorado Transit Coalition's (CTC) earmarks for funds since the group's inception in 1998, explained a graph that indicated the distribution of those funds, and noted that Steamboat Springs Transit had received \$4,899,445, the seventh highest total allocation in Colorado, between 1999 and 2006. He

said that competition for the funds was increasing so it was unlikely that high allocations would continue to be awarded to Steamboat Springs. Another funding source for capital projects was Energy and Mineral Impact Assistance grants.

Mr. Krawzoff reviewed a graph that showed regional bus counts by early, late, and third bus. He noted that ridership continued to increase; fares had been increased for the first time in ten years from \$3.50 to \$5.00 one way, but punch passes could be purchased that reduced that increase; and ridership was highest on the early bus, which operated every day all year and was full to capacity, and lowest on the third bus, which operated only during the winter. The third bus schedule was being evaluated to determine the time it would be the most useful. A recent change in ridership occurred when the oil and gas industry began employing former riders to Steamboat as well as several bus drivers. In regard to funding, the first bus costs were absorbed by the City of Steamboat Springs. When a second bus was put into service, Craig and Hayden were asked to contribute. Neither entity had paid its full share in 2005; both claimed that they did not have the funds and had other priorities. The County also contributed to the cost of providing regional transportation.

In regard to City transportation, the 2005-2006 winter ridership was down substantially, although winter continued to be the strongest ridership season. Mr. Krawzoff attributed that decline primarily to the lack of bus drivers, which has necessitated changing the 20-minute schedule to 30 minutes, which had in turn affected local riders as well as tourists. He noted that special event ridership was high, and summer ridership was increasing. In relation to cost, Mr. Krawzoff said that the per-hour cost of a new route within the City was \$56, excluding the cost of facilities and the purchase of new vehicles. Funding options for new routes included increasing the County sales tax, which required voter approval; imposing a Rural Transportation Authority Sales Tax; allocating additional funds from the City's general fund; imposing an entertainment/lift ticket tax, to which Ski Corp. was averse; charging fares; imposing a lodging tax, which would conflict with existing lodging taxes; soliciting a voluntary contribution from lodges; selling advertising for the sides of buses, which had a major aesthetic impact; or selling voice enunciator announcements that called out particular commercial establishments at certain stops. To recruit and retain drivers, higher wages, tips, ski passes, and reserved affordable housing had been considered. The latter two possibilities posed perceived equity and cost issues.

Ms. Fox commented that she was glad that the bus stopped at Steamboat II. She asked whether the Colorado Department of Transportation had ever been approached about constructing a park-and-ride facility at Highway 40 and County Road 42. Mr. Krawzoff said that he had not made such an inquiry but he would talk with CDOT. The current remote park-and-ride location being considered was in Craig since ridership had declined due to lack of such a facility. A second possible park-and-ride location was at The Haven in Hayden.

Commissioner Stahoviak noted that one proposed new route was to Steamboat II and Heritage Park. She asked whether that route would operate throughout the day. Mr. Krawzoff responded that it would. He said that when routes were offered only at peak hours, people were concerned about being able to return when they chose.

Commissioner Stahoviak stated that she hoped that transportation issues would be a topic of on-going discussion between the City and the County. She noted that at Mr. Krawzoff's January presentation to the City Council, the funding option of choice had been the lift ticket tax. If the ski area were not amenable to such a tax, she asked what the next option would be. Mr. Brenner said that the funding option of choice at the January City Council meeting was split between the lodging tax and the lift ticket tax. Commissioner Stahoviak asked whether the County Sales Tax could be increased without forming a Rural Transportation Authority. Mr. Krawzoff said that State law allowed exceeding the 8% maximum sales tax limit by 1% if that 1% were applied to transit purposes. --- stated that Yampa and Oak Creek would never support such a tax without receiving service. Commissioner Stahoviak said that in the past contracts with Alpine Taxi had subsidized service to South Routt. Comments had been that the hours of operation were erratic or inconvenient. She hoped that further discussion would occur because, in her opinion, outlying area citizens would benefit, particularly if a transportation system within the City could be created to meet their needs. Mr. Krawzoff agreed. He noted that non-bus-riding City residents benefited by finding parking spaces in town that were available due to others who rode the bus. Also, traffic through Hayden had been increasing substantially every year. The regional bus to Craig, which seated 55 riders, took much of that traffic off the road.

Mr. Ivancie asked whether Trailways and Greyhound would ever return to the area. Commissioner Stahoviak answered that service had been discontinued to Oak Creek, Craig, and then Steamboat because it was not cost effective to come to this area.

Mr. Krawzoff said that he was exploring train possibilities. He was on a Statewide Transit Association task force that was evaluating how Senate Bill 1 transportation funds were spent throughout Colorado. He said that a Statewide vision for transit should be established that would address city-to-city issues. Ms. DelliQuadri said that a federal grant application to investigate rail possibilities had been denied due to the lack of support from Union Pacific Railroad.

Commissioner Stahoviak said that further discussion on the transit topic was warranted. In-depth potential funding options and a regular route to the Heritage Park/Steamboat II area were issues that the County would be interested in participating in. Mr. Brenner suggested that the Commissioners talk further about this issue and stated that the City would remain interested in partnering in any new endeavors.

On a personal note, Commissioner Stahoviak stated that she deeply appreciated the para-transit program, its drivers, and its schedulers. She added that she would be unable to continue to serve the community without the program's services.

Mr. Kaminski asked how many ski area communities offered free transportation. Mr. Krawzoff said that every ski area community in Colorado provided free bus service. Mr. Anderson asked how other communities funded their transit systems. Mr. Krawzoff said that funding varied but often included a higher dedicated sales tax than Steamboat Springs. Mr. Anderson asked whether other ski communities had condominium and lodge transportation. Mr. Krawzoff thought that they did. He added that consolidation of lodge vans had often been

discussed, but the current system should be regarded as a fully-funded, private, efficient transit system rather than a detriment to the Steamboat Springs Transit system.

**EN RE: FUTURE JOINT MEETINGS AND AGENDA ITEMS**

The City will host the April 18, 2006 joint City/County meeting that will begin at 5:00 p.m. Agenda items will include the adoption of a resolution amending the Urban Growth Boundary amendment criteria and the West of Steamboat Springs Area Plan adoption. The June joint meeting will be hosted by the County. Agenda items will include further discussion of the Steamboat Springs Area Community Plan Action Items Priority List, potential joint funding of some of the infrastructure in the West of Steamboat Springs area, and a report from staff regarding the establishment and monitoring of a water quality baseline data base.

Commissioner Stahoviak asked that City Council members and the County Commissioners attend a joint Yampa Valley Housing Authority meeting on May 9, 2006, at which a draft of the Authority's regional housing plan would be discussed.

No further business coming before the governing bodies, same adjourned sine die.

---

Kay Weinland, Clerk and Recorder

---

Douglas B. Monger, Chairman

---

Date