

Brown Ranch Annexation Committee (BRAC)  
Wednesday, March 1, 2023  
Meeting Summary

Attendance: Robin Crossan, Joella West, Gary Suiter, Leah Wood, Kathi Meyer, Jason Peasley (BRAC); Jason Lacy (third-party facilitator); Jon Snyder, David Van Winkle, Jonathan Flint, Angela Cosby, Mike Lane, Rebecca Bessey, Dan Foote, Kim Weber, Mark Beckett (City staff); Emily Katzman (YVHA staff) Sheila Henderson, Robin Schepper (YVHA consultants)

**A. PRIOR MEETING RECAP**

1. **Approval of Minutes** – Minutes (the official video recording) from the February 15, 2023 meeting were approved unanimously.

**Meeting Summary and Transcript** – BRAC members continue to be concerned that the third-party meeting transcript mis-identifies speakers. Going forward, the meeting transcript will be sent to City Council only, and will not be distributed as part of the BRAC packet.

2. **Community Outreach Plan** – Mike Lane presented the updated draft BRAC community outreach plan. Robin Schepper and Sheila Henderson were available for questions and follow-up. The goals of BRAC’s community outreach efforts are:

- To be transparent, open, and easily accessible.
- To share information and gather feedback throughout the process.
- To make materials, collateral, meetings, and public comment seamless and available throughout all portions of the discussion.
- To reach diverse audience across community.

Following direction from BRAC during the January 20, 2023 meeting, staff from the City met with YVHA’s staff and consultants to revise their respective plans into a combined community outreach plan. The scope of the revised plan is estimated to cost \$49,500 and includes:

- Advertising/Marketing (\$10K)
  - Social media, print/radio, collateral
- Translation/Interpretation (\$6.5K)
  - Translation of materials, interpretation of town hall meetings
- Consultant Enhancement (\$33K)
  - Interagency collaboration, community/partner outreach & meetings, YVHA content amplification, presentation prep, BRAC fact sheets

Questions and Discussion

- Q: Kathi Meyer: Since receiving community input is a goal of BRAC community outreach efforts, what methods do you plan to use to receive community input? When both parties receive feedback/comment, can that be shared with BRAC?
- A: Mike Lane: The City intends to publish more social media content and press releases to generate publicity and, in turn, public comment. The City will share any public feedback it receives. Robin Schepper added that in order to solicit public input, BRAC will host monthly

community meetings. Robin hopes to host the first town hall the third week of March and will present on the highlights of what has been discussed so far (water, sewer, streets, transit, etc.). The goal is to bring the community along in the process rather than just having them comment on the final annexation agreement. Additionally, the BRAC community outreach consultants will go to community groups with educational BRAC content and to solicit input. Often, going directly to people is more effective than inviting them to attend a City meeting.

- Q: Kathi Meyer: Please be more specific on what “interagency collaboration” means. Can you clarify if this is an estimate, and you will bill hourly?  
A: Robin Schepper: This accounts for the time that YVHA’s consultants, who are not paid staff, spend collaborating with City staff on communications. For example, planning and hosting monthly townhall meetings. This is an estimate of time through July. As consultants, they will take direction from BRAC, not from YVHA.
- Q: Robin Crossan: what does the \$8K for community/partner outreach cover?  
A: Sheila Henderson: The cost of hours for direct outreach to groups. We have a goal of meeting with 40 different groups, including Human Resource Coalition, Rotary, etc. We will collect input to share with BRAC at those meetings.
- Robin Crossan expressed concern that amount of time and money estimated in the Community Outreach Plan is too much, particularly when the *Steamboat Pilot* covers the details and outcome of each BRAC meeting. In response, Leah Wood commented that not all community members read the *Pilot* and we must reach broader swath of community beyond use of the newspaper. Jason Peasley added it is the responsibility as stewards of community to reach out proactively, so community members are engaged in the conversation.
- Joella West suggested BRAC host a March 2023 townhall to see how many people attend, what questions are asked, etc. to understand whether the proposed Community Outreach Plan is effective or needs to be adjusted.
- Gary Suiter asked about recruitment effort for townhalls. Robin Schepper clarified they will go directly to groups to invite people to townhalls, with special emphasis on reaching under-represented groups. Townhall sessions will be hosted at two different times so they are accessible to people with varying schedules.
- Motion to approve the Community Outreach Plan with a clarification that the plan must not exceed \$49,500: Motion by Leah Wood, Second by Kathi Meyer. Approved unanimously.

**3. City Services/Operations/Maintenance Responsibilities – General Municipal Services (water, wastewater, and stormwater)–** Jason Lacy asked for any feedback or concerns about direction given at 2/15/23 BRAC meeting.

- Joella West indicated City Council did not raise concerns.
- Water Rights Dedication Policy: Leah Wood asked if City Council discussed the current water rights dedication policy, which requires an applicant to dedicate water rights or pay a fee in lieu. YVHA does not have water rights. City Council may choose to waive or reduce the fee. Robin Crossan indicated City Council discussed all options during an executive session at the 2/28/23 City Council meeting and is not yet prepared to make a decision or discuss with BRAC until the Fiscal Impact Study has been completed. Jason Peasley clarified YVHA’s

position: there are ample water rights thanks to the City's effort to secure and firm water rights. Adding a fee in lieu will be a detriment to the goal of providing affordable housing at Brown Ranch. Jason Lacy concluded that this subject will be revisited in detail when BRAC discusses the Fiscal Impact Study.

- Kathi Meyer asked about the 2010 infill study performed by the City and asked if the findings are still valid. She encouraged revisiting the study to determine whether buildout of developable infill lots has been accelerated, slowed, or as anticipated. This impacts the conversation around many city services, including water distribution.
- Kathi Meyer clarified YVHA anticipates building 2,264 housing units at Brown Ranch, not 2,264 EQR. These are not the same thing and is important to understand, as it ties into when the third redundant water supply needs to be online.
- Robin Crossan provided an update regarding the idea to engage a 3<sup>rd</sup> party expert to review the draft annexation agreement: the City is interviewing economics firms who may be able to provide feedback on the Fiscal Impact Study.

#### **4. Draft Annexation Agreement**

Dan Foote, City Attorney, summarized the language added to the draft Annexation Agreement.

- Jason Peasley indicated all updates to the Annexation Agreement are acceptable to YVHA except language in Section G.5. regarding the water rights dedication policy. The group suggested adding a placeholder indicating "Compliance to be determined in a future meeting." Similar placeholder language will be added to Section 8 Vested Property Rights.
- Robin Crossan confirmed City Council had no comments or changes on the draft agreement.
- Motion to approve working draft Annexation Agreement as it currently exists (non-binding): Moved by Leah Wood. Second by Robin Crossan. Approved unanimously.

#### **5. Agenda Schedule**

Jason Lacy asked for confirmation that all parties are still comfortable with the BRAC discussion schedule.

- The revised BRAC agenda schedule is attached at the end of this meeting summary.
- BRAC members committed to check in on schedule and progress at each meeting and were encouraged to be prepared to add a meeting to the schedule or extend existing meetings to accommodate the substantial conversations ahead.

### **B. CURRENT DISCUSSION - City Services/Operations/Maintenance Responsibilities – General Municipal Services (Streets and Transit)**

#### **Streets**

Jon Snyder, City of Steamboat Springs Public Works Director, presented on streets and transit in Steamboat Springs. David Van Winkle, Streets Superintendent, and Jonathan Flint, Transportation Manager, supported the presentation and were available for questions. [Note: this meeting summary is not intended to capture all the details of the streets and transit presentation. Please see the meeting recording at approximately 1:08, as well as the information sheets included in the packet, for additional details.]

Assumptions: The streets at Brown Ranch will be public and maintained by the City, which will provide an equitable level of service across the City of Steamboat Springs. Today's conversation focuses on on-site street infrastructure; impacts to US40 will be discussed in a future meeting.

- City Streets Division services include:
  - Pavement maintenance, including pothole repair, crack filling, seal coating, and overlays
  - Snow plowing
  - Striping: including roadway shoulder, turn lane, and centerline striping, crosswalk marking, curb painting, bike lane marking, and parking lot striping
  - Sign installation and maintenance
  - Sweeping
  - Stormwater and drainage maintenance, including inlet, ditch cleaning, culvert cleaning, and minor capital improvements or replacement efforts
  - Spring scoria pickup
  - Bridge maintenance
  - Guardrail maintenance
  - Noxious weed management within unimproved portions of the public rights-of-way
- Total cost of service = average \$25,092/lane mile annually. Every street is different, and design has significant impact on real cost of maintenance.
- Estimate of 23.5 land miles of road at Brown Ranch.
- Snow plowing;
  - Currently 5 plowing routes that take approximately 10 hours to complete and include 3 different m [1:11]
  - A sixth plow route will be needed prior to the first home at Brown Ranch being occupied. Upfront capital investment = \$846,500
- All in operating costs for streets = \$800,400 annually (13% increase to streets budget).
- Design considerations for onsite snow storage:
  - Importance of integrating snow storage into land use planning and site design. Narrow roads are more difficult to maintain, particularly when plows have to push snow into the sidewalks. Sidewalk maintenance is responsibility of the adjacent property owner. Sidewalks should be sufficiently offset from street.
  - Regarding street section: if a developer aims for the minimum width required in the Community Development Code, it will be challenging for both City and adjacent property owners to maintain.
- Alleys
  - The City maintains alleys in older neighborhoods, including Old Town, Brooklynn, etc.
  - West End Village, which was developed in the early 2000s, is the last subdivision in which City maintains residential alleys.
  - YVHA has proposed the City maintains alleys at Brown Ranch. This would be a departure from current practice. If YVHA wants City to maintain alleys at Brown Ranch, design must account for sufficient on-site snow storage. The alleys should also be built in the same standard of the roads, so the alleys are durable, requiring less maintenance.

- On-street parking
  - On-street parking is a valuable tool to residents and businesses. If land use planning relies on on-street parking, road must be wide enough to accommodate parking and snow storage during winter.
  - City staff expressed a concern that Brown Ranch is under parked from a practical standpoint, even if it is code-compliant.
- Discussion and Guiding Questions:
  - *Who will maintain alleys?*
  - *What is BRAC's opinion on the feasibility of cost-effective winter maintenance and the corresponding amount of onsite snow storage currently proposed?*
  - *Cost of service. Is there enough sales tax revenue to fund streets?*
  - In response to a question from Jason Peaseley, Jon Snyder acknowledged the street sections proposed by YVHA in the Brown Ranch Community Development Plan (included in the agenda packet) and compliant with code. However, the code represents a compromise between the practicality of maintenance and the cost to develop. A minimum code-compliant street section is not ideal for winter maintenance.
    - Jason Peasley suggested YVHA work with City Public Works to workshop street sections during platting process.
    - Jason Lacy questioned to what extent these details need to be memorialized in the Annexation Agreement. Conclusion: details of street sections do not need to be in the Annexation Agreement, with the exception of alleys.
  - If City maintains alleys at Brown Ranch, that decision, along with minimum snow storage requirements, must be memorialize in the Annexation Agreement. Conclusion: YVHA is willing to dedicate snow storage in exchange for City-provided alley maintenance. Gary Suiter recommended adding this language into the next draft of the agreement so City Council can review and discuss.
- Questions:
  - Q: Gary Suiter: Does annual operating cost estimate (\$800,400) include snow removal from alleys?
  - A: Jon Snyder: Yes.
  - Q: Kathi Meyer: at one point there was recognition that further west, the less snowfall. Is Brown Ranch eligible for that recognition?
  - A: Jon Snyder: Yes, but the reduced annual snowfall is accounted for in the Community Development Code for on-site snow storage requirements on private property. There is not material difference in snow accumulation totals to impact snow storage requirements for streets and public rights of way.
  - Q: Kathi Meyer: Has the City considered any creative methods that delay the need to deploy a 6<sup>th</sup> snowplow route?
  - A: Jon: The City cannot serve Brown Ranch without an additional plow route on day one. Existing plow routes are already too long and staff is suffering burnout.
    - Kathi followed up with a statement that the City will benefit because Brown Ranch will contribute to either more frequent plowing or less burnout from staff by adding a 6<sup>th</sup> plow route.

- Robin Crossan clarified: there is no money in the City budget for 6<sup>th</sup> plow route.
  - Q: Robin Crossan: how do raised crosswalks impact efficiency of plowing?  
A: David Van Winkle: raised crosswalks on Yampa are well designed and do not affect plowing. However, speed bumps are challenging for snow maintenance.
  - Jason Peasley: clarified YVHA's district parking strategy at Brown Ranch. This concept is designed to be flexible to accommodate if we need more parking. Jon asked that we provide more parking than what is provided at Alpenglow Village.

## Transit

Jon Snyder and Jonathan Flint, Transit Manager for the City of Steamboat Springs presented on transit in Steamboat Springs.

- Land development concepts presented by YVHA are heavily predicated by delivery of robust transit service.
- Jonathan Flint has proposed two transit service options. Please see agenda packet for route design maps. Routes were designed according to the following assumptions:
  - If we're going west, bus service should go all the way west to Steamboat II, Heritage Park, Silver Spur, and Brown Ranch.
  - Bus trip needs to be competitive with length of car trip to be used.
- Option 1 ("robust") costs at full buildout:
  - Winter operations: \$772,264.50
  - Summer operations: \$714,792
  - Annual operational cost: \$1,487,056.50
  - Equipment needs: 6 new buses = \$4.5M
  - Annual replacement cost: \$393,750
  - 20 stopes (estimated): \$3.3M (paid for by developer)
- Option 2 ("bare bones") is the service the City can provide without adding additional operations and capital expense to the transit budget if those expenses cannot be funded. It involves relocating the current KOA bus stop to the entrance of Brown Ranch. The City staff recognize this option doesn't meet the expectations outlined in the Brown Ranch Community Development Plan. There is an option to add micro-transit (e.g. Yellow Line), which has the benefits of responsiveness and flexibility. Micro transit is also a contract service, meaning there is no capital outlay for vehicles.
- Funding: the cost of transit service outpaces revenue growth. The City cannot afford the existing system and is cutting transit service each year to stay in budget. There is no way to provide robust transit to Brown Ranch unless new revenue is put in place or significant cuts are placed elsewhere.
- Questions and Discussion
  - Q: Jason Lacy: How has community responded to Yellow Line?  
A: Jonathan Flint: Use is as high as ever. With current funding constraints, there is little room to grow the service. The cost per rider is over 5x the cost/passenger of traditional bus service.

- Q: Kathi: Please provide an update on planning behind the Rural Transit Authority (RTA). How will this impact Brown Ranch?  
A: Jonathan Flint: An RTA would create a new transportation entity. It would be a voter-approved system that would contain at least 2 public entities. Craig, Hayden, and Steamboat Springs are collaborating to research needs of community and cost of service. Anticipate a 1-2-year study/decision period before community's choose to bring this to voters. An RTA will focus on broad service (moving people from region to region), rather than moving people within a region, so the City would still be responsible for providing SST service.
- Jason Peasley emphasized that YVHA is prepared to accept all responsibilities outlined in the presentation (construction of bus stops, shelters, sidewalk construction, etc.). However, YVHA needs assurance that City will provide bus service to Brown Ranch. YVHA has heard through community engagement that safe, reliable transit is a top need/priority. For example, the current terminus at KOA is not safe, as residents west of that stop must walk on US40 to reach the bus stop. Option 1 is great goal to work toward. YVHA proposes commitment by City to figure out robust service option to West Steamboat.
- Jonathan Flint suggested a partnership opportunity with Routt County to fund micro-transit service, since some neighborhoods are outside of the City.
- Bus currently runs at 44 passengers/hour; should run at 29 passengers/hour (SST is already strained to meet current transit need).
- Q: Leah Wood: what other funding sources has the City considered to fund transit?  
A: Gary Suiter: property tax, paid parking, paid transit (everything). Robin Crossan added that the solution to the City's general fund shortfall is likely a property tax, rather than full reliance on sales tax.
- Q: Kath Meyer: are there grant funds for ongoing transit services since this is an affordable housing development?  
A: Jonathan Flint: there is grant funding for for capital expense. There is not consistent grant funding for continued operations.
- Pros/cons of paid transit: paid transit is more expensive than providing free transit service, because it takes longer for passengers to load, so would require adding busses to routes. There is also large upfront cost for installing fare collection method. Estimated ridership fall of 40%. Conventional wisdom: charge people in single-occupant vehicles who are impacting roads, rather than people who are using transit.
- Content of annexation agreement:
  - YVHA wants some level of commitment from City there will be transit service for Neighborhood A at minimum, as well as a commitment from City to explore dedicated funding for future transit expansion. Don't want document silent on transit. Want to demonstrate that the need/desire to reach more robust level has been discussed, even though there is no guarantee.
  - Dan Foote: clarified the Annexation Agreement needs to reflect there has been discussion regarding some level of transit service. The level of details and commitment is to be determined, pending City Council's approval.

### **Summary of Decisions**

- City will maintain alleys subject to sufficient snow storage easement provided by YVHA/Brown Ranch.
- Dan Foote will work with City Councilors to determine language to add to Annexation Agreement regarding commitment to level of service, in recognition that funding is not currently available.

### **C. NEXT MEETING**

- Wednesday, March 15, 2023 at 9am
- Agenda:
  - Follow up on streets and transit with draft language added to the Annexation Agreement.
  - Fiscal Impact Study – presentation led by YVHA. Goal: help everyone understand how we’re thinking about fiscal impact model (revenue assumptions, denominators, etc.). Focus on general fund (operations).

### **D. PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

Meeting summary prepared by Emily Katzman, YVHA Development Project Manager  
March 1, 2023