

Working Group (WG) Mtg. #25 Summary

August 16, 2010

DRO Recreation Center 4-6:30pm

NEXT MEETING DATE AND AGENDA

September 13 at 4 pm to 6:30 pm @ LPC FAIRGROUNDS AT PINE ROOM

Agenda:

- Review strategy prioritization results and overview community meetings
- Review LPC *Opportunities and Constraints Mapping/Suitability Analysis/Fiscal Impact Models*
- Discuss weighting results of attributes for Suitability Analysis

FUTURE WG MEETING DATES: ALL MEETINGS AT 4:00 PM

September 20 – FLUP and Build-out Scenario: Durango Rec Center, Eolus Room

September 27- FLUP and Build-out Scenario: Durango Library

October 4 – FLUP Build out scenario and fiscal impact analysis:

August 16 MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting Participants:

WG Attendance: Greg Spitler, Tracie Hughes, Roy Horvath, Dick White, Sally Bellerue, Dick Norton, Barbara Jefferies, Brian Kimmel, Wade Moore, Elizabeth Jackson, Jim O'Donnell, Peter Treguillus, Jennifer Lopez

Staff/Consulting: Robby Overfield, Tracie Hughes, Charlie Deans, Leslie Klusmire, Jim O'Donnell

Discussion:

Meeting began with introductions of some new folks to the consulting team as well as the working group. From there the discussion began on a recap of the keypad polling exercise August 5th. Barbara asked if we are taking in account of the survey results from the community meetings. Charlie answered yes, they will be tallied up after our last two night meetings Tuesday in Florida Mesa and Fort Lewis Mesa. August 31st will be the closing date for voting on prioritization of strategies. Dick White said in order to do this in a compact way, the process had to be set up the way it was. The group said there were some very good ideas that came out of the meeting. Recap of the community meetings were still a little more hostility based, but there was much more understanding of the process from the people that attended than before. Briefly mentioned the education forum for August 30th on Land Use Infrastructure and Fiscal Impact Analysis located @ the Durango Rec. Center @ 6:00pm. Some clarification that education forum is on how a fiscal impact analysis is generated, not the actual analysis undergoing for La Plata County.

Charlie took a minute to talk about expectations. The goal is February to get Comp. Plan, FLUP to BOCC. The next logical step after designations, FLUP, etc... Barbara wanted to know about the growth areas, and property rights. Charlie mentioned there will be designated areas that will have implications as to preferred areas of growth, but there won't be any less rights than what they have today. Existing rights will be honored and there will be no net loss of property rights. Peter Treguillus brought up that the City of Durango has an issue in the process and their involvement, as implied by their planners. Charlie mentioned that he had met with the City staff four times to date, but that we are in the process of formalizing an intergovernmental working group. Charlie believes that this perception will improve over time. Charlie and Robby gave a breakdown of GIS and the mapping as a tool, a way of informing the community and its effectiveness. 16-18 maps have been prepared during the process. Charlie began mentioning some of the methods behind the formulation of the first draft of opportunities and constraints. Brian Kimmel mentioned that many people don't know that you can go closer than 450' from the well head. It tends to be a policy issue. Wells quickly became an issue in terms of takings and what the actual regulatory policy is for this. Working Group wants to know some of these details. Group asked that Anthony come to a working group meeting so they can better understand what they should be looking at. No value is being placed on the map as it exists today. BK mentioned this is the kind of map that shows the variety of impacts on a person's property. These are just attributes, not restrictions. They can all be opportunities, or all constraints, but we are not quite yet making that judgment.

The next item discussed was weighting development suitability. CD handed out a suitability weighting table to each of the WG members and requested them to list their relative importance of the attributes listed on a scale of 0 (low suitability for development) to 10 (high suitability). The tables with were collected to be tabulated. It was requested that the tabulations show the range and the median values.

8/16/10 Working Group Relative Weighting Results

High Suitability for development = 10

Low suitability for development = 0

!0-30 slope	30 and >	irrig land	irrig dit	o&g wells	fire sus	biodiv	fldpln	riprn	wl hab	airpt	landfl	ex wtr	ex swr	prox state	ex plat	
8	10	10	10	7	5	5	8	5	5	8	10	10	10	10	10	
8	4	10	8	5	5	5	5	4	5	8	6	10	10	10	10	
8	2	5	7	5	4	3	3	3	3	8	4	10	10	10	10	
7	2	5	6	5	3	2	3	3	3	8	4	10	10	10	9	
7	1	5	5	5	3	2	2	2	2	7	4	10	10	9	8	
5	0	5	5	5	1	1	0	2	2	5	4	10	10	9	8	
5	0	5	5	5	1	1	0	1	1	5	4	10	10	8	7	
5	0	2	5	3	1	1	0	1	1	4	3	9	10	8	7	
3	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	3	2	9	9	7	5	
3	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	9	7	5	
0		2		2	0		0	0	0	1	0	5	8	5		
5	0.5	5	5	5	1	2	0	2	2	5	4	10	10	9	8	MEDIAN
5	1	4	5	4	2	2	1	2	2	5	3	9	10	8	8	MEAN
5	0	5	5	5	1	1	0	2	2	5	4	10	10	9	8	MODE
5	1	5	5	5	1	2	0	2	2	5	4	10	10	9	8	WEIGHTING VALUE

Attribute	Relative Weighting: High suitability for development= 10 Low suitability for development = 0		
20-30% slopes			
30% and greater slopes			
Irrigated Agric lands			
Irrigation ditches			
Oil and Gas well sites (450' buffer)			
High Wildfire Susceptibility			
High/Outstanding Biodiversity			
100 Yr Floodplain (floodway is 0)			
Riparian areas			
High value Wildlife habitat			
Airports – 65 Ldn noise levels and greater			
Landfills- (500 ft buffer)			
Existing Waterlines			
Existing Sewer lines			
Proximity to State Highway			
Existing vacant platted lots			