

**Working Group (WG) Meeting #2 Summary**  
**Monday August 3, 2009**  
**Durango Library**  
**4-6 p.m.**

**NEXT MEETING**

---

**August 17, 2009**

**4-6 p.m.**

**Eolus Room, Durango Recreation Center**

**AGENDA:**

1. Review Draft Guiding Principles (15 min)
2. Review revised Working Group agenda/schedule (5 min)
3. Economic Vitality Issues/Opportunities/Vision/Goals (90 min)
4. Open discussion/questions (10 min)

**MEETING SUMMARY**

---

**Meeting Participants**

**Staff/Consultants:** Jason, Charlie, Gabe, Tracie, Julia, Robbie

**Working Group (WG):** Jennifer Lopez, Barbara Jefferies, Travis Craig, Roy Horvath, Sally Bellerue, Jack Llewellyn, Wade Moore, Brian Kimmel, Jeanine Justice, Bruce Whitehead, Peter Tregillus, Sue Herbst, Jack McGroder, Dick White

**Community Profile Overview**

Charlie and Gabe provided an overview presentation of the Community Profile on the county's demographics, economic background, and a few of the maps that have been prepared related to land ownership and development constraints on the private lands. Discussion involved receiving WG's comments and revisions on the Community Profile, accessibility to the report and maps, and the purpose of the Community Profile. It was suggested that we should determine the demographics of the Hispanic population in the County (basically disaggregating them from the Caucasian census information,) and to combine the population forecast tables with the historical growth tables to get the whole picture. The WG members requested that the draft Profile be available to them as a Word document for their revisions. Some members suggested creating a map that showed a 200' setback from oil and gas wellheads as another constraint to future development on the private land ownership. It was also suggested to put the mapping that's been prepared on the county's GIS webserver for viewing by the public. Describing the oil and gas industry as also boom and bust, similar to tourism, and more information on water resources, was also requested for the next draft.

**District Plans Evaluation**

As a preview of the work that Gabe has been preparing for the County under a separate contract, he gave a short presentation on the draft findings and recommendations of the District Plans evaluation. He overviewed their existing policies on consistency, strengths, weaknesses and alignment with county policy. He also provided some examples of best practices related to "sub-area" planning in other counties in the southwest (e.g., as sectors, neighborhoods, districts plans etc).

### **Comprehensive Plan Working Group agenda/schedule**

Charlie presented the draft WG schedule for the completion of this phase of the Comprehensive Plan. Using the WG meeting pattern of every other Monday, and allowing time for community meetings on the goals and strategies, would put the draft Comprehensive Plan at February 1<sup>st</sup>. It was suggested rescheduling the WG meetings so the community meeting dates proposed during the week of Dec 14<sup>th</sup> would be moved to the week of Dec 7<sup>th</sup>.

### **Open Discussion/Questions**

Charlie stated he wanted to provide an opportunity at this meeting for open discussion and questions with the WG, since once the WG began working in earnest on each of the Plan Elements, the future agendas would take the entire two hours. He suggested rescheduling the discussion on the draft Guiding Principles to the next meeting to allow ample time for open discussion at this meeting. There was a question from a member about how the other municipalities would be involved in the planning process. Jason stated that the other three municipalities had each identified a representative to participate with the county in developing the comprehensive plan. They are Pat and Sarah from Ignacio; Jack from Bayfield, and Vickie from Durango. These representatives would not be members of the WG but would meet together regularly as a regional planning group as the plan is developed. A letter has been sent to the Southern Ute tribe but a representative has not yet been identified.

Charlie requested some direction from the WG on how to best engage the district planning groups in the comprehensive plan process. Should they be contacted now, and if so, what's the best means to engage them? There was consensus from the WG that the district planning groups need to be involved early and that individual interviews or small group discussions would work, and to meet with them on their turf.

There was a request from a member (in response to one of the Guiding Principles) to have information on CO water laws regarding water harvesting and graywater uses.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

---

1. CBD to send out Community Profile in a Word and pdf document format.
2. CBD to revise meeting schedule.
3. Robbie to check on possibility of putting GIS maps on the County webserver.
4. Gabe to research Hispanic demographic information.

### **IDEAS WITH AGREEMENT**

---

1. District Planning Groups should be contacted for their input on the plan (although there were different suggestions on how this should be done).
2. Move community meetings to the week of Dec 7.

### **QUESTION/ANSWER**

---

### **OBSERVER COMMENTS**

---