

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2014
COMMISSIONERS' CHAMBERS AT PUEBLO COUNTY COURTHOUSE
215 WEST 10TH STREET**

ROLL CALL AND DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Commissioners Present: Betty Alt; Donald Bruestle; Ron Greenwell; Epimenio Griego; Kiera Hatton; Ronald Leyba; Roger Lowe; Philip Mancha; and Arnold VanZandt.

Commissioners Absent: None.

Staff Present: Joan Armstrong, Director; Sandy Blanco; Kathy Burnsed; Dominga Jimenez-Garcia; Gail Wallingford-Ingo; and Jeffrey Woeber.

Others Present: Gary Raso, Assistant County Attorney; Greg Styduhar, County Attorney; and Pat Coffee and Dave Benbow, County Public Works Department.

Acting Chair Bruestle called the Pueblo County Planning Commission meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF JANUARY 28, 2014 MINUTES

Mr. VanZandt moved to approve the minutes of the January 28, 2014 meeting as mailed. Ms. Alt seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

(a) Certificate of Appreciation to Rick Clark, Outgoing PCPC Member and Chairperson.

Acting Chair Bruestle presented a Certificate of Appreciation to Rick Clark, outgoing Pueblo County Planning Commission member and chairperson.

(b) Introduction of New Member.

Acting Chair Bruestle introduced Roger Lowe, the new Pueblo County Planning Commission member. Mr. Lowe stated he is retired and lives in Colorado City, noting he used to work for the Colorado City Architectural Control Committee.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Director's Report was presented by Joan Armstrong. She requested the staff reports be made a part of the record of the proceedings.

(a) Acceptance of Map Amendments and Planned Unit Developments--None.

(b) Correspondence--Two pieces of correspondence were distributed: Email, dated February 21, 2014, from Mike Smoots, objecting to [Special Use Permit No. 2013-015](#); and Memorandum, dated February 11, 2014, from Jeffrey Woeber, Planner II, Department of Planning Development, Update of Pueblo Regional Development Plan, Overview of Recent Update Efforts.

(c) Continuance--[Special Use Permit No. 2013-017](#).

(d) Withdrawals--None.

(e) Board of County Commissioners' Action--Summary of actions taken on February 12, 2014.

(f) Administrative Reviews:

- [Special Use Permit No. 1998-028](#) allows the approved Solid Waste Transfer station to be open to the general public and as a drop-off location for "single stream" recyclable materials in an I-2 Zone District.

The Commission accepted the Administrative Review, thereby approving the continuance of this permitted use with the existing conditions of approval, comment, and a Directive to Staff to present a report at the April, 2014 meeting.

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 25, 2014**

- [Special Use Permit No. 2004-004](#), Amended allows the extraction and processing of sand and gravel in an A-1 Zone District.

The Commission accepted the Administrative Review, thereby approving the continuance of this permitted use with modified conditions of approval, and a Directive to Staff to present a report at the February, 2016 meeting.

- [Special Use Permit No. 2005-020](#) allows natural resources extraction and processing of sand, gravel, and borrow materials; a portable crusher and screening plant; hot mix (road) asphalt plant; scale house; and concrete batch plant in an A-1 Zone District.

The Commission accepted the Administrative Review, thereby approving the continuance of this permitted use with modified conditions of approval, notation, and a Directive to Staff acknowledging that it is unnecessary to schedule this special use permit for further review unless the use and/or property do not maintain compliance with the Pueblo County Code, and/or a complaint is received and verified that there is a violation of the conditions of approval as imposed, and/or if a review is specifically requested by the Planning Commission.

- [Special Use Permit No. 2012-003](#) allows “Motor Vehicle, Retail” use in an I-2 Zone District.

The Commission accepted the Administrative Review, thereby approving the continuance of this permitted use with the existing conditions of approval, and a Directive to Staff to present a report at the February, 2015 meeting.

- [Special Use Permit No. 2012-004](#) allows an equestrian arena, commercial/club, riding academy, and stables in an A-3 Zone District.

The Commission accepted the Administrative Review, thereby scheduling the permit for rescission at the March 25, 2014 public hearing. Due to time constraints for public notice, the Rescission will be heard on April 22, 2014.

Ms. Armstrong requested the Commission take action to accept the late correspondence, request for continuance, Board of County Commissioners’ action, and the administrative reviews as presented.

Mr. Greenwell moved to accept the late correspondence, request for continuance, Board of County Commissioners’ action, and the administrative reviews as read into the record and make the Commission’s comments a part of the record of the proceedings. Mr. VanZandt seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

STATEMENT OF HEARING PROCEDURES BY CHAIRPERSON

Mr. Raso reported that the applicant and/or representative are called upon to speak, followed by any opposition, with the applicant having the final say.

PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Raso explained there are no items on the Consent Agenda and two items on the Regular Agenda for this evening’s meeting.

CONSENT ITEMS

None.

REGULAR ITEMS:

- [Special Use Permit No. 1999-040](#), Pueblo County Department of Planning and Development, requests a Declaration of Abandonment for the approved use of natural deposits extraction and processing of sand, gravel, and borrow, and establishment of a portable crusher and screening plant in an A-1 Zone District.

Mr. Jeffrey Woeber, Planner II, Pueblo County Department of Planning and Development, summarized his staff review dated February 11, 2014 in a PowerPoint presentation. He stated

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 25, 2014**

this is a request for a Declaration of Abandonment for a gravel pit that was approved over fourteen years ago and was never established. In 1999, when it was approved, the applicant indicated they were going to use some of the materials for a Highway 50 project, which never occurred. In 2011, they did a reclamation plan through the State for an airport runway project, but the material wasn't right and the reclamation plan and the bond was released by the State in February, 2012. A section of the Code states if a special use permit hasn't been established for a period of five years, it shall be deemed abandoned. The Planning Commission, at its discretion, can continue the special use permit for an additional period of time, or issue a Declaration of Abandonment. The use hasn't been established for fourteen years, noting they would have to start from scratch with a new reclamation plan through the State. The staff recommendation is based on the fourteen years that have passed since the initial permit approval, with the changes that have occurred in the vicinity, as well as the applicant not having any current projects or a current reclamation plan in place, and recommends the Planning Commission issue a Declaration of Abandonment.

Mr. Woeber stated last month the Planning Commission inquired as to whether the owner and applicant had been notified of the request for abandonment since nobody appeared at the meeting. Staff ensured the current staff report was sent to the owner and applicant by certified mail, noting copies of the receipts were attached to the staff report as Exhibit 7.

Mr. Raso requested the staff memorandum, prepared by Jeff Woeber, dated February 11, 2014, be made a part of the record.

There was no opposition to the declaration of abandonment of the special use permit.

Acting Chair Bruestle closed the hearing and entered staff's comments into the record.

Mr. VanZandt moved to approve the Declaration of Abandonment of Special Use Permit No. 1999-040. Ms. Alt seconded the motion.

Discussion occurred. Ms. Hatton thanked staff, noting they did a great job and likes seeing the certified information in their packet. Mr. Greenwell questioned why the certified card in his packet wasn't signed. Mr. Woeber replied the signed card wasn't received until after the staff report was prepared and mailed. Mr. Lowe asked Mr. Woeber if he had any further communication from the applicant, and Mr. Woeber replied no. After discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

- [Special Use Permit No. 2013-015](#), AT&T Mobility, requests a special use permit to allow the establishment of a 149-foot monopole type telecommunications tower in an A-1 Zone District.

Acting Chair Bruestle reported he was advised by Mr. Raso that it would be appropriate for the Planning Commission to go into Executive Session for some legal advice pertaining to this special use permit. Mr. Raso stated this request was made pursuant to an exception in the Colorado Open Meetings Law, which allows the Planning Commission to go into Executive Session to receive legal advice.

Mr. Lowe moved that the Planning Commission go into Executive Session to receive legal advice. Mr. Greenwell seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

After reconvening, Mr. Raso stated he advised the Planning Commission on some legal issues and no decisions were made.

Ms. Gail Wallingford-Ingo, Planner II, Pueblo County Department of Planning and Development, summarized her staff review dated February 18, 2014 in a PowerPoint presentation. She stated the applicant is requesting a special use permit to allow the establishment of a monopole type telecommunications tower with an overall height of 149 feet and related accessory buildings and support facilities on a 2,500 square foot leased parcel of land in an A-1 Zone District. The property is located on the north side of Colorado Highway 78 West, northwest of the intersection of Rock Creek Road. The tower location is at the southwest corner of the 160-acre parcel of land, which is improved with a single-family residence and several agricultural related buildings. The majority of the surrounding property is vacant, unsubdivided land, with a few single-family residences.

Ms. Wallingford-Ingo stated staff routinely requests all applicants explore options of other towers in close proximity before applying for a new one. They discovered, through research, an

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 25, 2014**

existing 25-30 foot tower north and northwest of the proposed site on the Hudson Ranch. It was installed by the Pine Drive Telephone Company eight to ten years ago, noting it's not structurally capable of accommodating any additional carriers nor could it support additional mounted equipment. An issue that came up, through the review process, is the existence of a private air strip on the parcel to the south. The special use permit was permitted in 1999, and based on the existence of the air strip, AT&T was requested to verify with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) that the proposed tower, if approved and erected, would not cause a hazard. A determination was done, noting they didn't have to file with the FAA because it wasn't considered a hazard. There are no intentions to mark or light the tower, nor is it required by the FAA or the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). It will be available for the co-location of two additional service providers for a total of three. The applicant, on several occasions, attempted to meet with the area residents to discuss the application, but due to scheduling conflicts or other things, couldn't get a meeting scheduled. The opposition submitted three petitions indicating this application is similar to one the Planning Commission denied in 2011 in an A-1 Zone District. The staff report depicted some substantial variations between the two, noting the current application is for a 2,500 square-foot leased area on 160 acres, and the 2011 application was for just under three-tenths of an acre on a half-acre parcel. The current application is an unsubdivided parcel of land, which conforms to the development standards of the A-1 Zone District, and the 2011 application was for a non-conforming parcel of ground that wasn't traditionally sized or utilized for agricultural purposes and was platted as a residential subdivision. The applicants in the 2011 application chose to submit their own request for a new tower instead of attempting to utilize three to four others that were in close proximity.

Ms. Wallingford-Ingo stated the Department of Planning and Development is recommending approval of the application with seven conditions of approval, noting they're limiting it to the monopole at a specific height that was designated. They require it to be painted or coated with a non-reflective forest green, grey, or other neutral color in an attempt to mitigate or camouflage the potential visual impact it may have. They also have to go through the process of modifying the drawings, submitting the zoning authorization, and providing stamped engineered drawings. In order to maintain security, they have to fence the leased area or a designated area within the leased area to ensure there's no access other than by those who are designated, and they have to submit final as-built drawings. They are going to tie them to the designated area and the as-built drawings to ensure that co-location is permissible and there's adequate room for the additional support facilities. If they're required to light the tower in the future, they'll have to come back to the Planning Commission for an amendment to the special use permit prior to the installation of such, noting they don't envision that because of the nominal height, but they don't know what could happen in the future.

Ms. Hatton questioned the criteria for determining if a tower is available or not for co-location. Ms. Wallingford-Ingo replied the applicant has to do a structural analysis relative to frequency, noting AT&T can give more details when they make their presentation. Ms. Alt reported she visited the site this afternoon and asked that it be made a part of the record. Mr. Raso requested the staff memorandum, prepared by Gail Wallingford-Ingo, dated February 18, 2014, be made a part of the record. Regarding the late correspondence from Mr. Smoots, dated February 21, 2014, the Federal Telecommunications Reform Act prohibits health issues from being considered. They don't preempt Pueblo County, noting they defer to their jurisdiction and require the decision to deny to be in writing. Their decision would be evaluated on the basis of substantial evidence, as opposed to any competent evidence, noting the decision can't be predicated on the basis of health hazards from radio waves.

Mr. Tim Carr, Vertical Real Estate Consulting, Inc., representing AT&T Mobility, 5760 East Geddes Circle, Centennial, Colorado, represented the special use permit. He reported he's a Site Acquisition Consultant with Vertical Real Estate representing AT&T, and presented a PowerPoint presentation. He stated wireless usage is growing exponentially in the United States and around the world. Not only do most people in the room have at least one cell phone, but 50% of Americans now use their wireless device as their sole communication device. Based on a study by the FCC, 70% of 911 calls are made from a wireless device. In the last few years, there are more mobile devices in the world than people. The proposed wireless site would be used for talk, text, and data services, noting it's a 149-foot structure with ground equipment housed in a 12' x 28' shelter. There is a significant gap in coverage in the area, with no coverage to the west along Highway 78, noting the proposed site is the least intrusive means to close the significant gap. The site search starts with a search map. It's an area that's selected by AT&T engineers and indicates where the wireless facility should be placed in order to meet the coverage objectives. It's designed by an AT&T engineering group and is based upon factors such as the existing sites in the area, the population density, environment, and the terrain. The candidate selection is scientifically based on several factors. They are computer

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 25, 2014**

generated propagation maps of radio frequency signals. They need to avoid interference with other sites. The site must fit into the cellular network and be appropriately distanced from other sites. The purpose of the proposed site is to close a coverage gap, noting a coverage gap can exist when any of the following occurs: dropped calls, slow data service, low voice quality, lack of 3rd or 4th generation wireless technology, and the lack of in-building coverage. The coverage gap is verified using coverage maps, which predict the RF signal coverage and strengths. They are scientifically and mathematically based and combined with customer feedback, data on the network showing dropped calls, and signal strengths from surrounding cell sites. Currently, there's no in-house coverage in the area, and none at all west of the site. The proposed site will provide excellent coverage along Highway 78 and the surrounding area to the northwest, southwest, and northeast, noting the significant coverage gap is covered with the new site. A candidate for a site location must be feasible, noting it has to be technically feasible, leasable, and buildable.

Mr. Carr stated there were no towers identified by a database search within a three mile radius of the proposed site. However, during a field observation, a tower was found approximately one-quarter of a mile to the northwest of the proposed site. The site isn't feasible, noting it's approximately 25 feet tall and not tall enough to meet the coverage objective. It's not permanently attached to the ground and wouldn't pass a structure analysis to handle the required equipment loading. AT&T has proposed the least intrusive means to fill the significant gap in coverage, and respectfully requests the Planning Commission grant their request for approval. He entered his presentation into the record as Petitioner's Exhibit "1".

Mr. Lowe asked Mr. Carr if the utilities for the tower would be underground, and Mr. Carr replied yes. Ms. Alt questioned how far the tower would be located from the house. Ms. Wallingford-Ingo replied it's depicted on Exhibit 2 of the staff report. Ms. Alt questioned if it was a considerable distance from the house, and Mr. Carr replied yes. Mr. Mancha asked Mr. Carr if the property was being leased, and Mr. Carr replied yes. Mr. Mancha questioned if the owner of the property was interested in doing business. Mr. Carr replied yes, noting they're in attendance tonight. Mr. Greenwell questioned if the existing tower was currently in use. Ms. Wallingford-Ingo replied yes, by the Pine Drive Telephone Company. It was never permitted, but is in operation for their radio communications.

Mr. Travis Parsons, Radio Frequency Engineer for AT&T, 3626 Mountain View, Longmont, Colorado, spoke in favor of the special use permit. He reported due to some public concerns about safety issues, AT&T goes to great strides to run calculations, analyze all of their cell sites, and abide by all FCC regulations. He submitted a letter into the record as Petitioner's Exhibit "2". Mr. Leyba asked Mr. Parsons if he worked for AT&T. Mr. Parsons replied yes, noting he's the engineer for the proposed site for radio frequency.

Mr. Dustin Sullivan, 397 East Stewart Drive, Pueblo West, Colorado, spoke in favor of the special use permit. He reported he's the Vice President of the Communication Workers of America Local 7702, and works at the AT&T call center on Main Street. AT&T customers rely on them to make sure they can connect with people all the time, noting they currently have 450 representatives in Pueblo. He supports the permit because AT&T has done so much for the community and had the top corporate fundraiser in 2013 for the March of Dimes. Mr. Leyba asked Mr. Sullivan what kind of calls they take. Mr. Sullivan replied customer service relating to bills and trouble shooting.

Ms. Laurie Clark, 6821 Highway 78 West, spoke in favor of the special use permit. She reported they are the owners of the property and are in support of the permit. Acting Chair Bruestle asked Ms. Clark what the distance was from her house to the proposed site, and Ms. Clark replied one-quarter of a mile.

Mr. Mike Smoots, 6877 Highway 78 West, spoke in opposition to the special use permit. He reported his house is closest to the proposed tower site. The property is zoned A-1, noting towers aren't supposed to be there. The tower that was denied wasn't consistent with the intent, spirit, and purpose of the A-1 Zone District. He had presented some information related to medical issues, which isn't permissible, and understands it's financially advantageous to the people involved. He doesn't use AT&T for a carrier, noting there's no problem with the signal and uses his cell phone in his house without issues. He asked the Commission to consider the people that live out there who are in the A-1 Zone District.

Mr. VanZandt asked Mr. Smoots how close his house was to the proposed tower. Mr. Smoots replied less than the Clark's house, and based on the map, he's just under 50% closer than they are. Mr. Leyba asked Mr. Smoots about the aesthetics, noting he indicated it didn't fit in with the

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 25, 2014**

local environment. Mr. Smoots replied it's 150 feet high and not far from his house, noting it's not very desirable. Mr. Leyba asked if there were any other towers in the area. Mr. Smoots replied yes, a little one that's hardly above the trees. Mr. Leyba asked Mr. Smoots if the 149-foot tower would diminish the local environment, and Mr. Smoots replied yes.

Mr. Gary Martino, 6870 Highway 78 West, spoke in opposition to the special use permit. He reported his family has been out there for over 100 years and his children are the fifth generation. They choose to live in the country and these kinds of things diminish their quality of life. The highway to Kansas is lined with poles that were never taken down, noting the wires are still hanging. He questioned if the lease had a clause for removing the tower if not being utilized, or if it had to be painted regularly. There is phone service in the area, noting they can get a phone line hard wired into their house. They may not have AT&T service, but there are other providers out there. AT&T was probably turned down by several neighbors before finding the proposed site, noting they didn't want a pole on their property.

Mr. Leyba asked Mr. Martino if towers diminish the quality of life in the A-1 Zone District. Mr. Martino replied yes, noting that's why they chose to live in the country. Mr. Leyba asked Mr. Martino if there were any other towers in the area. Mr. Martino replied he heard about one, noting it should be removed if it doesn't meet zoning requirements. Acting Chair Bruestle questioned the protocol or requirements for abandoned equipment. Mr. Raso replied with a special use permit they have a protection they don't have for power poles in the public right-of-way, which is the declaration of abandonment. Acting Chair Bruestle questioned if at some point in the future the applicant no longer utilized the equipment, if the jurisdiction could require the tower to be removed. Mr. Raso replied yes, noting they could revoke or rescind the special use permit. If they failed to remove it, even after the special use permit was rescinded or declared to be abandoned, it would become a zoning violation and the court would issue a mandatory injunction requirement to remove it. Mr. Martino stated they're not going to do anything that wasn't financially beneficial, noting it wouldn't be removed if they didn't have to. Mr. Griego asked Mr. Martino if he had a land line or a cell phone. Mr. Martino replied he has a cell phone and used to have a land line until it needed repair and couldn't get it fixed. Mr. Greenwell questioned the size of the lots. Ms. Armstrong replied they're a minimum of 35 acres in the A-1 Zone District.

Mr. Carr rebutted the testimony given. He stated the lease they signed with the Clarks has a termination clause. If AT&T stops during the lease, they have to remove the tower from the site. Mr. Leyba asked Mr. Carr how long the lease was for. Mr. Carr replied it's a 25-year lease in five-year increments. Ms. Hatton questioned why they chose the site. Mr. Carr replied because of the terrain, noting they have limited space in providing coverage. Ms. Alt asked Mr. Carr how often it would be painted. Mr. Carr replied there's nothing specific in the lease for painting. Mr. Greenwell referred to the topographic map with respect to Mr. Smoot's property and the tower site. Mr. Carr stated it was too small to depict on the map. Mr. Griego stated there's a tower on the St. Charles Mesa that looks like a windmill, and asked Mr. Carr if they could do something like that. Mr. Carr replied there's no tall vegetation in the area, noting a 149-foot tower would be less visible than a monopine, which looks like a tree. Ms. Hatton asked Ms. Clark if there was a maintenance clause in the lease with AT&T. Ms. Clark replied the contract requires them to maintain the access road and the facility, with a time period. There is no specific painting requirement other than in the conditions imposed by staff. Mr. Carr asked Ms. Amber Tafoya from AT&T to speak on behalf of the application.

Ms. Amber Tafoya, 940 West 133rd Circle, Westminster, Colorado, spoke in favor of the special use permit. She reported she is AT&T's Director of External Affairs for Colorado. They have been using an Alltel site, noting Verizon acquired a number of sites from Alltel and those sites had to be left on AT&T's technology for four years. The contract is up in June, noting it goes to a dead zone and the coverage would be gone. Highway 78 is remote, noting she wants to be able to provide service for people to be able to call 911. If somebody had a heart attack and couldn't give their location, 911 relies on the nearest cell tower, which is part of the reason for their request. If they could do it another way they would, because they understand the inconvenience. They are concerned with the public safety of their customers and want people to choose them as their carrier. Mr. VanZandt asked Ms. Tafoya how far the signal would reach. Ms. Tafoya replied because of the elevation, it could stretch out to six miles, but good coverage is at three miles. Mr. Mancha stated he understands agreements and some degree of competition, but didn't understand why they chose this site. Ms. Tafoya stated it's not only agreements, but actually technology. The other sites they looked at in the area either didn't meet the coverage objective to hit the dead zone, or they would've had to go 100 feet higher. Mr. Mancha questioned what they would have done if the Clarks had said no. Ms. Tafoya replied they would have been in trouble because their other option was to go higher with the

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 25, 2014**

tower. Mr. Greenwell questioned the situation with the airport if they would've had to go higher. Ms. Tafoya replied they would've had to get into lighting, the FAA, guy wires, and other problems. Ms. Hatton questioned if they would be seeing an abandonment for an Alltel tower. Ms. Tafoya replied no, noting they're still using it. It just doesn't work for their technology anymore.

Acting Chair Bruestle closed the hearing and entered staff's comments into the record.

Mr. Greenwell moved to approve Special Use Permit No. 2013-015 with seven conditions of approval. Mr. Lowe seconded the motion.

Discussion occurred. Mr. Leyba stated they heard from two citizens who were very passionate about where they live. Mr. Smoots understood they couldn't consider the health issue, and Mr. Martino explained the value and quality of life was going to be impacted. The four criteria for a special use permit they have to consider includes the devaluation of the environment and the livelihood of their neighborhoods over agricultural property. Ms. Hatton questioned if the special use permit would come back for review. Ms. Wallingford-Ingo replied pursuant to the special use permit regulations, they would see it in one year. Mr. Greenwell stated he's voting to approve it as is, but there could be another alternative in making it look better. Acting Chair Bruestle stated maybe if there were more structures built around it, noting it might be more conspicuous with the landscape.

After discussion, the motion carried by an 8 to 1 vote, with Mr. Leyba opposing the motion.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

- Election of Officers

Acting Chair Bruestle stated they have two officers to be elected, the Chairperson and the Vice Chairperson. Ballots were distributed and nominations were taken for the office of Chairperson. Mr. VanZandt nominated Mr. Bruestle. Mr. Mancha nominated Mr. Bruestle. Mr. Leyba nominated Mr. Griego. Ms. Hatton nominated Mr. Greenwell.

After the ballots were counted, Mr. Bruestle was appointed as Chairperson.

Ballots were distributed and nominations for Vice Chairperson were taken. Mr. Leyba nominated Mr. Griego. Ms. Hatton nominated Mr. Greenwell.

After the ballots were counted, Mr. Griego was appointed as Vice Chairperson.

It was agreed upon by the Planning Commission that the following slate of officers be appointed for 2014: Donald Bruestle, Chairperson, and Epimenio Griego, Vice Chairperson.

- Discussion: Comprehensive Plan, Previous Efforts in Updating it

Mr. Jeffrey Woeber, Planner II, Pueblo County Department of Planning and Development, reported they're looking at updating the existing Comprehensive Plan. He prepared a memorandum, which was distributed prior to the meeting, outlining how it started, where it went, and where they are now. It started in 2011 with the City, who needed some revisions done on population and growth estimates. That was the scope for a while until Ms. Julie Ann Woods, the County Planning Director, got involved and determined since the Comprehensive Plan was ten years old it needed a full rewrite, or a new Plan. They did some serious work for a while and appointed a Core Group that met with some of the key players in the City and County. They included the City-County Health Department, the Colorado Department of Transportation, the Pueblo Economic Development Corporation, and Pueblo West. They determined they would do a new Comprehensive Plan that would focus on the City, Pueblo West, and the St. Charles Mesa. The more rural areas of the County would be done separate through subarea plans.

Mr. Woeber stated they talked to the Colorado Department of Transportation, who was doing the funding for the update of the Long Range Transportation Plan for the County. They were going to tie into that, noting there was a considerable amount of money that was available. They were looking at some additional funding through the City, County, and Pueblo West, and

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 25, 2014**

went along with that for a while. They talked to some consultants for feedback on how to best move forward and started with a survey at the Chile and Frijoles Festival in September, 2012. At that time, Ms. Woods, who was the County Planning Director, moved on and became the City Planning Director. She continued to move forward with the Plan update and did some work on community engagement activities, how to gather public input for the Plan, and the content of the Plan. In March, 2013, Ms. Woods presented the proposal to City Council, who chose not to support the update to the Comprehensive Plan and everything came to a standstill. His memorandum indicated they didn't know what the City was doing, noting that changed as of this morning. They met with the City Planning staff and are back on board with doing population projection updates and looking at minor amendments. They are in the early stages of doing the minor update and are looking at meeting with the City the middle of March.

Chair Bruestle asked Mr. Woeber if any money was involved to date. Mr. Woeber replied no, noting a rewrite of the Plan is a good idea, but the City and County don't have the resources and it would involve hiring a consulting firm. Mr. VanZandt questioned who the Director of City Planning was. Ms. Armstrong replied Mr. Steven Meier, noting he's also the Director of Parks and Recreation. Mr. Mancha stated the Planning Commission met with the Board of County Commissioners last year, who were very supportive, but they didn't have the money to do anything. There are new tax monies in Pueblo County from the sale of marijuana and suggested going back to the Board of County Commissioners and asking for some. Chair Bruestle stated it's a good idea, noting his concern is the collaborative financial effort between the jurisdictions of the City and the County. They should find out what the City can do before going to the Board of County Commissioners. Mr. Mancha stated he's not trying to cut out the City, noting they need to find out if they're willing to use some of the marijuana money for planning. Chair Bruestle asked Ms. Armstrong if there was time available for the Planning Commission to meet with the Board of County Commissioners. Ms. Armstrong replied yes, noting the Board of County Commissioners gave the Planning Department back their work sessions, which are on Mondays prior to their regulatory meetings. Mr. Woeber stated the next work session is on March 10, 2014, at 2:00 p.m. Ms. Armstrong stated they're allotted 30 minutes up to an hour, noting part of the work session is to discuss upcoming land use cases, and other items such as this. Chair Bruestle questioned the next available date, noting he's not available on March 10, 2014. Ms. Armstrong replied she could submit for another work session with them to talk about the Comprehensive Plan. Chair Bruestle stated he doesn't have to be at the meeting if staff and a few Planning Commissioners could attend. Mr. Mancha and Ms. Hatton indicated they would attend. Ms. Armstrong stated he could submit a letter with his viewpoints.

Mr. Leyba stated they need a specific amount to ask for from the Board of County Commissioners, and Chair Bruestle agreed. Ms. Armstrong stated Mr. Woeber did some preliminary requests from different consulting groups on the cost for the unincorporated area of Pueblo County and not the City of Pueblo, noting they can dig up the information. Chair Bruestle questioned if they should include the City of Pueblo, and Ms. Armstrong replied she would like to include them in the update. Mr. Greenwell questioned how they move forward at this point. Ms. Armstrong replied they can move forward with the inner area they were previously looking at. They have internal resources, noting a lot of it has already been done by the City with the Transportation Plan, Census, and mapping. Colorado City, Rye, Beulah, Avondale, and Vineland won't be a part of the core areas, noting they include Pueblo West, the airport, the City of Pueblo, South I-25, and North I-25. Mr. Raso asked Mr. Woeber what the City and County paid the consulting group for the Plan in 2002. Mr. Woeber replied he didn't know, noting the Plan was done through PACOG and there should be records. Ms. Armstrong stated if they want a dollar figure to present to the Board of County Commissioners at the work session, they would need to give the consultants another parameter and didn't know if it could be accomplished in two weeks. Mr. Woeber stated the consulting firms like to have an RFP that's well defined. Chair Bruestle questioned if they were asking for ball park figures because in the absence of an RFP they would only have general numbers. Ms. Armstrong replied that's what they asked for before to find out if it was feasible.

Ms. Armstrong stated they have a meeting with the City on March 18, 2014, noting Mr. Woeber can call the consultant that gave them the initial cost to see if they would be willing to give them another figure with the revised area. If they can't get it before March 10, 2014, they may have to extend the work session to another date in March, 2014. Mr. Mancha stated it's a better alternative to meet with the City before going to the County. Chair Bruestle stated he would like to move forward before too much time passes, but wants to make sure they have a well prepared presentation. Ms. Armstrong stated they would get the costs, send them to the Planning Commission members, meet with City staff, and then set up a work session with the Board of County Commissioners.

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 25, 2014**

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VanZandt moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Griego seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Joan Armstrong, Director
Department of Planning and Development

SJB