Present: Commissioner James Newberry
Commissioner Nancy Stuart
Commissioner Gary Bumgarner

Also Present: County Manager Lurline Underbrink Curran
County Attorney Jack DiCola
County Clerk and Recorder Sara Rosene
Public Health Nurse Brene Belew-LaDue
Finance Director Scott Berger
Assistant County Attorney Bob Franek
County Planner Kris Manguso
Chief Building Official Scott Penson
Housing Authority Director Jim Sheehan
Road and Bridge Supervisor Ken Haynes

Those present recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

Commissioner Bumgarner moved to approve the minutes of the Regular Board of Commissioners meeting of April 17, 2012.

The motion passed unanimously.

Finance Director

Scott Berger, Finance Director, presented the Warrant Register and Expenditure List to be paid on June 6, 2012, for vendor payments. The list for this period was verified for the Board’s approval.

Commissioner Newberry moved to approve and sign the general warrants and Social Services warrants to be paid on June 6, 2012.

The motion passed unanimously.

Housing Authority

The Board convened a Special meeting of the Grand County Housing Authority.

Public Comments/Issues

Chief Deputy Clerk and Recorder Sandra Renfroe presented:

David Kleist, Owner/Mgr. of Snooty Coyote Liquors is requesting renewal of his Retail Liquor Store License.

The Sheriff’s letter reflects no adverse actions.

All fees have been paid to the State and to Grand County; therefore, I would like to recommend approval of his request.

[End of Staff’s recommendation]

Commissioner Newberry moved to authorize the renewal of the Retail Liquor Store License for Snooty Enterprises of Grand County doing business as Snooty Coyote Liquors.

The motion passed unanimously.

Public Health Nurse Brené Belew-LaDue came before the Board to invite all of them to the first meeting of the Community Health Assessment meetings. It is a stakeholder meeting and they would love the input from the Board to form the Community Health Assessment. The first meeting is June 27, 2012, from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m.
County Planning Director Kris Manguso stated that she spoke with the County Manager about a month ago about an administrative amendment for a Special Use Permit. Verizon gave a tower to Snow Mountain Ranch so Snow Mountain Ranch will own the tower now. They already own the land. This amendment transfers the Special Use Permit into Snow Mountain Ranch and it gets rid of the $25,000 bond that was discussed because it is on their own property. They own it. It is their tower. It is all private and there is no reason to continue that bond.

An administrative amendment will be considered when there changes to the original permit such as limited to a change in the name of the permittee (which is what we are doing) or other minor changes that do not otherwise affect the operation of the permit. It only requires a resolution and Ms. Manguso presented:

Resolution No. 2012-6-1, “A RESOLUTION GRANDTING AN ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENT TO THE SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR CELLULAR INC. NETWORK CORPORATION D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS, PERMITTING A CELLULAR TELECOMMUNICATIONS TOWER LOCATED IN THE E1/4SW1/4 OF SECTION 32, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 76 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., COUNTY OF GRAND, STATE OF COLORADO”

Commissioner Newberry moved to approve Resolution No. 2012-6-1 and authorize the Chair to sign all applicable documents as presented.

The motion passed unanimously.

Road and Bridge Supervisor Ken Haynes stated that he is having a meeting with Freeport McMoran regarding the paving on County Road 3 regarding the bids received for the work.

Mr. Haynes will need a supplement to the asphalt budget. Commissioner Newberry asked Mr. Haynes to bring forward everything that he wants to do in the paving budget and then the Board can look at that to make decisions.

The Peterson Trails is roughed in along Highway 40. Mr. Haynes is waiting for direction from the engineer.

Bill Clark and Tim Gagnon met with Terry Blum regarding the re-paving of Pole Creek Meadows.

Mr. Haynes stated that he is trying to be compliant with signs on County Road 3. In cooperation with the EMS Department, Mr. Haynes put up mile marker signs. The new standards require that numbering goes from the south to the north and from the west to the east. This is exactly 180 degrees out of what it was in 2003. This caused confusion. Mr. Haynes asked if the Board would like him to continue changing mile markers and asked if it wanted to change County Road 3 back. The Board would like to leave County Road 3 as it is but not change any other roads.

Mr. Haynes stated that in years past, when they removed asphalt from the roads, private companies have asked that it be put in their pit. Mr. Haynes stated that he has been asked to share the material with other companies. Mr. Haynes asked if the Board would like him to go to bid to get rid of the material. The County cannot use the material in its own crusher.

The Board would like an advertisement in the paper to sell the material.

Mr. Haynes stated that last year, it took until December to get all the money due to the County from Valley Recycling. Mr. Haynes stated that he is on a month to month contract and the County is already four loads in arrears in being paid.

The County Attorney will contact Valley Recycling regarding the need for them to honor their contract.

Mr. Haynes is having a problem with the Rowley Park. Mr. Haynes stated that Denver Water would like to take over the property. Mr. Franek stated that he does not know what the Board wants to do with the property. The requirement of the donation from the Rowley family was that if anything was ever done with the property, it had to be a park.

Denver Water has agreed to give access to the property.
Mr. Haynes stated that he met with the facility manager of operations for Rocky Mountain National Park. The Park will use the Park’s machinery to put down some chip and seal. In addition, the County will be able to purchase some material. The County will do all of the prep work for the County roads.

The east retention pond at the Granby Airport is not on County property. The problem has been resolved with the property owner.

Ms. Underbrink Curran stated that she received a call asking who the contact is for the clubs that use the Flying Heels Arena. The County does not assign anyone and the clubs will need to provide that information to the County.

Board Business

Commissioner Newberry moved to authorize the Commissioners to sign letters to:

1. County Maintenance Crew
2. Ed Moyer
3. Kathy Etler
4. Katherine Morris
5. Teri Mordick
6. IT Department

thanking them for their work doing the Colorado River Cooperative Agreement signing.

The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Newberry stated that the County received a letter from the Grand Lake Fire District informing the County that the lease for the EMS sharing the building is at $500 per month and will be raised to $900 per month for a term of five years.

Commissioner Bumgarner moved to waive the building fees for the newest Habitat for Humanity house.

The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Newberry stated that the County received a notice that House Joint Resolution 121022 was passed during the regular session. This designates a portion of the river as the Eisenhower portion of the river.

The Board received a request from the Kremmling Chamber to have the EMS on standby for the Cliff Golf Tournament and Muddle Shuffle.

Commissioner Bumgarner moved to authorize EMS as standby where they are needed at Kremmling Days.

The motion passed unanimously.

The Board received a note of thanks from the West Grand Community Educational Foundation for waiving the fees for the use of the fairgrounds and the EMS fees.

The Board received a request from the Advocates for the safe house to have three more loads of Class C gravel.

Commissioner Bumgarner moved to authorize the use of three loads of Class C gravel for the Advocates.

The motion passed unanimously.

Calendars

June 5  Airport Advisory meeting at 6:30 p.m.
CCl conference
June 6  Grand Lake Stakeholders meeting at town hall at 3:00 p.m.
Businesses without Boarders at 247 E. Agate at 8:30 a.m.
June 7  Colorado Big Thompson tour
June 8  Pie Contest at Hot Sulphur Springs Days at 6:00 p.m.
June 9  Memorial Service for Doctor Arnold at 1:00 p.m.
June 11 Mayor and Managers meeting in Grand Lake at 9:00 a.m.
June 13 Walk through at the Fairgrounds at 5:30

Sara Rosene requested the use of County chairs and tables for the Trinity Episcopal Church for their 100 year celebration.

Commissioner Bumgarner moved to allow Trinity Episcopal Church to use tables and chairs for their 100 year celebration.

The motion passed unanimously.

Board Business

Grand County Sheriff Rod Johnson stated that the fire danger in the County is considered moderate. Grand County is not at the point of a fire ban.

Sheriff Johnson stated that the downside to call a fire ban too early is whether or not you should agree with the federal agencies. If the County has a fire ban and the federal agencies do not, it is very confusing to the citizens in the County.

Sheriff Johnson stated that he could call the federal agencies and see if the County agencies want to put on a fire ban outside the agreed upon conditions. The conditions in the County has not yet met the criteria for a fire ban.

County Attorney DiCola stated that the Board needs competent evidence to call a fire ban. The Board relies on the Sheriff to provide competent evidence.

Commissioner Newberry asked if the fire districts are included on the calls between the Sheriff and the federal and state agencies. Sheriff Johnson stated that they are invited but he does not know if any fire districts that are participating.

Ms. Underbrink Curran suggested that the Board may want to put some information on the “Commissioner’s Corner.”

Sheriff Johnson stated that he would be happy to have a local conference call to discuss the fire danger with the local districts. Sheriff Johnson stated that he is meeting at Grand Lake Fire District at 11:00 a.m. on June 5. The Board is invited to attend. The Sheriff will hold a conference call at 1:00 a.m. today to talk with the fire districts.

House Bill 1451 Memorandum of Understanding, Deb Ruttenberg

Deb Ruttenberg came before the Board to get a signature on the HB1451 MOU.

The Counties have two options on how they are evaluated; 1. Solely evaluate and receive incentive funds based on the indicators that the State evaluation people from Omni provide you or 2. You can add your own. The County goes with what the State is measuring.

Commissioner Newberry moved to authorize the Chair to sign the Memorandum of Understand Pursuant to House Bill 04-1451 between the Grand County Department of Social Services, Grand County Board of County Commissioners, 14th Judicial District Probation department, 14th Judicial District, Grand County Public Health Department, West Grand School District, East Grand School District, Colorado West Regional Mental Health, Inc. – Alpine Center, Colorado Health Partnership (representing the Behavior Health Organization/BHO), West Slope Casa (MSO), Juvenile Services, Grand Beginnings, Advocates: Victim Assistance Team, and Division of Youth Corrections (DYC), as presented.

The motion passed unanimously.

Manager and Attorney Items

County Manager Underbrink Curran asked for a motion for the Chair to able to execute a Construction Contract between Grand County and Power to People for replacing the lights in the Extension Hall in the amount of $2,895
Commissioner Bumgarner moved to enter into a Construction Contract with Power to the People in the amount $2,895 as presented.

The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Underbrink Curran asked for a motion to allow the Chair to execute a Memorandum of Understanding between Grand County and the Bureau of Reclamation for microtoxin monitoring in the Grand Lake area in the amount of $13,050. The money for that is in the Water Protection budget.

Commissioner Newberry moved to authorize the Chair to sign the Memorandum the Understanding between Grand County and the Bureau of Reclamation as presented.

The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Underbrink Curran was asked to go to the board retreat for the Town of Grand Lake to give an update on the Windy Gap Firming Project and water issues in general. Those present were very complimentary of the efforts put forward by the board to get Grand Lake cleared up.

There was an irrigators meeting last week with the Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, Northern, Grand County, and the River District. It was a good meeting; however, people are discouraged about the amount of water that is in the river. There were some concerns over check dams. There was no concern over getting the check dams being re-established.

Ms. Underbrink Curran stated that there was a question from some of the property owners below Windy Gap. When Northern drew down the reservoir the stream re-established itself going back through there. It makes the water a little cooler and it does not transport sediment. One of the questions was, if the County did not have a problem with mud flats, why can they not take place. Ms. Underbrink Curran stated that she understands that the Board does not have a problem with that and she has sent the question to Northern.

Last week, Ms. Underbrink Curran met with Under Secretary of Water and Science with the Department of Interior (Ann Castle) who had an invitation only meeting in Summit County. Grand County was invited as well as property owners below Windy Gap, stakeholders in Grand County, the Mayor of Grand Lake, the River District, Middle Park, State Department of Natural Resources, and a number of people from the Department of Interior. There had been some question about the State having the sole authority for the Wildlife Mitigation Plan with the Windy Gap Firming Project. Under Secretary Castle made it very clear that the Department of Interior respects what the State is doing and yes they have the authority to take care of wildlife issues; however, she made it very clear that under Senate Document 80 the Bureau of Reclamation also has responsibilities that are over and above what the State would do and while they are more than willing to acknowledge and respect what the State is doing they intend to take a different look at things based on what she believes is their requirement under Senate Document 80. One of those being fish flows below Windy Gap and Grand Lake; issues like that she believes over and above what the State would look at.

In the Wildlife Mitigation Plan, it says that the CPW will establish a plan for what they will do with the $7 million and they want to be in on Learning by Doing. That is a consensus based process. Grand County urged them to look at the fact that this was just a precursor to what Learning by Doing was going to be. They want to be taken off the advisory committee and made part of the management committee. That will be taken back to Mike King.

Ms. Underbrink Curran stated that she met with the Forest Service and they are asking that the County allow consultants Tetra Tech and the Washies give the Regional Forester and his group an overview of the Steam Management Plan, how it was put into place, and what it is all about.

The Ouray Ranch Homeowners Association has asked that the County come to their regular meeting and Ms. Underbrink Curran will be doing that to bring them up-to-date on the Windy Gap Firming Project.

The Town of Kremmling has asked that Commissioner Bumgarner and Ed Moyer go to their June 18 meeting and explain what a RICD is and that it doesn’t need a water right and the County has done some investigation at the Highway 9 bridge. They want to look at it as economic development.

The County received a call from the Corps of Engineers. They are going to start having public meetings on the establishment of a wetland bank around Kremmling.
Ms. Underbrink Curran stated that she has an ongoing negotiation with Northern tomorrow. It is hoped that the County and Northern will be able to agree on a draft MOU that everyone can say this can go in on the 1041 application.

There was a section in the IGA that they have been looking at for quite some time that they called the penalty section. It was a section that Northern felt that Grand County reneged on their original permit for their 1041 and that is why they are applying under protest. They are worried that if they do not build the entire 90,000 acre feet now, that the County would object to having that work done later. The County has said that if it has the same environmental footprint, the County does not care. They want to penalize Grand County if something were to happen in the future. While Ms. Underbrink Curran feels that she has been given some authority to negotiate for water, she does not believe that she was given the authority to negotiate on the Board’s powers.

Ms. Underbrink Curran received an e-mail from the Winter Park Ranch Water and Sanitation District saying that District has built a new lift station about 15 feet off of County Road 835. They raised the grade in the area to be level with the County Road. Now the County road has been widened to come up to the lift station. To protect the lift station from snow plowing, the District is looking to install a guard rail about 2 feet out from the bollards that are installed and to protect the lift station from cars running into it. Mr. Klancke is working with Alan Green on design. Mr. Klancke asked if the County would share the cost. The estimated cost is $8,750.

Mr. DiCola stated the lift station is on the district property but the County Road right of way comes up to it. The County granted a variance to the setback.

Aspen Ridge Subdivision Exemption Sketch Plan and Variance to Road and Bridge Standards

The following is all or part of staff’s Certificate of Recommendation to the Board as it was provided by staff for inclusion in the minutes of the meeting held on June 4, 2012.

RE: Aspen Ridge Subdivision Exemption – Sketch Plan and Variance to Section 3.3 of the Road and Bridge Standards

APPLICANT: Andre A. and Natalie M. DeBakker

LOCATION: A 39.57 acre tract of land being a portion of the NE ¼ of the SW ¼ of Section 17, Township 1 South, Range 75 West of 6th P.M. (Behind Four Way Estates Subdivision)

ZONING: Forestry and Open District (F)

APPLICABLE SECTION OF CODE: Grand County Subdivision Exemption Regulations, Master Plan, Zoning Regulations and Road and Bridge Standards

EXHIBITS: Letter of Application; Sketch Plan; GIS Vicinity Map; Pictures of County Road 8031; Variance Letter; Variance Support Letters

STAFF CONTACT: Kristen Manguso

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting approval of a Subdivision Exemption in order to divide a 39.57 acre parcel of land into three (3) lots.

DISCUSSION:
The applicant is the owner of approximately 39.57 acres of land recorded at Reception No. 2006009459. This request is to create three (3) lots, two (2) of which will be approximately 2.4 acres in size and the third will contain approximately 34 acres. There is currently a single family dwelling on proposed Lot 2.

This property is north of, and adjacent to, Four Way Estates Subdivision, Unit Number One. Access is off County Road 8, to County Road 8031. This property was included in the Urban Growth Boundary in 2006 by Planning Commission Resolution No. 2006-9-4.

Mr. DeBakker has indicated that he wishes to gain approval of this subdivision exemption request to avoid foreclosure on the entire property. According to County records, a Notice of Election and Demand in reference to this property was recorded in December of 2011 at Reception No. 2011008884. The Applicant has also indicated that he wishes to subdivide the 34 acre parcel of land sometime in the future. He is aware that this will require a full subdivision process, and compliance with all regulations in effect at that time.

COMPLIANCE WITH GRAND COUNTY ZONING REGULATIONS:
The tract of land is located within the Forestry and Open Zone District. The intent of the district is for low density single-family residential uses. The minimum lot size for this zone district within a growth boundary as
designated within the Grand County Master Plan is two (2) acres. The proposed Subdivision Exemption parcels are approximately 2.4 acres and 34 acres in size, in compliance with the minimum lot size.

**COMPLIANCE WITH GRAND COUNTY MASTER PLAN:**
This tract of land was amended into Grand County Urban Growth Area 1 as designated by the Grand County Master Plan by Planning Commission Resolution No. 2006-9-4. The general goal for the use of those areas within adopted growth areas is to provide land for future growth in a manner where it can best be accommodated.

Grand County encourages building architecture to be compatible with location and the environment, colored to blend in with the surrounding vegetative cover. New developments shall preserve and enhance community appearance and design. In support of this, the following note has been placed on the plat: *Earthen tone colors and materials that blend with the natural environment are to be used on the exterior of all structures, including but not limited to, facades, roofs, doors, and trim.*

It is also a goal of the Master Plan to ensure that new development is not out of character with the surrounding area with respect to uses and Lot size. The surrounding properties consist of the 4 Way Estates Subdivision, Unit Number One, which consists of one to two acre parcels, and is adjacent to the south. Larger metes and bounds parcels (40-150 acres) are located to the east, west and north. With the above in mind, it is Staff’s opinion that this development request is not out of character with the surrounding lot sizes and that the density and use of this subdivision exemption request is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Master Plan.

**COMPLIANCE WITH GRAND COUNTY SUBDIVISION EXEMPTION REGULATIONS:**

Section 2.3 LOTS

(2) As a minimum requirement, Lot dimensions shall conform to applicable zoning or other land use requirements. In addition, each Lot shall have a minimum area of two and four tenths (2.4) acres.

The proposed Subdivision Exemption parcels consist of 2.4 acres and approximately 34 acres in size, therefore, this request meets the minimum lot size requirement of 2.4 acres as required within the Grand County Subdivision Exemption Regulations.

3.2 SKETCH PLAN

(2) The sketch plan shall contain or be accompanied by the following information:

(a) **Proposed name of the exempted tract.**

This request is correctly titled

**ASPEN RIDGE SUBDIVISION EXEMPTION**

A portion of the NE ¼ SE ¼ of Section 17, Township 1 South, Range 75 West of the 6th P.M., Grand County, Colorado

Conveyed by Reception No. 2006009459

(b) **A correct legal description of the entire property to be divided.**

A correct legal description has been provided.

(c) **The names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the applicant(s), and the land surveyor, engineer, and/or designer of the proposed division, if any.**

The applicant has provided proper contact information.

(d) **Date of preparation, scale and north sign (designated as true north).**

A scale, date of preparation, north sign and vicinity map are shown on the sketch plan.

(e) **Location and principal dimensions for all proposed street rights-of-way, easements and Lot lines.**

The sketch plan shows the developer is dedicating a 60 foot private access and utility easement across the southern property boundary of Lots 1 and 2, which provides access to all three lots. In support of this, Note #1 on the plat shall be amended to read as follows:

*Access to all 3 lots is provided by a 60 foot private access easement. The real property under the easement is part of Lot 3. The utility easements are dedicated for public utility use. ✔A correctly executed easement shall be provided prior to recording.*
Staff sent this request to Mountain Parks Electric for their review, and their comment is as follows:

In general, we don’t have an issue with drives going under our power lines. However: I can’t tell where our pole is exactly. Obviously, it may be difficult to build a drive through the 60’ if a power pole is right in the middle of the ROW. Any costs to relocate the power line will be the responsibility of the entity requesting the relocation.

Even if the power pole is not an issue, we also have concerns if any grade changes will be necessary when the drive/road is built. The National Electric Safety Code clearances must be met. If the power line needs to be raised, those costs would be the responsibility of the entity causing the clearance violation.

As part of the approval, the Applicant will be required to obtain engineered cost estimates for the construction of the driveway to serve Lot 2 across the 60 foot private access and utility easement. These estimates must include any costs associated with relocation of any power poles, and ensure the necessary clearances are met.

Currently, a domestic well exists on the property. The Applicant also has an approved augmentation plan for twelve (12) wells by Case Number 07CW121, that addresses water on this property. If this request is approved, the Applicant is required to surrender the domestic well and comply with the approved augmentation plan, and the augmentation plan shall be recorded with any final plat. The following note is contained on the plat stating that “This Subdivision Exemption is required to comply with the Water Augmentation Plan Case Number: 07CW121, recorded at Reception No. 123701 of the Grand County Records”.

The augmentation plan requires measuring devices to be installed on each well when drilled, and that at the time the Applicants development plan is approved by the County, the Applicant shall establish a homeowners association that shall be responsible for ensuring that the terms and conditions of this decree are met. To comply with the augmentation plan, the Applicant shall form a Homeowners Association as required within the water augmentation plan. The proposed covenants and bylaws have been provided, and are under review by the Grand County Attorney’s office.

The applicant will be required to assure and guarantee construction of any improvements through a Subdivision Improvements Agreement with Grand County. This can be accomplished by a Board of County Commissioners Resolution restricting the lots from sale until such time as the improvements are fully completed, then inspected, approved and released by Grand County and any applicable public agencies, or by providing 110% of the total cost of the required improvements through a letter of credit or escrow funds. Complete and comprehensive engineered construction plans and cost estimates, identifying all required improvements, shall be provided prior to recording of any final plat.

(f) Location and principal dimensions for all existing streets (including their names), alleys, easements, water courses, and other important features within and adjacent to the tract to be divided.

VARIANCE

County Road 8031 is a non-county maintained, publicly dedicated 60 foot right-of-way as shown on the plat of Four Way Estates Subdivision Unit Number One, recorded in 1972 at Reception No. 123701 of the Grand County Records. County Road 8031 is not currently constructed to County Road Standards, being approximately 14 feet wide, and is privately maintained by the property owners. There are currently six (6) single family dwellings accessing off County Road 8031, which, according to Road and Bridge Standards, creates 48 Average Daily Trips (ADT’s). Lot 1 in Four Way Estates remains vacant at this time, yet will contribute an additional 8 ADT’s to this roadway once it is improved.

A total of 16 additional (ADT’s) may be generated as a result of this development request as two (2) additional single-family residential lots will be created. Therefore, the total number of ADT’s in which County Road 8031 has the potential to serve is 72. Section 3.3 of the County Road and Bridge Standards require that any access that serves more than 20 ADT’s be improved to Access Road Standards.

Table 3.3 of the Grand County Road and Bridge Standards requires that any Access Road be built with two (2) driving lanes of ten (10) feet in width, and one (1) foot shoulders on each side. The applicant is requesting a variance to the criteria contained within said standards, specifically, Section 3.3, Road
Classifications and Table 3.3 of the Road and Bridge Standards which requires that any roadway that services in excess of 20 ADT’s is required to be constructed to Access Road standards. The request is to allow for the road to remain in it’s existing condition until such time as the Applicant processes a full subdivision on the 34 acre parcel.

Section 8.1 allows for variances to the Road and Bridge Standards, which may be granted by the Board of County Commissioners under the following circumstances:

a) Where, by reason of exceptional situations or conditions, the strict application of these regulations would result in peculiar practical difficulties, or undue hardship upon an individual provided the conditions in SECTION 8.1.2c are met.

b) Where an individual is proposing to construct a low volume or local access road and the strict application of these regulations would result in excessive cut and fill slopes, visual scarring, or other environmental damage, variances in road design standards may be granted if granting the variance will result in lessened environmental damage, and the conditions in SECTION 8.1.2c are met.

c) Variances from the difficulties or hardships described in SECTION 8.1.2a&b may be granted provided relief will not result in substantial detriment to public health, safety and welfare, substantial impairment of the road design and construction standards, or the granting of any special privilege or use.

This request has been forwarded to the East Grand Fire Department (EGFD), Emergency Medical Services (EMS) and the Grand County Road and Bridge Department (RAB) for their review and comments.

Letters from EGFD and EMS both state they have no opposition to the variance request, although EGFD requested a turnaround be provided prior to construction of a single family dwelling on either Lot 1 or Lot 3. RAB has provided an email stating they are in support of this variance, with the condition that the Applicant sign a waiver prepared by the Grand County Attorney’s office. They will have a representative at this hearing.

As stated above, the existing road is maintained by the property owners using County Road 8031 for access. Letters of support from all owners along the road with the exception of Lot 1, Four Way Estates, have been provided. Lot 1 property owners have not provided a letter of objection or support, and you may recall this is a vacant lot.

It is staff’s opinion that this request can be justified under (a) and (c) of this section, as this road was dedicated on August 10, 1972. The right-of-way is in compliance with County regulations, however, at that time, the developer of Four Way Estates was not required to construct the road according to any standards. These types of situations are addressed in Section 8.3 and 8.4 of the Road and Bridge Standards, Upgrading Existing Roads.

Based upon the property owner support letters, the agreement of EMS and EGFD, and the fact that this request will not result in a public health, safety or welfare issue, staff recommends the Board approve the variance as requested.

The Applicant stated their intent to propose a full subdivision sometime in the future on proposed Lot 3. The Applicant is placed on notice, that if this variance is granted, that at such time as a full subdivision is submitted for review, all county standards regarding subdivision, including roads, must be met. This includes, but is not limited to, the requirement that County Road 8031 be constructed to County Road and Bridge Standards, and a second means of ingress/egress will be required. Further, the Applicant is on notice that there is no guarantee that any subdivision will be approved.

The names of abutting subdivisions and the names of the owners of abutting unplatted properties. The names of the abutting property owners are shown on the sketch plan as required.

Approximate acreage of all Lots to be created by the division of land.

The submitted sketch plan shows the acreage of the proposed lots as follows:

Lot 1 – 2.407 acres
Lot 2 – 2.402 acres
Lot 3 – 34.72 acres +/-

The names of abutting subdivisions and the names of the owners of abutting unplatted properties. The names of the abutting property owners are shown on the sketch plan as required.

Approximate acreage of all Lots to be created by the division of land.

The submitted sketch plan shows the acreage of the proposed lots as follows:

Lot 1 – 2.407 acres
Lot 2 – 2.402 acres
Lot 3 – 34.72 acres +/-
The Subdivision Exemption Regulations require a minimum Lot size of 2.4 acres, therefore, this request is in compliance.

(i) Relevant site characteristics including the existence of any special natural or man made hazards.
N/A

(j) Certified notice that the mineral estate owner has been notified pursuant to C.R.S. 24-65.5-101 et al.
The Applicant is the mineral estate owner.

(k) A current title insurance commitment
Title insurance commitment issued by Land Title Guarantee and dated February 13, 2012, has been provided. ✔Current title work dated within 6 months will be required prior to recording. The commitment shows two (2) Deeds of Trust encumbering the property, both in favor of Grand Mountain Bank. The submitted plat shows the correct signature blocks for all lien holders as required. If this request is approved, the legal descriptions of the property will change. Because of this, ✔Modifications of all Deeds of Trust shall be provided prior to recording any final plat.

STAFF COMMENTS:
✔In order to address water quality concerns for the long term, if this proposal is approved, the applicant will be required to provide $1,000.00 per lot, for a total of two (2) lots. The applicant will be required to enter into a wastewater/water quality agreement as well.

✔The standard septic system design detail, as approved by Grand County, shall be included on any final plat.

✔East Grand Fire requires an emergency services impact fee to be paid of $454 per lot, for a total of $908. This fee shall be paid at recording.

✔If the Board does not grant the requested variance, the applicant will be required to assure and guarantee construction of all required improvements through a Subdivision Improvements Agreement with Grand County. This can be accomplished by restricting the lots from sale until such time the improvements are fully completed, then inspected and approved by Grand County and any applicable public agencies, or by providing 110% of the total cost of the required improvements through a letter of credit or escrow funds. ✔Complete and comprehensive cost estimates, identifying all required improvements, shall be provided if required.

✔A certificate showing taxes paid, both past and present, shall be provided with any final plat recording.

✔A 11" x 17" address map showing the addresses for all lots shall be provided prior to any recording of any approved final plat.

✔An electronic copy of the final plat in AutoCAD.dwg or AutoCAD.dxf format shall be provided prior to any recording of any final plat. The drawing shall be based or transformed to a known coordinate system, not an assumed local coordinate system. If GPS Lat/Long is not used for this reference, the Geographic Coordinate Data Base should be used to obtain relative coordinates available from the BLM at www.blm.gov/gcdb. The drawing shall include either a data dictionary to explain the layers, or a self-explanatory layering system.

✔The Board of County Commissioners has determined that all land divisions impact the schools in Grand County, therefore, with any final plat approval, and prior to recording of any final plat, the applicant will be required to provide school fees in the amount of $4,603. This figure was calculated using the formula found in Section 2.10 (6)(2)(a) and (6)(3) as follows:

School Fees Formula Calculation
2 Lots x .50 = 1
1.0 x .0691 = .0691 assessable acres
.0691 assessable acres x $66,625 per acre = $4,603
Total School Fees = $4,603

The per acre price was calculated using assessors data based on sale price for Lot 1, Pinon Ridge Subdivision Exemption, Lot 40, Elkhorn Ridge, and Lot 1, Four Way Estates Subdivision.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION:
The Grand County Planning Commission recommended sketch plan approval of this request with Resolution No. 2012-3-1.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**
Staff recommends approval of the Aspen Ridge Subdivision Exemption Sketch Plan and Variance to Section 3.3, Road Classifications, contained within the Grand County Road and Bridge Standards with the following conditions to be met or sufficiently addressed with any final plat:

1. If required, a waiver prepared by the Grand County Attorney’s office regarding the turnaround shall be provided.

2. Complete and comprehensive cost estimates, identifying all required improvements, shall be provided with any final plat submittal.

3. The standard septic system design detail, as approved by Grand County, shall be shown on the final plat.

4. A draft easement agreement for the private access and utility easement.

5. The Board of County Commissioners Certificate shall reference Resolution No. 2008-11-12.

6. Note #1 shall be amended to read: “Access to all 3 Lots is provided by a 60 foot private access easement recorded at Reception No. 2012_______ of the Grand County Records. The real property under the easement is part of Lot 3. The utility easements are dedicated for public utility use.

7. Note # 4 shall include the language “These lots are reserved for residential use only.”

8. The easements shall be labeled “20 foot public utility easements”.

9. The following additional notes shall be contained on any final plat:
   - The following materials must be submitted to Grand County with any application for a building permit:
     - An individual soils report, engineered foundation plan and an underdrain plan. In addition, all foundation excavations must be inspected by the engineer prior to any footing structures being placed within the excavation and the engineer must certify that the foundation has been correctly designed for the existing soils. If the inspection indicates that the foundation plans should be revised, then the engineer shall provide a modified foundation plan and an amended building permit shall be obtained. No request for a footing inspection shall be made to the Grand County Building department until such certification has been made.
     - A site specific survey depicting, at a minimum, the lot, the intended driveway access to a public road, the building envelope, the intended location of the home, well and septic system, any waterways or irrigation ditches within the lot and the natural water drainage channels.
   - All exterior lighting shall be designed and installed to direct light inward and downward onto the site and away from adjoining properties. This can be accomplished by installing downward facing, hooding lighting fixtures.

10. All final plat requirements are met.

All legal documents are subject to review and acceptance by the County Attorney.

[End of Staff’s memo]

Ms. Underbrink Curran noted that he has to build the 60-foot road and the turn around.

Mr. DeBakker stated that the current County Road 8031, of the five homes that are on there, four of them have circular driveways. There is also a turn-out 500 feet from County Road 80. Even though it is a narrow road, there are multiple places to turn around. It is his full intent to eventually improve the road to County Standards. He noted that, at this point, he cannot do it. It makes sense to do the subdivision exemption first and then do the full subdivision.
Commissioner Newberry stated that what sketch plan does is give you all the issues that are out there. Under what is being presented today (the way Commissioner Newberry hears it), the fire district wants a turn around and the County will require it. When Mr. DeBakker comes back for a subdivision, Commissioner Newberry would be surprised if those same people that do not have a problem giving you a variance right now do not have some problem with you putting a subdivision back there. This is to give you a heads-up also. There is no guarantee that a subdivision will be approved.

Ms. Underbrink Curran stated that this would add a variance to the Road Standards to just this subdivision exemption. If a full subdivision would come into the future, that variance is no longer valid. The Board agreed with that statement.

Ms. Manguso stated that when approving this, there is no guarantee that a full subdivision will be approved.

Commissioner Newberry moved to approve the Aspen Ridge Subdivision Exemption Sketch Plan and variance to the Road and Bridge Standards as presented.

Discussion: Ms. Underbrink Curran stated that under normal circumstances, the Board would grant the variance today so that if he comes forward with a final plat, the Board has said that it is ok on this thing. The Board will grant the variance at the time of final plat.

Commissioner Bumgarner applauded the applicant for talking with his neighbors.

The motion passed unanimously.

Attorney Items

Mr. DiCola stated that there was an issue with regard to drainage by Lake Granby. It has been referred to the insurance company.

Scott Ford, Yampa Valley Data Partners, Presentation, “Measurements for Economic Development Success”

Scott Ford introduced Roger Good to discuss economic development.

Mr. Ford stated that he has been involved in economic development in some sort for a number of years.

Mr. Ford stated that they went through a process in Routt County about three years ago and the discussion came down to that economic development is a huge term that all of us think we understand. There are a number of ways to measure economic development.

Mr. Ford stated that Routt County has worked determining what economic development means for their County.

Mr. Ford stated that almost everything we do has an economic impact. At a very high level, most of the things that we are involved with as people in our Counties rarely do we cause economic harm. You can have an economic impact if someone shoplifts from a store. It would be a negative impact. If someone buys from the store, it would be a positive impact.

If the definition of economic development is broad, everything becomes economic development. If that is the case, it is difficult to structure a strategy.

Mr. Ford stated that he looked at Bureau of Economic Development analysis information that is based on tax returns. Mr. Ford looked at sources of income by industry sector and sources of employment by industry sector and how the income of households is drifting at a rate that is greater than inflation.

The analysis looks at the top three industries in the county and aggregates them together and determines if it is above or below 50 percent of the sources of income. Government is not included in industries. Mr. Good stated that the premise behind the three industries is to be diverse enough to weather a fair amount of ups and downs. One measurement of diversity is what percentage of the total workforce is consumed in the top three industries. With a little bit of work, it was determined that counties that have historically weathered ups and downs in economies have had less than 50 percent of their citizens’ income tied to the top three industries. If one of those three industries get hit, the pain the county feels is great.
One of the goals in Routt County is diversity. One of the ways to measure diversity is while they cannot figure out what all the industries are, if the top three is much more than 50 percent the ability to weather a severe storm is severely impacted.

Mr. Ford stated that the definition of economic development has been narrowed. They have recognized that not everything is economic development. One of the ways that it gets narrowed is say that all of the initiatives for economic development that the County can get involved in, “is this making that 50 percent number keeping us above or below the line and is it growing a particular income?”

Mr. Ford stated that there are 20 private industry sectors. You could be the most diverse county if you, for example, said let’s have 5 percent of our employment out of each of those sectors and 5 percent of our income out of each of those industries. If that income was minimum wage you would be the most diverse county but the poorest in the United States. There has to be diversity balances in the tripod but the other leg that says are we moving our wages and our household income at a rate greater than inflation.

This example has been used to create a regional economic development strategy. One of the strategies is to increase telecommunication capabilities. Another strategy is to increase the educational level of the workforce. The temptation is to quickly drive to activities. The question then becomes is the diversity and income moving forward. Those are hard things to move.

Losing the construction industry in Grand County made the County more diverse. The data supports that the economy is a lot like 2005 and 2006.

Mr. Ford stated that it is often said that the quality of life is the best asset a community has. His question to those present is “what is quality of life?” There are 10 counties on the western slope that were indexed against Routt County. The question then becomes “is it just us or is it happening to everyone?” If it is happening to everyone, are we responding better?”

Mr. Ford stated that it is tough to be narrowly focused but it is important to do so.

Mr. Ford stated that Routt County found that they were getting a number of people who could live and work anywhere. He believes that same thing is happening in Grand County. Routt County has found a growth in “location neutral business.” They can live and work anywhere.

After investigation, it was determined that telecommunication infrastructure, transportation, and education are the most important. If you can do those things, businesses (in some form) will come.

Mr. Good stated that there needs to be a consideration for the number of jobs and the type of jobs that are needed for economic sustainability.

Mr. Good provided this example: I could open a hotel and hire a bunch of people at a lower salary. The unemployment rate would go down, but the cost would be lowering the average wage. That is not a bad thing, but there needs to be consideration of what will happen when that type of job comes in.

Mr. Good encouraged the County to select two or three things (not more than three) that really define what economic development means to you. Going after unemployment is a reasonable goal. You need to determine how you are going to measure it and what steps need to be taken.

If the second one is education, there needs to be a way to measure it and an outline of the steps that are going to be taken.

Once all the goals are determined, the County needs to stick with the goals. Once you pick a goal, it should preclude you from doing the other. Mr. Good noted that the County needs to pick carefully.

Mr. Good stated that the Routt County Economic Development Cooperative took the task to identify the goals. There were 10 to 12 people. The ground rule for the meetings were: “if you don’t make it to the meeting, you don’t make it to the meeting and we are going on without you.” They ended up with six or eight people that attended regularly.

Mr. Good stated that the determination in Routt County was that economic development met that they increased diversity and increased wage source income.
Public Hearing – Off-Highway Vehicle Hearings

The public hearing scheduled to begin at 1:30 p.m. was called to order by Chairman Stuart at 1:44 p.m. County Attorney DiCola set the record.
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Mr. Alan Green, of Grand County Road and Bridge, stated that he received some requests last year with regard to OHV use in Grand County from some clubs.

Mr. Green sought public input in order to create a map. Once he created a map, he put legal notice in the paper to solicit public comment on the maps.

Road and Bridge Supervisor Ken Haynes read the following letter:

The Grand County Road and Bridge Department strives to provide the traveling public with the safest, best maintained, and signed roadways possible.

With the approval of snowmobile use on designated roads to access public lands, Grand County Road and Bridge would recommend acceptance of OHV use on roads that would allow access to public lands to keep continuity in recreational use of County roads.

The Road and Bridge Department would like to thank the Board of County Commissioners for their continued support of the department.

Sincerely, Ken Haynes

The first request received was from Robert Florquists with regard to Cottonwood Pass, County Road 55, Parshall Divide, County Road 20, Beaver Creek, etc.

Mr. DiCola asked how the proposed routes relate to the snowmobile routes. Mr. Green stated that they access public lands. There were a couple of requests that do not access public lands.

Mr. DiCola asked Mr. Green to talk about the requests that are not recommended and then asked him to talk about the requests that Mr. Green recommends that have opposition.
Mr. Green stated that the first request the Road and Bridge does not recommend was from Douglas Bellatty with regard to County Road 519, County Road 5194, 5194W, and County Road 876. Mr. Bellatty indicated that there is a water system that he accesses, administers and maintains and would like to use an OHV and use the County Roads to access the water system. The request does not benefit the public. Mr. Green is recommending that the Board not accept those roads.

Mr. DiCola stated that a special district or public utility can use OHVs for meter reading or repair for business purposes.

Mr. Green stated that Matthew Reed sent a letter requesting that all County Roads be open to OHV that have speeds of 45 miles per hour or less. There are others that have signed off on the letter.

Mr. Green stated that he received a letter from Norm Benson requesting that all County Roads should be open to ATVs, UTVs, and other such OHVs unless clearly signed as closed to OHVs. He also included a letter to the state of Colorado proposing legislation to allow OHVs meeting certain requirements on public roads.

Mr. Green suggested that those requests be denied.

Mr. DiCola stated that you have to have a driver license to operate an OHV on a public road. If the person does not have a driver license, they have to be 10 years old and in the direct eye contact of a person with a driver license to drive on a public road.

Mr. Green is asking that the roads in Old Park not be open for use by OHVs.

Mr. Green stated that Mr. Florquist’s request comes out of Hot Sulphur Springs over Cottonwood Pass. The Parshall Divide goes onto public land. There is also a portion from County Road 3 to County Road 340 to the National Forest.

Commissioner Bumgarner stated that he is opposed to allowing use of County Road 3.

Sheriff Johnson stated that there is not a lot more impact on a road from a motor cycle to an OHV. He noted that if the Board is setting up just portions of roads for use, the Board may want to consider allowing no use on the specific road.

The Board agreed that County Road 3 should not have OHV use, County Road 340 will be allowed if the old gravel pit can be used for parking, and County Road 33 OHV use allowed.

Jay Clough stated that on the areas on the east coast have worked to have interconnecting trails. Grand County might consider working with adjoining counties to have a similar system.

The Board is fine with allowing use on County Roads 20 and 55 as long as the Town of Hot Sulphur Springs has no problem with it. The Board is fine with allowing use on County Road 50.

Ryan Collins of Aspen Canyon Ranch would like County Road use from Cow Creek (near the intersection of County Road 311 and 3) to County Road 3. The Board does not agree with the use of County Road 3.

The Grand Lake Town Manager would like the use of County Roads 48, 49, 491, and 492. The Road and Bridge Department agrees with the request.

County Roads 4 and 4482 will allow people to park at Stillwater and ride to the National Forest Service. Mr. Green agrees with this request.

Mr. DiCola stated that if the Board does not designate County Roads for OHV use at this hearing or by resolution, it is illegal to use the County Roads for OHV use.

Sheriff Johnson stated that he is not opposed to OHV use on the roads. The only thing that bothers him is the use of OHV by 10 year old children.

Commissioner Newberry moved to continue the public hearing to August 14, 2012, at 10:45 a.m. for continued discussion.
Discussion: The Board members will discuss this matter with the towns.

The motion passed unanimously.

The Board of Commissioners will bring this conversation to CCI and Mr. DiCola will bring it up with other County Attorneys.

**Attorney Items**

County Attorney DiCola presented the following Resolutions for Board approval:


- **Resolution No. 2012-5-33**, "A RESOLUTION APPROVING AND AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF THE COUNTY OF GRAND, STATE OF COLORADO TO EXECUTE AN APPLICATION FOR AMENDED GROUP COVERAGE BETWEEN CIGNA HEALTH AND LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY AND THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF THE COUNTY OF GRAND, STATE OF COLORADO"

- **Resolution No. 2012-6-2**, "A RESOLUTION OF THE GRAND COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS APPROVING APPOINTMENTS OF MEMBERS TO THE NORTHWEST REGIONAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD"

Commissioner Newberry moved to approve Resolution Nos. 2012-5-33 through 2012-5-35 and 2012-6-2 as presented.

The motion passed unanimously.

**Abatements (continuation) – SREI Creeksedge, Inc. and SREI WPS, Inc.**

County Attorney DiCola researched whether or not a developers discount is applicable to these properties. The Assessor is required, under some circumstances, to value property based on an anticipated market absorption rate. The market absorption rate is applied to subdivisions that are up to 80 percent sold. Once they are 80 percent sold, the market absorption rate goes away.

In both of these cases, the market absorption rate went away and now the taxpayer’s representative is saying because they were foreclosed on or taken back by a bank or investor, you can “unring the bell.”

Mr. DiCola stated that the first market absorption rate says: “The anticipated market absorption rate is a method which adjusts the value of property to account for the developer’s cost of development in placing site improvements. Its purpose is to assist a developer by relieving some of the burden of carrying the upfront costs expended in preparing the property for development and retail sale. The anticipated market absorption rate recognizes the time value of a developer’s investments by treating the value of individual subdivision lots like payments in an anticipated future annuity stream. In other words, instead of valuing a multi-lot subdivision development as a sum of the values of the individual lots, the anticipated market absorption rate discounts the value of the development to the amount that a purchaser of the development would be willing to pay for the entire development on the assessment date. The value derived is a present value of the future income stream represented by the anticipated future sales of the individual lots. The adjustment of value is important because in valuing a property the sum of the parts can be and often is greater than the whole.”
Mr. DiCola stated that it is his understanding that the Property Tax Administrator’s position is that you can “unring the bell.” Mr. DiCola stated that he does not see that in the Property Tax Administrator’s Regulations nor does he find it in case law. A developer’s discount is a discount when the developer has a bunch of lots for sale and the lots will not be sold in one year. The “bell was rung” and 80 percent of the subdivision was sold and the developer’s discount went away.

It is the opinion of the taxpayer’s representative that the developer’s discount should be applied. If the Board finds that the developer’s discount should be applied, the Board will need to direct the Assessor’s Office to apply a developer’s discount to the properties.

Mr. Berger stated that he spoke with the Property Tax Administrator’s Office and they said that because this property was taken back, it is not to an end user therefore the application of present worth would apply because these lots have not be absorbed.

Commissioner Bumgarner moved to deny for developer discount AB11-49 for 2010 on Schedule Nos. R192422 and R192423

The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Bumgarner moved to deny for developer discount AB11-50 for 2010 on R195071, R192547 R192546, R192545 all of which are vacant parcels and R195081 which is an improved parcel.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Berger stated that on the Dvanch Property (Abatement No. AB11-49) that once the property was sold it was replatted. It was never approved. It got too cost prohibitive to develop the property because the city was requiring a bridge be built and the utilities taken under Vasquez Creek.

There is a 90 day recession clause in the access agreement across this property. There is an easement across this property than can be taken away by either the owner or the adjacent owner.

Commissioner Newberry moved to deny Abatement No. AB 11-49.

The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Newberry moved to deny Abatement No. AB 11-50.

The motion passed unanimously.

Caroline Bradford – Gore Canyon Whitewater Park (Phase 1) – Grant Update

Ms. Bradford is present to discuss the Water Supply Reserve Account Grant. The process involves more detail than had been discussed in the past.

Ms. Bradford stated that County has already spent approximately $500,000 on the project.

When Ms. Bradford applies for the grant, she will need to show the investment already made by Grand County. To describe the phases, Ms. Bradford stated that Grand County has invested $500,000 in Phase 1. In order to show that the County is continuing to invest money in it, Ms. Bradford is stating that Grand County will put another $100,000 into the project before it is finished. The County is not obligated to that amount, but that number is put in as a starting place.

The cost to finish the project at Pump House is $1.2. On top of that another $1.7 is needed to build a road down Inspiration Point and build the structures.

Ms. Bradford stated that she spoke with Susan Cassel of the BLM to verify the BLM support. The EA will be $15,000 and the BLM will cover that cost.

Ms. Bradford would like to ask for $100,000 from the Colorado Basin Fund and she would like to ask for $400,000 from the State Fund. There is about $5 million in the State Fund right now.
Ms. Bradford stated that she put the $100,000 because the County is spending money.

Ms. Bradford described the timeline:

1. The County needs to apply for the grant now. The grant decision has a couple of phases. The June 25, 2012, meeting of the Roundtable is a good place for the Board of Commissioners to be.
2. The July 23, 2012, meeting of the Roundtable is when the vote on the grant is taking place.
3. At the September Board meeting of the CWCB is when the vote will take place.
4. The County will need to go under contract with the State within six months.
5. If the County spends a little money out of the grant next spring, that gets the clock ticking.
6. The County has five years to spend the money. Ms. Bradford is putting three years into the grant. The staff wants shovel-ready projects.

When you apply for the money, you don’t have to spend it. No one holds it against you if you end up not finishing the project.

Ms. Bradford stated that when you apply for the Water Supply Reserve Account grant you need to identify where you are going to get the rest of the money. The County needs to make a good case that it can fund the entire thing. Ms. Bradford has put together a fundraising plan. Ms. Bradford is working on a retail partnership program to help raise money.

Commissioner Newberry stated that with RICD and the fishermen, there has been a rub with the boaters and the fishermen. Ms. Bradford stated that it is a separation of uses. No one fishes at the site they are using because they fish on the trail upstream of the launch.

Ms. Bradford stated that there needs to be a list of frequently asked questions on the County’s web site to discuss the project. Commissioner Newberry asked what the relationship is between the County and Ms. Bradford. Ms. Bradford stated that there is not a contract. She should be under contract to coordinate the project and to ask for grant money.

Ms. Bradford stated that Susan Cassel of the BLM and she thought that $15,000 would be the right amount for an environmental assessment and the other numbers for the other items were accurate.

In order for the Board to have certainty with Ms. Bradford for how much the County is spending asking other people for money, she can provide a contract.

The Board is ready to move forward with this and with a contract with Ms. Bradford.

Board Business

Road and Bridge Supervisor Ken Haynes stated that there was another $9,000 addition on fog seal for the County Road 491 project. Mr. Haynes spoke with Commissioner Bumgarner before he left for another meeting and he has no objection to go to the $75,000 limit for fog seal.

The Board has no objection to the limit of $75,000 for fog seal on County Road 491.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:53 p.m. Minutes were taken and prepared by Sara L. Rosene, County Clerk and Recorder. Approved this _____ day of July 2012.

______________________________
Nancy Stuart, Chair

ATTEST:

______________________________
Sara L. Rosene
Grand County Clerk and Recorder