GRAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, February 12th, 2020

MEMBERS PRESENT: Sally Blea  Will MacDonald
Ingrid Karlstrom  Kim Shepton
Deborah Fitch  Bob Gnuse
Marcus Davis  Henry Broadhurst

MEMBERS ABSENT: Tara Fournet

STAFF PRESENT: Robert Davis  Alex Taft
Taylor Schlueter  Chris Leahy
Maxine LaBarre-Krostue  Patty Kemper

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Marcus Davis at 6:38 PM. Roll call was taken.

Minutes from January 15th, 2020 were presented. Motion to approve was made by Ingrid Karlstrom, seconded by Sally Blea. All in favor "aye", none opposed, motion carried.

Chairperson Marcus Davis gave a reminder to Public Attendees to come to the microphone and identify themselves when making public comments. There was one (1) member of the Public in attendance.

Lots 34 & 47, Grand View Park – Amended Final Plat

Presented by: Alexander Taft, Planner, LEED Green Associate

CERTIFICATE OF RECOMMENDATION

Planning Commission, February 12, 2020; Board of County Commissioners TBD, 2020

PROJECT NAME: Amended Final Plat, Lots 34, and 35, Amended Final Plat Grand View Park

APPLICANT: Mitchell D. and Margaret A. Greene

LOCATION: Lots 34, and 35, Grand View Park, 366 GCR 4571 & 390 GCR 4571

ZONING: Mobile Home District (M)

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS: Grand County Zoning Regulations, Grand County Master Plan, Grand County Subdivision Regulations

ATTACHMENTS:
I. BACKGROUND

Grand View Park was originally approved and platted in 1923 recorded at Reception No. 28445. The lots originally created in 1923 were approximately 40' x 100' or 4,000 ft². The developers who purchased the property in 1996 and completed the subdivision in 1997 created lots in the range of 10,000 ft² (.25 acres). The lots in the subdivision are serviced by well and public sewer. The service was extended by the developers in 1997. This subdivision borders US Highway 34 to the west.

II. PROPOSAL:

Mitchell D. and Margaret A. Greene are the owners of Lot 34 and 35 by Warranty Deed at Reception No. 2019007560 and 2017006376. The Applicants propose to combine the two lots and to allow a larger buildable area and create separation between their property and neighbors.

Lot 34 currently contains a dwelling and the Applicant intends to begin construction of a garage in spring or early summer of 2020.

III. STAFF COMMENTS AND ANALYSIS

This Amended Final Plat involves a lot combination of Lot 34 and Lot 35 resulting in one conforming lot. The property owner also owns Lot 47 southwest of this proposal, but has no plans for it currently.

The lots subject in this proposal are residential use and is surrounded by residential uses. The zone district throughout Grand View Park is Mobile Home District which allows individual mobile homes. It appears that the homes within the subdivision are all site build timber frame construction.

The lots as they exist today are pre-existing and non-conforming. They were a vast improvement over the lots created by the original plat. Both lots are served by public sewer via Three Lakes Water and Sanitation District. Access to utilities is either in the adjacent roadway or overhead. The amended plat will benefit both lots by creating a larger area where structures could be built without causing encroachment into the setbacks.

IV. COMPLIANCE WITH GRAND COUNTY REGULATIONS
A. MASTER PLAN

The Grand County Master Plan contains seven (7) Plan Elements that form the core of the Master Plan. The Plan Elements include policies and implementation actions, of which one (1) are relevant to this proposal.

Plan Element 4 - Community and Public Facilities

As stated in Plan Element 4 in the Grand County Master Plan, development shall be located near public facility infrastructure. This increases efficiency and benefits existing users by reducing the impacts on outside resources. The parcels in this proposal are surrounded by existing electric, gas, and telecommunication utilities that make development less impactful.

B. ZONING REGULATIONS

The parcels involved in this proposal lie within the Mobile Home District, existing inside the Grand Lake “Joint Review” Area. The site is surrounded by vacant land or residential uses.

(a) The owners of these lots will construct a single family dwelling garage, consistent with uses by right in this District.
(b) This District requires 30’ minimum front yard setbacks, 5’ minimum side yard setbacks and 20’ minimum rear yard setbacks.
(c) The minimum lot size in the Mobile Home Zoning District is 15,000 ft² (0.34 acres) when serviced by either public water or public sewage facilities. All lots comply with this minimum as proposed.
(d) Any new construction shall comply with Section 14.4 Off-street Parking.


Grand County has used the criteria in CRS 43-2-303, regarding vacation of roadways to review vacation of utility easements:

43-2-303 (1) All right, title, or interest of a county, of an incorporated town or city or of the state or of any of its political subdivisions in and to any roadway shall be divested upon vacation of such roadway by any of the following methods:

(1)(b) The board of county commissioners of any county may vacate any roadway or any part thereof located entirely within said county if such roadway is not within the limits of any city or town.

(2) No roadway of part thereof shall be vacated so as to leave any land adjoining said roadway without an established public road connecting said land with another established public road.

(3) In the event of vacation under subsection 1 of this section, rights-of-way or easements may be reserved for the continued use of existing sewer, gas, water or similar pipelines and appurtenances for ditches or canals and appurtenances and for electric, telephone, and similar lines and appurtenances.
The vacation of the interior lot line easements created by the plat will not eliminate access for adjacent property owners. The intention of this vacation is to better connect the lots to optimize the buildable area.

D. SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS - 4.3 Final Plat/4.4 Amended Final Plat

The application shall comply with the Subdivision Regulations Amended Final Plat -Section 4.3. Conditions are listed in **BOLD**. Staff notes how the proposed Plat addresses each of the following below:

**Section 4.3 (1) (a-c)** this application meets the statement of requirements of the Preliminary Plat. The minimum scale complies as it is at a one inch (1") equals forty feet (40') scale on a twenty-four inch (24") by thirty-six inch (36") sheet.

**Section 4.3 (2) (a)** Title shall read:

2nd Amended Final Plat
Amended Lot 34A Amended Final Plat of Grand View Park
Being a Replat of Lots 34 and 35, Amended Final Plat of Grand View Park according to the Plat Recorded at Reception 97005037
Part of SW 1/4 NW 1/4 Section 24, Township 3 North, Range 76 West of the 6th P.M.
Conveyance to the owner's Recorded at Reception No. 201 4004579 and 2017004109

A scale of one inch (1") equals twenty feet (20'), date of creation and north arrow are all located on this proposed Plat.

**Section 4.3 (2) (b)** Legal Description is as follows:
Amended Lot 34A, 2nd Amended Final Plat of Grand View Park

**Section 4.3 (2) (c-d)** this proposed plat shall include primary control points, rights-of-way lines of streets, and easements and widths of rights-of-way, and adjacent property lines. Right of way lines for the full width of GCR 4571.

**Section 4.3 (2) (e-f)** Boundaries, Right-Of-Way lines, easements are all shown on the plat and dimensions, bearings, and curves are identified on line and curve tables. Rights-Of-Way show names and number. Pre-existing recorded easements with reference to their location of recording within the Grand County Real Estate records of the Grand County Clerk and Recorders Office.

**Section 4.3 (2) (g-i)** Location and description of monuments shall be included with a legend on the proposed Plat. Lots include acreage to the nearest 1/100th. All lots are intended to remain residential use.

**Section 4.3 (2) (j)** a copy of the cover page to a previous title commitment was included in the submittal, an updated title commitment shall be submitted prior to the Board of County Commissioners review.

**Section 4.3 (2) (k-m)** corrections shown below are needed for the Dedication placed on the Plat. The County Attorney’s Office shall review the Dedication. The Planning Commission (l) and Commissioner (m) certificates need to be added or corrected.

DEDICATION
KNOWN ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS: That Mitchell D. and Margaret A. Greene are the owners of that real property situated in Grand County, Colorado, more fully described as follows: Lots 34 and 35, Amended Final Plat of Grand View Park, according to the plat recorded June 23, 1997 at Reception No. 97005037; that they have caused said real property to be laid out and surveyed as, Amended Final Plat, Amended Lots 3 4A 2nd Amended Final Plat of Grand View Park and does hereby dedicate and set apart all the streets, alleys and other public ways and places shown on the accompanying plat for the use of the public forever, and does hereby dedicate those portions of said real property which are indicated as easements on the accompanying plat as easements.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF Mitchell D. and Margaret A. Greene, have caused their name to be hereunto subscribed this ________day of ____________, 20__.

______________________________
Mitchell D. Greene

______________________________
Margaret A. Greene

STATE OF COLORADO )
ss
COUNTY OF GRAND )

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this__ day of ____________, 20__ by Mitchell D. and Margaret A. Greene .

My Commission Expires:
Notary Public

______________________________

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

I, Warren Ward, a duly licensed land surveyor in the State of Colorado, do hereby certify that this Amended Final Plat, Amended Lots 3 4A 2nd Amended Final Plat of Grand View Park truly and correctly represents the results of a survey made by me or under my direction, and that said plat complies with the requirements of Title 38, Article 51, Colorado Revised Statutes, 1973, and that the
monuments required by said Statute and by the Grand County Subdivision Regulations have been placed on the ground.

____________________
(Surveyor's Signature)

(Surveyor's stamp and registration number shall appear with this certificate)

PLANNING COMMISSION CERTIFICATE

Approved this ___ day of ____________, 20__ by the Grand County Planning Commission, Grand County, Colorado.

________________________
Chairman

COMMISSIONER’S CERTIFICATE

Approved and all public dedications accepted this ___ day of ____________, 20__ by the Board of County Commissioners of Grand County, Colorado. Acceptance of this platted subdivision by the County of Grand does not constitute an acceptance of the roads and rights-of-way reflected hereon for maintenance by said County. Until such roads and rights-of-way meet County specifications and are specifically accepted for maintenance by Resolution of the Board of County Commissioners of Grand County, the maintenance, construction, and all other matters pertaining to or affecting said roads and rights-of-way are the sole responsibility of the owners of the land embraced within the subdivision. This approval does not guarantee that the size or soil conditions of any lot shown herein are such that a Building Permit may be issued.

________________________
Chairman
Board of County Commissioners
Grand County, Colorado
Section 4.3 (2) (n) certification by a qualified professional insuring compliance with the design standards is not applicable.

Section 4.3 (2) (o) a two and one-half by three inch (2 ½” x 3”) vertical box in the lower right-hand corner shall be provided for use by the County Clerk and Recorder.

Section 4.3 (2) (p) this application complies, covenants are not subject to change because of this proposed Amended Final Plat.

Section 4.3 (2) (q-r) vicinity map has been supplied and shall remain on the proposed Plat. The proposed Plat complies with provisions of (r) any new construction shall follow established criteria for stormwater drainage within each lot.

Section 4.3 (2) (s-u) these provisions are not applicable. No land areas are being dedicated with this Amended Final Plat. No additional studies are being submitted or required to meet engineering requirements. Colorado Land Use Commission no longer exists.

Section 4.3 (2) (w) addresses shall be shown on the Amended Final Plat and a digital copy will be supplied to the Grand County GIS Coordinator. Amended Lot 34A, 390 GCR 4571 (Trail Ridge Dr).

Section 4.3 (2) (x) Statement of taxes due showing current taxes paid for 2018 have been supplied, all taxes due and payable shall be paid prior to recording the Final Plat.

Section 4.3 (2) (y) 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.

V. PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

Planning Commission review of this application scheduled February 12, 2020.

VI. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the approval of the 2nd Amended Final Plat, Amended Lots 34A, Amended Final Plat of Grand View Park and vacation of interior lot line easements with the following conditions to be met prior to the recording of the Plat:

1. The title shall be amended to include conveyance to owners with location of Recording and a date of creation (4.3 (2) (a)).

2. This proposed plat shall include primary control points, rights-of-way lines of streets, and easements and widths of rights-of-way, and adjacent property lines. Right of way lines for the full width of GCR 4571 (4.3 (2) (d)).

3. Names of rights of way shall be corrected and total widths shall be shown (4.3 (2) (e)).

4. Pre-existing recorded easements with reference to their location of recording within the Grand County Real Estate records of the Grand County Clerk and Recorders Office (4.3 (2) (f)).
5. Location and description of monuments shall be included with a legend on the proposed plat (4.3 (2) (i)).

6. Corrections to the dedication statement shown on the plat to be reviewed by the County Attorney's Office prior to recording the Plat Mylar (4.3 (2) (k)).

7. Corrections to the surveyor's certificate shown on the plat prior to recording the Plat Mylar (4.3 (2) (l)).

8. Planning Commission and Commissioners certificate shall be correctly shown on the plat prior to recording the Plat Mylar (4.3 (2) (m)).

9. A statement of taxes that shows all taxes due and payable shall be paid prior to recording the plat. (4.3 (2) (x)).

10. An electronic copy in AutoCAD.dwg or AutoCAD.dxf of the Final Plat shall be submitted (4.3 (2) (y)).

11. All recording fees are to be paid by the Applicant.

Chairman Marcus Davis noted, Deborah Fitch, Commissioners needed to step out, however we still have a quorum.

Commissioners asked if the subject lots were non-conforming lots to begin with. Then it has been sub-divided and replatted but still non-conforming lots? Would think that the County would develop something that says, whenever something is replatted it has to conform.

Staff replied that, the report at the time stated it was increasing the conformity but not to the full extent needed. Staff agreed and is pushing for the replatting to make the property conform.

Commissioners stated the Certificate states the owners would like to construct a Single Family Home, but stated tonight the owners are building a garage.

Staff replied that is was a mistake, the applicant is wanting to build a garage.

Commissioners stated when we replat original subdivisions, the goal is to decrease non-conformity where we can, but the lots are already drawn. We cannot bring the entire subdivision up to conformity, though we try to make adjustments reasonable with the existing houses and infrastructure that is in place. We are not allowed to increase non-conformity. We have had discussion about accessory buildings without a primary structure on a lot. We are wanting to combine the lots so a garage can be added. Are we doing that because by putting up the garage there will not be room for a primary structure ever?

Staff replied the applicant's proposal was to build a garage where it encroaches over the property line.

Commissioners added, so not necessarily separate on Lot 34A. Where the garage is to be placed will be over the lot line. The applicant realizes this lot cannot be sold separately and moving a lot line would increase non-conformity on one lot and decrease non-conformity on the other lot. By removing the lot line, it is the best of both worlds. The applicant still owns
Lot 47.
Additional recommendation added, A title commitment dated within 6 months shall be provided prior to Board of County Commissioners Meeting (4.3) (2) (j).

Motion to recommend approval by Kim Shepton for Lots 34 & 35, Grand View Park – Amended Final Plat with 11 conditions as presented plus 1. Seconded by Will MacDonald, No Discussion. All in favor "aye", none opposed.

**Headwater Trails Alliance – Master Plan**

Presented by: Alexander Taft, Planner, LEED Green Associate

**CERTIFICATE OF RECOMMENDATION**

Planning Commission February 12, 2020; Board of County Commissioners T.B.D.

**PROJECT NAME:** Headwaters Trails Alliance (HTA) Master Plan  
**APPLICANT:** Grand County Community Development  
**LOCATION:** Unincorporated Grand County  
**APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:** Grand County Master Plan, 30-28-106 C.R.S.  
**EXHIBITS:** Headwaters Trails Alliance Strategic Trails Plan  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Community Development Staff  
**REQUEST:** Community Development is introducing a plan to be ultimately incorporated to the Grand County Master Plan

**I. DISCUSSION**

Staff is frequently in the process of analyzing our guiding documents from regulations to adopted plans. Recently Headwaters Trails Alliance (HTA) updated their Master Plan beginning in 2015 and adopted in May 2019. Internally, staff has discussed making the completed HTA Master Plan part of the Grand County Master Plan since HTA is referenced many times and an old plan was incorporated by reference. The HTA Master Plan analyzes critical components of trails and network which over time will need work. The plan itself identifies approximately $6 Million dollars’ worth of construction and maintenance over the next ten (10) years.

**II. STAFF ANALYSIS**

Headwaters Trails Alliance (HTA) is a 501(c)3 not-for-profit organization registered in Grand County, Colorado. The organization was formed in 1996 following the development of the Headwaters Master Trails Plan, with the charge of administering that Plan.

HTA moved forward with a geographic regional approach to defining specific priorities and goals, splitting the county into the Winter Park-Fraser, Granby-Grand Lake, and Kremmling-Hot Sulphur Springs Sub-Areas.
The first portion of this plan presents a countywide overview of trails and related facilities, other plans, opportunities/constraints, and demographics that have bearing on the overall plan, the mission, goals, and objectives of Headwaters Trails Alliance.

The second portion of this plan is the Strategic Trails Plan for the three aforementioned sub-areas. Through significant stakeholder outreach and internal deliberation, HTA’s Trail Planning Subcommittee distilled four overarching goals for improving the trail system, including:

• **Goal 1**: Improve the interconnectivity between federal lands and municipal/residential centers throughout Grand County.

• **Goal 2**: Provide enhanced outreach/education to trail users, residents, and visitors.

• **Goal 3**: Redevelop the area trails into a diverse, four-season system that provides high-quality experiences while minimizing conflicts.

• **Goal 4**: Enhance the community focus of the trail system to provide quality of life and potential economic activity improvements throughout the area.

The HTA Plan incorporates a multitude of jurisdictions providing recreational amenities in Grand County including the US Forest Service trails/trailheads/campgrounds, Bureau of Land Management trails and facilities, National Park Service trails and facilities, multijurisdictional trails and other trails:

• The USFS incorporates 459 miles of non-motorized, motorized and wilderness trails, maintains more than 40 trailheads and maintains 430 designated campsites.

• The BLM manages more than 75 miles of motorized and non-motorized trails in Grand County.

• Rocky Mountain National Park provides approximately 100 miles of hiking and equestrian trail opportunities within Grand County.

• Multi-jurisdictional trails include paved, six-mile Fraser River Trail which begins just north of Winter Park Resort in Old Town Winter Park, a seventeen-mile Fraser to Granby Trail which begins at the Fraser Valley Sports Complex on County Road and the 80-mile Colorado Headwaters Scenic Byway which runs south on US 34 from Grand Lake, turning west on US 40 paralleling the Colorado River through Hot Sulphur Springs to Kremmling and continuing on a gravel route to the south end of Gore Canyon and to State Bridge.

### a. Grand County Master Plan

The State of Colorado gives counties the authority to adopt a master plan through Planning Commission via 30-28-106 C.R.S. The goal of a master plan is to engage the public to guide decision making processes over an established length of time.

The most current version of the Grand County Master Plan makes reference to the following documents:

“The 1998 plan was a compilation of various portions of two previously accepted documents: 1997 Grand County Strategic Growth Plan and the Fraser Valley Comprehensive Land Use Plan (adopted 1979). Relevant portions of those two documents, along with refinements that had been made by the Grand County Planning Commission and ‘Growth Area’ maps prepared by each community and the county, formed the basis for that plan. In addition the 208 Water Quality Standards, Grand County Headwaters Trails Master Plan, Fraser
Valley Master Road Plan, and the Specialized Transit Development Plan were adopted by reference as components of the Grand County Master Plan.”

We have interpreted this to mean that any future updates of the plans require an adoption that follows State Statute. We bring forward this plan as a ‘heads up’ for Planning Commission consideration and familiarity as we may reference this document in any future development proposal.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff is recommending that Planning Commission consider this document as development projects come forward. The intent is to insure consistency of the development projects with the recommendations of the HTA Master Plan.

At this time, Staff and the County Attorney are researching the appropriate process for amending the Master Plan to incorporate in the HTA Plan. Staff proposes to provide proper public notice and will bring this plan back for formal adoption by the Planning Commission. At this time no vote or motion is need to adopt.

Disclosure, Alexander Taft does sit on the Board for the Headwater Trails Alliance, (HTA). The County would like to support the trails and open space and utilize an Inter-Government Agreement, (IGA) with Fraser and Winter Park.

Commissioners ask for clarification regarding this presentation. Is the goal for a future vote or just informative so you know, where are we at on this presentation?

Staff replied it is informative for a future vote. We cannot make any changes to the Headwater Trails Alliance, (HTA) Master Plan in itself, but we would like to amend the Master Plan at some point in the future.

Commissioners stated it could be phrased as, the current version of x,y,z. The plan is looking at this as reformulating the Master Plan as well as for adoption of the Master Plan.

Staff replied correct.

Commissioners asked, what are some of the highlights of the Master Plan for HTA?

Staff replied from the County’s perspective, there is a lot of development in the Fraser Valley and the County wants to be able to connect to the trails to lessen vehicle trips and ecological impact. The goal is for sustainable and better quality of life, and enjoyment. The County likes the HTA plan, for example, if a large subdivision comes in and uses the HTA plan as a suggestion for connectivity for trails or open space, we would like to adopt the plan. The question is how do we amend the Master Plan? It has to be done by resolution of the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners. The list of conditions identified in the Staff Certificate would be the same as a resolution. We are still working with the County Attorney to figure out how that might work. How do we actually amend the Master Plan which is almost 10 years old? We want to develop a scope of work for the Master Plan Update. There are similar efforts going on in the County such as Grand Places 2050. This was started with the US Forest Service because they have a very old Master Plan they are trying to update. Winter Park Ski Resort is involved, Town of Fraser, Grand County, Colorado Fish and Wildlife, and the Town of Winter Park among a few. Ultimately, we will have plans that focus on environmental sustainability while at the same time promoting trails. We have 600 miles of trails, we could say for example, as a Master Plan objective let’s double the amount of
trails in the County. We can look at what other communities are doing. This would create a good framework for us as we plan for sustainable development.

Commissioners stated that it is an interesting question on how do we utilize this Plan without having to update the Master Plan? When we look at our Zoning Regulations or Subdivision Regulations what is interesting is we look at all local, state and federal rules and regulations when we talk about compliance. Does it negate the use of an updated Master Plan for a reference document from Grand County’s Master Plan or can we reference another source? The Master Plan calls out HTA, however, HTA has a new Master Plan and we would like to add that as a reference for arguments moving forward. Would encourage consideration that whatever is latest and greatest should be in the Master Plan. Do we have an Inter-Governmental Agreement (IGA) with HTA? They are also worried about parking for trails and who has to provide the space. They also thought we can add the HTA as a review agency, we can add to our list if needed to bring in when developing subdivisions or trails.

County Attorney stated the Master Plan is an advisory document, so if you are incorporating by reference another plan or document, it is not like when you decide to send it out for review it is more of a planning and guidance document. If we have a document that incorporates by reference the HTA Master Plan, what we would typically do is - ask if this was something that could be enforced by law as a rule or regulation then we might say as amended. We probably would not do that because we don’t know what it is going to look like when it is amended, especially if someone else is amending it. Because it is an advisory document, i.e., the Master Plan, it does allow us to exercise some discretion because we are not using it as a regulatory document.

**Fire Impact Fees – East Grand Fire District**

Presented by: Robert Davis, Director Community Development
METHODOLOGY

- **Buy-in method**
  - New development buys into an existing system of infrastructure and facilities paid for by previous residents/businesses/development
  - Impact fee program recoups these costs
  - Based on build out

1. Quantify existing land use
2. Quantify capital costs
   - Fleet replacement
   - Existing station facilities
   - South station
3. Allocate costs to land use
   - Forecast call volume
4. Allocate costs to existing and new development
   - Existing as percentage of buildout
   - Percent remaining
5. Calculate fee
   - Costs (by land use) divided by remaining development (by land use)
EXISTING LAND USE

### Non-Residential Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>2019 Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Condominium</td>
<td>150,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Lodging Hotel</td>
<td>680,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Merchandising</td>
<td>236,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Mixed Use</td>
<td>337,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Office</td>
<td>43,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Recreation</td>
<td>84,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Special Purpose</td>
<td>265,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Warehouse/Storage</td>
<td>139,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential - Event pt</td>
<td>1,399,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,299,392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Economic & Planning Systems
Z:\Shared\Projects\DEN-51049-Est_Grand_Infill_FINAL\model\51049 Impact Final.Rpt

### Residential Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>2019 Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Single Famly</td>
<td>3,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Duplex-Triplex</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Condominiums</td>
<td>3,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Multiple Units 4-6 units</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Multiple Units 9 or more Units</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Manufactured Homes</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Farm or Ranch Residence</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,288</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Economic & Planning Systems
Z:\Shared\Projects\DEN-51049-Est_Grand_Infill_FINAL\model\51049 Impact Final.Rpt

BUILDOUT ESTIMATE

- Interviews with
  - Town of Fraser
  - Town of Winter Park
  - Grand County
- GIS Parcel analysis

### New Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2018 Bulidout</th>
<th>New Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential (SU) 7,298 20,744</td>
<td>13,446 194%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Residential (sq ft) 3,099,352 6,674,396</td>
<td>1,372,047 42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Economic & Planning Systems
Z:\Shared\Projects\DEN-51049-Est_Grand_Infill_FINAL\model\51049 Impact Final.Rpt

### Estimated Increase at Buildout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residential SU</th>
<th>Non-Residential Sq Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fraser</td>
<td>3,991</td>
<td>635,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Park</td>
<td>6,162</td>
<td>133,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Grand County</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td>584,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,446</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,372,047</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Economic & Planning Systems
Z:\Shared\Projects\DEN-51049-Est_Grand_Infill_FINAL\model\51049 Impact Final.Rpt

### Buildout cost allocation

- 65% of residential will be new
- 29% of non-residential will be new

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2018 Bulidout</th>
<th>New Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential (SU) 7,298 20,744</td>
<td>11,464 65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential (sq ft) 3,099,352 6,674,396</td>
<td>1,372,047 29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Economic & Planning Systems
Z:\Shared\Projects\DEN-51049-Est_Grand_Infill_FINAL\model\51049 Impact Final.Rpt

Economic & Planning Systems
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IMPACT FEE CALCULATION

### Capital Asset Inventory
- Engines and Vehicels: $5,368,300
- Existing HQ and Red Dirt Hill Stations: $6,043,704
- South Station Construction: $3,000,000
Total Value: $14,432,004

### Cost Allocated by Land Use Type
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>$13,113,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$1,318,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,432,004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Table 9

---

IMPACT FEE CALCULATION

### Buildout Call Forecast

There was an average of 319 incident responses over the past five years. This equates to 0.0392 calls per residential unit and 0.0298 calls per 1,000 square feet of non-residential development as shown in Table 9. At buildout, an increase of 447 calls per year is estimated of which 91 percent are assigned to residential development and 9 percent are assigned to non-residential property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2014-2018 Avg</th>
<th>Buildout</th>
<th>Increase (New Development)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td>Calls</td>
<td>Per Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (DU)</td>
<td>7,296</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>0.0026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential (1,000 Sq. Ft.)</td>
<td>3,296</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.0029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Calls</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Economic & Planning Systems
### IMPACT FEE CALCULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Allocated by Land Use Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>$13,113,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$1,318,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$14,432,004</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Allocated to New Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$8,500,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$387,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$8,887,369</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
13,113,611 \times 0.65 = 8,500,141 \\
(1,318,393 \times 0.29) = 387,228 \\
8,500,141 / 13,446 = 632 \\
387,228 / 1,372 = 282 or $0.28/sq. ft.
\]

**Table 10. Impact Fee Calculation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Asset Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engines and Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,398,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing HQ and Red Drf Hill Stations</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,643,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Station Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$14,432,004</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (DG)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential (Sq. Ft.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,372,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Allocated by Land Use Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>$13,113,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$1,318,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$14,432,004</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Allocated to New Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$8,500,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$387,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$8,887,369</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Updated Impact Fees**

- Fee per Residential (DG) 13,446 = $632
- Fee per 1,000 Sq. Ft. Non-Residential 1,372 = $282
- $0.28/Sq. Ft

Source: Economic & Planning Systems
Thank you!

CALL ALLOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure Fires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Dwellings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes and Mobiles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Residential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assembly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores and Offices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fires and Incidents [1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Vehicles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vehicles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Construction Vehicle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brush/Grass/Fire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robber/Embers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Fires</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Incidents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Emergency/medical [1]</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Alarms</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmal Responses</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Hazardous Responses [1]</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Responses [1]</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Aid - Nth Inc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1] Observed call counts include motor-vehicle accidents.
Todd Holzwarth, East Grand Fire Protection Chief, was present and able to answer any questions for the Commissioners. This is Round 4 for impact fees. We are using a new method to calculate the fees. A little history, the impact fee was established in 2001. The impact fees help defray costs. The taxes do not take effect until the home is built. The impact fee is imposed by the county and or town. The funds are used for capital items not operational items. We can use it for land, new trucks, buildings, etc. For 19 years the impact fees have helped defray these costs.

Commissioners asked how the fees will apply. Will it be like an annual fee for a single family dwelling?

Chief Holzwarth replied that it is a onetime fee, collected when applying for a building permit.

Commissioners asked about the projected building of 13,446 new residential units. A home owner wouldn’t pay any part of this fee, because they would not start paying tax until they owned the home and get their first tax bill. So the person that pays this impact fee is either the developer or contractor doing the construction and it is paid for through their building permit.

Chief Holzwarth replied the way we have handled this in the past is before they apply for a building permit, they come to the Fire District and pay the impact fee, the Fire District stamps their plans, so when they turn in the plans to the County the fees have already been collected.

Staff added that the lots developed prior to 2001 have not paid the impact fees. After 2001 as part of the subdivision process, the developer has pre-paid the fire impact fees prior to the final plat being recorded.

Commissioners asked what is changing in the existing fee structure (compared to the new proposed fee structure), is it a different percentage?

Chief Holzwarth replied it is a different methodology than last time. Last time we had our Capital Improvements Plan and we tried to establish how many units or square footage for commercial or
single family dwellings there would be. This time around, one of the rules is we cannot do the study ourselves. We hired a consultant that received our input and they came up with the calculations (we agreed to this method). The consultants used a different system and the costs did go up. More single family dwellings than commercial is being built which is creating imbalances. Each home is paying less proportionately of the taxes for the value. The County is doubling the homes, we don’t necessarily double our workload but it is definitely going up. We had 399 calls last year which was up over 10% from the year before. In 5 years we could see a doubling in our calls. It is mostly an operational cost not a capital cost but we have to be able to keep up with the increase.

Commissioner stated this new method is an iterative method. You look historically in 2018 how many units or homes were built, then you look at a projection of how many are going to be built to meet the demands of the market, then you look at what are your capital expenses and budget.

Chief Holzwarth replied that the consultants calculated using all the information collected. They are familiar with the county and have done our study in the past. We have a statute to follow.

Commissioners asked to understand the rationale between the non-residential and commercial fees.

Chief Holzwarth replied non-residential is anything that is not residential including commercial. We are looking at replacing more than adding new equipment. The commercial businesses pay more taxes than residential.

Commissioners asked about the build out, does it go under the premise that we only have so much land left to build on.

Chief Holzwarth replied that this is an estimate and the agreement is every 5 years this will be revisited. If the estimates are not as accurate as we hoped in 5 years we will be back.

Commissioners asked if anyone has talked to the water people to make sure we have the water needed for the future build out?

Chief Holzwarth stated studies can be made to be almost anything you want it to be depending on who is doing the studies.

Commissioner asked what the reasoning behind the square footage for commercial and not residential.

Chief Holzwarth replied the general consensus that we have we believe that statue supports being different on those. For non-residential, you go by square footage calculation for houses. The size of the house does not matter, it has been calculate the same since we started impact fees. In 5 years it will be revisited again along with what the capital needs might be. East Grand is in maintenance mode, we don’t add new trucks, we replace them once they get to be about 15-16 years old. There is new technology, the trucks do not wear out but we are tough on them. Starting them cold and driving them hard, they sit idling then return and get shut down.

Commissioners asked about false alarms.

Chief Holzwarth replied they are really not false alarms, most of them there is a reason the alarms have gone off. Could be a CO monitor system alarm or the system is interpreted something that thinks it is an alarm, may not be a fire could be dust, the systems are getting better and smarter. Legislators passed a law that all structures have to have a CO system. We did not have this 15
years ago now we go out on carbon monoxide calls. Sometimes we find a reason for the CO system to call the alarm sometimes we don't but it does save lives.

Commissioner stated they like this study better than the previous studies. Fascinated that there is so much non-residential in this district and 9% calls are non-residential but 91% of calls are residential. That is a staggering difference.

Chief Holzwarth stated roughly 86% of revenue is from residential.

Commissioners continued this makes sense there are two (2) different buckets. There is the upfront cost of purchasing your capital and knowing you have a foundation to stay afloat and then there is ongoing taxes that help pay for your expenses and operations. Before this goes to Board of County Commissioners, Mr. Davis on page 9, above table 1 (file error reference please remove).

Chief Holzwarth replied ultimate build out, there is land trades with the Forest Service and there is agricultural land.

Commissioner offered a suggestion - would you consider an exemption for people that meet exceptional fire protection with new build? Could avoid this impact fee if they have indoor sprinklers, to help avoid extra service calls that the fire department is getting?

Chief Holzwarth replied that he does not believe this option would be supported by the statute. They do get a break on their homeowner insurance with extra precautions built into the new homes. These benefits are also building code requirements.

Motion to recommend approval by Ingrid Karlstrom for The East Grand Fire District, Fire Impact Fees. Seconded by Sally Bleu. No Discussion. All in favor "aye", none opposed.

Motion to adjourn the meeting, Ingrid Karlstrom. Seconded by Sally Blea. No Discussion. All in favor "aye", none opposed.

Meeting adjourned at 8:10 pm.