The Board of County Commissioners met in regular session on July 26, 2016. Those present for the session were Lynn M. Padgett, Chair; Ben Tisdel, Vice Chair; Don Batchelder, Member; Connie Hunt, County Administrator; Marti Whitmore, County Attorney; and Hannah Hollenbeck, Deputy Clerk of the Board.

- **Note – This meeting was recorded for reference purposes.**

**A. 9:02 Call to the Public:**

*The "Call to the Public" agenda item is a time when the public may bring forth items of interest or concern. No formal action may be taken on these items during this time due to the open meeting law provision; however, they may be placed on a future posted agenda if action is required.*

**County Road 1 Public Improvement District (PID)**

Aleta Jupille was present to clarify statements she made during the July 12th Public Improvement District (PID) Public Hearing. She asked that her statement be listened to, and that revisions be made specifically pertaining to the requirements of the statute.

Jupille also was concerned about Agenda item H-10, which contemplating additional legal fees for Paul Sunderland, Special Counsel. She asked why the PID committee was not advised to hire their own legal representation instead of relying on the County's special counsel. Commissioner Padgett said that Jupille's comments were more appropriate for the public hearing.

**B. 9:07 Road and Bridge Reports:**

**1. Road and Bridge Report:**

*Steven Calkins, Assistant Road and Bridge Supervisor, was present.*

Calkins updated the Board on the mag-chloride application process. He explained that the process had taken longer due to bad weather and equipment failures; however, he expected crews to complete the application process in the next week. Commissioner Padgett asked if the roads were graded immediately prior to applying mag-chloride. Calkins confirmed that all roads were graded before mag-chloride was applied. Commissioner Padgett said that the Board had received some public comment that indicated that this had not happened. Commissioner Tisdel stated that in Ouray County, grading sometimes didn't immediately appear like it had been done, due to the lack of road material.

Calkins continued with the report; he said that the necessary screening for the County Road 361 Project had been completed, and crews were doing some pothole repair on the chip sealed portion of County Road 1. Calkins said that a heavy rain event had resulted in a road failure on County Road 5; crews were able to complete temporary repairs.

**2. Request for award of Loader and Belly Dump proposals:**

Calkins said that the department had demoed one of the loaders, and was working to get another out for demo. Request for award for the Loader would be on a future meeting agenda.

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Batchelder and seconded by Commissioner Tisdel to award the Belly Dump trailer bid to Utility Trailers of Colorado in the amount not to exceed $ 59,534.00. The motion carried unanimously with no discussion.*

After the motion carried, Hunt said that the belly dump trailer and the loader were the final two pieces of equipment recommended by the Road and Bridge Audit. As the cost for the loader was less than anticipated, there was a bit of principal left on the lease purchase; Hunt said that she would be coming back to the Board in order to consider the purchase for additional equipment, like a visual sign board.

The Board briefly discussed marking the County Road 24 Test Section in order to clearly delineate that no maintenance be performed on that section of road.

**C. 9:22 The Board convened as the Board of Social Services to consider the following items:**

**1. Request for approval of the following reports and authorization of the Chair's signature on certification page:**

**a. County YTD Expenditures, April 2016:**
**b. Expenditures through Electronic Benefit Transfers, May 2016**
**c. Check Register, May 2016**
**d. County Allocation / MOE Report, APR-16:**

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Batchelder and seconded by Commissioner Tisdel to approve the County YTD Expenditures, April 2016; Expenditures through Electronic Benefit Transfers, May 2016; Check Register, May 2016; and County Allocation / MOE Report, APR-16; and authorized Chair's signature on certification page. The motion carried unanimously.*

**2. Caseload Report**

Commissioner Padgett reported that she had learned about a non-profit group that had been scoring Colorado counties Social Services departments based on services provided. She said that the metrics for Ouray County were misleading, as the Social Services director had previously stated that roughly half of the individuals and families that qualified for services were actually receiving them. Commissioner Padgett said that Social Services could only provide assistance to families and individuals that actually

wanted to be clients. The Board elected to discuss the matter with the Social Services director when she returned. Commissioner Padgett noted that Ouray County had done very well in other aspects of the study.

Commissioner Tisdel said that he wanted to have a discussion regarding opioid addiction epidemic with the Social Services director as well.

**3. Request for approval and authorization of Chair's signature on a Memorandum of Understanding between the State of Colorado Department of Human Services and Ouray County Board of County Commissioners for the Works Program and Child Care Assistance Program and on its Fiscal Impact Form:**

The Board of Social Services reconvened as the Board of County Commissioners to consider the MOU.

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Batchelder and seconded by Commissioner Tisdel to approve and authorize Chair's signature on a Memorandum of Understanding between the State of Colorado Department of Human Services and Ouray County Board of County Commissioners for the Works Program and Child Care Assistance Program and on its Fiscal Impact Form. The motion carried unanimously.*

**D. 10:08 First Reading of Ordinance 2016-002 Establishing Regulations for Short Term Rental (STR) of Residential Properties, and requesting a motion to schedule a second reading and to publish the Ordinance in full on July 28, 2016:**

*Susie Mayfield, County Assessor, and Mark Castrodale, Planning Director, were present.*

Commissioner Padgett read the title of Ordinance 2016-002.

Mayfield suggested that a provision be added to Section 7(F) that stated that a permit or a renewal would not be granted if there were any outstanding tax payments or other fees. Whitmore suggested adding "*and property owner shall pay such taxes and remain current, if applicable*" to paragraph E. The Board agreed. Commissioner Tisdel recognized that it was a simple administrative task for departments to check with one another to ensure there were not outstanding fees or taxes. He was concerned about verifying the information with the City of Ouray and the Town of Ridgway. Whitmore said that it was anticipated that the County would enter into intergovernmental agreements with the City and Town, if the Ordinance was approved.

Commissioner Tisdel asked about the implementation date. Whitmore said that it was staff's intent to not have the Ordinance implemented until January 1, 2017. Commissioner Padgett wanted the regulations to go into effect on December 1, 2016 and be enforced beginning January 1, 2017. She thought the time would allow staff to make sure all properties were notified and permitted beginning January 1, 2017. Mayfield said her staff had been developing a list of vacation rentals and potential vacations rentals. She said it may take additional time to fully develop the list. Mayfield said that her office sent out declarations close to January 1, but that property owners had until April to file to form. Commissioner Padgett reiterated that she wanted to see the short-term rental (STR) permits coming in in December. Castrodale asked if it was Commissioner Padgett's expectation that approximately 250 STR applications come be submitted in December. He added that his staff still had a fair amount of work to complete. Commissioner Padgett said that it would be good to have some lead time in accepting and issuing permits and that was why she was suggesting the December date. Commissioner Padgett explained that she wanted to make sure that the Assessor had the ability to know if a property was intended to be used as a STR on January 1st. She also wanted to determine the best process for the implementation procedure. She thought that the period between January and March could be used for a transition period.

Castrodale clarified that Land Use staff could start receiving applications, but until he and his staff processed a few applications, he would have no idea how long it would take to process a permit. Mayfield agreed that it would be a discovery process for her office as well. Whitmore said that she had thought that the Ordinance would be publicized and staff would attempt to send a notification letter to as many properties as possible; in October or November a follow up letter would be sent to properties that had not submitted an application, and a final letter would be sent after notifying STR operators that they were not in compliance with the Ordinance. Whitmore said that it was a multistep process, as there was lots of data to gather. Commissioner Padgett agreed with Whitmore's timeline.

Castrodale suggested that that 14 day process time be extended to 30 days in Section (7)(G). He further suggested that "*all complete applications*" be added to Section 7.

The Board briefly discussed the proposed fee with Castrodale. Castrodale said that until a few applications were processed, he was really just guessing about what the cost for staff time would be. He thought a $250 to $500 charge would cover the amount of staff time to process a request. Commissioner Padgett said that she was inclined to charge $300.

Whitmore said that she anticipating having to revise the Ordinance after a year of processing applications.

Commissioner Padgett said that she understood the purpose of the Ordinance to be to allow STRs in the County, but not in a way that affected the residential character of neighborhoods by causing a public health and safety issue. She suggested the Board consider an additional "whereas" statement that stated such. She added that it was important to consider that STRs had depleted the supply of affordable long term rentals.

Commissioner Padgett thought that Steven Crockett's public comment regarding maximum number of people and vehicles per rental property was good. She thought it was advisable to have the maximum number of occupants and vehicles for a household posted on a notice inside the property, along with

emergency phone numbers and property address. She thought that the provision also allowed neighbors to discuss the maximum numbers, based on the site inspection. Commissioner Batchelder asked if Commissioner Padgett was suggesting that the permit include a limitation on number of parking spaces and individuals in the dwelling. Commissioner Padgett clarified that she was suggesting that a STR must demonstrate that there was adequate parking that would not harm the neighborhood. Castrodale said that it made sense to limit STR occupancy, much like bed and breakfasts were limited to four bedroom houses. Commissioner Padgett was hesitant to put a restriction on number of occupants; she was advocating more for sensible restrictions tied to sanitation and adequate parking that retained the residential aspect of the neighborhood. She thought the limitations should be specific based on the site plan. Castrodale recommended that it be tied to the certificate of occupancy as well, instead of the building permit. Commissioner Batchelder pointed out that there were some buildings in the County that did not have a record of a certificate of occupancy. Castrodale said that a process could be made for older residences that did not have a certificate of occupancy or building permit.

Commissioner Batchelder suggested that the application form include a statement from the owner that stated maximum occupancy and parking. He said that staff could then determine if the numbers were reasonable. Commissioner Padgett agreed.

Mayfield asked about non-traditional housing, like yurts, that were being as short term rentals. Castrodale pointed out that a yurt, or any other non-traditional housing, would not have a certificate of occupancy. Commissioner Padgett suggested that language be added prohibiting a short term rental permit on a building that had not, or could not receive a certificate of occupancy. The Board agreed.

Commissioner Batchelder said that the changes the Board was considering constituted as substantial changes to the Ordinance and that it would need to be resubmitted for first reading. Whitmore agreed. The Board agreed to revise the Ordinance and resubmit for first reading.

Commissioner Tisdel requested that a provision regarding trash mitigation be added. After a discussion, Commissioner Batchelder suggested adding that the short term rental permit application must include a trash disposal plan, and that the plan must be provided to the renter. He added that trash must be stored in a bear-proof container or enclosed structure. Commissioner Padgett thought it was advisable to add any special instructions pertaining to trash pickup posted on the list of emergency phone numbers, address and maximum number of occupants and vehicles posted inside the rental.

Commissioner Batchelder addressed the public comment received from Steve Crockett. He asked for the Board's comments regarding neighbor notification. He thought it was reasonable to require neighbor notification. Whitmore asked what the Board or staff would want to do with information received from neighbors. She said that if the approval for a permit was kept at the staff level, then it put staff in a difficult position. Commissioner Padgett suggested that a provision be added to the Ordinance that stated "*Excess complaints from use of a short term rental may result in non-renewal of the permit.*" The Board agreed. Commissioner Batchelder still thought it was reasonable that the property proposed to be used as a short term rental be posted as such in order to notify neighbors that an application was in process and to inform them of the process for complaints. Castrodale confirmed that if there were questions or contention regarding a permit that it could be sent to the Board for approval. Whitmore agreed that the process was included in the Ordinance. Whitmore suggested that the timeline be lengthened to allow adequate time for scheduling in the case an application was sent to the Board; she suggested the language "*30 days, unless staff refers the application to the Board of County Commissioners.*" The Board agreed.

Commissioner Batchelder requested that some additional "whereas" statements be added; he suggested that the last five "whereas" statements from Steve Crockett's alternate Ordinance draft be incorporated. The Board agreed.

Commissioner Padgett requested that an additional "whereas" statement be added that stated: *"Whereas, the Board desires to mitigate potential conflicts between short term rentals and parking problems, trash, noise, and other activities that may be in conflict with traditional residential use."*

Commissioner Padgett stated that if the regulations were unworkable for Land Use or Assessor staff, she was supportive of banning short term rentals all together. She said that if short term rental regulations could not be controlled within the County's existing resources, she would find the use to be in conflict.

Commissioner Batchelder asked about the enforcement and violation aspects of the Ordinance. Whitmore said that any confirmed violation would be enforced like any other violation of Ordinance; Land Use staff would notify the property owner and give them the opportunity to come into compliance. If the property was still in violation, the Board would be informed and staff would request direction. Commissioner Batchelder asked if the section pertaining to violation should be developed a bit more. Commissioner Batchelder indicated that it would be more helpful if Land Use staff presented a proposed fee schedule and draft application form during the next first reading.

Mayfield asked if the Ordinance would pertain to property owners that were renting out spare rooms or basements. Whitmore confirmed that it would be.

**E. 9:35 Commissioner / Administrative Reports:**

**Commissioner Batchelder** discussed the following:

1) **Ouray County Housing Authority (OCHA) Intergovernmental Agreements -** Commissioner Batchelder said OCHA had met with the County and the municipality's managers and administrators and determined it would be most beneficial for a Tri-Agency meeting to discuss the proposed IGA as well as the municipalities' expectations from the Housing Authority. Commissioner Padgett suggested working the topic into the Tri-Agency dinner. The Board authorized Hunt work to set the meeting.

**Commissioner Tisdel** discussed the following:

1) **Colorado Courthouses Documentary -** Commissioner Tisdel reported that Rocky Mountain PBS had filmed a segment about the Ouray County Courthouse the previous weekend. The series was expected to air on December 29th.

2) **BLM Redistricting of San Miguel and San Juan Counties -** Commissioner Tisdel said that the redistricting was going to be a topic at the CCI Western District meeting on August 26th. Commissioner Padgett indicated that the BLM State Director would be present at the meeting to discuss the redistricting. She requested that San Juan, San Miguel, Hinsdale and Ouray Counties meet prior to the meeting in order to come up with specific united talking points. The Board directed Hunt to set the meeting for August.

3) **Other Updates -** Commissioner Tisdel reported that he had been appointed to the Governor's Forest Health Advisory Committee. Commissioner Tisdel asked that the West Region Wildfire Council Chipping Program be added to the County website. Commissioner Tisdel encouraged the other Board members and staff to complete the CCI 360 Review Survey. Commissioner Tisdel was interested to see how many vehicles used County Road 1 as an unofficial bypass while Highway 550 was closed to traffic during a recent accident.

**Commissioner Padgett** discussed the following:

1) **Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) -** Commissioner Padgett said that she was awaiting materials regarding the revitalization of the program. Susie Mayfield, County Assessor, said that her office tracked properties that had solar arrays, and included it as a separate, non-taxable account for tracking purposes.

2) **Secure Rural Schools (SRS) Payments -** Commissioner Padgett reported that SRS was not reauthorized for 2016. She added that in order for the funds to be available in 2017, the money would have been appropriated in 2016. She postulated that it would have a significant impact on the County's school districts, as well as the Road and Bridge department. She estimated the lost payment to Road and Bridge to be approximately $18,000.

**Connie Hunt, County Administrator,** discussed the following:

1) **COSI Grant Contract** – Hunt presented the Grant Contract for scholarship monies for students attending Western State Colorado University. The Board agreed to ratify the Contract at the next meeting.

2) **Ouray County Transit Advisory Council (OCTAC)** – Hunt reported that the OCTAC would be holding a meeting on September 29 at the Ouray Count 4-H Event Center in order to discuss transit needs in the county.

3) **Other Updates** – Hunt said that she was working on 2016 Budget projections and development of the 2017 Budget.

**Marti Whitmore, County Attorney,** discussed the following:

1) **Colorado River District** – Whitmore reported that she had attended the strategic planning session and regular meeting. She said that the group was working to determine new priorities.

**I. 11:37 The Board of County Commissioners convened into an Executive Session pursuant to CRS 24-6-402(4) b and e, for the purpose of receiving legal advice from the County Attorney and for determining positions relative to matters that may be subject to negotiations regarding water matters:**

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Batchelder and seconded by Commissioner Tisdel to convene into an Executive Session pursuant to 24-6-402 b and e, for the purpose of receiving legal advice from the County Attorney and for determining positions relative to matters that may be subject to negotiations regarding water matters.*

*A roll call vote was taken on the motion with the following results:*

*Commissioner Padgett voted in the affirmative.*
*Commissioner Tisdel voted in the affirmative.*
*Commissioner Batchelder voted in the affirmative.*

*There was no discussion. Motion passed unanimously.*

*As County Attorney, it is my opinion that the discussion of the matter announced in the motion to go into executive session constitutes a privileged attorney-client communication.*

Martha Whitmore

*Martha Whitmore, County Attorney*

Lynn M. Padgett

*Lynn M. Padgett, Chair*

**11:38 The Board of County Commissioners entered into executive session:**

**11:58 The Board of County Commissioners came out of executive session:**

Commissioner Padgett stated that the Board had just concluded an executive session during which a discussion regarding legal advice was obtained by the County Commissioners on the subject announced in the motion. No formal action was taken during this executive session and because of attorney/client privilege, no recording was made.

**11:58 Lunch**

**F. 1:30 Eric Parish, Management of America:**

**1. Review of Cost Allocation Plan:**

Parish reviewed the Cost Allocation Plan. He stated that the County's total allocated costs increased by $72,000.

**G. 2:00 Blair and Associates:**

**1. Presentation of 2015 Audited Financials:**

*Pete Blair, Blair and Associates, was present; Jeannie Casolari, County Treasurer and Public Trustee and Jill Mihelich, Chief Deputy Treasurer, were also present.*

Blair presented the audit. After presenting the report, he recommended that the County go through outstanding warrants in order to clean them out.

**H. 2:39 General Business:**

**1. Request for approval and authorization of Chair's signature on the Ambulance Service License and Ambulance Permits for Emergency Medical Vehicles:**

Commissioner Padgett pointed out that there were minor inconsistencies regarding the check boxes.

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Batchelder and seconded by Commissioner Tisdel to approve and authorize Chair's signature on the Ambulance Service License and Ambulance Permits for Emergency Medical Vehicles. The motion carried unanimously.*

**2. Request for approval and authorization of Chair's signature on Assignment of Tax Lien Sale Certificate No. 20120032 to sell County-held Tax Lien to private investor and adoption of Resolution 2016-041 Approving the Assignment of a County-Held Tax Lien No. 20120032:**

*Jeannine Casolari, County Treasurer and Public Trustee, was present.*

Casolari said that the tax lien amount, if paid in the month of August, was $156,899.96. Commissioner Padgett asked if there was any reason not to sell the lien. Whitmore said that from a legal standpoint, there was no reason not to sell it.

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Batchelder and seconded by Commissioner Tisdel to approve and authorize Chair's signature on Assignment of Tax Lien Sale Certificate No. 20120032 to sell County-held Tax Lien to private investor and adoption of Resolution 2016-041 Approving the Assignment of a County-Held Tax Lien No. 20120032. The motion carried unanimously.*

**3. Request for approval of warrants:**

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Batchelder and seconded by Commissioner Tisdel to approve the warrants as presented. The motion carried unanimously.*

**4. Request for approval of the following minutes:**

**a. July 5, 2016**

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Tisdel and seconded by Commissioner Batchelder to approve the July 5, 2016 as modified. The motion carried unanimously.*

**b. July 12, 2016**

Hollenbeck requested that the Board take no action on the July 12, 2016 in order to allow her to make revisions. The Board agreed.

**5. Request for approval and authorization of Chair's signature on letter to House Committee on Natural Resources: *(ratification)***

Commissioner Padgett explained that the letter was sent after a Mesa County Commissioner stated she was going to testify in front of the House Committee on Natural Resources regarding tar and oil sands. The Mesa County Commissioner stated that she had consulted with western Colorado counties regarding the topic, but according to other Colorado commissioners Commissioner Padgett had contacted, this was untrue. Commissioner Padgett said that letter was sent as an effort to clarify that Mesa County did not necessarily speak for Ouray County. Other western Colorado counties had used Ouray County's letter to clarify their stance as well.

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Tisdel and seconded by Commissioner Padgett to ratify approval and authorization of Chair's signature on letter to House Committee on Natural Resources.*

*Commissioner Batchelder stated that he was going to vote against the motion, not because he disagreed with the intent, but because he disagreed with a statement made in the letter.*

*With no further discussion, the motion carried 2 to 1.*

After the motion carried, Commissioner Batchelder stated that the last paragraph in the letter created a chicken and egg situation. Commissioner Padgett said that the intent of the letter was to clarify that Mesa County did not speak for Ouray County, and that one Mesa County Commissioner took liberties stating that she had consulted with other Western Colorado counties, when she had not.

**6. Request for adoption of Resolution 2016-036 ratifying approval of an Amendment to Final Plat for Elk Mountain Resort PUD – Phase 1A:**

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Batchelder and seconded by Commissioner Tisdel to adopt Resolution 2016-036 ratifying approval of an Amendment to Final Plat for Elk Mountain Resort PUD – Phase 1A. The motion carried unanimously.*

**7. Request for adoption of Resolution 2016-039 ratifying approval of a Marijuana Cultivation Facility License for Dalwhinnie Farms LLC:**

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Batchelder and seconded by Commissioner Tisdel to adopt Resolution 2016-039 ratifying approval of a Marijuana Cultivation Facility License for Dalwhinnie Farms, LLC. The motion carried unanimously with no discussion.*

**8. Request for adoption of Resolution 2016-040 ratifying approval of the Special Use Permit for a Commercial Equestrian Facility for Madison Shambaugh Horsemanship, LLC:**

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Batchelder and seconded by Commissioner Tisdel to adopt Resolution 2016-040 ratifying approval of the Special Use Permit for a Commercial Equestrian Facility for Madison Shambaugh Horsemanship, LLC. The motion carried unanimously with no discussion.*

**9. Request for approval and authorization of Chair's signature on Budgetary Transfer Forms:**

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Batchelder and seconded by Commissioner Tisdel to approve and authorize Chair's signature on Budgetary Transfer Forms. The motion carried unanimously.*

**10. Request for approval and authorization of Chair's signature on Amendment to Fee Agreement for Legal Services:**

Commissioner Batchelder recognized that there were some questions surrounding the request; he also recognized the necessity behind it, as the County had retained counsel to advise the Board the PID committee, at the direction of the Board.

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Batchelder and seconded by Commissioner Tisdel to approve and authorize Chair's signature on Amendment to Fee Agreement for Legal Services. The motion carried unanimously.*

**11. Request for approval and authorization of Chair's signature on Emergency Management Performance (EMPG) / Local Emergency Management Support (LEMS) Grant Agreement and on its Fiscal Impact Form:**

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Batchelder and seconded by Commissioner Tisdel to approve and authorize Chair's signature on Emergency Management Performance (EMPG) / Local Emergency Management Support (LEMS) Grant Agreement and on its Fiscal Impact Form. The motion carried unanimously.*

**12. Request for approval and authorization of Chair's signature on FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program's "Delegation of Project Management Duties" Designated Agent's Form and on its Fiscal Impact Form:**

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Batchelder and seconded by Commissioner Tisdel to approve and authorize Chair's signature on FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program's "Delegation of Project Management Duties" Designated Agent's Form and on its Fiscal Impact Form with the stipulation that no general fund dollar be used, without Board approval. The motion carried unanimously.*

**13. Request for approval and authorization of Vice-Chair's signature on a Special Event Permit and Agreement to film and conduct interviews at the Ouray County Courthouse for Rocky Mountain PBS "*Colorado Experience*" series: *(ratification)***

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Batchelder and seconded by Commissioner Padgett to ratify approval and authorization Vice-Chair's signature on a Special Event Permit and Agreement to*

*film and conduct interviews at the Ouray County Courthouse for Rocky Mountain PBS "Colorado Experience" series. The motion carried unanimously.*

**14. Request for authorization on a monthly basis to issue the necessary warrants for the Clerk's Operating Fund and Motor Vehicle Fund expenses prior to the 15th of each month for the preceding month with ratification at the next Board meeting:**

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Batchelder and seconded by Commissioner Tisdel to authorize on a monthly basis to issue the necessary warrants for the Clerk's Operating Fund and Motor Vehicle Fund expenses prior to the 15th of each month for the preceding month with ratification at the next Board meeting. The motion included authorizing Chair's signature on the warrant. The motion carried unanimously.*

**15. Review and acceptance of Public Trustee Report – June 2016:**

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Batchelder and seconded by Commissioner Tisdel to accept the Public Trustee Report for June 2016. The motion carried unanimously.*

**3:15 The Board recessed the meeting:**

**J. 6:03PM Public Hearing – Hearing on Formation of Ouray County Road 1 Public Improvement District (PID)** ***(The Public Hearing was conducted and recessed on July 12, 2016 to July 26, 2016)***

**1. The purpose of the proposed district is the improvement of the currently unpaved portion of County Road 1 by chip seal, such improvement to be funded by issuance of a bond to be repaid from a mil levy assessed against all property within the District.**

**Based upon the facts presented at the hearing, the Board may consider adoption of a Resolution.**

**2. Possible consideration of Resolution 2016-038 forming the District and Ordering an Election on Issuance of Bonds and Imposition of Mill Levies:**

Commissioner Padgett reopened the public hearing, continued from July 12, 2016. She explained the purpose of the hearing. She explained that she would allow the petitioner to make a statement.

George Kerber, County Road 22 resident, interrupted to state that he objected to the petitioner being permitted to make a statement, but no time for the opposition group was contemplated. Commissioner Padgett stated that the Board intended to allow all public comment.

Commissioner Padgett entered into the record an email from GIS staff verifying that the legal description of the PID boundaries matched the map.

Dick Kreutzen, representing the County Road 1 Fix PID group, reminded the Board that there was a silent majority; as 300 property owners had signed the petition. Kreutzen said that the committee had met earlier in the afternoon to review their options. He said that the committee determined that, as approximately 300 people had signed the petition, it was the Board's responsibility to place the question on the ballot; Kreutzen said that anything less would be a breach of faith to those who had signed the petition. He urged the Board to place the formation and funding question on the ballot.

Commissioner Padgett invited the County Clerk and Recorder, Michelle Nauer, to make a statement.

Nauer said that the voter database program had reopened following the primary election; she said that original number of voters within the proposed District was 999, the revised number was 902.

Commissioner Padgett opened the hearing for public comment.

Barry Doyle, 1565 Canyon Drive, thanked the Board and the PID group for the work done on the residents' behalf. He supported the CR 1 Fix Committee. He said that the County and residents alike had worked for years in order to find a solution for paving County Road 1. He mentioned specifically the multiple unsuccessful TIGER Grants that the County had submitted. He stated that he supported the project, even if it would increase his taxes. He thought that the residents had a moral, ethical and communal obligation to form the proposed District.

Dan Miller, 6867 County Road 1, stated that he was originally on the fence about the proposed project. He agreed with Barry Doyle's comments regarding the Committee's work; however, he questioned why the project constituted a moral obligation. He did not think 300 signatures were a majority. He did not support the project as he thought traffic would increase. He stated that the disrepair of roads was not confined to County Road 1; Miller stated that there was a gravel road problem in Ouray County.

Michael Frenze, 375 Hunter's Chase Road, said that he and his family signed the petition against the proposed improvements. Frenze said that Log Hill Mesa was one of the more affordable areas for housing in the County, and increasing taxes to pay for road improvements was counterproductive to trying to preserve and create affordable housing. He said that even if the road was paved he and his family would not use the portions of County Road 1 that were proposed for improvements due to the highly dangerous intersection at Colona.

Karla Waltz, 221 Snowy Peaks Drive, was against the improvements. She did not think the project was good for the County and thought that the impact on Colona would be disastrous. She did not think that drivers would observe the posted 20 mph speed limit in Colona. Waltz said that traffic would back up at

the intersection in Colona and create a dangerous situation. Waltz said that use of the road by contractors and heavy equipment would increase and cause additional damage to the road. She reiterated that she was against the project.

Jim Waltz, 221 Snowy Peaks Drive, explained that he lived just inside the boundaries of the proposed District. Waltz said that he had signed the petition supporting the project, but after further thought, he regretted signing it. Waltz said that the Board had received a petition against the project that was signed by 61 people; 17 additional signatures had been obtained since submitting it to the Board. He said that 13 signatories lived outside the boundaries of the proposed District. Waltz thought that this fact was significant because it demonstrated that the PID was a not a benefit to the County.

Marjane Trehal, 3470 County Road 1C, stated that she was against the proposed improvements because she had no confidence that the job could be done correctly. She said there had been questionable work done on County Roads 1 and 1C previously and she had no assurances that the improvements proposed could be completed correctly.

Peggy Howe, 5594 County Road 1, was concerned about the legality and process to date regarding the PID improvements. She said that the opposition had consulted with an attorney about the interpretation of CRS 30-20-506 and 508 (4)(a-b). Regarding 30-20-506, which detailed the bond provision, the attorney stated that the language requiring the bond was mandatory, not permissive. She said that the language supported the argument that the petition was fatally flawed. Second, she was convinced that 30-20-508(4)(a-b) required the BOCC to form the PID through and election; in other words, the BOCC could present the question of formation to the electorate, but could not form the PID. Howe continued to say that many in the public viewed the process to be fraught with impropriety. She thought that the County was trying to push the agenda of the PID promoters, rather than promote governance by and for the people. Howe noted that the public had a thirty day window during which the public could challenge the actions of the BOCC.

Sunderland inquired about the name of the attorney Howe had consulted. Howe said that the attorney had originally indicated that Howe could identify the person, but Howe wanted to double check. She said she would get back to the Board.

George Kerber, 2108 County Road 22, asked what happened when property values increased and the tax revenue skyrocketed. He asked what would happen to the additional money. Kerber said that there had been a lack of disclosure. He thought that PID was an unlimited and unbounded tax increase. Kerber said that he had surveyed the signatures on the petition and that 80% of the signatories lived on the south side of the proposed boundary. Kerber stated that the process appeared to be a tactic from a carefully selected majority to force the northern residents into financing improvements that residents on the south side wanted. Kerber said that election judges, political party representatives and the County Attorney had all recused themselves from participation in the PID discussions; he asked why the Chair of the Board of County Commissioners had not done the same as she lived in the proposed PID boundaries. He called on Commissioner Padgett to recognize her conflict of interest and to recuse herself as commissioner.

Based on public comment received, Commissioner Padgett asked Sunderland to repeat his statement regarding the County Attorney's recusal and why the rules governing attorneys were different from the rules pertaining to Commissioners.

Sunderland explained that the County Attorney recused herself based on the rules that governed attorneys, and that rule had no application to Commissioners. Sunderland said that the public comment received suggesting that Commissioner Padgett had a conflict of interest because she lived within the boundaries of the proposed District was unfitting as the Board of County Commissioners was always voting on matters that could affect them. Sunderland said that Commissioner Padgett satisfied the requirement of disclosing that she lived within the proposed District boundaries.

Roger Berry, 167 Sunrose Lane, cautioned the Board that if they proceeded with the formation of the proposed District, they would damage the chance for an increased mill levy for Road and Bridge. Berry said that the proposed project was not a benefit to the County as a whole. He stated that the advice of the County's counsel was obviously more advocacy than advice.

Aleta Jupille, 236 County Road 22A, stated that she was against the project not based on the merit of the PID, but because the process did not feel right. She felt that the desire of the Board was to form the proposed District. Jupille said that she learned from the statute that the proposed District did not comply with the requirements. Jupille said that if the proposed District was to be formed, it should be done legally. She urged the Board to follow the rules.

William Stowers, 689 County Road 22, said that his house was listed for sale and prospective buyers had elected not to view his house after they heard about the proposed improvements. Stowers was dissatisfied with the current Road and Bridge service levels and he was not in favor of paying additional taxes to the department.

Dennis Michaud, 819 Pine Drive, said that the best way to solve the formation question was to put it to a vote. He supported project.

Tim Jensen, 442 South Badger Trail, recalled that the County previously committed to chip sealing one mile of the road per year. He understood that there was no uproar or contention surrounding that plan because there were no additional taxes imposed on the residents. Jensen thought that a paved road took away the rural character of the County. Jensen estimated that his taxes would increase by $300 per year.

Deborah Ernst, 92 Coral Bell Drive, said that the increased traffic would be a detriment to the residents who lived on Log Hill Mesa. Ernst said that she saw a benefit from the proposed improvements in the form of reduced wear and tear on her vehicle. She stated that many residents said they didn't use the section of road that the project proposed to improve.

Robert McGowen, 869 County Road 22, was not supportive of the proposed improvements. He said that he had never obtained an answer to why the roads in the County were in such bad shape. He said that any improvements to County Road 1 as performed by the County were a temporary fix. McGowen said that there was an accountability issue with the Board of County Commissioners and Road and Bridge department. He thought there needed to be an analysis performed to deal with the issue of why the roads were in bad conditions; McGowan said that the Road and Bridge department used the wrong equipment and products.

Randal Fischer, 11893 County Road 1, was against the proposed project. He did not think that the BOCC had received reliable information regarding the financial aspects and therefore could not make a sound decision. He thought that the cost aspects should be disclosed to the public as well. He asked if anyone in a position of authority had reviewed and concurred with the financial aspects. He thought that a competent review as essential. Fischer said that Commissioner Padgett should recuse herself as she had been involved in prior informal meetings where she indicated she would support an improvements project.

Roger Pynan, 2657 County Road 22, reminded the Board that the voters passed a County-wide mill levy increase in 2001 in order to pave County Road 1. Subsequently, he said that Government Springs Road was paved. He said that all of the residents on County Road 22 did not use the portion of County Road 1 under consideration. He said that County Road 1 was dangerous in the wintertime, and that the washboard in the summertime was tedious. He urged the Board to reconsider the north/south boundary of the proposed District. He did not think the boundaries were realistic.

John Hulburd, 124 Bristlecone Drive, stated that he had prior experience being on road committees and associations in other counties; he said that Ouray County roads were the worst he had ever seen. He thought that some of the assumptions made in the PID proposal were inaccurate. He said that chip-seal deteriorated quickly with increased traffic and speeds.

Dale Demuth, 246 County Road 1C, said that he did not want to increase taxes; he also wanted to still be able to use his ATV on the County Road. He was afraid that chip sealing the road would increase traffic and speeds. He was opposed to the improvements. Demuth said that he conducted a traffic count at the intersection of County Roads 22A and 1C at various times of day over the weekend. He counted 34 cars during one hour in the morning on Monday and 29 cars during 5pm-6pm on Saturday. Demuth added that he had recently registered a car in Ouray County and paid $240 in taxes and a portion of it included a payment to Road and Bridge.

Karen Gualteieri, 3759 Ponderosa Drive, said that by creating an unofficial bypass, the County would lose out on sales tax from people stopping in the Town of Ridgway. She said it was a County-wide impact.

Hunter Frenze, 375 Hunter's Chase Road, stated that he would be voting against the improvements, if it went to the ballot. He thought the repairs were an unnecessary upgrade. He did not agree that encouraging more vehicles to travel on County Road 1 was moral. He was also wary of the potential tax increase to property owners.

Patty Painter, 8526 County Road 1, agreed with previous commenters who were opposed to the improvements. Painter explained that she was primarily concerned about safety, increasing traffic and speeds. She firmly believed the County as a whole needed improved roads.

Dave Beckhardt, 416 County Road 22A, said that there had been assertions that the improvements would be of benefit to the County; Beckhardt did not think there had been any proof that there was a net benefit, after taking into account all of the pluses and minuses. Beckhardt referenced a document that was available on the County's website called "District Formation and County Government." He drew the Board's attention to a table on page two of the document that listed the pros and cons for forming a PID. Beckhardt specifically mentioned the first two cons which stated that a PID may add responsibility to a County that may already be overloaded, and had limited staff; and that the PID could be administratively intensive, depending on the funding mechanism. He believed that most of the County staff was overloaded, and that there was limited staff. He did not think that the BOCC should form the PID as the two cons he mentioned outweighed the benefits. He said that there was not proof that the improvements offered a net benefit to the County.

Cyndi Nelson, 650 Ponderosa Drive, was against the PID based on her experience of living on county roads that were originally gravel and then were paved. She said that chip sealing County Road 1 would change the characteristics of the neighborhood. She thought speeds would increase and would result in more accidents.

Dale Demuth, 246 County Road 1, stated that he was forced to pull over in order to let speeding and tailgating cars go around him earlier in the day.

Roger Berry, 167 Sunrose Lane, said that the PID should be dismissed based on the testimony the Board had heard. He said that a large body of residents and property owners wanted to see the road fixed; he encouraged the Board to move forward with a County-wide mill levy increase for Road and Bridge. He said that a County-wide increase would be supported.

Randal Fischer, 11893 County Road 1, did not think that the Board or the public had been provided with the right information. He thought the number of accidents would increase if the road was chip sealed.

William Stowers, 689 County Road 22, stated that most of the residents who lived on the north end of boundary were retired or blue-collar workers. He said that they did not have the money to afford a tax increase.

Robert McGowan, 869 County Road 22, encouraged the Board to pursue a County-wide mill levy increase. McGowan said that the Road and Bridge department needed to be improved as crew members did not know how to property maintain the County roads.

Commissioner Padgett closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

**7:19 The Board took a short break and reconvened at 7:22:.**

Commissioner Batchelder said that the Board's role was fairly limited and set by State statute. He listed the four components set by CRS 30-20-506: first, the petition must contain either 200 signatures or 30% of the electors within the proposed District. Commissioner Batchelder said that this provision had been met. Commissioner Batchelder explained that the second provision asked if the proposed improvements constituted a "general benefit" to the proposed District. Commissioner Batchelder said that the Board had received testimony supporting both sides of the argument. Third, was the cost of chip sealing excessive compared to the value of the property within the proposed district. Commissioner Batchelder said that the Board had received public comment that it was excessive; however, the Assessor had previously stated that the cost of the project was 1% of the value of the property within the proposed District. Fourth, any other matters, as legally required; Commissioner Batchelder said that the Board had received public comments that stated the petition had been invalidated by the committee changing the boundaries after signatures had been obtained. Sunderland had previously provided advice stating that this action did not invalidate the petition. Commissioner Batchelder said that the PID committee did not have a preference regarding if the PID formation question went to a vote, or if it was formed via BOCC resolution. Commissioner Batchelder said the only outstanding question was the topic of the bond. He asked if there was any discussion at the staff level regarding the bond when the petition was filed. Nauer said that there was no discussion as her office only dealt with the validity of the petition signatures. Sunderland said that his interpretation of the statute was that the County could waive the bond requirement; Sunderland was clear that the language in the statue gave the Board discretion in setting the bond requirement.

Commissioner Batchelder addressed the public comments that pertained to previous ballot initiatives to pave County Road 1. He said that the initiative in 2001 was tied to a bond and a filing mechanism and that both failed.

Commissioner Tisdel remarked upon the unusual situation that the Board had found themselves in. He said that the Board was without their customary County Attorney and that Sunderland was not always available for consultation. Commissioner Tisdel said that the PID committee had approached the Board with a proposed IGA and contemplated PID; page two of the proposed IGA did state that the County would be reimbursed for the cost for County employees' time and resources. Commissioner Tisdel thought this could constitute a bond. The Board had decided at the time that the IGA could not enter into the IGA at the time, as the PID had not been created. He added that the Board had briefly discussed waving the bond. Commissioner Tisdel said that not always having access and opinions from Sunderland regarding legal matters had made the process more complicated.

Commissioner Tisdel said that he found the form of the petition to be adequate and that it met the statute. He said there was the question of whether or not the proposed District's formation should be deferred to the voters, or formed by the Board. He thanked the petitioners for stating that it should be placed on the ballot.

Commissioner Tisdel said that he was struggling with the question of whether or not the improvements constituted a net benefit. He said it was encouraging to hear so much support for a County-wide mill levy increase for Road and Bridge. He thought that the County-wide levy was a better path forward and was dedicated to the goal.

Commissioner Padgett recognized that some members of the public had expressed that she was not qualified to issue an opinion on the PID formation. She said that the question of the bond was a surprise to her, and regretted that it came so late in the process. Commissioner Padgett stated that she was really struggling with the bond requirement. She recognized that the County did not require a bond to be filed at the time the petition was submitted, and recognized that this was an error. Commissioner Padgett said that some members of the public had threatened legal action if the proposed District was to be filed and she wanted to understand the risk to the County from that.

Sunderland responded that there was no case law interpreting CRS 30-20-506; however, he said that estoppel could be applied where a government entity had taken action on which an entity had relied upon to their detriment. He thought that if the opponents to the proposed District were to file a lawsuit, the courts would apply estoppel in order to state that the failure to comply was immaterial. Sunderland said that his advice was still that most of the costs associated with information gathering, and Clerk and Assessor research, would have been incurred anyway. He suggested that the cost associated with the public notice and the mailer be determined. Nauer said that her staff had kept a tally; the cost for the public notice and the mailing was approximated at $650.00. She approximated that 15 hours of staff time were associated with the mailing and the petition verification.

Roger Berry, 167 Sunrose Lane, said that he was struck by the failure of Sunderland to suggest dismissing the proposed District to the Board. He said that it seemed that Sunderland was advocating for the proposed District instead of offering advice.

Peggy Howe, 5594 County Road 1, said that it was her interpretation that the point of posting a bond was to protect tax payers from any expenses incurred by the PID process. Commissioner Padgett said that it was interesting that statute would require the County to refund the bond if the PID was formed. She said that the bond was simply a placeholder. Sunderland affirmed that Commissioner Padgett was correct: he said that if the proposed District was formed and financed, the District would enter into a contract with the County to repay any costs. Commissioner Padgett estimated the costs incurred to date, including employee time, to be around $1,000. Kreutzen said that the committee had some funds from fundraising, and could post a $1,000 bond.

Dave Beckhardt, 416 County Road 22A, asked if CRS 30-20-506 addressed future expenses. Sunderland clarified that the statute stated that expenses connected with the proceedings would be covered by the

bond. He advised the Board to focus the scope of the discussions on the costs incurred by the County to date.

Commissioner Padgett repeated her interpretation of Sunderland's advice: the lack of a bond was not a barrier to moving forward with the formation of the district. She wanted to discuss the benefits and unintended issues associated with the proposed improvements. She said that there were many different studies that indicated that the County was throwing money away on County Road 1; she said that studies indicated it would become cheaper to maintain and much safer if the road was paved. Commissioner Padgett referenced traffic counter data from 2010 to present: she said that approximately 26% of the traffic on County Road 1 was on the north side of County Road 1; 47% was on the south side. She said that the increase suggested the majority of traffic was from residents that were avoiding the road. She thought use of the road once paved would be residents using their own road.

George Kerber, 2108 County Road 22, said that residents living on the south side supported the project, but that the residents on the north side did not. He thought that if the Board formed the District, then residents living on the south side would gang up against those on the north.

Randal Fischer, 11893 County Road 1, asked how the cost of the improvements was compared to the property valuation of the proposed District. Commissioner Batchelder said that the proposed cost of the project was 1% compared to the value of the property within the proposed District. He said that until there was specific ballot language, there would be some unanswered questions. Commissioner Batchelder said that the question before the Board was whether or not to form the District; ballot language was a separate matter.

Cyndi Nelson, 650 Ponderosa Drive asked what would happen if costs increased; particularly if County residents were asked to consider a County-wide increase for roads. She asked if eventual road improvements were taken into consideration with the proposed mill levy. Commissioner Padgett said that the County Engineer had worked closely with County elected officials and staff and the PID committee to ensure that the Board would have an idea of costs for chip sealing. The estimated number was then divided by the assessed value of property within the proposed boundaries that was obtained from the Assessor's office in order to develop a reasonable idea of cost. Kreutzen attested that the process was correct, but added that after the proposed District was scaled back, it decreased the project costs by 30%. Commissioner Padgett reiterated that the purpose of the hearing was not to debate the costs of the proposed project but was whether or not to move forward with the PID formation.

Roger Berry, 167 Sunrose Lane, clarified what the dollar value of the property within the district was. Mayfield estimated it was approximately $290 million. He said that 1% of $300 million was approximately $3 million. Berry thought that the projected costs of the project were excessive compared to the estimated value of the District's property.

Commissioner Tisdel stated that he thought the petition conformed to most of the statutory requirements. He said it was possible that the question of formation be sent to the ballot. He asked if it was fair if the only formation question proceeded this year, then subsequently have another ballot question about funding.

Commissioner Padgett recommended another way to poll the Board by suggesting that each of the Commissioners weigh in on each of the statute's four points. She said that the funding question could be addressed later, if formation was successful.

Commissioner Padgett asked if any Commissioner believed that the petition was not valid. Commissioners Padgett, Tisdel and Batchelder agreed that the statutory provision had been met, and that the petition was valid.

Commissioner Padgett asked if chip sealing the gravel section of County Road 1 conferred a general benefit on the proposed District. Commissioner Batchelder stated that he was split on the question. He thought the only way to resolve the question was to pose the question of formation to the voters. He stated that there was evidence on both sides that was convincing. He thought it was reasonable to let the residents and property owners decide. Commissioner Padgett reminded Commissioner Batchelder that in order for it to get to a vote, the Board would need to find that the proposed improvements conferred a general benefit. Commissioner Batchelder said that there was more pervasive evidence that the proposed improvements conferred a general benefit. Commissioner Padgett agreed with Commissioner Batchelder. She said that there had been lots of discussions about the inadequacy of County Road 1; she could agree that the proposed improvements could confer an unqualified general benefit. She said that the voters could each decide whether or not it conferred a general benefit to them as individuals if the question made it to the ballot. Commissioner Tisdel stated that the proposed improvements could confer a benefit, but agreed with Commissioner Padgett and Commissioner Batchelder regarding the ballot question.

Commissioner Padgett next asked if the cost of the proposed improvements was excessive to the property values. Commissioner Batchelder stated that 1% was not excessive. Commissioner Tisdel and Commissioner Padgett agreed.

Finally, Commissioner Padgett asked if any Commissioner believed that the process failed to conform to the statutory requirements. Commissioner Batchelder said that the only evidence that was confirmed as lacking was the bond; however, he stated that the Board received legal advice that indicated this could be fixed by asking for a bond after the Board created the District. Commissioner Batchelder said that he could find that the provision had been met, as long as there was a condition in the motion for the requirement of a $1,000 bond. Commissioner Tisdel stated that the Board had been caught in an odd position. He said that Sunderland's advice that the bond requirement could be rectified by requiring a bond after the petition was filed created some nonconformity questions. Commissioner Tisdel said that he was uncomfortable relying on the argument of estoppel. Commissioner Tisdel said that he could not make

the finding that the process had conformed to all pertinent statutory requirements. Commissioner Padgett agreed with Commissioner Tisdel.

Kreutzen pointed out that he had come before the Board on two previous occasions before the petition was submitted to discuss the bond. Commissioner Tisdel recognized that it was the Board's failure.

Commissioner Padgett said that the Board could move forward with the formation of the project but that the process would feel messy. She did not think that it would allow for a good barometer of the project. She said that if the Board formed the proposed District that the County would be distracted with divisive lawsuits, and was wary that it would detract from the real issue of the need to improve County Road 1.

Commissioner Tisdel was appreciative that the process had resulting in many valuable comments that indicated support for a broader County-wide road improvement solution.

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Tisdel and seconded by Commissioner Padgett to dismiss the petition and not form the District. Commissioner Tisdel said that the Board agreed the first three points of the statute had been met; he stipulated that if another petition came forward and the bond was included, then the situation would be remedied. He reiterated that the motion rejecting the formation was a result of the merits or efforts of the petition group, but instead was a process question.*

*A roll call vote was taken on the motion with the following results:*

*Commissioner Padgett voted in the affirmative.*

*Commissioner Tisdel voted in the affirmative*

*Commissioner Batchelder voted in the negative. He stated that he indicated previously that, based on legal advice received, that all provisions had been met. Commissioner Batchelder continued to say that the only way he had ever seen roads improved was through special districts. He reminded the Board and the public that there had never been a successful initiative for a tax increase for County-wide roads. He thought it was very encouraging to hear so many citizens expressing support; but he was cautious, as he also heard many residents saying that they did not want to be included in the proposed District, as they claimed to never use the road.*

*Commissioner Padgett agreed with Commissioner Batchelder's points regarding a County-wide tax increase for road improvements.*

*There was some discussion. Motion carried 2 to1.*

After the motion carried, Kreutzen stated that there may be other individuals who wanted to continue with the project, but he would no longer be involved.

**M/S/P** – *Motion was made by Commissioner Batchelder and seconded by Commissioner Tisdel to close the public hearing and adjourn the regular meeting. The motion carried unanimously.*

**8:55PM** **The Commissioners adjourned the regular meeting:**

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF OURAY COUNTY, COLORADO

Attest:

Lynn M. Padgett, Chair

Ben Tisdel, Vice-Chair

Michelle Nauer, Clerk and Recorder
By: Hannah Hollenbeck, Deputy Clerk of the Board

Don Batchelder, Commissioner