



PLAN JEFFCO UPDATE

JULY 2002

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

Candidate Forum	1
Annual Meeting	12
Summit Communications	13
OSAC Notes	14

THE ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMIT WAS A SUCCESS

COMMISSIONER CANDIDATES COMMENTS¹¹

Candidates were emailed questions and provided responses. Auburn and Sheehan responded to audience questions at the July 8 Candidates Forum. Cal Johnston planned to be present, but was detained out-of-state by car trouble. The emailed responses are first, followed by the responses from the Candidates Forum.

Question for Sheehan.

#1 What do you hope to achieve if you are re-elected?



Continue to preserve priority Open Space Lands – we now have 1-in-10 acres preserved.



Closing of Rocky Flats in 2006.



Lower the mil levy by another .5 mils-represents \$3 million reduction County-wide every year.



Denver Regional Council looked upon as a grass roots forum for greater leadership in uniting issues of Transportation & growth



A line on the map and preservation of Right-of-way for the “Missing Link” of the 470 Beltway



Establish a "Multi-use Facility" for juvenile sex offenders in Arapahoe County



Continue to be fiscally conservative while improving County services.

#1. What do you hope to achieve as County Commissioner?

Auburn:

I am committed to restoring open and honest government, and to rebuilding confidence with the citizens that they will be heard on matters affecting their welfare. I am committed to openly discuss issues and by working together, find solutions. I am also committed to recruiting the right people for county leadership positions and restoring the county to its leadership role in Colorado.

Johnston:

As a Jefferson County Commissioner, I hope to achieve, and will work toward:

1) Restoring stability and decision making ability to the office of Jeffco Commissioner. Presently, there are only "Acting Directors" of the offices of: County Administrator, County Attorney, Human Resources Director, Airport Manager and Public Works Director resulting in instability in Jeffco Government. The BCC (Board of County Commissioners) have contracted a facilitator to mediate disagreements among the BCC. Local newspapers (Courier, Transcripts, Sentinel, and Westminster Window widely refer to the Jeffco BCC as a "dysfunctional family" and their disagreements and alleged dislike for each other as a "soap opera." Decision making paralysis is evident in many areas including inability to decide on replacement people for the aforementioned positions, and in the BCC's inability to make a decision about the juvenile sex offenders group home.

2. Providing regular communication to all Jeffco residents about Jeffco BCC actions via a newsletter or other means. In addition, I would hold regularly scheduled town meetings throughout Jeffco to learn and listen to diverse citizen needs and interest. I believe that more open public comments should be allowed and encouraged at public commissioner hearings.

3. Implementing the "Future Jeffco Strategic Plan" to provide vision, policies and goals that tie together the existing community plans, city or town comprehensive plans, master plans and other local planning efforts. As a framework for coordination of planning efforts among all governmental, business, nonprofit, homeowner and other citizen groups in Jeffco, the Future Jeffco Plan provides the comprehensive, master plan required by the 2001 growth legislation passed by the state legislature and fills in glaring gaps in Jeffco planning presently. I support implementation of Phase II of the Future Jeffco Strategic Plan that calls for five-year action plans among all public and private interest groups and citizens in Jeffco.

4. Providing better and more services to the citizens of Jeffco to improve our quality of life by:

A. Providing creative solutions to transportation problems and traffic congestion. The BCC should be involved in the I-70 Corridor decision making process to improve access to the mountains. The BCC should work more closely with the RTD to implement the "Fast Tracks" program and to get a Light Rail line to both the northwest and central areas of Jeffco at least as far as the Taj. Working closely with C-DOT might allow privately funded C-470 toll lane construction and reverse flow one-way service road flow along C-470. Alternative modes of transportation carpooling and van transportation could improve traffic flow and would mitigate traffic congestion in Jeffco.


b. Providing more resources and education to prevent wildfires in the mountain areas of Jeffco. The Cooperative Extension Services and Emergency Management Divisions of Jeffco should greatly expand wild fire prevention and abatement efforts and increase slash collection locations and times. The BCC should work cooperatively through Jeffco County Departments to forge intergovernmental cooperation among the special district, municipalities and county in training and equipping local firefighters in non-urban firefighting techniques. A combined intergovernmental approach and efforts must be

- used to control the wild fire threat. Countywide wild fire open flame and fireworks bans with appropriate punishments must be enforced as requested of all local government authorities by the Governor.
- c. Doing more to provide preventative health care to the estimated 17,000 to 20,000 children in Jeffco without access to medical or dental facilities. With an estimated 15% of Jeffco's population being without health insurance or access to health care and at least 1/3 of them children, the Jeffco Health Department must be given adequate resources as the critical health network of last resort for Jeffco's children. Colorado's commitment to public health for its children ranks 48th out of 50 states even before the Governor vetoed the portion of the state budget funding public health and cut its budget by 4% or by \$7.5 million. The safety net for Colorado's Children, CHIPS (Children's Health Improvement Program) will face a \$300,000 shortfall in Jeffco this year and even more next year. It provides a meager \$500 per year dental care limit per child and slightly more for medical care. The children of the working poor (133 to 185% of the federal poverty level) are the ones caught in the middle through no fault of their own since their parents work for employers without health insurance benefits and the parents make too much money to qualify for Medicaid (aid to the poor) and not enough to afford health insurance. The \$1.6 squandered by the Jeffco BCC in the last year to purchase land its related costs for the ill-fated Juvenile Sex Offender's Home could be sold to make up the Jeffco Health Department's budget deficit along with other budgetary adjustments to cover the CHIPS children. Healthy children are better students, more motivated and productive, less likely to be involved in the criminal justice system and better able to enter the work force in adulthood. In summary, as a Jeffco Commissioner, I hope to achieve: stability and foster effective decision making among the BCC; better and more open communication among all Jeffco citizens and interest groups; implementation of a more focused, goal and vision driven comprehensive master planning process in Jeffco with more public input; better and more efficient services to Jeffco residents in the areas of transportation and traffic needs, wild fire prevention and abatement, and preventative health access and treatment for the thousands of Jeffco children in which it is lacking.

#2. What is your position with regard to putting the new policy language regarding disposal of open space lands on the ballot next year so that the voters can make them part of the Open Space resolution? What is your position on disposal of Open Space lands?

Sheehan:

 I supported and approved the language in current Board policy, it is premature to go to the vote of the residents.

 For the most part, the goal is to preserve the Open Space lands, so any disposition would have to be weighed heavily. However, we have a good process in place with the Open Space Advisory Council to make recommendations as needed. Obviously, if we dispose of one place, and add more Open Space in an another place, this may be worth the trade, for example.

Auburn:


I believe the voters should decide whether, or under what circumstances Open Space can be sold or traded. After all, there is a special tax approved by the voters for open space purchases, so it seems to make sense for the voters to decide some limits on how their open space taxes are used. However, I have to reserve my conclusion on whether I would support all of the language in a proposed ballot until I see the final version. Nevertheless, I am committed to hear citizen arguments on all perspectives, and discuss the matter with them, before making a final decision.


Johnston:

I strongly support the citizen initiative process that allows ballot proposals to be placed on ballot for voter approval. I also understand that citizens statutorily do not have the initiative process at the county level in Colorado but must rely on the BCC to refer citizen generated proposals for a vote. I support a county regulation (law) that creates a clear process for disposal of Open Space lands that mandates input from the Plan Jeffco Citizens Advisory group, the Open Space staff and the 80% approval of the Open Space Advisory Committee (8 out of 10) with a majority vote of the Jeffco BCC.

#3. Do you believe it is essential to preserve the Mountain Backdrop? If elected County Commissioner, what will you specifically do to protect the Mountain Backdrop?

Sheehan:

 I support preserving the Mountain Backdrop.

 I have approved an addition 15,000 acres of open space – much of it Mountain Backdrop-since I have been in office. Sixty percent of Jeffco's Mountain Backdrop is currently preserved.

Auburn:

I support preserving the mountain backdrop, and will work with my fellow Commissioners, staff and the citizenry to identify and acquire properties that will meet that objective. However, I also recognize that, unlike the Federal government, the county can't just print money to buy what it wants. So I think we may need to consider additional sources of revenue or options to acquire properties. Again, I expect government and the citizenry will work together to identify financing alternatives (perhaps additional bonds, an increase in the Open Space tax, purchase options, conservation trusts or other alternatives).

Johnston:

I strongly support the five county (Larimer, Boulder, Jefferson, Douglas and El Paso) Agreement that preserves the Mountain Backdrop. The Mountain Backdrop preservation steps for Jeffco are addressed in the Open Space Master Plan of 1998 in the "Front Range Mountain Backdrop Project" and, to some extent, some other community plans. Specifically, I would work closely with the other four counties and with GOCO, CDW (Colorado Division of Wildlife), Colorado State Parks, the BLM, the Open Space Advisory Committee, staff and Plan Jeffco; and, the Denver Water Board to complete an inventory and map analysis of the Backdrop. I would work for the purchase and preservation of the Mountain Backdrop (with Jeffco Open Space and GOCO funds). This process would be based on the goals of the Front Range Mountain Backdrop Project, the Open Space Proposal Acquisition Nomination and Purchase Process, the GOCO process and input from citizen advisory groups. I would given priority for purchase and preservation to those lands identified on the "Natural Heritage Inventory and Mountain Backdrop Map 6" of the Jefferson County Open Space Master Plan.

#4. What do you think the county should do to deal with the telecommunications tower issues on both a local and national level? Do you believe the county should do more to monitor the transmissions to ensure that they do not exceed the legal limits? What would you do to ensure that the transmissions do not exceed their legal limits. Do you believe that telecommunications towers are consistent with preservation of the Mountain Backdrop?

Sheehan:

 I initiated and gained Commissioner support for a letter that has been sent to the FCC requesting they re-evaluate their mission standards.

 I have offered support to Tom Tancredo's legislation for health study monies.





 I am the only active Commissioner who is willing to put County matching funds toward further health study

 The Commissioner's have initiated rules and regulation changes to clarify current Telecommunications Plans.

 Towers in violation with County rules and regs should be cited and followed up in court.

 The County currently monitors along with the FCC tower emissions:

 We use a \$7,000 Wandel-Goltermann RF meter to confirm standards

-  We check towers before and after changes made to any tower
-  We are aware of higher RF areas
-  We respond to all citizen requests
-  Jerry Ulceck from the FCC is headquartered in Denver and checks every 5 years on license renewals as well as County requests.

Auburn:

The issue of telecommunications towers is probably one of the most difficult issues that county government and the citizens are required to address, and I need to learn a lot more about the issues before I can make any final decision. But, then, that is one of the purposes of public hearings: to assure that these difficult issues are considered from all perspectives, and yet keeping in mind that my duty as a Commissioner is to support the welfare of Jefferson County Citizens.

Although I do not have all of the facts, this is what I have learned. There has been concern expressed from various interest groups that broadcast activities pose a threat to the health of residents in the immediate area of the towers. There is also a strong sentiment that the towers are an eyesore that need to be removed, or at least moved to some other part of the county. In fact, I personally agree that they are an eyesore and inconsistent with preserving the beauty of our mountain backdrop.

The broadcasters, on the other hand, claim that they have some vested rights to broadcast from the towers. They claim those rights were "grand fathered" years ago, and they have no intention of completely abandoning the tower sites without a fight. The matter is further complicated because, even though the location of towers falls under the county's land use authority, the Federal Communications Commission has authority to regulate broadcast activities. Apparently, the FCC has interpreted its regulatory authority to encompass some of the county's land use authority under federal law (based on expert advice I have received, I don't agree with the FCC interpretation). An additional complicating factor is that there are towers on two other mountain backdrop locations.

Simply put, where there is disagreement to this degree, there may be no solution other than to litigate the issues. On the other hand, I don't support litigation as a first option. Although I know this matter has been festering for some time, I would prefer to get all the interested parties and groups to the negotiating table and try to develop a consensus solution that will scale back (preferably eliminate) broadcast activities on any part of the mountain backdrop, establish lower broadcast emissions, and develop a monitoring program to assure that broadcast emissions are not exceeding approved levels. Regardless of any consensus developed, if the towers are not removed now, I would like to see them phased down or out (or moved) with advanced technology.

Johnston:

It is obvious that Jeffco's Telecommunications Land Use Plan and Regulations needs to be revised to consider illegal and non-conforming land use and zoning issues, health issues, new technology effects and possible amortized removal of present sites to more appropriate locations. The Jeff BCC should deal with the telecommunication is at the local, state and national level because land use and zoning issues are local and state issues and tower usage and licenses are a national issue requiring FCC licenses and regulation. Jefferson County should do much more to monitor the transmission of Broadcast TV and FM, analog and digital, microwave dishes, cellular radio, PLS, receiving and transmitting and repeater sites, two way radio, satellite, etc. that could or does emanate from existing or planned sites to assess their health effects, intensity, and proper licenses and permits and their appropriate locations. This should be done in cooperation with other state, local and national agencies.

I]
D
w:
D
ar
si
M



s
h

and aesthetic nature of the Mountain Backdrop.

#5. Do you believe the proposed Rocky Flats Wildlife Refuge should be protected from future mineral and transportation development? Explain your answer and if your answer is yes, what would you do to protect the proposed Rocky Flats Wildlife Refuge from such development?

Sheehan:

 I would discourage mineral and transportation development on Rocky Flats Wildlife Refuge, nevertheless, I would protect property rights of current owners.

Auburn:

I believe that Rocky Flats should be protected from mineral development beyond the existing leases. Although I would like to see all mineral production stopped on the Flats now, the cost to the taxpayers of trying to prevent extraction of minerals under present leases would be enormous. On the other hand, I believe we should assure that the land is reclaimed and restored to its original beauty even on those parcels presently subject to mineral lease activities.


Other than roads or trails that are necessary to gain access to the Flats as decided in the final plan, the Flats should be protected to the greatest extent reasonable from transportation development. What that means seems somewhat unclear even to those who are now involved in the Parkway development; but I am committed to working with the cities, Federal government and citizenry to minimize adverse impact to the Flats.

Johnston:

I believe the proposed Rocky Flats Wildlife Refuge should be protected from mineral and transportation development much like the Rocky Mountain Arsenal area. The scenic, wildlife, ecological biome qualities of the Arsenal are unique and need protection status in perpetuity as a NWR and should be deeded as such to the federal government. The area could serve as a buffer to future development from adjacent municipalities and as protection for the Mountain Backdrop. In addition, it would be a natural wildlife traffic area. Of course, toxic cleanup as a Superfund Site mandated by the EPA must continue until the land is deemed safe for habitation by wildlife, visitors and NWR personnel.

#6 If a high speed beltway connection is built or planned in the foothills corridor of north Jefferson County, do you think that the development of existing open lands along the corridor should be discouraged. Explain your answer and, what if anything, would you do to preserve these lands?

Sheehan:

 Development should be discouraged on existing Open Space lands. The Vauxmont property and Cimarron project, as well as development near the Airport make sense for a balance of Open Space, residential, and commercial.

Auburn:

To my knowledge much of the land adjacent to the proposed beltway, assuming the highway 93 corridor, is open space. Additional areas contain geophysical hazards and are unstable due to gas storage. I believe open space should be considered with any site development proposal given the availability of funds for purchase or the required maintenance of those lands. When the beltway is finally under way it is imperative that concerned parties sit together and decide what should be done.

Johnston:

If the Jefferson Parkway, A.K.A. Northwest Parkway or W-470 Beltway, is built or planned in the foothills corridor of north Jefferson County, developments of existing open lands must be discouraged unless they meet

the guidelines of the North Mountain and North Jeffco Community Plans, the Open Space Master Plan for Jeffco, the Mountain Backdrop Agreement. Regrettably, Jeffco is in need of jobs close to residential areas to control traffic congestion and to provide sources of income for the county, municipalities and special districts. Daily, of the 300,000 people that live in Jeffco that are employed, approximately one-half leave the county to go to and from their jobs. Jeffco is definitely in need of office and light industrial zoned areas to provide jobs close-by. Given this fact, buffers must be designed between and among developments and can be achieved with appropriate zoning, site development platting plans, open space acquisitions and low density commercial and residential areas that don't conflict with the aforementioned agreements and plans. A recent Transportation Study on the feasibility of the Northwest Quadrant beltway seems to suggest that most traffic in the area is generated locally and not outside of the area and that arterial street (Wadsworth, Kipling, McIntyre) improvements may suffice for the near future.

#7. If the 90 home Ten Eyk development proposal for the Mountain Backdrop at the mouth of Coal Creek Canyon, currently within the City of Arvada, is transferred to County jurisdiction, what environmental protections do you believe should be required? Note to Rick-if you believe you cannot respond, please tell us what environmental protections should be required for development in the scenic areas in front of the foothills.

Sheehan:



I have discussed with Diane Ten Eyke that I would encourage preservation of the Mountain Backdrop. What other environmental protections are you referring to-they have Arvada water? The current restrictions on the development that the City has put in place, generally, would be a required minimum.

Auburn:

Although I have requested documents relating to the Ten Eyk proposal, I have not received those documents prior to preparing this response. I am very concerned about the impact of any development on our environment, and especially concerned about the availability of water to support development along the Front Range and in the mountains. But I am also a strong advocate of private property rights. What I can do as a Commissioner will depend on what is presented and what zoning and platting rules and regulations will require for this development. Additional consideration will come from the "North Mountains Community Plan".

Johnston:

If the 90 home Ten Eyk development proposal for the Mountain Backdrop at the mouth of Coal Creek Canyon, currently within the Arvada City limits, is transferred to Jeffco jurisdiction, environmental protections that must be employed are: large areas of greenbelt and open-space land in the development, low density housing, placement of homes to conform to geographic contours to mitigate Mountain Backdrop visible scars, mitigation for wildlife trail transfers, minimum dislocation of exiting vegetation and ecology, and other mitigations that conform to the North Mountain and North Jeffco Community Plans. Screening, below ridge line development, limitations on construction heights and aesthetic compatibility with view corridors must be employed. Developer impact fees to provide for open space, parks and recreation could be imposed. This flagpole annexation into the Mountain Backdrop and Coal Creek Canyon may not be allowed because of a citizen's initiative that courts have ruled may be on the ballot this fall. The city of Arvada Planning Commission voted against the annexation into the Mountain Backdrop which may influence votes in the election.

#8. Do you believe that Open Space acquisitions should be used as a land use planning tool? Should they be part of a regional planning effort? Should Jeffco Open Space acquisition become part of an integrated planning process?

Sheehan:



It is used as a planning tool today and in regional efforts. It is part of the integrated process today although not a formal restrictive document.

Auburn:

See next question for response.

Johnston:

Open Space acquisitions should not be used as a land use planning tool but must meet the goals, objectives and criteria of the Open Space Master Plan for acquisitions. As part of a regional planning effort, the acquisitions must consider the community plans in effect, the Future Jeffco Strategic Plan, the Mountain Backdrop preservation criteria and be of significant ecological, cultural, or recreational benefit. Open Space acquisitions should definitely be part of an integrated planning process developed with the input of Plan Jeffco, the Open Space Advisory Committee, the Jeffco Planning and Zoning staff, special district government entities, municipal governments, and state and federal government agencies and departments. I support the Open Space Department approach of meeting with municipalities and special district and providing grants and venture grants to these governmental entities to purchase and develop parks, recreational areas and open space.

#9. What would you do to reduce urban and rural sprawl. Should there be agreed upon enforceable urban growth boundaries? In this regard, what do you consider the essential elements of a Jefferson County land use plan to reduce sprawl and are they all in place? What would you do to improve the existing land use plans?

Sheehan:

✂ We receive great pressure “against” from current residents today when we approve (high density) residential developments inside the current urban growth boundaries – these are mostly in-fill areas, I might emphasize.

✂ We have urban growth boundaries now. How would you like enforcement to take place?

✂ The problem with reducing sprawl is that you must increase density and Jeffco Residents do not want increased density. Colorado voters voted down Amendment 24 by 70% of the vote. With Open Space purchases now equaling 1-in-10 acres of Open Space, we need to balance all of our County’s needs.

Auburn:

I am addressing both of these questions (#8 and #9) together because they relate to land use planning.

I believe land use planning should be comprehensive, addressing all uses. In addition, I believe that land use planning should be closely coordinated with transportation planning, and that there should be a comprehensive plan addressing all of those uses throughout the county. My understanding is that there are now a number of community plans, a separate Open Space plan, and a transportation plan for the county. I would like to see those plans combined, so that one planning function isn’t reacting, or adjusting, its approach to planning because some other plan has already been done. Although I believe there is some coordination between city planning departments and CDOT, I think there needs to be better coordination in order to reconcile differing land use objectives and assure that the factors driving land use decisions are thoroughly addressed and agreed upon. One example that comes to mind is the expansion of Highway 285 to Conifer, which seems to be a real catch 22.

On the one hand, some residents in the Conifer area want to slow growth and preserve the flora and fauna that have historically formed the basis for their natural mountain lifestyle. One way to slow growth is to limit vehicular access to the area. However, with limited vehicular access to Conifer, some residents complain about gridlock or the inability of the existing 285 to accommodate the increased Conifer area population. So what happens, the road gets expanded to relieve gridlock, which makes the area more accessible, which leads to greater growth, which eventually leads to even more gridlock and auto emission pollution. Perhaps that result is inevitable, but better interaction between the state, local government and its citizenry to consider all environmental and community impacts – not just apparent transportation needs – would have been preferable to simply planning and constructing a road.

In the case of Open Space, it seems that a countywide comprehensive plan that involved the cities would also be beneficial because some of the county Open Space tax goes to the cities. In other words, it seems to make sense for


the counties and cities (including recreation districts) to coordinate their planning activities and better assure the proper balance between active recreational development and open space preservation keeping in mind that monies available for open space may be a limiting factor.

Johnston:

Urban and rural sprawl can only be controlled with master comprehensive plans with teeth that provide for buffer zones, percentages of open space and green belt areas, limitations on Planned Developments, limitations on housing and commercial densities, and zoning controls. Comprehensive Master plans must be statutorily mandated for municipalities and counties that require provisions for (1) urban growth boundaries that clearly state where developers can build; (2) regional management for sections of the state where counties and municipalities could show where development could go but a regional body (several county and municipality representatives) would oversee the master plans. Intergovernmental cooperation would be necessary with punishment being denial of state or local funding.

#10. Recently the Jeffco County Commissioners were asked to consider regulating growth in the Turkey Creek watershed on the basis of the results of the Report "Water Resources Assessment of the Turkey Creek Watershed", a study done by the USGS, and JeffCo P & Z. This study indicates that development in this watershed is barely at a sustainable level at present, and future development would seriously deplete the water resources for the entire area. What would action, if any, would you propose to deal with continued development in this area?

Sheehan:

 We are currently examining the study's recommendations and putting a time-line together that would help us examine the recommendations and determine if they are feasible, including scheduling public hearings for an "overlay" zone.

Auburn:


The Turkey Creek Watershed was the first real effort in this nation to comprehensively study mountain groundwater. I applaud the watershed study, but I believe that more needs to be done throughout the mountains (not just in the Turkey Creek area). In that light, I believe that local government needs to use what authority it has, and perhaps obtain additional authority in the form of new legislation, to allow water quantity and quality to be a factor in local land use decisions. It seems that we have simply grown – and will continue to grow—beyond the point where we can tolerate the state making well permit and other water use decisions without due consideration for the stress on local jurisdiction resulting from the developments that are encouraged by the water rights the state has granted. However, the county should not pioneer new land use planning methods without input from the many other agencies influencing land use.

Johnston:

Given the scarcity of mountain groundwater demonstrated by the results of the "Water Resources Assessment of the Turkey Creek Watershed" Report, future development must be contingent on the development of surface water reservoirs and the formation of water districts supplying water transported from outside sources. The continued development of the Turkey Creek Watershed area through the use of individual wells would be detrimental to the welfare and well being of existing area homeowners and commercial interests, especially during drought conditions when wells may go dry.

#11. There are many mountain communities in Jeffco that were platted in the early 1900's, and have tiny lot sizes (for example, 15 lots to an acre). Because they were platted many years ago, these properties often come under "grandfather clauses", which allow growth and development projects that would never be allowed on more recently (post-1972) platted land. What do you propose to do to deal with this situation and would you support a change in the law that would overlay local community plans onto these small lots?

Sheehan:

 Excellent question and suggestion. This analysis is currently being worked on by our Long-range Planning department, they will investigate the implications of doing exactly this.

Auburn:

I would consider reasonable changes in the law that would allow us to overlay community plans onto the smaller lots. However, there are requirements for separation of septic systems that may make some of these lots unbuildable due to health and safety concerns, or perhaps there are slope limitations and setback requirements that would also limit building. There also are a number of other factors to consider in trying to limit building on those lots (for example, "takings" issues). Nevertheless, because of limitations on both sides of the issue, I would urge us to try to negotiate with landowners in order to convert the properties to open space or allow landowners to consolidate lots to current standards. This would mitigate some growth concerns but, more importantly, keep government from implementing laws and regulations which amount to seizure of property and denial of property rights.


Johnston:

Revised zoning and site development regulations by Jeffco Planning and Zoning Department will solve some of the problems of small lots platted prior to 1972. Since these small lots (some as small as 50 feet by 100 feet) can never be developed by the present county rules that will not issue septic tank permits if the lots are less than 3 ½ acres and required that septic tanks must be 200 feet from any well. One solution would be to combine several plats by purchase in order to have a large enough site to develop. Another solution would be to overlay the county community plans over existing platting lots (those done prior to 1972) and require a minimum lot size (3 ½ to 5 acres) in order to develop the land. I would support this approach.

#12. Do you think that the Ramsetter property that was acquired with general funds should be transferred to Open Space (assuming that the Open Space Fund would repay the general fund for the cost of the transferred lands)? If your answer is no, what do you propose the county do with that land?

Commissioner Candidate Forum July 8, 2002

Sheehan:

 Potentially. The City of Golden has offered to buy the land, we would like to wait to see what the recommendations are of the Non-profit Beltway group working to put a line-on-the-map. Golden has expressed interest in re-aligning Highway 93, west, over the current Open Space land.

Auburn:

I agree that the Ramsetter property should be transferred to Open Space.

Johnston:

The Ramsetter property that was acquired with general funds as a possible site for an Open Space Park and a Juvenile Offender Group Home should be transferred to Open Space (assuming the Open Space Fund would repay the general fund for the cost of the transferred lands) only if the property meets the criteria and guidelines for being nominated for purchase as set forth in the Open Space Master Plan. This means its would need to have, among others, significant ecological, cultural or recreational benefits and is one of the priority future sites as identified on Map 6 of the Open Space Master Plan.

Additional questions and answers from the Forum Questions and answers are based on John Litz notes and may not be accurate.: Blame me, not the candidate.

13. How will the County cover the upcoming Medicaid funding shortage?

Auburn:

The County needs to find answers to covering the Medicaid shortage?

Sheehan:

County needs to work with State and Congressional representatives to work on getting increased funding.

14. Opinions on the new shortened Planning Commission Hearing Process?**Sheehan:**

The Planning Commission is way behind and needed to speed up the process. It was a matter of balancing schedules. If more time is necessary it can be requested.

Auburn:

I am leery of shortening the process.

15. Do you support placing the new Open Space Property Disposal Policy on the 2003 ballot?**Sheehan:**

It should not be necessary. I will support a ballot issue if we find that it is not working internally.

Auburn:

Yes I support a ballot issue. The citizens need to have input.

16. What are your thoughts on alternative transportation?**Sheehan:**

I am in favor of the light rail build-out, but RTD and CDOT need to coordinate and combine their plans. Although light rail ridership accounts for only a small percentage of the trips, it includes 25% of the rush-hour trips.

Auburn:

Definitely supports build-out.

17. What is your opinion relative to codifying the Community Plans?**Auburn:**

Am a supporter of property rights, but we need to bring all plans in the County together in order to allow responsible development.

Sheehan:

Jeffco has comprehensive plans, the Community Plans. If too much teeth are put into the plans it can make changes difficult but we need to respect the neighbor's property rights.

18. Is it a mistake to be advertising for businesses to come to Jefferson County?**Auburn:**

The economy prospers with new business. We do not want to become stagnant, and we need more primary jobs not just retail jobs.

Sheehan:

Jeffco has had a net loss of jobs the last two years and we need to balance these lost jobs

19. How can we get South Table Mountain acquired?**Sheehan:**

I have no creative plans. We can use bond funds if they are available and if not look for an alternate funding method.

Auburn:

I also have no creative plans. I feel that the South Table acquisition has to have priority over other properties.

Environmental and Open Space Group Summit *At Plan Jeffco Annual Meeting, April 13, 2002*

The Plan Jeffco Annual Meeting took place at 9AM on Saturday, April 13, 2002. The theme for this meeting was an Environmental and Open Space Group Summit for which groups in Jefferson County and the immediate environs were invited to the Jefferson County Open Space offices in Golden. Approximately eighty representatives from over thirty groups interested in open space advocacy attended.

The first part of the meeting comprised brief presentations by attending organizations. A speaker from each organization gave a brief history of the organization and spoke about the organization's geographical area and focus. Many of the groups had information displays set up outside the meeting room.

The intermission allowed time for attendees to chat and network informally as well as view the information displays.

The second part of the meeting comprised a "brain storming" session to determine what the group felt regarding where open space advocacy in the county goes from here. Specifically, the following was discussed:

Groups should set up and participate in a formal communication network. Coordination and sharing of email information (email trees), the setup of a website and the establishment of a list serve were all discussed. It was decided to form a committee that would discuss and decide on details of the communication network. Elliot Brown, Plan Jeffco is the interim chair for that committee and will schedule a meeting before June.

Open Space advocacy groups should investigate historic preservation as a formal policy for promoting preservation of open space.

It was pointed out that Open Space

advocacy groups should strive to be "for" something, some sort of proactive plan, rather than always in opposition to something, namely inappropriate development. However, it was also asserted that sometimes the immediacy of a development threat prevents any other response other than opposition, at least until the threat of development is removed.

The notion of forming an umbrella group that would meet in the future was discussed. The consensus was that we should meet again but no consensus could be obtained regarding the details of the umbrella organization. An umbrella organization based on geographical subgroups was proposed. An umbrella organization associated with Plan Jeffco was also proposed. As an interim measure it was decided that the attending groups would sponsor a pre-election candidates' meeting at which questions, formulated by a sub-committee, would be posed to candidates. Plan Jeffco would take responsibility for forming the candidates' meeting sub-committee. It was decided to plan a meeting for the fall to discuss the details of an umbrella organization.



Communication Group Meeting, 5/21/02

Meeting Summary:

Attendees were Elliot Brown, John Litz, Preston Driggers and Carol Lomond. Eric Finstick, Ann Bonnell and Tom Gibson were absent.

Discussion:

Electronic communication was deemed to be at the core of whatever communication network architecture would eventually be devised. Several modes of electronic communication were discussed:

(i) Email tree of the organizations that attended the summit:

This already exists, under the management of Elliot Brown. It currently works to disseminate information among the organizations by Elliot sending out an email message. It is not intended to disseminate information directly to every member of every organization. Regardless, if it were intended to be a monitored or controlled line of communication it could continue to operate with a "tree master" who would receive information to be disseminated, edit it or modify it, and then send it out to the tree. An obviously, less controlled mode of operation would be to have all member organizations in possession of the tree and to allow them to independently disseminate information to the network. This would still restrict control of dissemination to the heads and/or designated members of the group organizations. The email tree would operate to send notices and urgent messages to the member groups not for extended discussion or debate.

(ii) Website:

A website was deemed to be an effective and necessary component of the communication network. The website could contain archives of meetings and articles, a "hot topics" page, resources for open space organizations, an update page for ongoing issues. An example of a resource article that was discussed would be primer on planning and development processes and procedures so that newer advocacy groups could benefit from the prior experience and mentorship of older groups who have been there before. An important component of a website that was cited is a links page. Links would

be established with important organizations as well as, hopefully, all member organizations. (The email tree could be placed on the website and a tool for its use provided.) A search engine to make the website more functional was cited as an advantage. In this regard it was pointed out that the ISP Earthlink utilizes the Google search engine and that this might be applied locally to any website.

Currently, there is a Plan Jeffco website (saveopenspace.org or PlanJeffco.org) and it has a "Summit" page containing a summary of the summit meeting as well as the information contained in the handout (organization synopses). Links, when available, have already been established with organizations that have websites and ideally links with all member organizations will eventually be established. It was proposed, in the interim, to establish the communication network website on the existing Plan Jeffco website.

It was pointed out that although a website is essential it is not enough because most people are not quite organized enough to regularly visit a website for information. Some form of "pushing" of important information is required and a list serve would provide this vehicle.

(iii) List Serve:

A list serve was deemed an important component of the communications network because it provides the interactivity and spontaneity of an ongoing discussion on a given topic. The list serve is a better way to handle discussion than an email tree. A topic could be a "hot topic" present on the "hot topic" page on the website. The creation of a hot topics could ideally be a "self generating" or reactive process that is derived from some form of initial input (email tree, email to website, phone tip, etc.), followed by creation of a list serve topic and finally creation of an article on the website hot topic page. The list serve should be integrated with website.

Giving people the choice of receiving information on a particular discussion could be handled by setting up separate list serves for separate topics. An individual could then register for the list serve of the topic/discussion that he or she wished to participate in. Details of registration issues would have to be worked out. It has been pointed out by several

members of the committee that Yahoo groups can provide adequate resources for setting up and organizing a list serve for the communication network. Elliot Brown will research Yahoo groups list serve and report to the committee.

Action Items:

- (1) Utilize existing email tree. Possibly disseminate tree to organization heads. (Elliot Brown)
- (2) Enhance existing Summit page on Plan Jeffco website. Establish links and hot topic pages. (John Litz)
- (3) Research Yahoo groups or other list serve possibilities. (Elliot Brown)
- (4) We already have two of three components of communication network essentially available for use with candidates night meeting.

OSAC NOTES

March 7 - Study Session: Presentation of County Weed Management Plan

Regular Meeting: Presentation and discussion of the Lafarge land trade.

April 4 - Study Session: Executive Session discussion on details of Lafarge Land Trade

Regular Meeting: Public discussion of the Lafarge Land Trade. Terms for the Lafarge trade were approved. Approved the Natural Areas Acquisition Plan. Listened to presentation by Clear Channel for a construction easement to allow them to mitigate an erosion problem common with the adjacent Open Space property. The easement was approved.

May 2 - Study Session: A tour of the new Whitlock Recreation Center in Lakewood.

Regular Meeting: Approved acquisition of 1.7 acres of the Denning property West of Kipling on 38th Avenue and adjacent to the Wheat Ridge

Recreation Center. Approved terms for acquisition of the 25-acre Chippewa Property on South Table Mountain West of Quaker and North of Golden Hills Road. Approved negotiations for 2 acres of the Oleo Trust property on Deer Creek East of the Hildebrand Ranch Park for a trail corridor. Approved modification of the Flying J plan to move the Highway 73 access road to a point with better sight distances

June 6 - Study Session: Discussion of simplifying the Joint Venture Grant process.

Regular Meeting: Comments by neighbors for and against the trade of the Northeast portion of Standley Lake Park to R-1 for a middle school site in exchange for the Northwest corner of 100th and Simms. Denied disposal of 6 acres of the newly acquired Blair Ranch in Evergreen Approved plans for an on-site registration system for Open Space campgrounds. Listened to a presentation on the end-of-line alternatives for the West Corridor light rail line.

July 11 - Study Session: Presentation and discussion of the 2003 budget.. The budget includes a 4% increase in salaries and benefits, but has only a 1.55% overall increase in total operations and maintenance expenditures.

Regular Meeting: Approved terms for acquisition of 110 acres from the Elmgreen family on the South side of Clear Creek at the County line. A similar-sized, adjacent parcel will have a conservation easement. Clear Creek County will make a similar acquisition on their side of the line and also will have a similar parcel with an easement. Approved the 2003 budget. Approved a resolution relative to the alternatives for the light rail West Corridor end-of-line.



If you have not!!! Join PLAN Jeffco or renew your Membership today!

PLAN Jeffco is the county-wide volunteer citizen's group that organized and drafted the Open Space Resolution that resulted in the formation of the Jefferson County Open Space Program in 1972. We currently function as a watchdog group, observing meetings of the Open Space Advisory Committee, participating in subcommittees, and issues groups, proposing and working for important acquisitions, and keeping citizens informed of what is going on in their Open Space Program. PLAN Jeffco provided the leadership for the successful vote for bonds in 1998.

PLAN Jeffco works for Open Space and we work for you! Please sign up or renew your membership now! Your address label shows the date of your last renewal. Call 303.526.0234 for membership information.

Name: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____

Our membership rate is:

\$25 per year

Make checks payable to PLAN Jeffco and send to:

PLAN Jeffco
26553 Columbine Glen
Golden, CO 80401

Are You wired??

If you are, PLAN Jeffco would like to have you on our email tree, so that we can inform you of special events and items that may be of concern to you. We will not share your email address without permission.

Please include with your dues payment or email to

jkclitz7@ix.netcom.com





Golden Eagle
Gene Dieckhoner



PLAN Jeffco
26553 Columbine Glen
Golden, CO 80401

RETURN SERVICE REQUESTED

Prsrt Std
U.S. Postage
PAID
Pine, CO
Permit No. 36

Email: jkltz7@ix.netcom.com
check our website:
saveopenspace.org

Jefferson County Citizens for
Planned Growth with Open Space

PLAN JEFFCO NEWSLETTER