

MONDAY, JULY 6, 2009

4:00 PM Incident Command System (ICS) for Executives
Snowmass Village Council Chambers

**PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
WORK SESSION AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room**

TUESDAY, JULY 7, 2009

10:00 AM	Noxious Weed Walk	Crystal Yates-White
12:00 NOON	Employee Appreciation Picnic	
1:00 PM	Prep for Annual Meeting with the Basalt Town Council	
1:30	Transferable Development Rights Work Session	Cindy Houben
2:45	Colorado West Regional Mental Health Center Emergency Funding Request	Nan Sundeen
3:00	Update from the Public Health Advocate and Request for Reappointment	Nan Sundeen Rose Ann Sullivan
3:30	BREAK	
3:45	Citizen Grant Review Committee Interview	Charlotte Anderson
4:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Memos of Interest• Future Agendas/Agenda Requests/Monthly Calendar• Board Membership Reports –NWCCOG, RRR, CORE, QQ, CCI, PEIS I-70, Club 20, CRRTB, RWPA, ACRA, RFTA, NC, BLM,• BOCC Open Discussion	
5:45 PM	ADJOURN	

WEDNESDAY, JULY 8, 2009

4 – 6 PM Mountain Valley Home Owners Association Meeting
Chateau Roaring Fork Conference Room

THURSDAY, JULY 9, 2009

1-4:00 PM I-70 Coalition Meeting, Silverthorne Library

AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

WORK SESSION DATE: July 7, 2009

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Noxious Weed Walk

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Crystal Yates-White

ISSUE STATEMENT:

The Pitkin County Weed Advisory Board (WAB) and Staff will take the Commissioners on a tour of several properties in Pitkin County infested with invasive noxious weeds. The goals of this tour are to:

1. teach identification of some of the most common and problematic weed species in Pitkin County;
2. demonstrate the consequences of disturbance and neglect on native plant communities; and
3. show examples of successful weed control.

Staff and the WAB will pick up the Commissioners at 10am in front of the Courthouse Plaza building and return them by noon. We will visit sites at Airport Ranch, the Pitkin County Airport, and the West Buttermilk subdivision.

BACKGROUND: The health of our environment is a high priority for residents of Pitkin County. Yet, the health and productivity of our natural plant communities are being threatened by the introduction and propagation of numerous invasive alien plants. Noxious weeds are much like fire in their ability to spread rapidly, threatening the recreational, agricultural, economic, and environmental value of our lands. Thousands of acres of land in Pitkin County are already infested with noxious weeds.

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN:

Environmental Protection:

Category: Protection of Water Quantity and Quality

- Preserve and protect watershed integrity.

Category: Open Space and Habitat Preservation and Restoration

- Preserve and protect open space and trails and important wildlife habitat.

KEY DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- Weed identification
- Impacts of disturbance
- Best management practices
- Integrated pest management

BUDGETARY IMPACT: Gas to transport Commissioners to and from sites

RECOMMENDED BOCC ACTION: Participate and enjoy!

Pitkin County Employee Anniversary Picnic

12:00 Noon, Tuesday, July 7, 2009

**At Veterans Park

**Next to the Courthouse

Menu

**Hamburgers *Bratwurst*
Veggie Burgers Salads *Desserts*
*Iced Tea & Lemonade **



Bring a dessert if your last name starts with
A,B,C,D,E,F,G

Bring a salad if your last name starts with
H,I,J,K,L,M,N

Bring a side dish if your last name starts with

O,P,Q,R,S,T,U,V,W,X,Y,Z

~ Especially honoring these Pitkin County "STARS" and Anniversaries~

30 Years –Carol McArdell, Library; Kathy Chandler, Library

25 Years - Don Bird, Jail

20 Years - Joe DiSalvo, SO; Temple Glassier, PW; Vicki Monge, Comm. Dev.; Jan Schubert, Communications

15 Years - Janice Estey, Library; Molly Ireland, Library; Penny Atzet, Library; Vinnie Oliver, Airport; Jose Manuel Jurado, R&B; Richard Brebner, Jail; Debby Payne, Assessor; Liz Frazier, Library; Ginny Bultman, Communications

10 Years - Roger Ryan, Jail; Michelle Strobl, Jail; Carla Ostberg, Env. Health; Dale Will, OST; Chris Hoofnagle, SW

5 Years –Desiree Wagner, Treasurer; Jason Ferguson, SW; Wendy Schultz, Assessor; Stephen Miller, Assessor; Debbie Kendrick, Jail; Heather Nelson, SO; Debbie Weinant, Com. Dev.

Congratulations!

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

WORK SESSION DATE: July 7, 2009

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Prep for Annual Meeting with the Basalt Town Council

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: Your annual meeting with the Basalt Town Council and staff is scheduled for July 14. Topics for discussion have been identified by the Town of Basalt as:

1. Basalt Water Tank Update
2. Kayak Park Update
3. Town to Town Special Event
4. Aspen/Pitkin County Housing Authority
5. Micro Hydro Project Update

Items identified for discussion by County staff include a joint budget update. There may also be an executive session.

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN: Regionalism - Pitkin County will work with citizens and groups and other jurisdictions in order to identify a shared vision for the region and to promote collaboration

BOCC RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please advise staff if there are any other topics you wish to add to the agenda.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

WORK SESSION DATE: July 7, 2009

AGENDA ITEM: Transferable Development Rights (TDR) WORK SESSION

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Cindy Houben, Community Development Department

ISSUE STATEMENT: The Board of County Commissioners requested a work session regarding the TDR program to determine how effectively the program is working, and to what extent it may affect overall growth trends.

BACKGROUND: The history of the TDR program is attached (**Attachment 1**) in a March 13, 2007 memorandum. The BOCC has had many discussions over the past 14 years regarding the successes and consequences of the TDR program. The initial goal of the TDR program was to preserve certain areas of back country lands within Pitkin County by using TDRs in conjunction with proper zoning. Together the Rural and Remote zone district and the TDR program precluded these rural and remote backcountry lands from experiencing out of scale and difficult to serve development. To a large extent this goal has been reached. Over 5,840 acres of lands within the RR zone district have been taken out of development (this includes lands rezoned to RR in order to obtain TDRs, including Child Ranch, Craig Ranch, Harvey Ranch, Crystal Island Ranch, Aspen Valley Ranch, Crown Mountain Ranch, Jerome Park, Chaparral Aspen Remote Parcel) and the development that has occurred within the RR zone district has been in scale with the services which can be provided and is in scale with the character of the area.

The TDR tool has resulted in development in the form of new development rights and new intensity of development (square footage) in the UGB and the Rural Area of the County. Approvals have been granted for the use of 332 TDRs on receiver sites: 89 TDRs for new development rights and 243 TDRs for additional floor area.

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN: Evaluation of the TDR program links to the Growth section of the Strategic Plan, specifically to the goal of establishment of a *County Growth Policy*, as part of the AACP update.

KEY DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1) Has the TDR PROGRAM outlived its original intent?

Staff believes that the TDR program is still effective and is a tool that we need and want within the Land Use Planning system. However, it has evolved through the years and needs to continue to evolve in order to keep pace with changing land use needs and circumstances (see items below for further discussion).

2) Has the TDR program been expanded too much?

Sending Sites: 306 TDRs have been issued to date; 116 TDRs have been extinguished. From 1996-2004 properties in the Rural and Remote zone district were the only eligible TDR sending sites. Since that time the program has been expanded to include constrained sites, limited development conservation parcels, additional zone districts (TR-1, TR-2, CD-PUD), OST Master Plans and historic resources. 87 TDRs have been approved for issuance from these “other” sending sites as follows (of these, 81 TDRs have been issued):

- 39 – constrained sites
- 3 – visually constrained sites
- 36 – Limited Development Conservation Parcels
- 3 – historic
- 5 – takings remediation
- 1 – OST Master Plan
- 0 – CD-PUD, TR-1, TR-2 zone districts

Receiver Sites: Approvals have been granted for the use of 332 TDRs on receiver sites: 89 TDRs for new development rights and 243 TDRs for additional floor area. Of these, 29 TDRs have been extinguished for new development rights and 87 TDRs have been extinguished for additional floor area (**refer to Attachment 2**). From 1996-2000 TDRs were primarily used for new development rights and to exceed 15,000 square feet of floor area. Additional receiver site opportunities were created with the 2000 and 2006 Code revisions when the growth management exemption for a single family residence was limited to 5,750 square feet of floor area in the Rural Area and the UGB, respectively.

3) What are some of the conditions that have changed that could warrant revisions to the TDR program:

Relevant changes in conditions include:

- GMQS HOUSE SIZE EXEMPTION: 2000(Rural) and 2006(UGB) implementation of 5,750 square foot exemption.

- Master Plans (discussion of Rural Area Master Plan provisions limiting house size; Discussion of the Aspen UGB and AACP growth and house size ongoing deliberations)
- House size analysis by Planning area (**Attachment 3**);
- Recent House Size trends in 2007 and 2008 (**Attachment 4**);

4) Factors or variables within the TDR Program:

- House size Cap at 15,000 sq feet;
- The 5,750 sq foot GMQS exemption;
- The TDR square footage value of 2,500 square feet and the equal value of each TDR as they are used to increase house size beyond the GMQS exemption square footage.

5) Fractional TDRs:

Staff continues to believe that fractional TDRs would not be beneficial for the program and would take considerably more staff time to administer.

6) Supply and Demand:

(See **Attachment 5**:2007 projections). Any changes to the factors noted in item 4 above would require new projections to ensure that supply and demand are at healthy levels.

7) Fairness concerning existing issued TDR values if changes to the program are warranted:

Staff recommends that if any changes take place to the program, existing certified and issued TDRs should remain at the 2,500 square foot value. All new TDRs could be issued at a new square footage value. Does the BOCC want to consider a moratorium on the issuance of new TDRs while revisions are being contemplated?

8) Example alternatives or revisions to the TDR program:

- *Reduce GM Exemption from 5,750 to 3,500 sq. ft./ Cap house size/reduce square footage value of TDR's*

Concept 1) Create a higher TDR demand by reducing the GM floor area exemption from 5,750 to 3,500 square feet. 2) Concurrently, lower overall cap from 15,000 to 8,250 sq. ft. (or lower? – make 5,750 sq. ft. the cap? There is precedent out there in other resort areas.)3) Reduce the square footage value of future TDR's below 2500 square feet .

Benefit Continue to use the commodity of large(er) homes as the incentive to purchase TDRs; At the same time, address growing concern that allowing 10-15,000 sq. ft. homes in the rural area is not in keeping with the broad community goal of preserving rural character; or the goal of promoting sustainable living standards; (Also see house size data, attachments 3 and 4).

- ***Fractional TDRs***

Concept Allow 2500 sq. ft. TDRs to be broken into, and sold in fractional increments;

Purpose/Benefit Enables the individual who only wants to build an addition of 300 s.f. to sell the remaining sq. ftge, rather than build it simply because he/she paid a premium for it and feels obliged to maximize its use.

- ***Zone Receiver Sites***

Concept Only allow TDR receiving sites in areas that are designated by a zoning overlay as receiving sites (UGB only? Or only specifically identified parcels and/or areas;)

Other administrative ideas for the existing TDR program or any other revised program include:

9) *Move Review of Rural Receiving sites for TDRs from Hearing officer to BOCC*

Concept The issue of allowing larger homes in the rural area via

TDRs has led to some concern about impacts to rural character; Given the more controversial nature of the “receiving site” review, it may be more appropriate to take these cases to BOCC, rather than the hearing Officer.

Benefits Allows the BOCC to be the final word on a controversial topic;

10) *Pacing*

Concept Only allow a certain number of TDRs to be used per year on receiving sites to control rate of growth attributed to use of TDRs;

Benefit Would control the rate of growth associated with use of TDRs, where no rate exists today; Some believe that growth in general should be slowed down;

11) Discretionary bucket

Concept Limit number of discretionary TDRs that can be issued by BOCC annually;

Benefit Reduces the chance of flooding the supply side of the market at any one given time.

RECOMMENDED BOCC ACTION: No action required

ATTACHMENTS:

1. History of the Pitkin County TDR Program
2. Approved TDR Receiver Sites & TDRs Extinguished Since 1996
3. Average Floor Area By Planning Area
4. Building Permit Activity Trends for 2007, 2008
5. 2007 TDR Supply & Demand

Attachment 1
MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of County Commissioners
FROM: Cindy Houben, Community Development Director
DATE: March 13, 2007
RE: TDR Work Session

The Board of County Commissioners requested that we have a work session regarding the TDR program. The Pitkin County Open Space and Trails Board and the Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission members have all been invited to attend.

This work session is designed to cover the following:

1. History of the Pitkin County TDR program (see attached Chart, Attachment 1);
 - The TDR program grew out of the initial development of the Rural and Remote Zone District in 1994 as a means to preserve the backcountry on the backside of Aspen Mountain/ Little Annie area. This area was beginning to see the pressure of large-scale residential development. The County as well as the majority of the owners wanted to preserve the character and open nature of the area. Later, in 1995, the County determined that other backcountry areas would soon feel the same pressure of large-scale residential development. Thus, a countywide analysis of other areas to be rezoned to RR was initiated. The TDR program at that time was basic and TDR's were only used for Development Rights that could be landed primarily within the UGB of Aspen. The use of TDR's for a basic development right was also an exemption from GMQS. Prior to that time the only way to acquire a new development right was through the GMQS process.

Since that time many adjustments have been made to the program, however the primary adjustment occurred in 2000 when GMQS was revised to limit house size in the rural area.

This revision expanded the role of the TDR to address square footage additions as well as basic development rights.

The constrained and visually constrained lot provisions were added to the land use code along with use of TDR's to preserve historic resources, and new zone districts were established that could utilize TDRs (TR-1, TR-2)

In 2006, the new Land Use Code included an additional revision to GMQS to limit house size in the urban area (as well as the Rural area), thus creating demand for TDR's. The Code also limited the use of TDR's in the Rural Area for square footage only thereby eliminating the ability to use a TDR in the rural area for a basic development right. In addition the generation of TDR's (supply) has increased through new provisions that allow TDR's to be severed from parcels of over 160 acres in size.

2. Basic elements of the TDR Program;

- Please see the attached summary of the TDR program. This summary describes the areas of the LUC that can be utilized to generate TDR's. The Summary also answers frequently asked questions about the administrative details of the program (Attachment 2);
- Attachment 3 illustrates the TDR's that have been certified recently (December 2006-present).

3. Current Land Use Code provisions that relate to the use of TDR's

- The Annual report done for the BOCC providing an evaluation of how TDR's have actually been used (new development rights vs. additional square footage), the numbers which have been severed, the remaining severed but unused pool of TDR's and the approximate amount of development which has resulted based on the "landing" of TDR's. (Attachment 4);
- We have also attached a chart that graphically summarizes 1) the resultant development from TDR's to date. 2) The various ways in which TDR's are generated through the Land Use Code provisions (Attachment 5).

4. Open Space and Trails projects where TDR's have been used (see Attachment 6);
 - This attachment lists the conservation easements and property acquisitions of the OST Board that have combined funding and the use of the land use code (the rezoning and constrained lots provisions) in order to secure the preservation of the subject parcels.
 - The new land use code requires that the sale price of a TDR be provided to the County. This will help the OST Board more fully understand the value implications of the total project.

5. An overview of the current TDR program as viewed by an economist, Robert Robinson from the Center for Applied Research (Resume, Attachment 7);
 - Robert will provide his insights at the meeting and will be available to continue to work with the county if necessary.

6. Follow up scheduling for additional work sessions if desired.

Attachment 2

APPROVED TDR RECEIVER SITES AND TDRS EXTINGUISHED SINCE 1996

Caucus/ Planning Area	Approved Receiver Sites		TDRs Extinguished	
	Development Right ¹	Additional Floor Area	Development Right	Additional Floor Area
UGB	29	36	24	12
Independence		23		14
Maroon/Castle	1	22		9
Owl Creek	1	13		9
Woody Creek	26	104	4	37
Brush Creek		3		1
Snowmass Canyon	3	2		
Snowmass/Capitol	12	12	1	3
Emma/Basalt	6	11		2
Crystal	11	17		
Frying Pan				
TOTAL	89	243	29	87

¹ Prior to the adoption of the new Land Use Code in 2006, TDRs could be used for development rights in the Urban Growth Boundary ("UGB) or the Rural Area. The 2006 Code only permits TDRs to be used for development rights in the UGB; approvals for TDRs for development rights in the Rural Area were granted under the prior Code.

AVERAGE FLOOR AREA BY PLANNING AREA

Based on October 2008 Pitkin County Assessor's Data

Planning Area	Avg. Actual Area (Free-Market Housing)	Avg. Heated Area (Free-Market Housing)	Avg. Actual Area (Affordable Housing)	Avg. Heated Area (Affordable Housing)
Aspen UGB	6,381	4,771	2,796	2,228
Independence	6,370	4,547		
Maroon/Castle	4,941	3,577		
Owl Creek	10,968	7,793		
Woody Creek	6,351	4,591	1,771	1,575
Brush Creek	4,717	3,372		
Snowmass Canyon	5,386	3,735	2,212	1,782
Snowmass/Capital	4,307	2,987	1,841	1,573
Emma/Basalt	4,016	2,779	1,582	1,531
Crystal	3,096	2,057		
Frying Pan	1,950	1,443		
Overall Average	5,317	3,787	2,040	1,738
Aspen UGB Average	6,381	4,771	2,796	2,228
Rural Average	5,210	3,688	1,852	1,615

Notes: Data is for single family detached and some duplex residences

"Actual Area" includes square footage for all accessory and primary improvements on site

"Heated Area" includes square footage for all heated accessory and primary improvements on site

Prepared by Pitkin County Community Development Dept., June 30, 2009

2007 & 2008 Building Permit Activity Resulting in Residential Square Footage

	2007 Summary		2008 Summary	
	Avg. House Size (in square feet)	# of Permits	Avg. House Size (in square feet)	# of Permits
UGB	7,477	22	7,757	14
Independence Pass	7,839	4	8,476	3
Maroon/Castle	5,624	3	11,508	5
Owl Creek	0		11,500	1
Woody Creek	7,633	8	5,644	12
Brush Creek	5,166	5	5,679	2
Snowmass Canyon	5,383	5	4,999	2
Snowmass/Capitol	6,827	11	4,722	8
Emma/Basalt	5,484	8	3,315	3
Crystal	3,278	7	4,570	7
Frying Pan		0		0
Total	54,711	73	68,170	57
Total Average	6,079		6,817	
UGB Average	7,477		7,757	
Rural Average	5,248		6,712	

Attachment 4b

**2007 & 2008 Building Permit Activity Resulting in
Deed Restricted Residential Square Footage**

2007 Summary**2008 Summary**

	Deed Restriction	# of Permits		Deed Restriction	# of Permits
UGB					
Independence Pass					
Maroon/Castle				968	2
Owl Creek					
Woody Creek	1,597	13		1,743	6
Brush Creek					
Snowmass Canyon	1,994	4		1,982	4
Snowmass/Capitol	721	1			
Emma/Basalt	1,302	3		1,333	2
Crystal					
Frying Pan					
Total	5,614	21		6,026	14
Total Average	1,404			1,507	
UGB Average	0			0	
Rural Average	1,404			1,507	

March 2007
SUMMARY OF TDR SUPPLY AND DEMAND
NUMBERS

(Given current code provisions and remaining RR TDR potential)

Supply: 290 (Assumption that 30 % of eligible properties will create TDR's with the new Land Use Code Conservation provisions)

569 X 30 % = 170 + 120 (existing TDR's) = 290 TDR Potential Supply.

Demand: 355 (assumption that 50% of the properties in the UGB that could add additional square footage would do so by purchasing TDR's)

Notes:

1. The 290 # may also be a little high because there are properties with multiple dwellings for which multiples of 35 and 70 would need to be subtracted.

2. Given the #'s above the supply side may be short by around 65 TDR's. This is not disturbing since TDR's are generated also through:

- Constrained lots;
- Re-zonings;
- CD- PUD (if we keep it);

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

WORK SESSION DATE: July 7, 2009

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Colorado West Regional Mental Health Center Emergency Funding Request

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Nan Sundeen

ISSUE STATEMENT:

Colorado West Regional Mental Health Center (CWRMHC) is requesting \$16,000 to help off-set the 2008-2009 debt of their Grand Junction In-Patient Psychiatric Hospital. They are requesting that each of the 10 counties who participate in their region pay a percentage (based on utilization of the program) of the hospital debt. Attached is the letter of request from Sharon Raggio, CEO of CWRMHC (see Attachment A) and a spreadsheet identifying the financial status of the psychiatric hospital (see Attachment B). She is planning to attend the meeting today to answer any questions. Also attached is the Budget MOI (Attachment C) recommending use of Healthy Community Fund – Fund balance to meet this request.

As outlined in the Budget MOI, in December 2005 CWRMHC opened a psychiatric hospital in Grand Junction in response to the closure of other inpatient psychiatric services at St. Mary's Hospital in Grand Junction, Montrose Memorial Hospital and Durango's Mercy Hospital. CWRMHC's psychiatric hospital has consistently lost money each year and stands to lose more in 2009 (approximately \$1,000,000). They expect to save approximately \$600,000 by actively working to improve hospital operations. They expect a shortfall of \$400,000 and are asking Pitkin County for \$16,000 in emergency operating cash to support the hospital now through December 2009. Contributions from Pitkin County will be used to leverage an additional \$50,000 match from Rocky Mountain Health Plans specific to operational funding for the psychiatric hospital for 2009.

BACKGROUND:

Inpatient psychiatric care is hard to find in Colorado, especially for indigent/uninsured people. We are fortunate that CWRMHC runs a psychiatric hospital in Grand Junction that is accessible to our most vulnerable residents with significant mental health needs. The hospital is in debt now from a combination of how the bonds were structured when it was built and the number of uninsured patients (39% of the patients in 2009, so far.) In 2008, (14) Pitkin County residents used 84 patient days at the CWRMHC psychiatric hospital in Grand Junction. Approximately half of those people were uninsured. The \$16,000 request for emergency funds reflects 39 uninsured patient days = \$410 per uninsured day.

CWRMHC is actively seeking to create efficiencies in the operation of the hospital. In addition, they are developing a "step down" model of care, which will provide alternative in-patient support that will be less expensive to operative (similar to moving a hip replacement patient to a nursing home for less expensive care and rehabilitation.) They expect to be self

sufficient in 2010, although this will likely involve annual contributions from counties to help cover the cost of the uninsured. Staff has advised Ms. Raggio about the Healthy Community Fund grant process if she is interested in funding for future years..

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN:

Safe and Healthy Community

Goal 1: Pitkin County residents, employees and visitors will live in a safe, secure and healthy environment.

Goal 2: People will have access to services they value to lead a safe and healthy life.

Goal 7: Pitkin County residents will have access to quality health services

KEY DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. How is CWRMHC doing on reaching their goal of \$600,000 in efficiencies?
2. Are other counties participating with contributions?
3. What is the likelihood that the Hospital will be self-sufficient in 2010?

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

\$16,000 from the Healthy Community Fund reserve balance, which is currently over \$350,000.

RECOMMENDED BOCC ACTION: Approve Budget MOI and \$16,000 contribution from the Healthy Community Fund – fund balance

ATTACHMENTS:

A: Letter of Request from Sharon Raggio, CEO of Colorado West Regional Mental Health Center

B: Excel spreadsheet from CWRMHC – March 09 Psychiatric Hospital Financial Statement

C. Budget MOI recommending approval of \$16,000 contribution to CWRMHC from the Healthy Community Fund

ATTACHMENT A

Name and address of organization: Colorado West Regional Mental Health, Inc
6916 Hwy 82 Box A Glenwood Springs, CO 81601

Contact person & phone number: Sharon Raggio, CEO 970-319-8216

Fax: 970-683-7280 E-Mail: sraggio@cwrmmc.org

FEIN:#: 84-0625890

Mission Statement

Create access to quality mental health and substance abuse services enhancing recovery and resilience in our communities.

REQUEST

Background: Colorado West Regional Mental Health Inc. (CW) headquartered in Glenwood Springs, was established in 1972 and today serves residents from 18 locations in a 10-county region covering 23,000 square miles on Colorado's Western Slope. It is one of only 17 community mental health centers in all of Colorado. We opened the CW psychiatric hospital in Grand Junction in December 2005 in response to the closure of other inpatient psychiatric services at St. Mary's Hospital in Grand Junction, Montrose Memorial Hospital and Durango's Mercy Hospital.

- *Without CW's psychiatric hospital, the nearest psychiatric hospital for residents on the Western Slope of Colorado is in Salt Lake City or Aurora.*

CW is under immense financial strain because of both the number of uninsured patients and the significant debt related to the construction of the psychiatric hospital.

- We did not engage in a traditional capital campaign to raise funds to build the hospital; rather we issued \$12,295,000 in Series 2005 bonds. The bond covenants are very strict and CW has struggled to meet them from the start. CW currently owes approximately \$10 million on these bonds to JPMorgan Chase Bank. Both the hospital and all outpatient clinics serve as collateral to securing the bonds.
- We did not engage stakeholders to help cover the cost of uninsured people who are referred to the hospital.
 - Since CW opened the hospital in FY2006, patients without insurance have added significantly to what is now a huge economic crisis.
 - 30 percent of hospital patients seen in FY2006 had no insurance.
 - Uninsured hospital patients in FY2007 represented 29.2 percent
 - Uninsured hospital patients increased to 37.3 percent in FY2008.

- So far in FY 2009, 39 percent of hospital patients have had no insurance.

CW lost money on the hospital to the tune of \$867,211 in FY2006 (*only opened half of the FY*), \$3,070,920 in FY2007, and \$2,514,886 in FY2008. To date (Feb 09) in FY 2009 (FY July to June), we have lost \$1,849,463.

The figures in this and the prior paragraph represent what could eventually be a cataclysmic mental health crisis for the Western Slope as well as State of Colorado.

- The loss of Colorado West on the Western Slope could result in at least 13,000 patients losing integrated mental health services and will detrimentally impact law enforcement services and other human service agencies in the region.

CW needs your assistance to support mental health services and to help keep the hospital open. CW cannot continue to sustain these losses.

Our situation is serious. We need the help of stakeholders so we will be able to continue to serve the psychiatric hospital needs of your community and your residents. Please give our request serious and immediate attention.

- Only with support from Western Slope stakeholders utilizing CW psychiatric hospital services will we hope to be able to maintain the hospital and be available to serve the citizens you represent.
- By improving hospital operations over the course of the fiscal year we will be attempting to cut \$600,000
- Therefore, we need at least an additional \$400,000 to maintain our ability to operate for the year
- A specific request to Pitkin County is to provide \$16,000 in emergency operating cash to support the hospital now through Dec 2009.

How will funds be used? We are requesting \$16,000 in emergency grant funding for this calendar year. These funds will be used as operating cash so the hospital can continue to remain open. If the hospital closes, residents of Pitkin County who need a psychiatric hospital stay will need to be transported, most likely by law enforcement, to Denver or Salt Lake. During the remainder of the calendar year, Colorado West will develop “step down” models of care for hospital patients. A step down is similar to models used in physical health care hospitals. A person may enter a hospital for a hip replacement and stay only a short while; step down to a nursing care facility for additional rehabilitation and stabilization; finally returning home. Some psychiatric patients need similar step down mechanisms. Today, these step down mechanisms do not exist, so patients stay in the hospital; an expensive alternative. This emergency funding request will go toward the \$400,000 CW needs to sustain this year and develop step down alternatives which will insure future sustainability.

How will you measure success? Colorado West will measure success by keeping the hospital opened through Dec 2009, having a defined step down continuum at the end of the calendar year and by improving hospital costs by \$50,000 per month from a Feb 2009 baseline.

Briefly describe the client base you will serve: The hospital serves people who are in danger of hurting themselves or another or are gravely disabled due to a mental illness. Most of the people who are in the hospital are committed on a legal hold against their will.

METRICS

- What is the cost of units of service provided to clients?
 Total grant request of \$16,000/ Uninsured Pt Days = \$per Patient Day
 This was calculated by taking the total grant request divided by the total number of uninsured patient days provided by the hospital in calendar year 2008.

- What is the total number of Pitkin County clients served for:

Year	Total Pitkin County admits	Total Pitkin County patient days	Total Pitkin County uninsured admits	Total Pitkin County uninsured Patient days
2008	14	84	7	39

- Pitkin County has not historically contributed to the psychiatric hospital operations. The \$16,000 asked for is based on a benchmark using Mesa County’s contribution on a per capita formula as follows:

COUNTIES	CY2008 Uninsured # Patient Days	2005		2007		Contribution at approx .87 per capita	Per Capita	Mesa Para Legal	Per Capita & Para Legal Contribution
		July 2005	Rank	July 2007	Rank				
Mesa	557	135,301	11	140,416	11	\$ 121,500	0.87		\$ 121,500
Pitkin	77	16,426	29	16,607	30	\$ 14,400	0.87	\$ 1,600	\$ 16,000

- Fund Leveraging –Contributions by Pitkin County will be used to leverage an additional \$50,000 match form Rocky Mountain health Plans specific to operational funding for the psychiatric hospital for this calendar year.

- Colorado West Regional Mental Health, Inc has less than 1 month operating cash on hand. Colorado West Regional Mental Health, inc is currently undergoing organizational restructuring to improve our financial situation. This entails bond restructuring as well as corporate restructuring.

PART V – ATTACHMENTS

Please see attached Hospital statement of operations and company wide balance sheet.

Colorado West Regional Mental Health, Inc. Balance Sheet As of March 31, 2009

	Curr Month	Prior Month	FY08 Year End
ASSETS			
Operating Cash	806,137	558,182	582,808
Board-Designated Cash	1,120,970	679,421	1,832
Accounts Receivable - GL	343,216	694,376	559,677
Accounts Receivable - Client	4,556,639	4,269,799	2,969,271
Allowance for Uncollectables	(3,471,739)	(3,225,443)	(2,010,782)
Prepaid Expenses	156,916	141,705	162,160
Current Assets	3,512,139	3,118,040	2,264,966
Assets Limited as to Use	724,360	716,885	714,018
Investments	70,660	70,660	495,462
Property, Plant, and Equipment	12,636,003	12,628,212	12,393,611
TOTAL ASSETS	16,943,162	16,533,797	15,868,057
LIABILITIES			
Current Portion Long Term Debt	645,000	315,000	315,000
Operating Liabilities	1,202,183	1,105,071	1,221,882
Recoupment Payable	637,652	587,652	467,652
Salary Related Liabilities	1,054,309	916,364	839,499
Line of Credit Payable	691,000	691,000	700,000
Deferred Income	280,542	217,659	48,478
Current Liabilities	4,510,686	3,832,746	3,592,511
Long Term Liabilities	9,367,473	9,697,289	9,695,813
TOTAL LIABILITIES	13,878,159	13,530,035	13,288,324
NET ASSETS			
Beginning Net Assets July 1	2,559,211	2,559,211	3,242,797
Temporarily Restricted Net Assets	68,012	65,904	20,332
Release of Temporarily Restricted Net Assets	344,508	344,699	0
YTD Net Income	93,272	33,948	(683,396)
Total Net Assets	3,065,003	3,003,762	2,579,733
TOTAL LIABILITIES and NET ASSETS	16,943,162	16,533,797	15,868,057

ATTACHMENT C
BOCC BUDGET MOI

Reso required Yes No FD initial _____

CHANGE TO CURRENT YEAR BUDGET REQUEST

BUDGET YEAR	2009
--------------------	-------------

DEPARTMENT:	Healthy Community Fund
PROJECT NAME:	Emergency Funding for Colorado West Regional Mental Health Center
STAFF RESPONSIBLE:	Nan Sundeen
PREPARER OF DOCUMENT:	Nan Sundeen

FUND CHANGES	Current Budget	Revenue Changes	Expenditure Changes	Adjusted Budget
CO West Regional Mental Health Center	0		16,000	16,000
				-
				-
subtotal		<u>-</u>	<u>16,000</u>	
Net program cost			<u><u>16,000</u></u>	

ONE TIME:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ON GOING:	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND: include discussion about what objective is advanced or problem solved by this project.

Colorado West Regional Mental Health Center (CWRMHC) is one of 17 community mental health centers in Colorado and it covers a 10-county region on the western slope. In December 2005 they opened a psychiatric hospital in Grand Junction in response to the closure of other inpatient psychiatric services at St. Mary's Hospital in Grand Junction, Montrose Memorial Hospital and Durango's Mercy Hospital. CWRMHC's psychiatric hospital has consistently lost money each year and stands to lose more in 2009 (approximately \$1,000,000). They expect to save approximately \$600,000 by actively working to improve hospital operations. They expect a shortfall of \$400,000 and are asking Pitkin County for \$16,000 in emergency operating cash to support the hospital now through December 2009. Contributions from Pitkin County will be used to leverage an additional \$50,000 match from Rocky Mountain Health Plans specific to operational funding for the psychiatric hospital for 2009.

Inpatient psychiatric care is hard to find in Colorado, especially for indigent/uninsured people. We are fortunate that CWRMHC runs a psychiatric hospital in Grand Junction that is accessible to our most vulnerable residents with significant mental health needs. The hospital is in debt now from a combination of how the bonds were structured when it was built and the number of uninsured patients (39% of the patients in 2009, so far.) In 2008, (14) Pitkin County residents used 84 patient days at the CWRMHC psychiatric hospital in Grand Junction. Half of those people were uninsured.

CWRMHC is actively seeking to create efficiencies in the operation of the hospital. In addition, they are developing a "step down" model of care, which will provide alternative in-patient support that will be less expensive to operate (similar to moving a hip replacement patient to a nursing home for less expensive care and rehabilitation.) Their goal is to be self sufficient in 2010, which may include on-going requests to counties to help pay for our local uninsured residents. Staff has advised Ms. Raggio about the Healthy Community Fund grant process for funding requests in future years.

FUNDING RESOURCES: Please indicate if project can be funding from additional revenues from grants or increased fees. Is project funded from dedicated funding source or from the general fund?
\$16,000 from the Healthy Community Fund reserve balance, which is currently over \$350,000.

ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS - This section should include a discussion of the potential future cost savings over a period of time; are there ramifications of delaying the project, is privatization an alternative for the project.

Colorado West Regional Mental Health Centers are focusing on creating efficiencies in crisis stabilization such that they will create a “step down” process, providing less care when patients are stabilized. This appears to be a good investment of Healthy Community Fund fund balance. The alternative is to deny this request and run the risk of CWRMHC not being able to transition to more efficient care because of the debt burden.

LINK TO STATIGIC GOALS: (Please explain how this project enhances the County's Strategic goals). Consider if project should have component of community involvement in order to obtain community support or education for the project.

Safe and Healthy Community

Goal 1: Pitkin County residents, employees and visitors will live in a safe, secure and healthy environment.

Goal 2: People will have access to services they value to lead a safe and healthy life.

Goal 7: Pitkin County residents will have access to quality health services

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL IMPACTS: Consider other costs that project may add to the budget including technology needs and staffing support, equipment, software, training, equipment, space and mileage or vehicles. If additional equipment is required, discuss impacts to future budget cycles.

No organizational impacts anticipated.

DATE OF CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL BY BOCC: _____

Route form to Finance for review, prior to going to
 Manager and/or BOCC

(THIS PAGE DOES NOT GO IN THE BOCC PACKET)

BUDGET YEAR	2009
-------------	------

DATE:	TRANS	NAME	DATE ENTERED
PROJECT:			
DEPARTMENT:			

APPROVAL SIGNATURES: *County Manager signature after BOCC approval*

DEPARTMENT HEAD	E-mail from	SECTION HEAD:	_____	Date
	E-mail date			
_____		COUNTY MANAGER:	_____	Date

ACCOUNT CODING:		BUDGET INCREASE	BUDGET DECREASE
Description	Fund/Dept#--Prgm#--Object#		

If the adjustment requires funding not included in this MOI, then it uses fund balance. If you have more revenues than expenditures, fund balance is increased. If revenues and expenditures equal, then put \$0 in the box below.

Increase / Use Of fund balance - \$

(Form found on:) M:/county/finance/forms/MOI form.doc rev 1/2006

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

WORK SESSION DATE: July 7, 2009

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Update from the Public Health Advocate and Request for Reappointment

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Nan Sundeen, Rose Ann Sullivan

ISSUE STATEMENT:

Tom Dunlop was originally appointed by the Board of County Commissioners to the role of Public Health Advocate (a five year term) in May, 2002. He was reappointed to a two year term in May of 2007. His term has expired and he is coming to the BOCC today to give a brief update of his activities and to request reappointment so that he can continue participating in state and national public health/public environmental health activities.

BACKGROUND:

Tom Dunlop initially requested this appointment after he retired as the Director of Environmental Health to allow his continued participation in state and national discussions of policies and programs related to public health, including environmental health. Tom's primary activities during this appointment have involved representing the needs of Pitkin County and other small, rural counties in public health policy and funding initiatives. Tom has presented an annual update to the Board of County Commissioners outlining his activities as Public Health Advocate each year.

At the time of his original appointment in 2002, the County's Environmental Health Department was in transition and lacked staff to address issues, policies and programs on a national or state level. The Environmental Health Department was reorganized in 2005 – becoming the Environmental Health and Natural Resources Department. At that time, two new positions were created to provide the County with the ability to better track and interface on public environmental health issues at the local, state and national levels. These positions are: (i) an Environmental Resources Manager (Rose Ann Sullivan), and (ii) an Environmental Health Program Supervisor (Carla Ostberg, who is also REHS-certified and recently obtained a Masters Degree in Public Health).

In 2006, the Board of County Commissioners, acting as the Board of Health, appointed Dr. Morris Cohen to the statutory role of Local Health Officer. In June, 2009, the Board of Health appointed Liz Stark as the Public Health Director.

In light of recent developments under the Public Health Reauthorization Act (including the incorporation of environmental health programs under the public health “umbrella”), and the better defined statutory roles of the Board of Health, Local Health Officer and Public Health Director, it is the opinion of staff that the Public Health Advocate appointment is redundant and will be confusing to entities and individuals that need to deal with the County on public health/public environmental health matters. Indeed, the existence of a Pitkin County Public

Health Advocate will only add to the confusion we already expect to occur – given the fact that the City of Aspen has appointed its own Public Health Director and has established itself as a Public Health Agency. Staff does not believe the Public Health Advocate appointment should continue.

Given the State of Colorado’s new public health/public environmental health initiatives, we feel confident that Tom will be able to find a new niche to fill that will allow him to continue his national and state activities on behalf of rural communities. However, if the BOCC desires him to play a more prominent role on behalf of Pitkin County, another option to consider is to invite Tom to join the Pitkin County Board of Health as a representative from the Town of Snowmass Village.

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN:

The appointment of the Public Health Advocate does not have a clear link to the Safe and Healthy Community portion of the Strategic Plan.

Goal 1: Pitkin County residents, employees and visitors will live in a safe, secure and healthy environment.

KEY DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Today, Tom will present an update on his activities as the Public Health Advocate over the past year. In addition, the BOCC is asked to determine whether or not to reappoint Tom to the role of Pitkin County Public Health Advocate.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

None.

RECOMMENDED BOCC ACTION:

Tom Dunlop’s service to Pitkin County has been exemplary, as usual. However, because of the evolution of the Environmental Health/Natural Resources department and the Public Health Reauthorization Act, this appointment is unnecessary and the BOCC is advised to decline the request to reappoint the Public Health Advocate at this time.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A: Update from Public Health Advocate- Tom Dunlop

**ATTACHMENT A
MEMORANDUM**

To: Pitkin County Board of Commissioners

From: Thomas S. Dunlop, MPH, REHS
Public Health Advocate

Date: July 7, 2009

Re: Reappointment as the Pitkin County Public Health Advocate

After retirement as the Environmental Health Director in 2001, I requested the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) consider appointing me as the Pitkin County Public Health Advocate. At that time this newly created, non-paid, volunteer position allowed me to remain active and engaged in local, state, regional and national environmental public health initiatives and discussions. As a County employee I had been performing this function for many years, particularly in areas surrounding the federal Superfund program. This opportunity also allowed me to become more exposed to the workings of agencies such as the Department of Health and Human Services, Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Justice, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry.

In retirement I feel a desire to continue to represent Pitkin County in venues and at various gatherings where decisions are being made that could have direct or indirect impact on citizens of the County. Initially, I was appointed by the BOCC to this position for a five year term, to be reviewed after that time. I was then reappointed to a two year term, a term that expired May 2009.

I am requesting a reappointment by the BOCC to allow me to continue to volunteer my time to represent Pitkin County. To support this request the following information is a summary of activities I have been actively engaged in during the past 12-18 months.

Local Contributions:

In 2008-09 the Colorado public health laws that had been in existence in one form or another since the 1940s were rewritten and appeared as Senate Bill 08-194. SB 08-194, later named the Public Health Act of 2008 (Act), was a unified act of many to update and modernize laws designed to educate and protect the citizens and visitors of the cities, towns and counties in Colorado. Long overdue, a sincere effort was made to create a fair and just process. Despite these efforts, many counties, including Pitkin County, struggled to comply with conditions of the Act.

In my role as Public Health Advocate I have become actively engaged in months of discussions to determine how the Act will impact Pitkin County. As the BOCC is well

aware, this has not been an easy task. It has involved the highest authorities in the County, as well as paid staff, non-profit organizations and volunteers helping to design a response that will do two things: serve the citizens of the County in a fair and equitable way, and comply with standards and conditions in the law. I feel that my role as the Public Health Advocate continues to be beneficial as I add an academic, as well as a voice of practice to the process. My 39 years as an environmental public health practitioner in Colorado, the last 33 years in Pitkin County, have added value to the discussions.

Significant work remains to be accomplished now that the first phase of compliance with the Act has been satisfied; establishment of a public health agency. The development of standards governing performance of the designated public health agency, to be established by the Colorado Board of Health, must involve local government at the most intimate level. If it is the desire of the BOCC and the public health agency to ask for help with this process, I would like to continue to contribute in my volunteer appointed role.

National Activities:

In the past twelve-months most of my involvement has been working with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the National Association of County and City Health Officials (NACCHO), and the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials (ASTHO). The focus has been, and continues to be, the National Environmental Public Health Tracking Program (EPHT).

Coincidentally, after my retirement and after my appointment in 2001 as the Public Health Advocate, I was asked by colleagues at the CDC to become involved with creation of the EPHT program. My BOCC appointment allowed me to continue to work with NACCHO after retirement representing an active health department. During the formative years of EPHT, I was one of two individuals representing all local health departments in the United States. As the past seven years have transpired there are now hundreds, if not thousands of local health department practitioners involved in the program.

The intent of EPHT is to create a surveillance network that will document an association of illness and disease such as childhood asthma, birth defects, and various forms of cancer to environmental exposures (i.e. air pollution, water pollution, land use and development). This program currently serves 16 states and one city (New York). At the request of me and others representing local government over the past years, attempts have been made to not only enlist more states, but to allow cities, counties and Native American health agencies to apply for grants and become part of the network.

Until January 20, 2009 most efforts to expand the program were thwarted by national leadership. Since this date, more funds have been made available to broaden the number of states that can apply for grants, but also to allow the sub-categories of government mentioned above to apply. I feel this has been the direct result of local voices being heard, being inserted on a regular basis into national programs.

What does this have to do with Pitkin County? With the resurgence of energy and new funding, on June 3, 2009, I received notice that a new round of CDC EPHT funding

was available. I sent an email to the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) encouraging an application for funding come forth. I received a reply from a colleague at CDPHE that indeed, an effort will be made to bring Colorado into this network. My voice and others like me have urged CDC to not award grant contracts unless the receiving state actively seeks city, town and county health departments in designing the program. It is vital to make this statement since most health and environmental data is generated at the local level. This data, when merged into a state system, is what fuels the data base being created in the national EPHT network.

If Colorado is successful, Pitkin County stands to become a contributor to and recipient of a wealth of health data being collected from thousands of public health systems around the country. While not completely prevented from accessing this information today, being a participant in the network will enhance access. A vital message in this network is the link between environmental health and public health. When the Pew Foundation challenged Congress to fund creation of EPHT in 2001, to the surprise of many, there was no common repository of health data linked to environmental exposures that clearly identified causes or contributors to illness and disease. This very active national environmental public health program is providing a response to this void.

On June 22, 2009 Richard Thompson, President of the Colorado Environmental Health Directors (CDEH), sent a letter to Lisa Miller, MD, MSPH. Dr. Miller is the Division Director, Disease Control and Environmental Epidemiology, CDPHE. The letter supports the State of Colorado's application to the CDC to seek EPHT funding. Mr. Thompson reinforces and reiterates my findings that by engaging local health departments in this State led effort, a trickle down benefit will be felt by local health agencies, no matter how large or small the department might be. To quote from his letter; "This ([EPHT]) could help consolidate the currently ongoing, but separate efforts the local environmental public health agencies are using to gather basic data and help develop a system to gather data in a consistent manner in the areas of air quality and drinking water where there is a great level of interest in Colorado."

During a recent meeting in Washington DC, I had the opportunity to meet with Barbara McCann, Executive Director of National Complete Streets Coalition. Complete Streets is an organization focused on creating safe streets and roads that encourage multi-use designs to accommodate pedestrians, mass transit, vehicles, bicycles and other users. This organization's steering committee is made up of representatives from: AARP, America Bikes, America Walks, American Council of the Blind, American Planning Association, American Public Transportation Association, American Society of Landscape Architects, Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals, City of Boulder, Institute of Transportation Engineers, League of American Bicyclists, Smart Growth America, and others.

I brought back information for Pitkin County Public Works, City of Aspen Environmental Health and Pitkin County Community Development. Hopefully this information will provide another source of expertise needed when designing, building, and maintaining routes of safe and efficient travel in Pitkin County.

General Discussion:

During the SB 08-194 evaluation process, the question was posed, "How well are the citizens of Pitkin County receiving environmental and public health services?" There

are opportunities to engage national tools that have been created trying to answer this question. For example NACCHO has developed a very successful process titled: Protocol for Assessing Community Excellence in Environmental Health (PACE-EH). This is a formal, community driven review of needs and responses that help identify where resources are best applied. The link between this and Pitkin County being a possible contributor to the EPHT program via the State of Colorado is clear. The BOCC as the Board of Health, Environmental and Public Health staff, non-profit organization (Community Health Services) and volunteers will have educational connections to a vast network of information that can be used in the continuous effort to improve health and quality of life to humans and the environment.

As the Public Health Advocate, I have had the opportunity to be a voice, not only for Pitkin County, but for many others in promoting the recognition that local health departments have skilled people who are capable of working at a regional and national level. Since the EPHT program continues to evolve, my role will continue to evolve as well, provided I can maintain the BOCC appointment.

A significant undercurrent of great magnitude being exhibited by the EPHT program is the clearly recognized relationship between traditional public health and environmental health. The name given to this national program was not assigned by accident. Countless examples are surfacing that shows a systems approach to public health and/or environmental health emergencies are better solved using an environmental public health workforce.

In the news recently, June 17, 2009, the Environmental Protection Agency formally announced a “Public Health Emergency in Libby, Montana.” The importance of including this case study in my report is the direct link between public health and an environmental cause. To quote from the announcement:

This determination [public health emergency] recognizes the serious impact to the public health from the contamination at Libby and underscores the need for further action and health care for area residents who have been or may be exposed to asbestos. Investigations performed by the Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry have found the incidence of occurrence of asbestosis, a lung condition, in the Libby area staggeringly higher than the national averages for the period 1979-1998. EPA is working closely with the Department of Health and Human Services, which is making available a short-term grant to provide needed asbestos-related medical care to Libby and Troy residents.

As some on the BOCC may remember, Pitkin County was in a similar situation in the early 1980s, with the designation of the base of Smuggler Mountain being declared a Superfund Site. Fortunately the outcome of intense years of investigation proved the citizens, specifically children, were not at risk living on the Smuggler Site. However, the similarity of the need to use a public health/environmental health systems approach between Libby, MT and Pitkin Co. to address a significant community crisis is the same. This example reinforces the need to maintain a presence in the ever evolving field of Environmental Public Health Tracking. I am providing this as support to have Pitkin County maintain attendance at the highest level of the EPHT program, to represent the small, rural, sometimes ignored constituents who make up a large portion of the population. Through a survey done by NACCHO a few years ago it was determined that around 65% of local health departments serve populations of 50,000 people or less.

During my recent experiences earning my Master of Public Health degree from the University of Massachusetts – Amherst (February 2009), it became obvious to me that there must be a concerted effort to connect the practice of environmental public health with academics. The gap that exists between these two has been a persistent barrier to seeing the bigger picture of how practice and academics, more closely unified, will result in a much stronger system of service delivery. My appointment as the Public Health Advocate has led me into various settings and venues with opportunities to promote a stronger public health system nationally, at the state level, and locally.

Conclusion:

As the Act was being locally deliberated, one option to satisfy the law was to modify composition of the Board of Health. While initially this option was not chosen, I would like to express my desire to be considered as an appointee to the Pitkin County Board of Health should that ever be revisited.

This concludes my summary of activities that have a genesis in my appointment as the Public Health Advocate. There are no ulterior motives in seeking reappointment, simply to continue to act as an active representative and offer my academic and practical environmental public health advice and service to Pitkin County.

Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

WORK SESSION DATE: July 7, 2009

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Citizen Grant Review Committee Interview

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Charlotte Anderson

ISSUE STATEMENT: Staff has been advertising regularly when there are any vacancies on Citizen Boards. The Citizen Review Committee has one youth vacancy and one regular vacancy. Maxwell Rispoli has applied for the youth position to this Board.

BACKGROUND: Traditionally, applicants for Citizen Boards meet with the BOCC in a brief informal interview. Citizen Grant Review Committee is established pursuant to Resolution #155-2002 and the referendum passed by the electorate on November 5, 2002, providing a 5-year dedicated mill levy tax to support Health and Human Services and Community Non-Profits. Requires the Board of County Commissioners to appoint five (5) members. The committee shall include one or two youth representatives. Each committee member shall be a resident of Pitkin County for a minimum of two years prior to appointment. Each trustee shall hold no other county or municipal office, shall not be employed by a municipality or county, and shall service without pay. Each member shall be appointed for a three-year term.

The purpose of this board is to establish priorities and criteria for funding health and human service and community non-profit programs within the guidelines of the referendum. To participate in a grant-making process that guarantees that the dedicated funds are put to best use to provide stable funding to health and human service and community non-profits, and to achieve the county's Community Goals. To make recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners to update Community Goals as necessary. To review all grant applications and ensure fiscal and programmatic compliance. To make recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners for distribution of funds, using the following percentages as a guideline: 59% to health & human service agencies, 17% to community non-profit agencies, and 24% in emergency grants to health & human service agencies suffering state and federal budget cuts. To establish relationships with local non-profits to more effectively discharge Committee responsibilities. To obtain broad community input on the value, efficacy and accountability of the agencies that apply for funding, develop, maintain and manage trails for similar purposes

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN: Community Involvement - creating and maintaining opportunities to engage, include, and incorporate caucus, neighborhood, municipalities, interest groups and individual participation, interests and feedback

KEY DISCUSSION ITEMS: Mr. Rispoli will attend your Work Session today for an interview with the Board.

BUDGETARY IMPACT: None

RECOMMENDED BOCC ACTION: Advise staff whether you wish to make this appointment at your next Regular Meeting.

ATTACHMENTS:

Application of Maxwell Rispoli

Since Mr. Rispoli is a youth member, he does not have a resume.

Current members of Citizen Grant Review Committee

PITKIN COUNTY CITIZEN BOARD APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

NAME Maxwell A. Rispoli

STREET ADDRESS 690 Pioneer Springs Ranch Aspen CO, 81611

MAILING ADDRESS PO Box 9559

PHONE (WK) (970) 948-6637 (HM) _____ (FAX) _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS max.rispoli@gmail.com

BOARD FOR WHICH YOU ARE APPLYING:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aspen/Pitkin Animal Shelter | <input type="checkbox"/> Housing Authority Board |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Basalt Library Board | <input type="checkbox"/> Pitkin County Library |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Board of Adjustment | <input type="checkbox"/> Open Space & Trails Bd of Trustees |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Board of Appeals | <input type="checkbox"/> Planning & Zoning Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Broadcast Services Advisory Bd | <input type="checkbox"/> Redstone Historic Preservation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Citizen Grant Review Committee | <input type="checkbox"/> Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Conflict of Interest Committee | <input type="checkbox"/> Retirement Board |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Election Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> Senior Services Board |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Advisory Board | <input type="checkbox"/> Weed Advisory Board |

HOW LONG HAVE YOU LIVED IN PITKIN COUNTY: 9 years

STREET ADDRESS PREVIOUS TWO YEARS:
323 west Hallam St.

I DESIRE THE APPOINTMENT FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS: To enhance my knowledge and understanding about the mechanics of government while committing my time to the important cause of service.

Please Return Application to the County Manager's Office at 530 E. Main St., 3rd Floor, Aspen, CO 81611, or FAX to 920-5198, Phone 920-5200
NOTE: Please Attach Resume with Completed Application

For Office Use Only:

<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Date	<input type="checkbox"/> Reso
<input type="checkbox"/> Notify applicant	<input type="checkbox"/> Citz Bd list

**CITIZEN GRANT REVIEW COMMITTEE
CURRENT BOARD (July 2009)**

<i>Regular</i>	Laura	Pritchard	Aspen	1-Apr-11
<i>Regular</i>	Anna	Gagne	Basalt	1-Apr-12
<i>Regular</i>	Tahnee	Perry	Aspen	1-Apr-10
<i>Regular</i>	Stephanie	Krolick	Aspen	1-Apr-10
<i>Regular vacancy</i>				
<i>Youth member</i>	Maxwell	Rispoli	Aspen	1-Apr-12

Memos of Interest

BOCC BUDGET MOI

Reso required Yes No FD initial _____

CHANGE TO CURRENT YEAR BUDGET REQUEST

BUDGET YEAR	2009
--------------------	-------------

DEPARTMENT:	Transportation
PROJECT NAME:	West Sopris Creek Chip Seal Project
STAFF RESPONSIBLE:	G.R. Fielding, Pitkin County Engineer
PREPARER OF DOCUMENT:	G.R. Fielding

FUND CHANGES	Current Budget	Revenue Changes	Expenditure Changes	Adjusted Budget
West Sopris Creek Road Capital Repair	0	-	270,000	270,000
Sopris Mountain Ranch HOA Contribution Capital Repair	270,000	125,000	(145,000)	125,000
subtotal		<u>125,000</u>	<u>125,000</u>	-
Net program cost			<u>-</u>	

ONE TIME:

ON GOING:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND:

Home owners at Sopris Mountain Ranch have requested a partnership to have West Sopris Creek Road paved or chip sealed. The Emma Area 2008 Master Plan supports this request; in section 5.1.1 it states: *That portion of West Sopris Creek Road which has a gravel surface should be paved with asphalt or rebuilt to specifications that would support a chip seal surface.* With the additional gravel added to West Sopris Creek Road last year, Staff believes with minimal improvements the road will be in good shape to receive a chip seal application. These improvements would be included in the work on West Sopris Creek Road under this contract and is included in the estimate.

Staff and the representatives of Sopris Mountain Ranch Home Owners Association (HOA) have met several times in the past several years to discuss different opportunities at partnering to complete this project. This option, while not a best case scenario of a full capital improvement project, can fit into both party's budgets at this time. While this segment of roadway is on the County's list for capital improvement, this list is not funded for construction at this time.

Traffic counts on this section of West Sopris Creek Road average 400 vehicles a day. This quantity puts this section of West Sopris Creek Road on a list of higher traffic gravel roads in the County which could warrant some sort of pavement. This is compounded by double this amount of traffic during the busier seasons.

The project contract will be executed through the Transportation Department for the construction of this chip seal. It would be expected to be finished by the end of the 2009 construction season.

FUNDING RESOURCES:

This project would be funded from the Capital Repair Fund. This year \$400,000 was put into the Capital Repair Road Fund which some of has gone to fund the McLain Flats Chip Seal. At this time there is a balance of \$275,000 in this line item.

ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS -

Option 1 – Allow the Sopris Mountain Ranch Home Owners Association (HOA) to fund as much of the construction as they can afford and not participate; however it is not anticipated that the HOA would proceed with the project if Pitkin County were to not participate. If the HOA were to proceed with their current budget, they would reach approximately half way to the main ranch entrance from the end of the existing pavement.

Option 2 – Participate up to \$100,000 or 50% of the project, which ever is the lesser amount, to complete the chip seal to Sopris Mountain Ranch Rd (the Ranch's main entrance). This would cover approximately 1.4 miles of the 2.6 mile gravel road with chip seal.

Option 3- Extend the project to the second cattle guard on West Sopris Creek Road. This would add another .4 miles to the project, bringing the total up to 2.3 miles. From an engineering standpoint, this is the best terminus for the

project. It allows for a clean edge of transition from a chip sealed surface to a gravel surface. This terminus is .3 miles from the first switch back on West Sopris Creek Road. This area gets less traffic than the lower portion and can be graded with Prince Creek Road. The HOA has expressed interest in participating for up to 1.9 of these miles and will contribute up to \$125,000. This would bring the County's portion to \$145,000.

Option 4 – Do nothing option. The County has the option to not allow any of this road to be chip sealed and continue to maintain the road as a gravel road.

LINK TO STATEGIC GOALS:

Fiscal Sustainability – Pitkin County will partner with the Sopris Mountain Home Owners Association to fund this project.

Regional Transportation Action Plan – Supplying the funding for this project will result in a higher quality driving surface to the public and aid in sustainability of a high level of service to constituents even with current budgetary difficulties.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL IMPACTS:

The County has an opportunity to potentially see a cost savings in several years. In the past 4 years the County has spent approximately \$42,000 per year on dust control and grading West Sopris Creek Road. This cost does not include the \$99,703 spent in 2008 to put a depth of 2 inches of gravel on West Sopris Creek. It is expected that this basic chip seal will last 5 years. If the County spends \$100,000 on this; a cost savings would be seen in 2-3 years and if the County spent \$145,000 the cost savings would be seen in 3-4 years.

These cost savings are an opportunity costs, not an out of pocket cost expense. Road and Bridge will still need the same machinery and the same staff. This will free up the Road and Bridge Crew's time to focus on other preventative maintenance. Shifting to this mode will have the potential of saving the County money in the long term as better maintained roads last longer. This will also have the potential of offering a higher service level at relatively the same costs.

A delicate balance between being conscious of current budgeting hardships and closely watching all expenses is needed in this circumstance. Staff recommends completing Option 3, despite not having funding for adequate maintenance on other paved County Roads. Staff feels it would be penny savvy but pound foolish to not partner on this project when some money is available.

DATE OF CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL BY BOCC: _____

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL IMPACTS: Consider other costs that project may add to the budget including technology needs and staffing support, equipment, software, training, equipment, space and mileage or vehicles. If additional equipment is required, discuss impacts to future budget cycles.

This represents the completion of over nine years of work, which was endorsed by Pitkin County voters in 2008 and the US Congress in 2006.

DATE OF CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL BY BOCC:

010 and 010A-2000- Ordinance Authorizing Purchase of Ryan Parcel

058-2000 – Resolution: Supporting the Creation of a Land Exchange to Preserve the Ryan Parcel in its Current State as a Community Asset

105-2008-Resolution: Approving a Ballot Question Authorizing Open Space Conveyance of 35-Acre Ryan Parcel to the United States Forest Service in Exchange for Replacement Open Space, Including a 8.6 Acre Parcel that will be Reconveyed and Replaced with Additional Open Space

132-2008-Resolution: Appropriating Sums of Money to the Various Funds for Pitkin County, Colorado 2009 Budget Year

MEMO OF INTEREST

WORK SESSION DATE: July 7, 2009

TOPIC: Public Health Director “Substitution” Form

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Nan Sundeen, Liz Stark

ISSUE STATEMENT:

Pursuant to 6CCR 1014-6, county or district public health agency directors are required to possess a minimum of five years within the past ten of public health experience and have a master’s degree in public health or a related discipline. County boards of health must submit form 1014-6 within 30 days of substituting or waiving the requirements to the state board of health for review. On June 10, 2009 the Pitkin County Board of Health appointed Liz Stark, RN, (Executive Director of Community Health Services, Inc.) as the public health director. The Board of Health must now seek permission to substitute Liz Stark’s 24 years as a licensed nurse for the minimum required Master’s Degree in Public Health or a related field. Attached is form 1014-6 for BOCC review and approval.

BACKGROUND:

The Board of Health may choose to apply for a substitution (substituting experience for education or education for experience) or a waiver (justification for why the minimum qualifications cannot be met). Staff recommends submitting a substitution request because Liz Stark has the required 5 years of Public Health administration (2 years on the Board of Community Health Services, 3 years (in October) as Executive Director of Community Health Services.) Liz has proven herself to be a competent Public Health Director during the past three years. It would be disruptive and irresponsible to try to replace her when she has been so successful thus far. The attached Substitution form 1014-6 requests that the state allow Liz’s 24 years of “on-the-job” training to serve as an equivalent to a Master’s in Public Health or related field (nursing).

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN:

Safe and Health Community –

Goal 7 – “Pitkin County residents will have access to quality health services.”

Action item B- “Complete mandates for Public Health Revitalization Act.”

KEY DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Approve proposed “Substitution” form 1014-6 for Board of Health Chair signature and staff will submit immediately.

BUDGETARY IMPACT: None

STAFF ACTION:

Staff will submit form 1014-6 with Board of Health Chair signature unless otherwise directed by the BOCC.

ATTACHMENTS:

A. Form 1014-6

Instructions for Form 1014-6 Substitution or Waiver of Minimum Requirements for a Public Health Director

Pursuant to 6 CCR 1014-6, county or district public health agency directors are required to possess a minimum of five years within the past ten of public health experience and have a master's degree in public health or a related discipline. For candidates who are otherwise prepared to carry out the duties of a public health director, the county or district board of health may substitute year for year professional public health work experience for certain academic requirements or exceptional academic preparation for certain experience requirements. To comply with 6 CCR 1014-6, county or district boards of health must submit Form 1014-6 **within 30 days** of substituting the requirements to the state board of health for review.

Instructions for Completing Form 1014-6

Section 1. Complete the items in section one. Items 1.2 through 1.6 pertain to the person appointed to the position of public health director for whom a substitution or waiver has been granted.

- 1.1 Enter the name of the county or district public health agency that shall be directed by the person appointed
- 1.2 Enter the name of the person appointed to the position of public health director.
- 1.3 Check the box corresponding to the highest degree attained. If the highest degree attained is not on the list, check "other" and write in the degree information.
- 1.4 Enter the total number of years of public health experience.
- 1.5 Enter the total number of years of experience supervising public health professionals.
- 1.6 Enter the total number of years of experience in a health, environmental, or administrative field.

Section 2.

- 2.1 Check the appropriate box to indicate whether the county or district board of health substituted experience for education, or education for experience, or whether the county or district board of health waived the minimum qualification requirements.
- 2.2. *Complete this section only if the county or district board of health granted a substitution of experience for education.*

Appointees to the position of public health director must have a minimum of five years experience in public health and at least a Masters Degree. For appointees not having a Masters degree, year for year public health or related experience may be substituted. Provide a narrative description of the appointee's experience for which such a substitution was granted.
- 2.3 *Complete this section only if the county or district board of health granted a substitution of education for experience.*

Appointees to the position of public health director must have a minimum of five years experience in public health and at least a Masters Degree. For appointees not having five years of public health experience, academic preparation beyond a Masters degree may be substituted on a year for year basis. Provide a narrative description of the appointee's education for which such a substitution was granted.
- 2.4 *Complete this section only if the county or district board of health waived the minimum qualifications.*

For appointees otherwise prepared to carry out the duties of a public health director, the county or district public health agency may waive unmet education and/or experience requirements. Provide a narrative description of the board's rationale for waiving the minimum requirements. The narrative must address: Limitations to the board's ability to recruit qualified candidates that are inherent in the jurisdiction (e.g, population); whether the person appointed will seek to obtain additional education and/or experience within five years of the granted waiver; and, whether the county or district board of health has explored joining with another county or establishing a district public health agency having a qualified public health director.

Section 3. Provide any additional information you wish the state board of health to consider in reviewing this substitution or waiver.

Please mail, fax or email to: **Colorado Board of Health**
ATTN: Linda Shearman, Program Assistant
Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
4300 Cherry Creek Drive South EDO-A5
Denver, Colorado 80246-1530
FAX: 303-691-7702, e-mail: linda.shearman@state.co.us

Form 1014-6: Substitution or Waiver of Minimum Requirements for a Public Health Director

Section 1.

1.1 County or District Public Health Agency	Pitkin County
1.2 Person appointed as Public Health Director	Liz Stark
1.3 Highest degree earned (Masters required):	<input type="checkbox"/> Associates Degree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bachelors Degree <input type="checkbox"/> Masters Degree <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral Degree <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)
1.4 Years of experience in public health (five years required):	5 years
1.5 Years of experience supervising public health professionals (two years required):	3 years (in October, 2009)
1.6 Years of experience in health, environmental or administrative field:	24 years

Section 2.1

<p>Check the appropriate box to indicate the type of substitution or waiver granted by county or district board of health:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Substitution of year for year professional public health work experience for academic requirements (complete section 2.2)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Substitution of exceptional academic preparation for public health experience requirements (complete section 2.3)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Waiver of minimum qualifications (complete section 2.4)</p>

Section 2.2 – Description of Substitution: Experience for Education

<p>Describe the experience, above and beyond that which is minimally required, for which the local or district board of health granted a substitution for the minimum education requirements:</p> <p>Liz Stark, RN, is a non-physician director candidate for the Pitkin County Public Health Director. She has five years, within the past ten years, of successful and responsible administrative experience in public health including almost 3 years of serving as the Executive Director of Community Health Services and 2 years prior serving on the Community Health Services Board of Directors. She has been licensed to practice nursing in Colorado for the past 24 years. Pitkin County appointed Dr. Morris Cohen to the position of Medical Officer three years ago and Ms. Stark works closely with Dr. Cohen in all areas related to medical decisions and emergency management. During her time as Executive Director she has exhibited exceptional skills in collaborative problem solving, organizational management, servant leadership and emergency preparedness. She has proven herself to be a successful and responsible Public Health Director supervising public health professionals as well as successfully including the Board of health in all aspects of the provision of public health.</p> <p>We are asking for a substitution "year for year professional public health work experience" for the Master's Degree requirement. Ms. Stark worked at Aspen Valley Hospital for 20 years (10 in medical/surgical and 10 in discharge planning/utilization review coordinator). These 20 years of experience with Pitkin County residents, tourists and employees, health care providers, non-profits, government programs such as child protection, public assistance and adult protection have proven to be invaluable in strengthening her skills as Public Health Director. Ms. Stark's knowledge of the public health issues facing Pitkin County and the skills she exhibits on a daily basis are all indications that she will be able to meet the obligations and duties of the Public Health Director as outlined in SB 194.</p> <p>Ms. Stark has proven herself to be a high performing Public Health Director already it is not reasonable or prudent for Pitkin County to consider recruiting simply to meet the minimum qualifications of a master's degree. We believe that her 24 years of nursing experience are equivalent to a Master's in Nursing and believe a substitution is appropriate.</p>

--

Section 2.3 – Description of Substitution: Education for Experience

Describe the education, above and beyond that which is minimally required, for which the local or district board of health granted a substitution for the minimum experience requirements:

Section 2.4 – Waiver of Minimum Qualifications

In order to comply with the minimum qualifications as established by the Colorado State Board of Health in 6 CCR 1014-6, this County or District Board of Health has waived the minimum qualifications in consideration of the following:

Provide the rationale by which the county or district board of health waived the minimum qualifications for the public health director. The rationale should include, but is not limited to, a description of the local jurisdiction served by the public health agency; limitations inherent to the jurisdiction on the board’s ability to recruit a qualified candidate; whether the person appointed to the position will seek to obtain additional public health education and experience within five years of the granted waiver; and, whether the county or district board of health has explored joining or establishing a district public health agency having a qualified public health director.

Section 3.

Provide any additional comments (or attach letter) the state board of health may wish to consider in reviewing this substitution or waiver:
With its small population of 16,000, the high cost of living and restricted housing options, recruiting and retaining professional staff with specific educational and professional backgrounds is often very challenging for the health care and government sectors. Pitkin County and Community Health Services are very fortunate to be able to utilize Liz Stark's experience and expertise in nursing and community problem solving.

Chair, County or District Board of Health

Date

President, State Board of Health

Date

Junior Livestock Sale

What is it?

The Junior Livestock Sale, which is the largest event of its kind in Colorado, has been a special event at the Colorado State Fair for many years.

The sale includes young people from Future Farmers of America and 4-H clubs, who raise exceptional show-quality lambs, hogs, goats and beef steers, which are nominated for the sale through a county weigh-in system. Most all of Colorado's counties have young people who participate in the sale.

After the animals are entered in the sale, they are judged in their respective class. The class level competition determines if an animal makes it into the Colorado Junior Livestock Sale. The whole process teaches youngsters how to nurture show-quality animals and how to compete—valuable lessons for a life in the agribusiness.

How did CCI get involved?

In 2001, Morgan County Commissioner Mark Arndt, serving as CCI's Past President, suggested to the Board that CCI's participation would be a positive way to support Colorado's young people in agribusiness. With a small amount of money from CCI, former Commissioner Arndt purchases animals from throughout the state with particular interest in selecting in turn from the five CCI Districts. Garfield, Morgan and Weld counties represented the 2008 purchases.

How to get your county involved?

It is very easy. Simply send a check payable to CCI. \$100 per county is suggested. Each year we have individual commissioners who participate also. In the past, several sponsors have been extremely generous in giving to this project. If you are a potential sponsor or know of one, please extend an invitation for you or them to participate.

Colorado Junior Livestock Sale 2009 Contribution

_____ County

contributes \$ _____

or _____

of _____ county

personally contributes \$ _____

Please remit by August 15, 2009.
Checks are payable to CCI.

Colorado Counties, Inc.

800 Grant Street

Suite 500

Denver CO 80203

303.861.4076

- Electronic and other info received during meeting...
 - Know issue was examined well
 - Build public awareness
- Compliment each other for work well done
- One board-unified front when possible
- Make time to meet as agreed
- Add caucuses
- We may disagree but work effectively
- Respect differences
- Follow public hearing process
- Review working agreements quarterly
- Freedom to be tough on issues and policy

MDI



8000 E. Iliff Ave.
Denver, CO 80231

June 29, 2009

VIA FACSIMILE

Hilary Smith
County Administrator
Pitkin County
530 E. Main St. 3rd Fl.
Aspen, CO 81611
Fax No. 970-920-5198

RE: Channel Lineup Change

Dear Hilary,

Effective July 31, 2009 Comcast will move ESPN Classic (Ch. 403) from the Digital Classic Package to the Sports Entertainment Tier. Current Digital Classic subscribers will need to subscribe to the Sports Entertainment Tier in order to continue to see this channel.

Should you have any questions regarding this information, please feel free to contact me at 303-603-5012.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Glenn Walker".

Glenn Walker
Franchise Compliance Specialist

Future Agendas

**PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
WORK SESSION AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room**

TUESDAY, JULY 14, 2009

9:30 AM	Braun Ranch Site Visit (Transportation Leaving from Plaza Three at 9:30)	Lance Clarke
11:00 11:15	SPECIAL MEETING Deaf Camp Special Event Liquor License EXECUTIVE SESSION Comcast Franchise Negotiations C.R.S. 24-6-402 4 e ADJOURN SPECIAL MEETING & EXECUTIVE SESSION (brown bag lunch)	Jeanette Jones John Ely
1:00	BREAK	
1:15	P Card Policy and Administration	John Redmond
1:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memos of Interest • Future Agendas/Agenda Requests/Monthly Calendar • BOCC Open Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Working Agreements 	
3:15	ADJOURN	
4:00	Annual Meeting with Basalt Town Trustees at Basalt Town Hall	
6:00 PM	ADJOURN	

AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE

**PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
WORK SESSION AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room**

TUESDAY, JULY 21, 2009

10:00 AM	Joint Meeting with Open Space and Trail Board Consideration of Wexner Land Exchange	John Ely Dale Will
11:00	Airport Update	
12 NOON	LUNCH BREAK	
1:00 PM	Quarterly Economic Condition Report	Tom Oken John Redmond
1:30	<i>Special Meeting - BOCC Convenes As Board of Health Community Health Services Quarterly Update with the Board of Health, BOCC Adjourns as Board of Health – Adjourn Special Meeting</i>	Mitzi Ledingham, Liz Stark
2:30	Citizen Board Interview	
2:45	Clean Energy Financing District	Dylan Hoffman
3:15	BREAK	
3:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memos of Interest • Future Agendas/Agenda Requests/Monthly Calendar • BOCC Open Discussion 	
5:00 PM	ADJOURN	

AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE

PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room

WEDNESDAY, JULY 22, 2009

12:00 NOON ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA
PUBLIC COMMENT, COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

CONSENT ACTIONS

Convene as Board of Equalization

Edification of Ratification of Hearing Officers Determinations

Adjourn as Board of Equalization

CONSENT ACTIONS- 1st Readings, Set for Public Hearing on

1.

CONSENT PUBLIC HEARING

1. Resolution approving an intergovernmental agreement between Pitkin County and the City of Aspen concerning mutual coverage and administrative services of the Community Development Departments, Cindy Houben & Brian Pawl
2. Ordinance Adopting Amendments to the Aspen/Pitkin County Housing Authority Employee Housing Guidelines, Tom McCabe
- 3.

LAND USE CONSENT PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Brush Creek Ranch Low/Impact Residential (LIR) PUD Conceptual Submission, 1041 Hazard Review, Scenic Overlay Review, Special Review, and GMQS Exemption, 1st Reading, (Continued from 6/24/09), PH (PN 4/26/09), S. Wolff
2. Elam Gravel Pit Special Review for Mineral Exploration and Mining Expansion, (Continued from 6/24/09), PH (PN 5/24/09), M. Kraemer

1.

LAND USE CONSENT ACTIONS

1.

LAND USE PUBLIC HEARINGS

2.

LAND USE ACTIONS

3.

BOCC OPEN DISCUSSION

ADJOURN

THURSDAY, JULY 23, 2009 – NWCCOG COUNCIL & RRR MEETING

Full Council

Olympic Hall, Steamboat Springs / 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Rural Resort Region: 12:30 – 3:00 p.m.

AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE

**PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
WORK SESSION AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room**

TUESDAY, JULY 28, 2009

(Commissioner Richards not present.)

11:00 AM to 1:00 PM	SPECIAL MEETING – EXECUTIVE SESSION ADJOURN SPECIAL MEETING (brown bag lunch)	
1:00	BREAK	
1:15	SPECIAL MEETING Convene as Board of Equalization Edification of Ratification of Hearing Officers Determinations ADJOURN as Board of Equalization	
1:30	Prep for Joint Meeting with Aspen City Council on August 4, 2009 Prep for Annual Meeting with Lake County on August 3, 2009	
2:00		
3:15	BREAK	
3:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memos of Interest • Future Agendas/Agenda Requests/Monthly Calendar • BOCC Open Discussion 	
5:00 PM	ADJOURN	

AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE

**PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
AGENDA**

MONDAY, AUGUST 3, 2009

12 NOON ANNUAL MEETING WITH LAKE COUNTY
Inn of the Black Wolf, Twin Lakes

TUESDAY, AUGUST 4, 2009

WORK SESSION Plaza One Meeting Room

(Commissioner Richards not present)

1:00 PM	SPECIAL MEETING Convene as Board of Equalization Edification of Ratification of Hearing Officers Determinations ADJOURN as Board of Equalization	
1:15	Citizen Board Interview	
1:30	Prep for Meeting with Gunnison County and AVH	
2:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memos of Interest Future Agendas/Agenda Requests/Monthly Calendar Board Membership Reports –NWCCOG, RRR, CORE, QQ, CCI, PEIS I-70, Club 20, CRRTB, RWPA, ACRA, RFTA, NC, BLM, • BOCC Open Discussion 	
3:45	BREAK	
4-6:00 PM	Joint Meeting with Aspen City Council at City Hall Liquor Server Training	

THURSDAY, AUGUST 6, 2009

9:00 AM – 3:00 PM Elected Officials Transportation Committee Retreat – location tba

AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE

MONDAY, AUGUST 10, 2009

5:30 PM ANNUAL MEETING WITH ASPEN VALLEY HOSPITAL BOARD
Aspen Valley Hospital Board Room

**PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
WORK SESSION AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room**

TUESDAY, AUGUST 11, 2009

10:00 AM	SPECIAL MEETING – EXECUTIVE SESSION ADJOURN SPECIAL MEETING	
12:00 NOON	LUNCH BREAK	
12:30	Travel to Gunnison	
3:30	Annual Meeting with the Gunnison County Commissioners Gunnison County Courthouse	
5:00 PM	ADJOURN	

THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 2009

1-4:00 PM I-70 Coalition Meeting, Silverthorne Library

AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE

**PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room**

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 12, 2009

12:00 NOON ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA
PUBLIC COMMENT, COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

CONSENT ACTIONS

1.

CONSENT ACTIONS- 1st Readings, Set for Public Hearing on

2.

CONSENT PUBLIC HEARING

1. 2nd Reading, Ordinance Repealing the Aspen/Pitkin Energy Conservation Code and the Aspen/Pitkin Efficient Building Code and Adopting the 2009 International Energy Conservation Code as Amended, Tony Fusaro (continued from 7/8)
- 2.

LAND USE CONSENT PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Pitkin Group Investment Inc. Appeal of Hearing Officer Determination 10-2008, (Continued from 5/27/09), PH (PN 2/1/09), M. Kraemer
2. Code Amendment-Snow Storage, 1st Reading, PN (PH), M. Kraemer

LAND USE CONSENT ACTIONS

LAND USE PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. Watson Divide Ranch Inc. Minor Amendment to a Development Permit, Approval and Agricultural Master Plan, (Continued from 7/8/09), PH (PN 6/21/09), C. Holcomb

LAND USE ACTIONS

1.

**BOCC OPEN DISCUSSION
ADJOURN**

AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE

**PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
WORK SESSION AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room**

TUESDAY, AUGUST 18, 2009

1:00 PM	RFTA Update	Dan Blankenship
2:00	Woody Creek Mobile Home Park Funding Request	
3:00	BREAK	
3:15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Memos of Interest• Future Agendas/Agenda Requests/Monthly Calendar• BOCC Open Discussion	
5:00 PM	ADJOURN	

AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE

**PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
WORK SESSION AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room**

TUESDAY, AUGUST 25, 2009

11:00 AM to 1:00 PM	SPECIAL MEETING – EXECUTIVE SESSION ADJOURN SPECIAL MEETING (brown bag lunch)	
1:00	BREAK	
1:15	Airport Update	
2:45		
3:15	BREAK	
3:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Memos of Interest• Future Agendas/Agenda Requests/Monthly Calendar• BOCC Open Discussion	
5:00 PM	ADJOURN	

AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE

**PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room**

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 26, 2009

12:00 NOON ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

PUBLIC COMMENT, COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

CONSENT ACTIONS

1.

CONSENT ACTIONS- 1st Readings, Set for Public Hearing on

2.

CONSENT PUBLIC HEARING

3.

LAND USE CONSENT PUBLIC HEARINGS

4.

LAND USE CONSENT ACTIONS

5.

Code Amendment-Snow Storage, 2nd Reading, M. Kraemer

LAND USE PUBLIC HEARINGS

6.

LAND USE ACTIONS

7.

BOCC OPEN DISCUSSION

ADJOURN

THURSDAY, AUGUST 27, 2009 – NWCCOG COUNCIL & RRR MEETING

Executive Committee – Strategic Planning Session

River Rock Café, Walden / 9:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE