

ATTACHMENT 1

Brown Ranch Annexation Committee (BRAC) Wednesday, March 29, 2023 Meeting Summary

Attendance: Robin Crossan, Joella West, Gary Suiter, Leah Wood, Kathi Meyer, Jason Peasley (BRAC); Jason Lacy (third-party facilitator); Jon Snyder, Angela Cosby, Rebecca Bessey, Dan Foote, Kim Weber, Mark Beckett, Chuck Cerasoli, Jamie Malone, Rich Brown, Brad Calvert, Jenny Carey, Craig Robinson, Matt Barnard, Aaron Suffard (City staff); Emily Katzman (YVHA staff) Sheila Henderson, Robin Schepper (YVHA consultants); Brian Duffany (City consultant - Economic & Planning Systems)

A. PRIOR MEETING RECAP

1. **Approval of Minutes** – Minutes (the official video recording) from the March 15, 2023 meeting were approved unanimously.
2. **Fiscal Impact Analysis** – Jason Lacy asked for any questions or follow up on the March 15, 2023 conversation regarding Fiscal Impact Study. There were no questions or comments.
3. **DRAFT Annexation Agreement**

Dan Foote on behalf of the City of Steamboat Springs added language to the draft Annexation Agreement regarding alley maintenance. In summary, the language indicates the City of Steamboat Springs is open to the concept of assuming alley maintenance responsibilities but would want to make those decisions in the context of a development application.

YVHA requested an expectation of ratio of paved surface to snow storage easement, so decision is not left unilaterally to the City's Public Works Director. YVHA will propose additional alley maintenance language to the draft Annexation Agreement.

Motion to approve the current draft Annexation Agreement: Motion by Robin Crossan, second by Kathi Meyer. Approved unanimously.

4. **BRAC Agenda Topic Schedule**

Jason Lacy asked for confirmation that all parties are comfortable with the BRAC discussion schedule. Robin Crossan suggested revisiting this conversation at the end of today's meeting.

B. CURRENT DISCUSSION

5. **Population Assumptions of Brown Ranch Community Development Plan**

Jason Peasley explained that YVHA had an error on two pages (pp. 79 and 81) of the *Brown Ranch Community Development Plan* (CDP) that identified a range of population that is not accurate (6,895 – 7,590 people). This is an over-estimation, based on the number of units proposed in the CDP. The City and YVHA need to agree on how many people per unit are anticipated at Brown Ranch. YVHA suggests using census and State Demographer data on the current number of people per household in Steamboat Springs (2.32 people per household with

a .15 margin of error). According to YVHA, using 2.32 people/household as the multiplier, it is more accurate to project approximately 5,252 people living in 2,264 housing units at full buildout.

Goal: to ensure YVHA and City of Steamboat Springs agree on the average people per household multiplier, since it is fundamental to the metrics being utilized for parks, fire, and other services.

Questions and Discussion:

Q: Joella West: Does YVHA intend to limit the number of people who live in a rental unit at Brown Ranch? How do you prevent doubling up?

A: Jason Peasley: This is addressed through YVHA property management policies, which often have occupancy limits and do not allow subletting. YVHA handles this through lease compliance. Also, some financing programs YVHA utilizes to build affordable housing have occupancy limits on units.

Q: Robin Crossan: For the number of homes occupied year-round, what is the average household size?

A: Brad Calvert: 2.32

Q: Joella West: the 2.3 average spans a broad variety of housing types planned at Brown Ranch. Is there benefit to phasing services like parks and recreation based on neighborhood density?

A: Jason Peasley: the denser phases will actually skew the average down, because there will be studio and one-bedroom units in multi-family buildings. Single family homes will skew the average up because they will be occupied by families with children.

Gary Suiter clarified that all work that City staff has done in past many weeks, is based on the previous population assumptions. Staff was unable to re-do their analyses after this issue was identified late last week. It is important when we have an assumption this critical, that there is consensus on the number and the process to identify the number.

Discussion followed about whether 2.32 is an under-estimation, considering many families will live at Brown Ranch. The average household size in Steamboat has decreased. According to the 2010 census, there were 2.53 people/household. Robin Crossan emphasized the importance of agreeing to a number now, because there will be increasing stress on City services –which will be more difficult to address— if the multiplier is underestimated.

Gary Suiter suggested this is rescheduled for a future agenda. He requested additional information to inform future conversation. Suggested a spreadsheet with the national standard, state standard, and local standard of people/household, overlaid with a “workforce housing factor” that accounts for many families anticipated to live at Brown Ranch. BRAC should also hear from both economics firms, RCLCO and EPS.

- Jason Peasley clarified that RCLCO already confirmed 2.32 is the appropriate multiplier.

Next steps: Follow up on April 12, 2023 during the meeting recap. Agree on the people/household multiplier and margin of error.

6. Exactions and Dedications of Land

Angela Cosby, City of Steamboat Springs Parks and Recreation Director, presented on staff analysis of YVHA's Parks, Open Space, and Trails plan as presented in the *Brown Ranch Community Development Plan*. [Note: this meeting summary is not intended to capture the details of Angela Cosby's presentation. Please see the [meeting packet materials](#) and the recording at approximately 35:45 for additional details.]

Annexation + Requirements:

The City's adopted plans establish requirements for annexation. The Community Development Code is designed for infill development. All documents apply to Brown Ranch.

- These plans are most applicable to parks & recreation: [Area Community Plan](#), [West Steamboat Springs Area Plan](#), and the [Parks, Open Space, Trails and Yampa River Master Plan \(PROSTR\)](#)
- Community Development Code
 - Section 605.G states parks shall not include
 - Nature preserves
 - Steeply sloped hills
 - Riparian corridors
 - Sensitive habitat zones
 - Areas that are inappropriate for active or passive recreation.
 - Stormwater drainage only where compatible with intended park use.
 - Section 606 Traditional Neighborhood Design (TND) Parks and Open Space Standards:
 - Primary: Community Parks, Regional Parks, Natural Areas, etc. Typically improved and maintained by the City.
 - Secondary: Neighborhood Parks, Plazas, Civic Spaces. Typically improved and maintained by HOA/District.
 - Tertiary: Mini Parks, Mini Plazas, Community Garden, Playgrounds. Typically improved and maintained by HOA/District.
 - Note: In developments built prior to the 2006 CDC update, City typically improved and maintains secondary and tertiary parks.
- Existing/Future parkland levels of service according to Parks, Recreation, Open Space, Trails and Yampa River Mater Plan:
 - Mini/neighborhood park – 5.5 acres/1,000 population
 - Community parkland: 6 acres/1,000 population
 - At least 46-acre large multipurpose park:
 - Not to exceed 5% slope
 - Recreation center/special use facility
 - Four-field complex + multipurpose sport fields
 - Large playground
 - Sports courts
 - Group picnic shelters

- Angela Cosby reviewed the proposed Brown Ranch park types next to existing level of service in the City of Steamboat Springs and requirements per the PROSTR. The Brown Ranch requirements presented are based on a population assumption of 7,243. Some acreage of Neighborhood and Community parkland proposed in the Brown Ranch development does not currently comply with the Community Development Code because it includes riparian area and occasional storm water detention, and/or steep slopes. Some trail mileage and open space acreage was not counted in this analysis because the trails are proposed in area that may be developed in the future.
- Brown Ranch Community Development Plan calls for high density development with small/limited personal outdoor space (to conserve water used for outdoor irrigation). Angela Cosby expressed concern that limited private outdoors space calls for higher levels of Parks & Recreation service.

Existing Parks and Recreation system is over capacity:

- Demand for additional special use facilities
- Trail closures
- Long waitlists for athletic fields
- Core trail congestion
- General overuse

Equity

- When looking at proposed Brown Ranch plan through equity lens, Brown Ranch should provide more park space than current level of service and what plans call for to reduce barriers to recreation access and opportunities for low-income residents.
- Costs Parks & Rec agencies more to maintain smaller parks than larger parks, due to high use and additional wear & tear. Parks in high density areas are typically closed more often.

Special use facilities

- The City of Steamboat Springs currently provides .56 special use facilities per 1,000 residents. Includes: Community Center, Haymaker, Tennis Center, Howelsen Ice Center, etc.
- As the City looks to annex west, it would make sense to provide a special use facility in west Steamboat. It is also called for in the PROSTR.

Discussion Questions:

- *Should the Brown Ranch development adhere to the City's adopted plans and Community Development Code?*
- *Should Brown Ranch residents receive the same level of service as existing Steamboat Springs residents? If not, what is an acceptable level of service?*
- *Should a regional park, sports complex, and/or special use facility be included in the Brown Ranch development?*
- *Could the Brown Ranch population be balanced to improve the quality of life for its residents?*

- *Should development of parks and recreation amenities be equally phased with the Brown Ranch development? If not, what is an acceptable level of service?*
- *Should a neighborhood association or other local governing entity be responsible for maintaining secondary and tertiary parks?*

Questions:

Q: Gary Suiter: When steep slopes, riparian areas, and storm water areas are not compliant with CDC to be included within parks, could those areas count as open space?

A: Angela Cosby: Yes, those areas are perfect open spaces. If those areas were identified as open space areas instead of parks, that would be a good modification to the Brown Ranch plan. Open spaces and parks are treated differently by the City. For example, the City does not use fertilizer in open space areas.

Q: Kathi Meyer: You talked about identifying certain land that we're trying to work on. But you didn't talk about who builds the facilities? Who maintains them?

A: Angela Cosby: These issues are up to BRAC to discuss (open item). This presentation was focused on providing the land and service generally, not who is developing it. Rebecca Bessey, Planning Director added clarification: neighborhood and mini parks are typically built by the developer and maintained by the HOA.

Q: Kathi Meyer: If Brown Ranch were to provide all compliance with the four plans, how much land is left for housing?

A: Angela Cosby: It is clear the open space requirement is larger than the Brown Ranch property, and that is not realistic.

Q: Joella West: To clarify, the numbers this presentation is based on is from the population estimate of 7,243. So, these ratios will change by adjusting to the population projection.

A: Angela Cosby: Correct, this presentation is based on a projected population of 7,243.

Gary Suiter offered the following observation: in other annexations, a developer dedicates land to the City of Steamboat Springs along with seed money, then the City steps in to develop the park. This is also common with recreation centers: a developer may dedicate land for the center, then municipality goes to the voters to fund the center.

Q: Jason Peasley: When doing your level of service analysis of existing City parks, did you remove natural preserves, steeply sloped hills, riparian corridors, and sensitive habitats from the calculation of parks? Are we applying the same standards between Brown Ranch proposed parks and existing City parks?

A: Matthew Barnard: No, we are using raw acreage for both existing City parks and YVHA's proposed plan.

Q: Jason Peasley: As it relates to the CDC, 3% of gross area is for parks and 15% is for open space. For Brown Ranch, that would be a total requirement of 75+- acres. YVHA is on board with meeting the goals of the PROSTR plan. But as we reference the code, it does not require a 1,000 acre dedication of open space.

A: Angela Cosby: Yes, but the Community Development Code is designed for infill development, not for the significant population gain that will happen at Brown Ranch.

- The Community Development Code anticipates this area being part of the City and has a regulatory framework for that (TND Zone District). To be clear, the City's master plans are not the only tools to guide development in the Urban Growth Boundary.

Jason Peasely clarified the intent behind the Brown Ranch parks and open space plan:

- YVHA focused on the concept of proximity of parks as a measurement related to providing access. West Steamboat Springs is severely underserved by parks. YVHA focused on people being within a block or two of parks and open space.
- Context of "Future Development Areas" identified in the Brown Ranch Community Development Plan: land within southwest of site, close to former M&M auto parcel has been left open for some kind of "community use." YVHA has been engaging in conversation with community partners (Sports Barn, Boys and Girls Club, etc.) to figure out the best use for that land. Regarding the 114 acres outside Urban Growth Boundary: as YVHA studied the site and worked with steering committee, the group decided to hold the 114-acres in trust for whatever the future community need is. YVHA intends to treat that land as "open space for now" but it is a "pressure release valve" so the community has land resources for future community need.
- YVHA is engaging with local environmental groups like Yampa Valley Sustainability Council and Friends of the Yampa on restoration of Slate Creek.
- Less (or smaller) private open space (individual yards) is a water conservation tool, an opportunity to prevent "uncontrolled watering".
- Stormwater detention: City plans call for regional stormwater approach. Parks and stormwater can be designed to be compatible. Parks are often spillover areas for flooding, high water, and rain events. Good example of working with natural environment. When there is more space to approach stormwater from a regional standpoint, stormwater detention areas behave more like a park rather than a "bathtub basin."

Questions:

Q: Joella West: when we talk about storm water detention, what use would we see when those spaces are full of storm water? What hazards are present?

A: Jason Peasely: water gets captured, sediment is filtered, and water is released at a rate compatible with local flow. Angela Cosby clarified these areas could be great open space.

Q: Jason Peasely: are you going to require us to provide 1,390.66 acres on 543 acres of land?

A: Angela Cosby: There is an acknowledgement that mathematically, we'll never be able to provide this. Are there specific ways we can compromise so we're providing housing and quality parks and open space.

- Q: Jason Peasley: Regarding the 46-acre regional park, where are you suggesting this land dedication? 46 acres where we've planned housing has enormous opportunity cost. To the extent that we can work on location, YVHA is open to that. It will serve more than just Brown Ranch. Will have to analyze impact on traffic, as it will draw people to the neighborhood. YVHA objective: if there is a land exaction, it would be outside UGB that is not currently planned for residential development.
 - Robin Crossan: land has to be flat, buildable (under 5% grade).
 - Partnerships on building special use facility.
 - Look at feasibility and road access.

Jason Peasley: YVHA's top priority is housing. That's the crisis we are trying to solve. Recognition that by trying to solve one problem, we're contributing to another (over use of existing parks). To the extent possible, YVHA will try to help solve that too.

Public Safety

Fire Chief Chuck Cerasoli and Interim Police Chief Mark Beckett presented on land dedications related to public safety at Brown Ranch. [Note: this meeting summary is not intended to capture the details of the presentation. Please see the [meeting packet materials](#) and the recording at approximately 2:04:10 for additional details.]

Guiding Questions:

- *What are the anticipated financial impacts on Capital needs for Public Safety?*
- *What are the anticipated financial impacts on operational expenses for Public Safety?*
- *How are these expenses accounted for during BR development?*
- *Are there alternative funding mechanisms available to support Public Safety?*
- The Brown Ranch Community Development Plan shows a location for a fire station/public safety building that works well for the City, with the request of considering swapping the location for the proposed transit center. However, the City anticipates needing close to 2 acres, where YVHA has currently proposed dedicating 1 acre to the public safety building.
- Needs:
 - 2 acres of land or large corner lot (for 20K SF building w/large turnaround area for apparatus)
 - Flat site
 - Close proximity to US40 – ideally accessed by 2 secondary roads
 - Dedicated at the beginning of Phase 1.
- There is a general lack of public safety training facility in community. Request Public Safety Training Site:
 - 3-5 acres of flat land
 - Located in close proximity to US40 or CR42
 - To be utilized by first responders throughout the county.

- Interim Chief Beckett expressed concern about Routt County Rifle Club immediately adjacent to the proposed Brown Ranch development. RCRC is a regional training facility for all area law enforcement. However, there is an immediate conflict a safety concern with having housing and open space adjacent to the rifle range.

Questions:

- Q: Kathi Meyer: Combined Law Enforcement Facility (CLEF) was designed for growth for next 20 years. Can you clarify why current facility is not adequate? Isn't there 3000 SF that County uses for training?

A: Mark Beckett: CLEF is maxed out. If fully staffed, no room for expansion. Briefing rooms used as office space. Training facility: intention w/fire and public safety building is to have something specific for Steamboat Springs.

Q: Kathi Meyer: Other communities have used regional approach on training facilities. Any conversations with Moffat County? I understand there are federal grants for this approach.

A: Mark Beckett: The money from federal grants is not as good as presented. The challenge of collaborating with Moffat County for a training facility is the long drive. Responders must be close to area of service in case staff is training and needs to respond to an emergency. There is not enough staff to pull people off to train.

- Q: Kathi: City Police Department is 73% staffed. I understand the barrier is a lack of affordable housing, correct?
- A: Mark Becket: Yes.
- Q: Kathi: what is the vision for Mountain Station:
A: Chuck Cerasoli: To rebuild the station with 5 bays.
- Q: Kathi Meyer: Brown Ranch would serve more than Brown Ranch, including subdivisions in County that are within the fire district. Would there be a cost share with those populations?
A: yes. Will discuss in April 12 meeting.

A: ISO ratings. How different insurance companies utilize ratings is up to them. Standard use to calculate insurance rates. Staffed station in close proximity is a benefit. Save residents of Brown Ranch and west of Steamboat Area money on insurance.

Jason Peasley stated that YVHA is happy to work with City to pinpoint where Public Safety building is located. YVHA wants to be as efficient as possible and provide an appropriate site to the community. Regarding 3-5 acres for Public Safety Training Facility: YVHA is open to exploring locations and concepts, weighed against loss of potential housing. Must also consider impacts of training facilities in residential neighborhood.

- Chief Cerasoli clarified that locating that fire/public safety station on a corner would reduce acreage needed. Robin Crossan expressed the importance of building for the future. These public facilities need to last for 50 years.

- Interim Chief Beckett clarified that City Police Department has had long conversations with Routt County Rifle Club. Thinks there are options to explore with RCRC, and the significant impact on quality of life for future residents of Brown Ranch must be weighed with the importance of that facility for regional law enforcement training.

BRAC Agenda Topic Schedule

Robin Crossan suggested extending the 4/12 meeting and having working lunch. The April 12, 2023 BRAC meeting is now scheduled 9 am – 2pm.

Joella West requested data from first BRAC Town Hall. What were the results?

- 30 people in the room that were not staff + 30 people on Zoom.
- Recording: 4 listened after.
- Summary of community meeting, outreach, hours spent will be included in next packet.
- Add communications and public outreach to each agenda. Include written download of comment received between each meeting.
- City Council will forward public comment received so it can all be compiled and reviewed.

Summary of Decisions

No decisions were made; however, the following next steps were identified:

- YVHA to work with City Planning Department to provide information on Brown Ranch population projections for 4/4/23 City Council Rainbow packet.
- YVHA will return to BRAC on 4/12/23 with a clarified or countered proposal.

C. NEXT MEETING

- Wednesday, April 12, 2023 at 9am
- Agenda:
 - Follow-up on March 29 items
 - Fiscal Impact Analysis

D. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.