

The Berthoud Planning Commission met in a regular session at the Berthoud Town Hall on February 8, 2007 with Chairman Chris Thorne presiding. The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m.

Members Present: Chris Thorne, Chairman  
John Bauer  
Stelios Androulidakis  
Jeff Hindman  
Brian Anderson  
Ben Zink

Members Absent: Scott Banzhaf, Vice Chairman

Staff/Town consultants Robert Anderson, Planning Director  
Sue Bowles, Planning Technician

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

There were no items on the Consent Agenda.

### **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – CAC PRESENTATION OF FINAL REPORT**

Chairman Thorne introduced this agenda item noting that this was a joint meeting to give the Town Board of Trustees and the Planning Commission an opportunity to see the Community Advisory Committee's (CAC) presentation of its Land Use Plan and final report.

Planning Director Anderson extended a heartfelt thanks to the CAC for its hard work. Staff attempted to use all of the CAC's information in some form or another. Tonight's meeting is really a continuation of the public participation process. Ultimately it is up to the Planning Commission to determine what plan is best for the community.

Thorne noted that prior to Planning Director Anderson's arrival, the CAC process stretched back quite a ways, and involved not just the private citizens, but also a lot of work from the planning dept, and well as back and forth between the commission and the board who were presented various iterations of the work as it went forward.

John Goreski, acting as the spokesperson for the CAC introduced the members in attendance. He noted his thanks to Wayne Reed who started this process. The CAC was appointed by the Board of Trustees in 2004 and given the task of advising the Town in its effort to update the 1992 Comprehensive Plan and the 2001 Land Use Plan. Tonight the CAC presents our recommended version of the Land Use Plan component which is a work in progress.

Goreski explained the project scope which included an inventory of transportation, utilities and physical features, goals and objectives through public input, developing a land use plan, evaluating the current growth management area, the Highway 287 land use and buffers, population study, physical and retail analysis, and the comp plan and its relationship to other existing plans. The Town of Berthoud, Downing Thorpe and James, and the CAC has completed 6 of the 8 items. They have not completed a Highway 287 land use buffer study, or looked at the updated comprehensive plan and its relationship to existing plans. Goreski noted

that urban planning is not like architecture or other design disciplines. Because there are no quick results. Once a vision is established, it takes years to see the results, but you have to start somewhere and have the fortitude and commitment to implement the vision.

Goreski read the vision is the Mission Statement that is on a plaque on the back wall of the Board Room, noting the key words that have been talked about for 20 years: Small; Agricultural; and History. We are more than just a town. We are a whole community of people. The final CAC is comprised of 12 individuals, diverse in their backgrounds, but committed to a common vision of Berthoud. 4 are Town residents, 5 are Larimer and Weld County residents, 3 are developers and land owners looking to develop here. We are parents with children in local schools. People with diverse professional backgrounds. Some of us have served on Town Boards and Planning Commissions, some are experts in land development. We have served on past citizen's advisory committees and the Chamber of Commerce. We have people with farming backgrounds and people who have worked in the planning field, so we have some credibility. He noted that although he can't speak to the rest of the CAC who chose not to participate and complete this process, however, they too have contributed their time and ideas.

Goreski went through the history of the process that began with the first meeting on November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2004 where they discussed the things they liked and disliked about Berthoud, and things they wanted to see. In May 2005, once the grants and DTJ contract were in place, they started working on creating goals and objectives which were later accepted by the Board of Trustees and the Planning Commission. In February of 2006 they began reviewing the 4 alternative development scenarios from DTJ which included satellite, onion skin, and other types of development. In the following months they held three Envision Berthoud workshops. Goreski encouraged everyone to look at the instant polling that took place on those dates, and particularly drew their attention to the 3<sup>rd</sup> workshop because the polling corresponds with the CAC's proposed land use plan. In May – June of 2006, they reviewed the preliminary development scenario and the Town Board and Planning Commission accepted those. July – October of 2006, there was 4 months of a hiatus while they waited for DTJ to produce 2 land use alternatives. During this time, Robert Anderson was hired and on November 1<sup>st</sup> of 2006 they had the first CAC meeting with Robert, and at that time they were informed of the budget concerns. Also at that meeting, DTJ presented 2 alternatives to the Town which were called B-1 and A.

On November 8, 2006 they had a 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting with Robert where the CAC marked up a map of one of DTJ's alternatives with the impression that that map would be presented at the community workshop. It was not. On November 18<sup>th</sup> they had workshop #4, and the B-3 map that was presented that evening was the closest representation to the CAC's proposal, but not completely. At that time Robert thanked the CAC and they understood they were dismissed at that time. In the following weeks an email was sent to the CAC from Liz stating that the town was out of money and couldn't facilitate any more meetings. Because of the CAC's map not being fairly representative of the community workshop, and the Town being out of money, the CAC took it upon themselves to hold 2 more meetings at the community center. On December 12<sup>th</sup>, the CAC presented its final map and the signed conclusion and hand delivered them to the Town Clerk and Robert Anderson.

Goreski went through some of the text, and explained some of the colors and symbols shown on the map.

The Highway 287 and County Road 17 node was an issue of fierce debate because this intersection is highly integrated in the Berthoud Separator Plan and that also was a point of much debate. How do we honor the separator plan and at the same time allow development at this intersection? We should look at this intersection in a way outlined by the Preliminary Preferred Development Scenario approved by the Planning Commission and Town Board. This allows individual development proposals to proceed integrating the community benefit of commercial, retail and mixed uses while allowing developers to propose quality developments. Through the development review process, critical elements such as density, community separator, buffer areas, setbacks and view corridors can be addressed. The east side commercial areas, DTJ took it upon themselves to map out a lot of the area outside of the current GMA. Our philosophy was, we support gathering up the small commercial nodes of previous plans in the eastern portion of the GMA and locating them into a new, mixed use linear corridor along 1<sup>st</sup> Street. The Preliminary Preferred Development Scenario did not support satellite commercial nodes in this area. The intent is to centrally locate these services while capturing revenue from well traveled road. Additionally, the intersection of County Road 1 and Highway 56 should be designated as neighborhood commercial, or is a good location for a civic use. We should preserve and protect the unique history of the Greenlawn Cemetery.

Another idea that DTJ came up with was the idea of a “ring road” or “green avenue” around the lakes in town. We thought this was a good idea, so we honored the idea, but tweaked it a little bit. The concept of a wide road with a median does not fit within the context of small town rural Berthoud. By following existing roads using existing right-of-ways, we can create an enhanced street section to provide a pedestrian, bicycle friendly network around the community linking neighborhoods and commercial centers together. When viewed with the PORT Master Plan, the ring road begins to tie the idea of community trail connectivity together. We also talked about locating some transit stations. Hopefully in the future we'll have commuter rail here, or some way to have mass transit come through town, so we want to be able to plan for that and have some locations in mind. We support the idea of multiple transit stops along the existing rail line that would service the downtown core as well as the proposed mixed use corridor along 1<sup>st</sup> Street. Additionally they could provide a park-n-ride format for commuters.

The GMA (growth management area) was not really discussed until the end of the process, and is the most controversial component. There was not GMA line shown on the DTJ maps. Citizens voted on several map scenarios, and there was no consensus. Today, we have a very well established line. Everybody agrees with it, and nobody is in dispute of it. When you move a line on a map, it affects people's lives and property rights. Does the Town of Berthoud have the right to say we're going to grow into your neighborhood? Maybe they do, and maybe they don't. The CAC supports maintaining the existing GMA with the exception of expanding the GMA on the north to include the area from CR 17 west to the existing GMA at Heron Lakes, then north to CR 14/Highway 60. We believe that Champion's identity should be preserved and not be part of our GMA. The boundary on the west side is well established as county rural. It's the edge of Town and is not threatened by any other entity. The south boundary also is well established. There are physical limitations of municipal services crossing the Little Thompson River and no eminent pressure from other municipalities. Furthermore, Boulder County is currently purchasing open space between Longmont and Berthoud. The eastern boundary is somewhat problematic. The existing GMA extends into Weld County and Berthoud does not have and IGA with Weld County. We do have an IGA with Larimer County. We also agree that maintaining existing county densities, rural, in the eastern area is key to preserving it as an agricultural area, and therefore we are not recommending any changes to the east side at this

time. Should Berthoud enter into an IGA with Weld County, the east boundary should be revisited.

We have designated some employment centers, including the area at the intersection of 1<sup>st</sup> Street and the new Highway 287 Parkway as an employment center. We support an employment center north of CR 10-E to the Highway 287 alignment east of the rail line and west of 1<sup>st</sup> St. This would be serviced by a transit stop. We still have limited access to Highway 287 which should be examined more closely.

Last but not least is the PORT Master Plan, which the CAC believes should be incorporated into the final Land Use Plan. With that overlay, some land use decisions become clear and new developments integrated with it.

Goreski noted the rules that the CAC adopted and followed throughout this process.

1. Respect. We will value each member for his or her thoughts, opinions and diversity. We will listen to other members and be considerate of their opinions, especially when they are different from our own. We will not interrupt others, and will raise our hands to be acknowledged.
2. Integrity. We will be truthful and open in all actions. We will speak honestly about our interests. We will work together in a shared responsibility to promote Berthoud's best interest over private interest.
3. Consensus. We will honor the CAC's decisions. We will provide an avenue for dissenting opinions. We will conduct CAC activities in a public forum, not in private conversations or meetings. We will not sabotage the CAC process or plan by way of private activities.

CAC member Eric Berg, 1001 Jefferson Drive addressed the commission. His family has been in Larimer County since about 1859. We have one chance to plan for the future. We've been lucky to survive the last immense growth spurt intact, and have the highest quality of life of any town on the Front Range. Do we want to become another poorly planned version of Johnstown. Do we want to have incompetent planning like they have in southwest Weld County? In response to Robert Anderson's memo of February 6<sup>th</sup>, 2007, Berg noted that the work of the CAC is a reflection of the guidance we received from the Town and the consultants involved. Any budget issues, product formatting issues, report formatting issues are a reflection of them, not the CAC. Instead of being critical of the CAC for finishing the task for the Town, the Town should applaud the CAC and the extra effort that were brought forward by us to bring this vision forward. The CAC was, and is a diverse group. There's town, county, developer's and we all worked together. Whether you live in town or adjacent to it, Berthoud is our community. I resent the fact that it was insinuated that this CAC was driven by "out of community" members. I wonder if our new town planner understands this community. He apparently doesn't respect our opinion. The vision statement for the Town, a town that works together controls its own destiny by being proactive in planning for growth while preserving and enhancing its rural character. That's exactly what the CAC did. We're a diverse group who worked together to plan for the future of this town. By maintaining the GMA on the west side of Town, I think we can meet the vision. Larimer and Boulder counties have strong land use regulations. There's no risk of outside interest. By maintaining the west boundary, we can take advantage of those regulations, and preserve open space by using their conservation development opportunities. We don't have to provide infrastructure for those areas.

Karen Stockley felt this was a fair group, and they made a lot of compromises. It's not a perfect map to everyone, but it is a very fair representation of what the community wants, and what was best for the community.

Another member of the CAC said, I encourage you to understand that you have a group of citizens here that does represent a good cross section. The perceived conflict between the "out of towners" and the "in towners", and the developer's and the citizen's doesn't exist in that group. The last phase when we were told we were not longer needed, we made these maps and paid for them out of our pockets, so the implication in the memo that was mentioned earlier that it's our fault that it went over budget is unfair. This GMA, where you have the problem is going east because you don't have any power with Weld County. If you don't do that, you can't preserve the agricultural environment. That should be the number one priority.

Scott Sarbaugh – has been well represented how we worked together to develop a unanimous map. That is quite a feat. I would like to expand on a couple of items that were critical to the process, and it is important for the Board and Commission, and the ground work we lived by. The rules that were mentioned earlier, we lived by those, and we operated that way. The most important piece of that is "we will work together in a shared responsibility to promote Berthoud's best interests over private interests. That truly was put forward. We operated the CAC within those rules.

Jack Williamson addressed the commission noting that it is important that the commission understand the process we used to evaluate the GMA. Back at the beginning we were given all the baseline maps from Wayne Reed and DTJ. We talked about 208 service area, sewer and water that is provided outside the GMA, and the impacts when the GMA is extended. North of my property is the Champion area which is served by Town sewer. They pay twice as much as people in town. We evaluated that, and working within the rules, came to the consensus that that was not a reason to expand the GMA. The next lengthy discussion we had was the protection the GMA gives the Town. We analyzed it to the point that it we came to a consensus that it is not necessary to expand to the west. Larimer County has a strong IGA with Berthoud that works well. Pressure from the west, there is none. Weld county it was not feasible to expand the GMA because it doesn't protect the town without an IGA. Expanding it doesn't do anything. Need an IGA with Weld county before discussing the GMA.

Dan Hooker noted that he lives in Weld County, and wanted to point out that CAC is a term you are going to be hearing. Weld County will be forming a CAC. From those CAC's, IGA's with Berthoud will probably be discussed. They are looking at Frederick, Firestone and Mead since at this point, there is no cooperation between them, and there is a development hodgepodge in those areas. They have a new bunch of commissioners in Weld County and they are concerned citizens, and like this CAC, they have diverse backgrounds. The new CAC will be talking with Berthoud and expect they will come to an agreement. My experience with this CAC has been very educational. I'm a retired engineer and I picked my area because it's where they planned an AG buffer, and I'd like to see that it stays that way.

Thorne again thanked the CAC members. It is very admirable that you expended private funds. Wish you hadn't had to do that. Although the formal role of the CAC will end this evening, we would certainly like to have you attend the Planning Commission meetings as we go forward.

The Commission took a short break.

Planning Director Anderson began his presentation with a sincere apology that the CAC mistook his abruptness and pushing of deadlines as being unprofessional or unfair or negative to them in any way. He came on board 6 months ago. One of the first tasks he was assigned by the Town Administrator was to finish a grant that was 2 years overdue. In doing that, the first thing you do is pick up the grant document and look through it. The audit was very clear. Then we did an inventory of what the \$130,000 spent so far had purchased and, he was concerned that there was only enough to fit in an envelope. There was no text other than 30 pages of goals and objectives, there was a photo safari, and there were 10 maps. The record of Envision Berthoud meetings were in a notebook. He was very concerned, as the reputation and credibility of a small town depends on grants, and the Town is not in a position to do poorly when it comes to grant performance, either in meeting the requirements. With that said, it certainly is not the fault of the CAC. It is clearly a planning function and we failed as a department. That has been duly noted, and is being fixed. I don't know the reason, and I don't care. There was no evidence of wrongdoing. 60-70% of the funds were spent on meetings, not on process or product. DTJ submitted bills for \$5,000 for each meeting. I also had a concern that this comprehensive plan would be completed by December 31<sup>st</sup> so that we could begin the review process. December 31<sup>st</sup> was the 2 year anniversary of the grant, and also its one year anniversary of being delinquent. With that, we had 3 meetings in November, and I was very clear. The meetings were a free-for-all conversation. They ran the gamut. I referred back to the grant. I needed information and I needed a map. Part of the reason for the two month delay between when I was hired and when we had the first meeting was because I was doing research going through minutes trying to collect what had been done, and there wasn't a lot to collect. I was concerned, and I apologize for being abrupt, but that's all I was, was abrupt. I was never unprofessional and unfair. I followed their dictums that they spelled out in their first meeting. I've been completely honest with them, and respected their work and have applauded their work time and again. But I was also honest with them that in applauding their work, it doesn't mean I support their work or agree with their submissions.

Robert went through the staff summary that had been provided to the Commission and Board of Trustees. For over 2 years and over 25 public meetings, the CAC has met with Town Staff, DTJ and privately. It has been said that the CAC was fired or let go. That is not true. We explained the financial difficulties we were having as a staff. The planning department is \$25,000 in arrears. We lost contact after that with the CAC. Again, I apologize for my abruptness. This has damaged the relationship between the CAC and myself.

The 94 pages of text of the draft comprehensive plan was done by staff and is a synthesis of notes I found, including the goals and objectives, and the map and the work that was done, and I tried to put it in a comprehensive plan format. The grant itself is not for a land use plan, it is for a comprehensive plan. I'm at a loss to understand how they thought they were working on a land use plan. The maps that have been produced, including staff's preferred plan and the CAC's plan are not readable or reproducible by the Town.

A comprehensive plan is a vision of a community. A clear concise document that identifies the vision that says what the town wants to be. We are requesting that all maps be converted to GIS format.

Additionally, no monies were budgeted for printing and distribution of the document. At this point we cannot update the website. We are working diligently on that. We've had some wonderful offers from this commission to help with the website, but we are trying to not have to do that, but it's expensive and technically sophisticated, and we are relatively unsophisticated and don't have a lot of hardware.

The most critical map of the 10 is the preferred land use alternative or plan, and that is what the CAC brought to you this evening as their recommendation. As a professional planner and public servant, my job is not to make decisions, but to provide information so you can make the decisions. I've tried to do that through this process. It's easy to shoot the messenger. Staff does have a recommended alternative map. Also produced by the CAC were 30 pages of goals and objectives. I distributed those to staff, most of whom hadn't seen them, and staff was somewhat concerned. As we go through these, it's up to the commission to determine which to include in the comprehensive plan. The grant is very specific in its 8 areas. It requires that assessment and needs and opportunities as well as neighborhood and town goals and policies and strategies include but not be limited to growth, housing, economic development, transportation, public improvements and infrastructure, parks open space and recreation and community culture. I've tried to take the CAC's goals and objectives and keeping their intent, create goals and objectives that fit into the grant requirements. It's not my document, it's your document.

Thorne suggested focusing on the highlights of the memo so we can focus on the land use plan that staff is recommending.

Robert explained that several major parts of our comprehensive plan have been pulled out of it, and he'd like to get those things put back in; the PORT plan is an integral part of the comp plan. The land use plan itself is part of a comp plan. We have 26 different ordinances that supplement this, and he'd like to get those integrated into the document. All of these things need to be centralized into one well constructed document.

Anderson moved onto the preferred land use alternative that staff is recommending. Mr. Goreski was accurate in his history of the CAC and the Envision Berthoud process. The Envision Berthoud audience was the global audience. The CAC was the technical component that would hash out details. With the final workshop, planning staff went to the CAC and said we need a map. At the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting we put a piece of acetate over one of these maps and came up with Land Use Plan Alternative B-3. Goreski said it was essentially correct but wasn't complete. We took a vote on it. Of the members present, this map won by 2. Members were allowed to continue comment, but no other votes were taken. Then we had the envision Berthoud workshop where all maps were presented.

One of the largest questions that the CAC and planning have struggled with is the GMA. State statute says this is that area that can be served by urban level services. Generally boundaries are extended by ½ mile or 1 mile because that is considered a distance that developers can realistically extend the lines to. The CAC places a boundary that is considered as a line in the sand. Staff disagrees with that. The county has allowed urban level development where urban level services are available. The Town should be annexing those areas so that it benefits from those developments.

The other conflict that staff has with the CAC's plan is the land use density. The CAC prefers rural and semi rural density in more areas than the town would recommend. In order for the Town to encourage development, there has to be enough density for the development to be economically feasible to the developer. Another issue that staff has is that the mixed use and commercial component along the railroad obliterates all M1 and M2 zoning districts. Let's find some industrial land to replace that.

In regards to the west side, an applicant (Mr. Haworth) came to the town 3 years ago and expressed a desire to develop in the town limits. They were told to wait while the comprehensive plan and land use plan were being updated. The CAC had some heartburn with moving that line in the sand at LCR 19. Staff's concern is that the property will develop in the county and that is a loss of \$3-4 million to the Town. It is planning staff's job to consider the financial future of a community.

Chairman Thorne opened the meeting for public comment.

David Lamb, a CAC member said it was unfortunate that it has come to this. He questioned Planning Director Anderson's integrity and lack of professionalism. He further noted that it bothers him to hear that Wayne didn't do a good job, that DTJ didn't and that the CAC was rogue.

There being no one else wishing to speak, the public comment portion was closed.

Chairman Thorne offered Mayor Karspeck and Trustee Sommers the opportunity to speak.

Karspeck asked that the Commission consider having the Board of Trustees look at this document first and give its opinions and recommendations to the commission prior to its review. He felt that mistake was made in the PORT Plan process by having the Board look at it after the Planning Commission since it is the commission that adopts the PORT Plan as well as the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Plan.

Karspeck also discussed the opportunity that Berthoud may have in regards to a transit stop, and noted that consideration needs to be given to determine where that primary stop should be and zone it appropriately at that stop.

Another observation Karspeck discussed was Hwy 56. We are fortunate to be able to get from one end of town to the other in 5 minutes and we need to be careful with that and preserve Hwy 56 from having too much ingress and egress with traffic lights everywhere.

Thorne asked for general comments from the commission noting that he would like them to reach a decision on the process for review noting that observations are important so we don't end up in the same position as the PORT Plan.

Zink stated that in regards to the PORT Plan, everyone is on the same page that that died or was left out due to lack of communication between the Board and the Planning Commission. Integration with the Board prior to the final decision making process is important. We need to have them on board early. Generally it would be wise to set the procedure clearly, including revisions and so on.

Thorne thought the Mayor's proposal was a sound one to have a recommendation from the Board regarding adoption of the plan and future amendments.

Thorne further noted that in regards to the goals and objectives, those were initially developed by the CAC, but they were then presented to the commission and board several times and endorsed by both.

Anderson also endorsed the Mayor's suggestion. He noted he would like to have a checklist of what needs to be done to complete these grants given the grant time frames.

Androulidakis said that having been in the CAC through most of the process, he understands some of the interplay. He agrees with Robert Anderson wholeheartedly. DTJ did not belong there, and shouldn't have been leading the meetings, and he was very upset to know the cost of these meetings. He further noted that both the CAC and the planning department have valid points and we will need to look at those issues. He agrees with the Mayor that the Board should endorse it.

Hindman – statutory process is very strange. He supports the Mayor's suggestion. He pointed out that this is an advisory document, and if we adopt something that has no support from the board, it is a worthless document. It is critical that we get that input.

Bauer too endorsed the Mayor's position, noting that it is sad to see all the work go into the PORT Plan and then not have endorsement. In terms of the things we have tonight, it's great that we're starting with the land use plan. We now have the entire comprehensive plan to go through. We're going to end again with the land use plan because that will be the final summary based on the comprehensive plan. We will see this again and at that time is when we'll be dealing with a lot of additional details. I just wanted it clearly understood that we will be using these maps as a basis as we move forward, just not in an electronic format. He thanked the Northern Front Range MPO, Downing, Thorpe and James and Wayne Reed and DOLA. He further thanked the CAC for all its hard work and wants to see them involved from here on out.

Hindman, echoing what Brian Anderson said in the Planner's memo that what's been produced so far only meets one-third of the grant obligations of the town, so I too would like to see a list of what's left in terms of required product and delineate how much of that is our responsibility. Some of that may be the Town Board or even the CAC's responsibility. I'd like to make sure we're going to meet our six month deadline, and I think with all the discussion and meetings that have gone into this we're going to be able to move forward and adopt something really quickly in terms of the map and then if we have to work through the rest of the comp plan, that's going to take time after that but everyone has enough information, we should be able to decide on the map. For clarification, when we redid the architectural standards, it was redoing a chapter of the development code, it was not lifting it out and creating a separate document. It was taking it a "design guidelines" chapter and turning it into a "design requirements" chapter.

Hindman strongly disagreed with Director Anderson's comment that the GMA is where you can provide services. He had a strong feeling when he was on the Board and we were asked to annex into certain areas based on the fact that it was in our 208 plan, and that map is of every area that gravity flows to the Town of Berthoud and to think that the Town would want to annex out to Carter Lake just because we can provide sewer service to anything uphill would be a huge mistake and Larimer County makes a huge distinction in terms of density that's allowed in the County based on sewer service, because there's already domestic water service through Little Thompson Water District. His strong feeling is that the Town never wants to have a policy of providing municipal services into unincorporated areas. From his understanding, the GMA is where the Town is choosing to provide services, and choosing to allow urban growth based on good planning, not just on where gravity takes you. He can see a lot of issues that we may not want to go into tonight, but he can see why the GMA on the west and the south was a big point of contention.

Hindman further said he'd had a disturbing conversation with Trustee Ashcraft yesterday, and in light of some of the comments tonight he thought it relevant to pass those on in a public forum. The Planning Commission got an email from Trustee Ashcraft today in which among other things he states he wants us to gather all the information but he also says he wants to stay away from arguments on which plan is better and gather all the information before making your decisions and that's quite a bit different from what he told me yesterday on the phone in which he expressed that he thought both plans were biased in different way, and he wanted the commission to find middle ground, which I'm all in favor of middle ground. I explained to him that I hadn't seen either of the versions and he informed me that I didn't really need to look at the CAC's version, I just needed to look at who was presenting it. He characterized the CAC as a very self interested group of out of town, no growth activists. I told him I did not agree with that approach and I don't think you should ever look at a plan based on who's presenting it, you should look at the merits of what's being presented. He also had some disparaging remarks about the planning commission about having some anti-government people on it and he didn't understand where that feeling was coming from. Anyway, I just want those to be known in light of his email today and I obviously don't agree with that and I think it's really inappropriate to discount the work that all the people have put in. I had not looked at the CAC report when I talked to Don, but when I look at it, and I see all the people who are here tonight, it is a very diverse group. It is not just county activists with a no-growth agenda. The plan that's presented has 50 years, thousands and thousands of units of potential growth. I feel like it's really divisive for that to be the attitude of a Town Board member, and I really agree with Mr. Burg's comments that we are a community and there's a lot of people who live outside of town that run businesses in town, support our schools, support and coach in our recreation program. We are more than just the incorporated town, and I think we owe it to those people to represent what's best for the entire area, not just what's potentially more lucrative for the Town in the short run.

Brian Anderson echoed some of the previous comments with the CAC for its efforts over the past two years. It seems to me as a liaison to the CAC, it started out and has continued to be a good confluence of different ideas and desires and expressions. He noted that there were certain things that seemed to be sprung on them at the end such as the alternative B-3 map 10 days prior to the community vis workshop. He asked that the results of the workshop be provided, and that Steve Mullin be asked for his comments and what his recommendations are.

Director Anderson said he did invite Justin Heidel with the Orton Family Foundation as well as Steve Mullin with Foresee. He will continue to try to get them in to help illuminate the process and to answer questions.

Androulidakis questioned that the CAC map included a portion of Highway 60, excluding Campion, but including the Colony Ridge area. We should iron out those issues.

Meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

---

Brian Anderson, Secretary

---

Sue Bowles, Planning Technician