



Archuleta County Development Services Department
ARCHULETA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Archuleta County Planning Commission Minutes, Special Meeting June 8, 2016

The Archuleta County Planning Commission held a meeting on Wednesday, June 8, 2016, at 6:00 PM at the Centerpoint Church, 2750 Cornerstone Dr., Pagosa Springs, Colorado. Chairman Michael Frederick called the meeting to order at 6:28 PM.

Commissioners in attendance:

Michael Frederick, Anita Hooton, David Parker, Betty Shahan, and Peter Adams.

Staff in Attendance:

John Shepard, AICP, Planning Manager; Todd Starr, County Attorney; and Sherrie Vick, Planning Tech

Public in Attendance:

See attached sign in sheets

Consent:

None

Old Business:

None

New Business:

Two Rivers Gravel Pit Major Sand & Gravel Permit, located in Section 11, T33N R2W NMPM at 12500 County Road 500. (2015-035SG)

Chairman Frederick opened the meeting and noted that all of the Planning Commissioners were present. Because of the large number of people in attendance there were going to be rules to conduct the meeting. The Planning Commission will evaluate the evidence in writing and verbally presented, according to our land use regulations and make a decision to recommend approval or disapproval of this project. The Planning Commission decision is a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners based on the majority of the Commission. Chairman Frederick asked the audience to move forward if they could not hear and that they be as quiet as possible during the proceedings. If attendees would like to address the Commission they will need to come up to the podium so Commissioners can hear and so comments can be recorded. Also, speakers must give their name, address, if representing a group of people, and the interest in the project. The Chairman also instructed the group that it was disrespectful to applaud or cheer. These proceedings do not allow for the speaker at the podium to answer questions from the audience. The order of the proceedings were to be that first the County Attorney would address legal matters, the Planning Manager would review the staff report, the Applicant would speak and then there would be public comment, in a certain order and time limits will be imposed. After the public comment, the Applicant will be allowed to address any comments made during that time. The Planning Commission would then close the public part of the meeting and discuss the project and give a decision.

Mr. Starr started with his comments at 6:34pm. Mr. Starr asked if anyone had any objections that the meeting moved from the fellowship hall to the sanctuary of the building. There were no objections made. Mr. Starr continued to address the Planning Commission's ability to deny a project by law. Archuleta County is a statutory county; our only power is granted by State statutes and local regulations cannot conflict with State or Federal Law. There are limitations regarding mining that are only under the State review, such as ground excavation, remediation of the mine, surface water and ground water pollution, and reclamation of the land. The fact that Archuleta County has not adopted 1041 regulations limits the County's ability to address those items. The County can address the impact of the development on the community or surrounding areas. The Commission can approve or deny an application based on specific standards in the *Archuleta County Land Use Regulations*. The Board's and the Planning Commission's primary duty is to protect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Archuleta County. Any decision

the Planning Commissioners make in respect to the health, safety and welfare of the county and citing specific sections of the Land Use Regulations can be defended. Mr. Starr continued regarding the question, could the County deny the use of public roads? If it involves protecting the health, safety and welfare of the community the County can restrict vehicle access to public roads. However, this cannot be used as the sole criteria to approve or deny a permit in a quasi-judicial setting like this.

Mr. Shepard began the staff report at 6:39 PM. C&J Gravel Products, Inc, of Durango, Colorado, represented by Nathan Barton, Wasteline, Inc., applied for a Major Sand & Gravel Permit for the proposed Two Rivers Pit, to be located on property owned by the James A. Constant Jr Revocable Trust and Leila B. Constant Revocable Trust; NW¼NE¼, S½NE¼ and NE¼SE¼ of Section 10 and N½SW¼ and S½NW¼ Section 11, T33N R2W NMPM at 12500 County Road 500 (Trujillo Rd), Pagosa Springs, CO. C&J Gravel proposes to construct and operate a sand and gravel mining and processing facility on approximately 62.6 acres of the 100 acres of the property east of the San Juan River, in accordance with Colorado Division of Reclamation Permit M-2015-004.

At a special meeting on February 10, 2016, the Archuleta County Planning Commission continued the noticed public hearing to their regular meeting on April 27, 2016. At that meeting, this hearing was opened and continued to June 8, 2016.

The *Archuleta County Land Use Regulations* Section 9.1 governs Sand, Soil and Gravel Mining. Sec. 9.1.5 provides that all sand, soil and gravel mining operations other than those qualifying for a Minor Sand and Gravel permit, are reviewed as a Conditional Use Permit (CUP, Section 3.2.3). Conditional Uses have potential for causing adverse impacts on other uses, requiring review and evaluation of their effects on surrounding properties and Archuleta County at large. Where conditions cannot be devised, or it is not possible to mitigate adverse impacts, an application shall not be approved. The Planning Commission will review this application's conformance with the *Archuleta County Land Use Regulations*, and make a recommendation to the Archuleta County Board of County Commissioners, who will make a final decision on the proposal.

Performance Standards for sand, soil or gravel mining are outlined in Section 9.1.6 of the Land Use Regulations. Mr. Shepard reviewed each section. Applicants believe the proposal complies with the requirement for compatibility (Surrounding uses are primarily agricultural, forestry, or industrial). The pit itself, while a 30-year project, will likely only have a few acres disturbed at any one time, and provide a buffer of at least 200 feet from the nearest property line and the San Juan River. However, no permanent screening has been proposed to mitigate impacts. Adjacent property owners have objected to the application as submitted.

Truck traffic is a major concern on County Road 500, including both the adequacy of the existing road network and the sufficiency of proposed mitigation. Haul routes would typically be limited to County Primary Roads (arterials and collectors) such as CR 500 and Pagosa Blvd. Existing traffic counts found 238 ADT on CR 500 at the Landfill, and 157 at the Constant ranch, in June 2014. While the application did not discuss the logistics of tracking truck movement, staff understood the operator intended to have a portable scale in place that can be used for all loaded trucks. On request of the County Engineer, a full Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) was completed by Roadrunner Engineering, LLC, on May 9, 2016. The study projected 37 Average Daily Trips (ADTs) of truck traffic, 9 passenger car/light truck trips per day, and 1 other single unit truck trip on average. Traffic would be split 72% northbound on Cascade/ Buttress/South Pagosa Blvd, 18% through the Town of Pagosa Springs, and the remaining 10% southbound on CR 500. Roadway impacts were evaluated using 18,000 equivalent single axle loading (ESAL) procedures to estimate proportionate share impacts to the roadways. The TIA estimates the Two Rivers Pit would account for 34% of traffic on CR 500, and 45% of traffic on S. Pagosa Blvd over 20 years. The Traffic Impact Assessment also analyzed accident records along the haul routes and sight distances on CR 500, proposing three locations for safety improvements.

Although the mining operation would not directly access dense residential or recreational areas, the only direct access to US Hwy 160 is through such areas, and the existing road network is limited. CR 500 is a narrow gravel road, especially south of the Landfill, and not built to accommodate heavy industrial truck traffic. Closer to Town, the current paving project on CR 500 was not designed for heavy truck traffic, nor were Town of Pagosa Springs streets. Large trucks cannot safely navigate turning movements at intersections in town, such as at S. 8th north of the high school, S. 8th at Highway 160, nor at S. Pagosa Blvd and Highway 160. The Town may be required to update their access permits with CDOT if this

proposal is approved. On the primary traffic route, restrictions on Cascade were lifted at some point, but adjacent property owners are very concerned about the existing truck traffic (especially garbage trucks and contractors going to the County Landfill), speeding, and the lack of trails for pedestrians, bikes, horses, etc. No analysis has been provided about the adequacy of the existing gravel on Cascade and Buttress, nor the pavement on S. Pagosa Blvd.

Visibility from adjacent property and the public road will be limited by the sequence of mining operations and terrain, and protected soil stockpiles. A visualization from CR 500 was provided. This may not be sufficient to screen immediately adjacent property. Applicants state that noise and vibration would not exceed the performance measures in Section 5.4.2.1, which is about 45db. This provision would apply to impacts on the immediate neighbors from site operations. Noise from truck traffic on haul routes would be subject to the more general County Noise Ordinance (#2003-8A). Monitoring these standards is the responsibility of the developer.

Section 9.1.6.2 covers Air Quality. Applicants state they would control dust on access roads, stripped areas, and excavations, and included copies of permits in their application. The County Engineer's review found that the increase in traffic from the Two Rivers Pit would exceed the current standard for application of Magnesium Chloride on County Road 500, which is one of the measures the County and Town have taken to comply with EPA standards.

Section 9.1.6.3 addresses Visual Amenities and Scenic Quality. All equipment would be temporary, and move with the phasing plan. No landscaping or buffer screening is proposed. Buffers or screening may be necessary to mitigate impacts on adjacent property. The proposed mining operation is not located near any other current operations. Section 9.1.6.4 covers Crushing, Processing, Batching and Hot Mix Operations, with only crushing proposed at this site. Two sections listed under Sec. 9.1.6.4, but apply to all of the review criteria, including the term of approval and DRMS bonds. The maximum permit term is 20 years, with a 5-year review.

A Conditional Use must also meet the development standards in Section 5, including Environmental standards, Infrastructure standards, and Site Development standards. There are also additional review criteria for a CUP in Section 3.2.3.4 to consider. Before acting on the application, the Commission must make necessary findings under Section 3.2.3.5.

On the 13th of May, Applicants made a revised offer for mitigation of impacts, which they value at approximately \$1,030,000 over 20 years, including:

- Archuleta County to receive 5,000 ton credit, material of choice, as up-front payment for 5 years of impacts to roads.
- Three (3) year contract to provide road base at \$5.00 per ton loaded or \$4.00 per ton stockpiled.
- First three (3) years C&J Gravel to pay \$0.50 per ton mitigation fee. After 3rd year, \$0.37 per ton.
- C&J to pay for and install safety lights described in the TIA, approximately \$25,000 cost.

The project was forwarded for agency reviews. The County Engineer reviewed the Traffic Impact Assessment and found it inadequate. The study did not address the paved roads and no mitigation plan for those roads. The County Building Official reviewed the Fire Safety Plan, since the site is not located in a Fire District. USDA NRCS provided comments on stockpiling topsoil, re-vegetation, and other considerations. The Army Corps of Engineers stated their jurisdiction would only apply if additional work is done on the river or wetlands. The Town of Pagosa Springs Planning Director provided several concerns with heavy truck traffic. SUIT Tribal Planning has asked for more time to review the full proposal.

Many members of the public contacted the Development Services Department since January regarding this application. Concerns of immediately neighboring property owners include compatibility of pit operations, truck traffic, and impacts on wildlife. Representatives of adjacent property owner Diamond T Ranch submitted extensive comments in objection. The majority of concerns received regarded impacts of proposed haul routes through developed subdivisions, including current substandard conditions of these roads, dust/PM air quality and traffic safety. Several members of the public provided detailed critiques of the application and supplemental materials. Support for the project was also received, citing the need for gravel and construction materials without driving from Durango, and in support of private property rights. All correspondence received was provided to the Planning Commission.

The Staff Report included recommendations and findings. If the Planning Commission concluded that, based on evidence provided the Applicants met the goals and objectives of the Land Use Regulations, then staff would recommend positive findings and 20 potential conditions of approval. If the Planning Commission concluded that, based on evidence provided the Applicants had NOT met the goals and objectives of the Land Use Regulations, then staff recommended the Planning Commission make specific findings to support that decision.

The Applicants' representatives started their presentations at 7:17PM. **Mike Olson**, 1315 Main Ave. Durango, CO, civil transportation engineer for C & J Gravel, spoke first. The owner John Gilleland, could not make it due to a medical emergency. C & J is located in Durango by the Mercy Medical Center. The company provides a good quality gravel to La Plata County and Archuleta County clients and has no violations on their record with State or Federal agencies. The gravel material at the Two Rivers pit is of good and hard quality. The next closest sources are in Durango or Arboles. This pit would reduce the cost of transporting the gravel from these other sources. **Nathan Barton**, Cortez, the mining engineer, spoke next. They submitted an application to the State Division of Mining, including an environmental statement, which address safety, soils, wildlife, water, vegetation, and impact on neighboring properties. The review by the State is a three-step process and in their case there was an additional review hearing. The project was approved through this process and now it is filed with Archuleta County. The project also went through an injunction filing with the District Court which was dismissed. C & J agrees to meet all 20 of the conditions recommended by the Planning staff and meet all the County regulations. Mr. Barton continued to show how the visual mitigation from the nearest neighbor would be met. The processing operation and stock pile of materials would be in the lower level of the pit and sheltered from view of the neighbor's property and County Rd 500. He also showed the reclamation of the project after 5 years and the continuation of the mining in additional areas. Mining will only be 2 acres at a time; the whole 60 acres will not be mined all at one time. There is water available for dust control on site through the property owner's rights, which will not affect downstream users. The setback of the project will protect water quality for downstream users as well. The access road is existing on the property and construction of the access to the County road will meet the County's road and bridge standards. They will be monitoring the trucks leaving the site and will know all the information required by the county and the routes the trucks are taking for final destinations. Mr. Starr asked **Daniel Gregory**, attorney for the Applicant, if the enlarged photo that Mr. Barton used to show the developments site was being submitted as evidence for the Planning Commission to keep? Mr. Gregory replied in the affirmative.

Mike Olsen continued the Applicants' presentation by explaining the traffic study information. Existing traffic counts were taken on March 30th in the middle of a week at 5 locations. At S. Pagosa and Highway 160, there were 1307 trips, on County Rd 500 just outside of the Town limits 452 trips, on Cascade Ave 189, and north of Cascade Ave. on CR 500 168. Approximately 90% of trips would be going northbound. 80% of the traffic would travel to S. Pagosa Blvd, 20% would travel to Apache Street in the Town and 10% would go south on CR 500. These counts were used to do equivalent calculations for the trucking of materials. Mr. Olsen estimated that 350 passenger vehicle trips equals one semi-truck loading trip. There would be 47 trips made when there is crushing going on. Once the crushing is done there would be 37 trucks trips per day which would include loading and unloading. At the pit site, County Road 500 is designated as a low-volume road. In most areas the county road is wide enough to meet the classification needed for the truck traffic. Analysis was done to through accident reports to see where problem areas were on County roads. A problem area was identified on County Rd 119 and that area will need further study. On County Rd 500 most of the reports were single car accidents related to weather or road conditions. The next evaluation was done on sight distances and reaction time required to avoid accidents. There are three curves on CR 500 which do not have sufficient sight distance. In these areas they would install warning signs in both directions that would warn motorists of oncoming traffic. The evaluation shows that the road is adequate for the truck travel as a gravel road. Further study would need to be done on the paved roads. The evaluation also included the pit's proportion of the impact to that travel route to S. Pagosa and the pit would be responsible for 45% of the impact, 4% of the impact to the travel route through the Town of Pagosa Springs which is CR 500 north of Cascade Ave. Road maintenance necessary would include 5" of aggregate on the gravel roads every 5 years and on the paved areas chip seal every 10 years. C & J is proposing just over one million dollars in a mitigation plan which is detailed in the application.

Chairman Frederick asked the Commissioners if they had any question for Mr. Olson. Hearing none, the chair opened the public portion of the meeting and directed the representative from Diamond T Ranch to start this segment.

The representatives for Diamond T Ranch started their presentation at 7:52PM. **Rob Podoll**, Greenwood Village, CO, the attorney representing Diamond T Ranch, contended that the Applicants have not shown how this industrial use fits into a residential, recreational, and agricultural area, or to provide adequate mitigation of the impacts to the area or the roads. **Devin Joslin**, Centennial, CO, transportation engineer, evaluated the traffic study information provided by the Applicants. The study shows that the mitigation measures proposed are not adequate to mitigate the impacts the traffic generated by the project will have on the roads. Three key concerns are not addressed in the Applicants' proposal. The current condition of the Town and County paved roads are not adequate to handle the volume of the truck traffic which would trigger a greater need for improvements. The Town of Pagosa Springs in its review comments state the roads have not been constructed to handle the truck traffic purposed. The intersection at S. Pagosa Blvd and Highway 160 was not addressed in the assessment, and lights and striping at this intersection may have to be modified to meet the CDOT requirements. Mr. Joslin highlighted key locations of impact not included in the Applicants' study. Guard rail is needed at mile marker 7 and 9 of County Road 500. Intersections at Cascade Ave. and CR 500, Apache and 8th Street, and Apache and CR119 need to be evaluated for passing ability of these trucks. These impacts identified should be addressed before an approval is given so the mitigation of these impacts can be added.

Dr. Erin Lehmer, 22 Kennebec Dr., Durango, biologist for Diamond T, presented information on wildlife impacted. Studies indicate that when operations like this become active, wildlife leave the area and do not return. Fish and river life will be affected by run off from the operations, in the ditch and the river, due to sediment which clouds the water. It will affect the insect populations and the fish will leave the area or die. The buildup of sediment also affects eggs laid by the fish which will reduce the fish population as well. If an area like this where hunting and fishing is a source of income for the community this kind of development can have a large impact on wildlife and economically. After Dr. Lehmer's presentation, Mr. Starr asked Mr. Podoll if the State Permit required an environmental impact study, and if so why is the County not preempted from considering this testimony. Mr. Podoll responded that the state application was in the packet and the only wildlife study that was done is Exhibit H.

John Hill, Ranch Manager for Diamond T, 3900 S Wadsworth Blvd., Lakewood, CO, stated this is a recreational area and people come out here to enjoy the peace and quiet. The home on the ranch was built in 2010. This is a residential area, not an industrial area. **Steve Harris**, Durango, CO, water engineer for the Harris Ditch and the ranch, stated there are 3 water issues. First, the drainage study states that there are two drainage ditches that exist currently. The uphill side drains in the river by the mouth of the Harris ditch and the downhill side drains in to a grassy area which will flow into the Harris ditch. This is unacceptable and there should be conditions that the drainage plan address the road drainage and it not be allowed to flow into the Harris ditch. Secondly, there is a question whether the gravel pit is going to be a "well". By definition, if the gravel pit hits water, the pit will need to get a well permit from the State. The Applicants did not do test holes to see if they would encounter water. The well on the adjacent property is only 340 feet deep and they started getting water at 120 feet. The application stated that they would be excavating down 100 feet. If they encounter water that the Applicant be required to notify the division of water resources immediately and operations are stopped until a permit is received from the State. The third issue is the legal right to, and the amount of, available water. In the application, the source of the water is vague and they will need a water court ruling on water rights. This Court application should have to be submitted and approved and in the mean time they should have a subsequent water supply available.

Mr. Podoll addressed the legality of the access. The access was part of a lawsuit for a bridge over the Harris ditch and maintenance rights along the ditch. In conclusion, Mr. Podoll pointed out that the Applicants have failed to show how this industrial use is compatible with the current uses in the area, and have not provided accurate studies to show how the use meets the land use regulations. Also, there is not adequate site mitigation for noise and dust and the traffic mitigation, and safety measures equally fall short.

Chairman Frederick asked for a representative from the Friends of the Meadows to proceed and limit it 15 minutes, then they would take a break.

The Friends of the Meadows started their presentation at 8:32PM. **Gary Waples**, 2980 Meadows Dr., stated his organization contracted with James Hawkins, an engineer, to evaluate the roads in the Meadows area. Mr. Hawkins' study of the roads showed that the roads are in poor condition and are not adequate for the proposed traffic load. The road will be destroyed and need to be reconstructed in a short amount of time. Mr. Waples submitted pictures of the roads taken by Mr. Hawkins. Reconstruction for the paved roads is estimated to be over 3 million dollars and the proposed mitigations is only a million. Chairman Frederick ask Mr. Waples to submit Mr. Hawkins' report for the record.

Beth Tollefsen 706 Buttress Ave., expressed her concern of how the traffic from the gravel pit will affect the value of their neighborhoods, quality of life and safety of people in this area. She also researched the restrictions originally accepted by the County on Cascade and County Rd 500.

Howard Strahlendorf 300 Cascade Ave. read the letter he had submitted which documented the history of the Cascade Ave agreements with the County.

At 8:56 PM Chairman Frederick announced a 10 minute break. The meeting recommenced at 9:12 PM with the announcement that each speaker would be given 3 minutes to be heard.

JR Ford, 452 Pagosa Street, stated that, in 1991, Cascade Ave was an easement agreement between land owners and the County, and at the time there was a limit on the weight of commercial vehicles and an agreement to maintain the road. There were signs with those limits and restrictions until 6-7 years ago they were removed. He and a group of property owners have been working with the County for several years to straighten out some the most dangerous curves on County Road 500 but much more is needed. It is unsafe for those large commercial trucks to be traveling up and down County Rd. 500 with only a few warning signs.

Jean Strahlendorf, 300 Cascade Ave, addressed road issues. She recalled that the limit was 15,000 lbs. Dust and noise caused by commercial trucks on gravel roads in the area already cause health issues because they stir up more than just dirt, it also makes airborne metals and fumes from the trucks. The noise levels are twice what the County Noise ordinance allows.

Barbara Kennedy, 605 Cool Pines Dr., representing the Colorado Timber Ridge HOA and members, would like to know how the truck routes are going to be monitored and how the County is going to keep the trucks off Bristlecone. Her HOA has its own metro district and they pay to have their roads in Colorado Timber Ridge Subdivision paved and maintained. Kennedy submitted a report from their road engineer stating the roads can't handle these loads. The HOA and its members can't afford replacing the roads sooner than scheduled. In some areas the grade on their roads is 5-10% and have tight curves. Large trucks cannot make these turns and should not be traveling on their privately maintained roads.

Joe Lister Jr., 626 S. Florida, stated that C & J have historically given back to the community they serve and have worked to solve problems in the community. The roads are an issue the community needs to solve.

Rodney Hubbard, 63 Antero Dr., stated the EPA report shows we fail to meet the air quality standards now. There is need to look at the impact these trucks will have on the area. The environmental assessment that the applicant submitted to the State was not a complete environmental study.

Mark Espoy, 1905 S. Pagosa Blvd., stated the Applicants were not taking in consideration the wear on the paved roads and did not address that in their mitigation measures.

Beverly Cuyler, 2017 S. Pagosa Blvd., stated she loves walking, riding bicycles and running in her neighborhood. With these trucks running up and down, the road will no longer be safe for people or the wildlife that crosses the road.

Paul Grave, 154 Pebble Cir, stated we need the gravel to continue economic growth for our County.

George Dougherty, 191 Columbia Ct., stated that gravel trucks and trash trucks damage the roads much more then cars do. There needs to be a greater detail to the mitigation of the road wear so the taxpayer is not footing the bill for their business.

Larry Hefling, 41 Pacifica and Meadows Dr., stated the trucks and traffic on the road today don't follow the speed limits. Adding more trucks will only make it more unsafe for automobile drivers and wildlife on the road.

At 9:48 PM, Chairman Frederick closed Public Comment. Mr. Starr reiterated that wildlife issues were under the State's purview not the County's, except as they relate to the character and nature of the neighborhood. Water-related issues were also under the State's jurisdiction. Wastewater is an issue in our criteria which should be taken into consideration.

The Applicants' representative started his rebuttal at 9:50 PM. Mike Olsen spoke to traffic. The routes shown follow best management practices consolidating traffic. The routes follow where demand is. They did look at intersections with state highways, but the additional traffic would not trigger CDOT access review requirements, although they would be willing to look at those in more detail. Looking at impacts, currently impacts are generated in Durango so La Plata County receives the benefits rather than Archuleta County. Mitigation offered is a suggestion to address concerns raised by the County.

Daniel Gregory of Durango, attorney for the Applicants, addressed the criteria as described by the County Attorney and Planning Manager. Information has been submitted by experts on both sides to the County, the State and to the courts. The State and the Court rejected the opposition arguments. The State order covered geologic, hydrologic and environmental concerns and the state approved the mitigation plans for these concerns. Mr. Gregory described results of the Court order, which was provided to the Planning Commission. Further, nothing is wrong with the bridge and the access. The issue here is the standards under the land use code, and whether or not this particular application has an incremental impact that would violate those standards. C&J Gravel has been in business for 38 years, and there is no evidence of any violations at a State level or local level. C & J is a good community member, has found a good source of gravel the community needs, and has accepted all 20 conditions the staff has recommended for this application's approval.

At 10:05 PM, Chairman Frederick closed the public meeting and requested a motion from the Commissioners and discussion.

Commissioner Hooton made a motion to recommend disapproval of the Two Rivers Pit Major Sand & Gravel Permit, with the findings that the Applicant has not met the Land Use Performance Standards by not providing mitigation that adequately addresses the impact on the roads, and the nature of the community, that is required in Sec. 9.1.6.1(1) and 9.1.6.1(2). Commissioner Parker seconded, and discussion commenced.

Chairman Frederick commented that he agreed that the major issue was the traffic impact. The road system that has developed is insufficient to support this gravel pit to access the arterial road system. Trujillo Road dead ends in residential streets. We should not be sending this traffic down streets designed as residential roads, in the Town or in the unincorporated area of the County.

Commissioner Shahan expressed concern with large commercial vehicles traveling through the downtown area.

Chairman Frederick called for the vote. Motion to recommend disapproval passed unanimously (5-0).

Reports and Announcements:

None.

Next Meeting:

Regular Meeting on June 22, 2016 at the Administration Offices.

Adjourn: Commissioner Shahan moved to adjourn the meeting, Commissioner Adams seconded. Meeting adjourned at 10:11PM.

Approved this 27 day of July , 2016



Sherrie Vick
Planning Technician



Michael Frederick
Chairman

