

Notes from July 12, 2010 Central Plains Community Plan Update Meeting – Apex  
Recreation Center

**AIR, ODOR & NOISE**

- Q: #5 – is that suggesting that county should consider additional monitoring?
  - o A: Plan was adopted 21 years ago, has more than land use recommendations.
  - o A: Should be more tied to what county can do, not at the State level, but talked to health department and are going to follow up on who is monitoring.
  
- Q: What is the ultimate goal of this process?
  - o A: Take policy sheets home to review, look at policies and what staff recommends, look at CMP, and return any comments if you do not agree.
  - o A: 4 policy meetings scheduled, specific land use meetings to follow.
  
- Q: #5 – can you provide information to us that it is not necessary anymore? For example in the case of a disturbance of land.
  - o A: We are in contact with Health Department and will follow up on this.
    - C: Might be helpful to go back to original maps, State might have these.
  - o Q: Will you talk to County Health dept or state?
    - A: Start local at the County-level, and work up to State-level.
  
- Q: I like the forum, but question on Industrial emissions – aren't they all chemical fumes? Coal and oil burning are chemical also, why would that change be made?
  - o A: #8 talked about coal and oil, #6 industrial & chemical – thought was to combine into one policy. This may be example of which to combine or leave separate.
  
- Q: What is chain of command? Other jurisdictions –
  - o A: Will check with Zoning Admin and other jurisdictions.
    - C: Fumes at residence.
    - C: Possibly go to jurisdiction of where source is from, will follow up.
      - A: Explore policy of working with neighboring jurisdictions.
  - o C: Sewage treatment plant 44<sup>th</sup> – we made contacts with golden & coors, response was you will still have fumes, since there is a limit of what they can do.
  - o C: County should be encouraged to work with other jurisdictions, so not only up to property owners.
  
- Q: Why are #6 & #8 separate?

- A: Will check into this.
    - C: Policies only talk about industrial emissions – residential, commercial, office, etc... also have emissions.
- Q: Page references missing, please include page #'s on future matrix?
  - A: Will include this on future documents – but all text is included, nothing was skipped on policy sheets. Page numbers might be different on pdf and web.
- Q: 10 – coordinated air quality – didn't really say what study was for? Wouldn't bring it up if you don't have a specific purpose. Might not be relevant for area now. Base line or target?
  - C: There were some other industrial uses along 72 and Fairmount that were contributing. Vehicle miles have increased as well.
- Q: Noise – 44<sup>th</sup>/McIntyre we need to have certain amount of protections.
  - A: Noise standards are in LDR and zoning resolution.
- Q: Also sewage treatment on 44<sup>th</sup> – bad odor
  - A: That is more existing conditions versus future land use.
- C: Trains that go across southern end of Fairmount very noisy. Excessive horns,
- C: There are things that can be done and could be put into plan – RTD example, no horn areas – as far as odor issue – if known existing problem, it still could be listed in plan. There are many mitigation efforts that can be done. Master plan can identify areas that are zoned incorrectly, even if half built out – should be something else, and county has right to down-zone if it needs to be fixed. Think a plan should have a pretty big vision.
- Q: #2 – some reason that needs to be omitted?
  - A: Current thought was that if it is something that the State does, the County doesn't have control – but it still can be included in the plan.
    - C: in housing section – odor issues in Fairmount area – more horses than there were people. Housing section reference this. Way odor is determined, State has large number of staff – educated noses – trained to identify.
      - C: Complaints from chemical from Coors tech center, not horses.
- C: Try to achieve is some point of balance – train noises – some like – some don't. Example of houses on RR line, were first houses to sell, so there should be some balance.
- C: 44<sup>th</sup> smell – Sometimes if you complain, by time inspector comes out – coors turns something off and odor is less. Specifically when you call county or golden, next thing that happens is that coors calls and apologizes.
- Q: 7d – page 2 – no mention of equestrian.
  - A: Believe equestrian is covered in recreation section, we'll search CMP and follow up.

- C: Heather found – Open Space Trails policy in CMP.
- C: Helpful to put recommendation – height of buttons should be high and low for peds & horses.
  - o C: Fairmount meeting – they were supposed to do that at McIntyre and 54<sup>th</sup>? & 52<sup>nd</sup>.
    - C: There is no way to cross there.
      - A: We will address this in equestrian meetings.

## **HISTORIC & ARCHAEOLOGIC RESOURCES**

- Q: Why are we talking about modifying community plan and CMP – does this go back out for public review?
  - o A: 3 plans being updated now, all of these amendments and modifications will be done at the time of Central Plains process. Coordinating between 3 plans and agreeing on language. Process when Central Plains goes before PC we'll request all modifications be handled at the same time. We will be able to modify and add future language after that.
- (No other questions)

## **WILDLIFE & NATIVE VEGETATION**

- Q: What is a request for a wildlife exhibit?
  - o A: Something similar to Lookout Mountain Nature Center. Educationally important. We will try and reword and examine to see if it is needed.
    - Q: If someone wants to develop, can citizens say we want wildlife exhibit?
      - A: No, that is not the intent of the language.
- Russ comment – fyi - we could use keypad response system for these meetings if people are interested in. Let Russ know.
- Q: Are you intending to have a glossary?
  - o A: Yes, and we will include biome.
- C: Appendix – some of it is unique to the area, has to be identified. Falcon example – needs to be addressed from plan to plan. If you put into appendix it has to be unique to separate plan.
  - o A: We have Colorado Wildlife data and will be shown on map. Maps can be updated without a full adoption of plan.
    - C: Falcon data is not included in data, so this still should be referenced.
      - A: Yes, anyone that has local info, please let us know.
- Q: Connection between protecting wildlife habitat and identified on map – who checks – monitors this? Do you check with CDOW?

- A: When someone comes in to rezone, there are standard referrals to CDOW and other agencies, like the State Historical Commission.
- Q: Reasoning in putting in such specific of a policy when no one is concerned about it versus some other general policies? Why not more specific language in other policies?
  - A: If policy was in existing plan, we tried to preserve it.
  - A: Certain goals have details under objectives, then there are policies under that. On this sheet it is just comparing goals to goals – really there are a lot more detailed policies, would have been a longer document.
  - A: Latest maps from CDOW will be included.

## **VISUAL RESOURCES**

- Q: Is there a map that shows Visual Resource area that need to be protected?
  - A: Not yet, but there will be.
- Q: Water towers are not mentioned for example #7 – would seem that water towers should be included?
  - A: Heather found in CMP– water section – says design and sight of water towers....etc..
    - Q: Could language be put in more than one chapter?
    - A: Yes, could be reworded and added, but trying to keep document size down and not duplicate policies.
- C: Arvada engineering division – threatened a large water tower along 93.
  - A: Next 3 meetings will be general policies – specific meetings will be after that, will get schedule out.
    - C: Suggestion – maybe next Fairmount meeting could have this as a topic.
      - C: That is being done.
- C: Russ: Keypad response? Please let us know.

THANKS FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!!!!!!