



Summary of Verbal and Written Comments Received until September 8th at 5:00 p.m.

Compiled September 13, 2010 and Revised October 28, 2010

Chapter 1, Introduction							
	Date	Name	Page	Comment Summary	Requested Action	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Action
1	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	14	Desire more explanation about the connection between this document, the zoning code, the allowance for 35-acre parcels and the county's subdivision review process and related requirements	Provide more explanation	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language.</i> The critical relationship between zoning and the CP in Garfield County is described. In the interest of brevity, the CP does not describe the subdivision process and its exemption of 35 acre parcels, which are governed by separate documents.	Retain Current Plan Language
2	21-Jul	GSAR	15	Issues Identified by County residents, Private property rights	Revise Text: Owners of large land tracts are often the chief and most important stewards of the lands in the unincorporated areas of the County and it should be the goal of the Comprehensive Plan to preserve and enhance property values and to secure those rights for individual property owners in a way that does not decrease property values	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language</i> It is a stated goal of the CP to recognize property rights (not just of large landowners). It is also a goal for the County to grow cost-effectively and to preserve rural character. In the long run these goals all work together.	Retain Current Plan Language
3	17-Aug	Kathleen Strang	10	Plan needs teeth	Make Mandatory	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language</i> That land use decisions be consistent with the CP is a requirement of the Unified Land Use Code. It must be changed there. The CP cannot act effectively as a "guiding" document unless it has "some teeth", if it cannot be changed on a whim. On the other hand, there is significant flexibility in how the CP is applied, and it can be amended as often as necessary--just with adequate notification (not in the same meeting as a decision which it impacts) and comprehensive consideration of the implications of change. What constitutes "compliance" or "consistency" with the CP has always been, and will continue to be a subjective judgement by elected and appointed officials. This CP update builds on previous editions by adding criteria and policies to help guide, and bring greater consistency to, land use decisions.	Retain Current Plan Language
4	16-Aug	Michael Larime	10	Plan needs the force of law, be binding for BOCC	Make Mandatory		
5	21-Jul	GSAR	10	Re: zoning vs. the CP: document should be advisory, rather than a mandatory, regulatory plan	Revise Text: The Garfield County Comprehensive Plan shall serve as a guiding document when making land use decisions and shall not be regulatory in nature. Any inconsistencies or lack of continuity in the Comprehensive Plan shall be resolved according to the fundamental		
6	13-Aug	GSAR	10	Desires clarification on nature of the plan (advisory vs. mandatory) would an application have to be 100%	Clarify Advisory vs. Mandatory		
7	16-Aug	Tom Jankovsky	10	Communities should have advisory plans	Modify ULUR to remove adherence requirements		
8	17-Aug	Ken Williams	10	Concerned that an application may need to be 100%	Clarify what "compliance" with the plan means		
9	18-Aug	Patrick Fitzgerald	10	Don't stifle creativity by making the plan mandatory	Do not make plan mandatory		
10	18-Aug	Larry Green	10	Supports the need to comply with the comprehensive plan	Require compliance with the plan		
11	18-Aug	Clark Anderson	10	Public indicated they wanted a document that was conformed to	Require conformity with the plan		
12	8-Sep	Town of Silt		Plan language weakens the town-centered growth approach by using "encourage" and "consider"	Use more affirmative language		
13	8-Sep	New Castle	19, 36	Wording in plan too flexible such as "should" (page 19) and considered (page 19) and encourage (page 36)	Modify Text to make wording stronger and easier to implement		

Chapter 2, Land Use and Future Land Use Map

	Date	Name	Page	Comment Summary	Requested Action	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Action
1	21-Jul	Roger Neal	Map	Colors for Res M and Res MH are difficult to read	Change colors for Res M and Res MH	<i>Recommendation: change colors and patterns for greater clarity.</i>	Change colors and patterns for greater clarity on map and land use table in Chapter 2
2	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	Map	Hard to differentiate colors between Res MH and H	Change colors		
3	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	Map	Hard to differentiate colors between Conservation Easements and floodplain	Use different pattern		
4	21-Jul	GSAR	17	Future Land Use, Overall Vision	Revise Text: Garfield County is dedicated to encouraging growth while managing and directing growth whenever possible , to the dedicated Urban Growth Areas to create thriving communities while promoting a diverse, sustainable and healthy economy throughout Garfield County , protecting wildlife, preserving the quality of our natural environment, and preserving the county's rural and western heritage	<i>Recommendation: revise text as follows</i> Garfield County is dedicated to managing and directing growth to dedicated Urban Growth Areas and other areas that can accomodate growth cost-effectively, in order to create thriving communities while promoting a diverse, sustainable and healthy economy , protecting wildlife, maintaining or improving the quality of our natural environment, and preserving the county's rural and western heritage.	Revise Text: Garfield County is dedicated to managing and directing growth to dedicated Urban Growth Areas and other areas that can accomodate growth cost-effectively, in order to create thriving communities while promoting a diverse, sustainable and healthy economy, protecting wildlife, maintaining or improving the quality of our natural environment, and preserving the county's rural and western heritage.
5	21-Jul	GSAR	20	Growth of new major residential subdivisions, Modify	Revise Text: Review of the fiscal costs vs. economic benefits to the public....	<i>Recommendation: revise text as follows</i> Review of the fiscal costs vs. fiscal benefits to the public....	Revise Text: Review of the fiscal costs vs. fiscal benefits to the public....
6	8-Sep	Town of Silt	19, 20	Plan should require mitigation of "fiscal costs to the public." Change references to fiscal impacts to "fiscal costs to the public will be mitigated to ensure that new development, at a minimum pays all of its costs"	Change Text: "fiscal costs to the public will be mitigated to ensure that new development, at a minimum, pays all of its costs"		
7	8-Sep	New Castle	19	Plan allows for fiscal cost only to be "considered" This is not in the best interest of garfield county residents as it allows for deficit generating land uses to be permitted	Plan should prevent futher fiscal impacts to county residents by development that does not pay its own way		
8	21-Jul	GSAR	21	Change in residential densities: do not modify	Revise Text: the Roaring Fork and Colorado River Valley areas are different in many ways and therefore should remain as distinct sub areas as is now the case. Constraints in one area should not take opportunity away from the other area, nor should one area be expected to mitigate for trends in the other area	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language.</i> The CP proposes to use the same land use categories throughout the County, but DOES treat the two areas differently in the application of land uses.	Retain Current Plan Language
9	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs		Reserve "maintain rural character" for western half of county or eliminate entirely <i>unless</i> there is a concerted effort to incentivize the protection of ag lands and ag production. Currently disingenious language	Remove currently disingenious language	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language.</i> The CP strongly encourages the protection of agricultural lands throughout the County. Some tools to accomplish this will be more effective depending on the value of the land.	Retain Current Plan Language
10	21-Jul	GSAR	25	Incentives should be implemented by the Comprehensive Plan in a way that allows property owners to use their land to its highest potential without diminishing its value	Incentives should be implemented by Plan	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language.</i> The plan does use incentives to find the balance between retaining rural character at 1 dwelling unit /6 acres, and allowing a property owner to achieve the previously allowed 1 du/2 acres through clustering and preserving open land. If the base density were 1 du per 2 acres, there wouldn't be enough incentive to achieve any clustering, and the result, over a large area, would not be retention of rural character. The value of the resulting lots, and their marketability, will be determined by a variety of factors, including: views, buildability, adequate potable water, distance to a town, proximity to open space, character of surrounding uses, gas prices, market volatility, etc.	Retain Current Plan Language
11	21-Jul	GSAR	25	The use of clustering should be an incentive and not be tied to a change in the base density for the unincorporated areas of the County	Do not require clustering to achieve higher densities *repeated in Aug 13 memo		
12	21-Jul	GSAR	21	Existing densities for outlying residential (1 du per 2 acres) should remain	Revise Text: Res MH (previous Outlying Residential) should allow a density of 1 du per 2 acres		
13	17-Aug	Kathleen Strang	21	Incentivize avoiding sprawl and saving agricultural land and	No Action Requested		
14	16-Aug	Ken Williams	21	Retain 1 du per 2 acres current land use designations, supports cluster development but not sure if it is market supported	Retain 1 du per 2 acres current land use designations		
15	16-Aug	Mike Blaine	21	Supports 1 du per 2 to <6 acres	No Action Requested		
16	18-Aug	Jack Pretti	21	Do not support incentivizing clustering as proposed	Retain 1 du per 2 acres current land use designations		

17	18-Aug	Patrick Fitzgerald	21	Does not believe that clustered subdivisions sell well	Do not require clustering		
18	18-Aug	Patrick Fitzgerald	21	asks that the terrain decide density, not the plan	Retain 1 du per 2 acres current land use designations	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language</i> This would suggest that flatter terrain have higher density than hillsides, which is generally true, but doesn't relate to retaining rural character and cost-effective growth.	Retain Current Plan Language
19	18-Aug	Mike Blair	Map	2 acre lots are too large in urban areas	Do not allow 2 acre lot subdivisions within urban growth areas	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan language.</i> The options for clustering are shown on page 21. Within the UGA, another clustering option is available--referred to as the Urban Residential Reserve--where clustering allows the land owner to reserve land for future urban development.	Retain Current Plan Language
20	18-Aug	David Harris	21	Confused about URR	Define/Clarify Urban Residential Reserve		
21	8-Sep	New Castle	Map	R-MH is inconsistent with New Castle planning. New Castle planned for 1 du per 10 acres as Rural Low Density within some areas of its plan	Modify map to make consistent with New Castle Plan	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language and map designation</i> Upon adoption of an IGA, within the UGB's the map	Retain Current Plan Language
22	17-Aug	Dick Morgan	Map	Prime agriculture land should not be designated for subdivisions. Too many unbuilt subdivided lots already.	Designate land use in agriculture areas (Silt Mesa, south of Silt) as a density of 1 du per 35 acres	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan map</i> Strong resistance to this idea was expressed by some individuals during this process.	Retain Current Plan Map
23	16-Aug	David Harris	Map	Growth should happen in and around municipalities unless there is a very clear public benefit. People want open space next to their communities	No Action Requested	---	---
24	8-Sep	Rocky Shepard	19, 20	Language should be added under Town Centers and Neighborhood Centers acknowledging that such centers exist and are desirable in unincorporated communities, confusing as to whether a plan amendment will be required to add a center to a development	Add Text: acknowledge Town and Neighborhood Centers exist and are desirable in unincorporated communities	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan language, refer to line 34 for additional explanation</i>	Retain Current Plan Language
25	8-Sep	Rocky Shepard	27	Remove density limitation of 5 du/acre and determined by underlying land use designation, from Town Centers and Neighborhood centers	Remove density limitation from Town and Neighborhood Centers	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan language, refer to line 34 for additional explanation</i>	Retain Current Plan Language
26	8-Sep	Rocky Shepard	28	Modify description language for unincorporated communities	Modify Text: Existing, large, self-contained subdivisions or development areas that contain town and neighborhood centers primarily to serve their own populations but also to provide commercial uses that complement and support	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan language, refer to line 34 for additional explanation</i>	Retain Current Plan Language
27	8-Sep	Rocky Shepard	28	Reconsider density limitation for unincorporated communities	Remove "determined by underlying land use designation" density from unincorporated communities	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan language, refer to line 34 for additional explanation</i>	Retain Current Plan Language
28	8-Sep	Rocky Shepard	23-30	PUD zone district is compatible with all land use designations	Add PUD Zone District to be compatible with all Land use Designations	<i>Recommendation: Add PUD zone district to all land use designations.</i> It is reasonable to think that a commercial, industrial or residential subdivision may be a PUD	Revise Text: Add PUD zone district to all land use designations.
29	8-Sep	Rocky Shepard	19	How would the contracting mechanism work to contract for police services from county sheriff?	Clarify	One appropriate model for a contracting mechanism may be the current agreement between Battlement Mesa and	Retain Current Plan Language
30	8-Sep	Rocky Shepard		Internal commercial is primarily for the convenience of area residents, to minimize competition with other commercial areas	Clarify	Refer to Line 6, in Chapter 3, Section 4	Retain Current Plan Language
31	8-Sep	New Castle	19	Allowance of unincorporated communities and growth near special district services seriously undermines the public input received	Remove unincorporated communities	<i>Recommendation: Retain Current Plan Language.</i> Refer to Chapter 2, line 34, below	Retain Current Plan Language

32	8-Sep	New Castle	19, 21	Recommends that special district or metro districts only be considered in rare circumstances and only after other options with municipal governments are determined unfeasible after an objective review process. The plan should include standards for making this determination that includes public input	Remove allowance for special/metro district (and HOA) provision of services. Plan should include standards for the rare circumstances that these may be allowed	<i>Recommendation: Staff agrees with this language, but believes the specific policy should be determined in the proposed IGAs. Add Policy: Special district or metro districts should only be considered in rare circumstances and only after other options with municipal governments are determined unfeasible after an objective review process.</i>	Revise Policy Chapter 3, Section 7:central water/sewer systems. Special district or metro districts should only be considered in rare circumstances and only after other options with municipal governments are determined unfeasible after an objective review process.
33	8-Sep	New Castle	46	Goal #2, replace the word "discourage"	Modify Text: The County will direct commercial development to the incorporated areas of the County where sales tax benefits can be derived for both the town and the county	Refer to Line 6, in Chapter 3, Section 4	Retain Current Plan Language
34	21-Jul	Tresi Houpt	Map	Concerned with designation of Cattle Creek Area	Work with Glenwood and Carbondale to plan this growth Area	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan language and map designation.</i>	Retain Current Plan Language and Map
35	3-Aug	David Harris	Map	Limit use of Res H for land use types	Eliminate Res H in areas outside of Urban Growth Areas e.g Cattle Creek	The CP identifies only three unincorporated communities, based on unique existing conditions, and discourages any others.	
36	16-Aug	Town of Carbondale	Map	Area between Glenwood and Carbondale need to be jointly planned through IGA; Chapter 3, Section 1	Create an IGA between Glenwood, Carbondale and County to jointly plan for Roaring Fork Valley between these two municipalities	Much of the Cattle Creek area (approx. 280 acres) has been designated High Density since the 2000 CP and it has extensive existing development, nearby infrastructure and services, and convenient access to transit. These are strong reasons in support of it being an appropriate location for future urban development.	
37	16-Aug	Town of Carbondale	Map, 19	Unincorporated community indicates "existing" large, self-contained Subdivisions. Cattle Creek area should be revised on Map to be consistent with this statement and include only existing areas of development	Change Map to show Unincorporated Community boundary at Cattle Creek only surrounding existing development		
38	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	Map	Area between Carbondale and GWS needs to be jointly planned via IGA	Implement mechanism to jointly plan for area between Carbondale and Glenwood Springs	At the same time, there are potential negative impacts with any additional development in this location: increased traffic, impacts on wildlife corridors, filling in currently open views from the highway, and increased urbanization that would have to be managed by a metro district which is generally not ideal. These impacts will have to be balanced against the possible benefits of housing closer to work destinations. Care must be taken to assure that this doesn't become a major retail center competing with nearby municipalities.	
39	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	19, 20	Concerned that plan discourages urban densities outside of growth boundaries but allows for varying residential and commercial develop to concentrate in nodes outside these growth areas. Especially concerned with Sunlight and Cattle Creek area	No Action Requested		
40	10-Aug	Pitkin County BOCC	Map, 19	Preclude new, or expansion of, existing Unincorporated communities that have broad regional impacts on everything from roads to school to social services to housing	Remove Growth in unincorporated communities, Map, Remove Unincorporated Community boundaries	What are the other options to an RH designation? (1) Purchasing the property for open space would best accomplish the wishes of those that want to preserve the open feeling of the corridor; (2) Designation of RMH would allow 35 6-acre lots, an estate density that would still not preserve the current open character, and would not take advantage of the existing infrastructure or contribute to housing goals. The highest end of the RMH range would allow 100 units clustered on 70 acres, but would leave approximately 140 open. The lowest density in RMH would allow somewhat rural character; (3) If the County were to adopt a TDR program, this area could be a sending or receiving site that would lessen development in other areas or decrease development in this area, depending upon the	
41	16-Aug	Martha Cochran	Map	Intensity of development in the Cattle Creek area is not appropriate and not reflective of what the public desired in this area; community buffers	Remove unincorporated community status from the Cattle Creek area		
42	8-Sep	Anonymous	Map	Remove "unincorporate community" designation from Cattle Creek/Bair Chase/Sanders Ranch property and administer a rural land use designation	Remove unincorporated community from Cattle Creek area; Designate R-L or R-M in this area		
43	8-Sep	Carbondale/Glenwood	19, Map	Revise boundaries of the "unincorporated community" in the vicinity of Sunlight and Cattle Creek to reflect only the existing developments			
44	8-Sep	Carbondale/Glenwood	22	Acknowledge the potential impacts of future development at Cattle Creek and Sunlight by including the recommended text:	Add Goal: Enter into an IGA or other mechanism, with the Town of Carbondale and Glenwood Springs to jointly plan for the future development of the Cattle Creek Area.		

45	8-Sep	Carbondale/Glenwood	22	Acknowledge the potential impacts of future development at Cattle Creek and Sunlight by including the recommended text:	Add Strategy: Work with the Town of Carbondale and City of Glenwood Springs to create a sub-area plan for the Cattle Creek area. The plan shall include analysis of the impacts to, among other things, environment/habitat, existing road networks, area schools, police, fire and utilities. The plan shall also address the appropriate mix of housing for all income groups, the mix of commercial development intended to serve the area, the amount of open/space and type of recreational amenities	priority of the County. The County welcomes participation in a constructive search for ways to utilize this site to meet the broad direction of the CP to cluster development near existing locations that have or can cost-effectively provide infrastructure and services.	
46	8-Sep	Carbondale/Glenwood	22	Acknowledge the potential impacts of future development at Cattle Creek and Sunlight by including the recommended text:	Add Strategy: Work with the City of Glenwood Springs to create a sub-area plan for the Sunlight area. The plan shall include analyses of the impacts to, among other things, environment/habitat, existing road networks/ area schools, police, fire and utilities. The plan shall also address the appropriate mix of housing for all income groups.		
47	8-Sep	Martha Cochran	Map	Unincorporated Community designation is not appropriate for Cattle Creek	Remove Unincorporated Community designation from Cattle Creek		
48	8-Sep	Rocky Shepard	Map	Believes the unincorporated community boundary is appropriate for the Carbondale Investment property aka Cattle Creek	Retain Unincorporated Community boundary for cattle creek		
49	8-Sep	Rocky Shepard	Map	Notes that new plan has a maximum density assigned to residential designations	Change designation of cattle creek property to mixed use, excluding conservation easement that should be PL/OS		
50	8-Sep	Rocky Shepard	Map	Map does not show 54 acre conservation easement	Correct map to show 54 acre conservation easement	<i>Recommendation: Correct Map Error</i>	Correct Map Error
51	8-Sep	Rocky Shepard	Map	Map does not show cattle creek property included within the Roaring Fork Water and Sanitation district	Correct map to show Cattle Creek property in a water/sewer service area	<i>Recommendation: Check with Roaring Fork Water and Sanitation District in regards to district boundaries. This property is not included in county data.</i>	Retain Current Plan Map
52	8-Sep	Carbondale/Glenwood	22	Acknowledge the potential impacts of future development at Cattle Creek and Sunlight by including the recommended text.	Add Goal: Enter into an IGA or mechanism, with the City of Glenwood Springs to plan for the future development of the Sunlight Area	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan map.</i> The CP identifies only three unincorporated communities, based on unique existing conditions, and discourages any others. The County welcomes participation in a constructive search for ways to utilize this site to meet the broad direction of the CP to cluster development near existing locations that have or can cost-effectively provide infrastructure and services.	Retain Current Plan Map
53	8-Sep	Martha Cochran	Map	Unincorporated Community designation is not appropriate	Remove Unincorporated Community from Sunlight		
54	8-Sep	Doug Pratte	general	Aware of Carbondale and Glenwood's Letter about Sunlight.	Request that Sunlight continue to be involved in any additional CP discussion related to the future land uses at the resort.		
55	21-Jul	Roger Neal	Map	Consider his property at same density as Sunlight due to proximity and ability to develop	Change property of 19 acres from Res L to Res H or Res MH as a "transitional density" * also submitted on August 24 with additional information	<i>Recommendation: Change designation to RMH as transitional density</i> This reflects a minor adjustment in the plan but maintains its overall intent while recognizing the continuity of the adjacent property.	Change Map Designation to R-MH

56	18-Aug	Robert Burry	Map	Change property to reflect Res MH instead of Res M based on plan policies	Change Map to show 120 acres as Res MH (2 to <6)	<i>Recommendation: consider the following options: (1) Change designation to RMH to be consistent with surrounding properties or (2) retain current map designation</i> This property is currently designated RM (1 du/6-10) and zoned Rural (min lot size 2 ac). North of the site, separated by a narrow strip of land, is Cattle Creek designated RH. South of the property is Aspen Glen subdivision, designated RM. (Aspen Glen is currently perceived as low density development, but is actually comprised of 1/2 acre to 2 acre lots, but is only 1/3 built out, and thus appears more open than it will eventually be.) The undeveloped portion of Cattle Creek and the Burry property together constitute the perceived open land along Hwy 82.	Change Map Designation to R-MH
57	27-Jul	Mary Geiger	Map	Need to correct to Mitchell Creek City UGB	Change UGB around Mitchell Creek Area	<i>Recommendation: Correct UGBoundary</i>	Correct Map Error
58	7-Sep	Dallas Gillespie	Map	Designate property along Mitchell Creek Road (toward hwy 6 and 24) to match the city's density along Donegan Road (this allows a mix of housing types on small lots). Owner would like to subdivide existing SF unit into a townhome/duplex	Requests property to reflect City's zoning	This property falls within the UGB for the City of Glenwood Springs. The assessor information for this lot indicates 2 dwelling units located on .46 acres. This land use (at 4 du per 1 acre) exceeds the highest density designation that the county maintains	Retain Current Plan Map
59	4-Aug	Russell Talbot	21	Concerned with Clustering and ISDS restrictions	No Action Requested	Clustering may result in lots that are smaller than Health Dept. requirements for individual sewer systems (septic). In this case, it is envisioned that easements could be extended onto portions of the retained open property to achieve the required area.	Retain Current Plan Map
60	15-Aug	William Zilm	Map	Change property to reflect Res 1996-01 Plan Amendment	Change Map to show Res H on property per Res 1996-01	<i>Recommendation: Correct the designation</i>	Correct Map Error
61	16-Aug	Mark Chain	Map	Change property to reflect Res 2008-04 Plan Amendment	Change Map to show Res Medium instead of Res Low for Fronning Family Properties of 31 acres	<i>Recommendation: Correct the designation</i>	Correct Map Error
62	16-Aug	Robert Burry	Map	Change overlay for conservation on his property to reflect actual easement	Correct easement boundaries	<i>Recommendation: Correct the easement boundary</i>	Correct Map Error
63	17-Aug	Steven/Chris Miller	Map	Change "Sweetwater" property from Res L to Res H	Change Map to show Sweetwater Resort Property of 488 acres to RH	<i>Recommendation: Consider the following options (1) Change the designation to R-MH; or (2) retain current map designation</i> There currently exists a 70 lot subdivison at Sweetwater property. There was little to no input on this property during the CP process, and therefore no public input received. However, it is clear that a major development would require significant upgrade to infrastructure and access. As the plan attempts to identify areas which would be appropriate for future development, this area may support future development contingent upon infrastructure and service improvements.	Retain Current Plan Map Designation; Add Neighborhood Center
64	16-Aug	Micheal Sawyer	Map	Change designation on east side of Seaton property from Res L to Res MH	Change Map to show east portion of Seaton Property as Res MH	<i>Recommendation: Change designation to RMH based on adjacency to R-MH on the north and east of the property as well as access to central sewer.</i>	Change Map Designation to R-MH
65	16-Aug	Town of Carbondale	Map	Change UGA on FLUM to reflect Carbondale Potential Annexation Areas	Change Map to show Carbondale, Potential Annexation Areas	<i>Recommendation: Correct UGA boundary for Carbondale</i>	Correct Map Error

66	16-Aug	Michael Larime	18	Supports growth near existing centers and maximizing open space	No Action Requested	<i>Recommendation: Retain current language and map designation</i>	Retain Current Plan Language and Map
67	10-Aug	Pitkin County BOCC	Map	Concerned that densities identified on FLUM will lead to a sprawling land use pattern rather than providing a buffer for less dense and open rural lands and a distinction between communities	Remove urban or suburban (Res H, Res MH and Res M) in rural unincorporated areas outside of urban growth boundaries, Change to Res L or RPN	While the strongest direction of the CP is to direct growth to existing municipalities, the plan also recognizes that there will continue to be a demand for various forms of rural living. The Neighborhood Centers and Rural Employment Centers are intended to recognize existing patterns that provide for convenience needs and provide locations for industrial facilities that need to be closer to the uses they serve. If these services can not be centralized, they would proliferate and further erode rural character.	
68	10-Aug	Pitkin County BOCC	20	Preclude the development of new, major residential subdivisions by significantly reducing allowed densities in the unincorporated areas outside of existing subdivisions and UGBs	Remove Growth of New Major Residential Subdivisions		
69	10-Aug	Pitkin County BOCC	Map, 19	Growth in Designated centers is contrary to the plan vision of directing development to commercial centers and services within urban growth boundaries	Remove Language growth in Designated Centers, Map, Remove Neighborhood Centers from Map		
70	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	Map	Modify FLUM to indicate prime agricultural lands between Rifle and New Castle	Indicate on map prime agricultural lands between Rifle and New Castle and Categorize RNP (1 du per 35 acres)	<i>Recommendation: Retain current map designations</i> Prime agricultural lands are identified in the Appendix 3.	Retain Current Plan Map
71	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	Map	Private in-holdings with limited access should not be classified Res L or Res MH	Classify these properties as Agriculture 1 du per 35 acres	<i>Recommendation: Modify description of of Resource Production/Natural to include: Private inholding with limited access.</i>	Revise Text: Modify description to include: Private inholding mostly surrounded by public lands with limited public access. Change Map to Reflect.
72	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	Map	May be errors in mapping,	Check East and West of Rifle Gap that indicates Res MH - should be Public. Also check containment dome north of Rifle, adjacent to Hwy 13 currently designated as Res MH	Check for Potential Errors	Checked. Retain Current Plan Map
73	16-Aug	Gene Hilton	Map	Would like to increase density for the existing Rapids Subdivision of 33 lots on 121 acres	Change density for Rapids Subdivision from R-MH (1 du per 2 to <6) to Res H	The existng subdivision lies outside of the New Castle urban growth area and is flanked by county RMH designated properties.	Retain Current Plan Map
74	8-Sep	Loyal Leavenworth	Map	Requests the designation on the 121.5 acres Rapids Subdivision property be designated RH, consistent with a 1997 PC review of a proposed PUD at this site.	Request Change from R-MH to R-H designation on property	see discussion under Chapter 2, Line 70	Retain Current Plan Map
75	16-Aug	Russell Talbot	Map	Concerned there is a submotive for designating land uses on the map	No Action Requested	---	---
76	18-Aug	David Harris	26	Define what "criteria" will be used for density range in Res H	Define what "criteria" will be used for density range in Res H	<i>Recommendation: Criteria for determining RH density within the allowed range will be specifically determined by the Planning Commission and will be based on "degree of public benefit", considering factors such as: amount of affordable housing (including a mix of housing types), amount of parks/trails/open space, energy conservation, fiscal impacts on the County, preservation of views, providing for schools and other public needs, etc.</i>	Revise Text to R-H Description: Criteria for determining RH density within the allowed range will be specifically determined by the Planning Commission and will be based on "degree of public benefit", considering factors such as: amount of affordable housing (including a mix of housing types), amount of parks/trails/open space, energy conservation, fiscal impacts on the County, preservation of views, providing for schools and other public needs, etc.
77	18-Aug	David Harris	22	Many defintions of a dwelling unit in the ULUR	Define "dwelling unit" in CP	<i>Recommendation: See Glossary</i>	Glossary: Define Dwelling Unit
78	31-Aug	Thomas Morton	Map	Would like for their planned subdivision of 4 acre parcel into 2 parcels be compliant with the CP.	Requesting the 4 acre property to be designated R-MH	<i>Recommendation: Staff recommends that the underlying designation be R-H as this property falls within the UGB for Glenwood Sprinas.</i>	Change Map Designation to R-H
79	28-Aug	Dwight Juhl, Tom Morton	Map	Would like for their planned subdivision of 4 acre parcel into 2 parcels be compliant with the CP.	Requesting the 4 acre property to be designated R-MH	See Line 1, above	Change Map Designation to R-MH

80	3-Sep	Doug Pratte	Map	Change a portion of the Crystal Ranch Corp property of 414 acres from R-M to Industrial (68 acres) based on 2000 plan designation of resource extraction	Designate 68 acres of the Crystal Ranch Corp property to Industrial	<i>Recommendation: The Planning Commission should consider either of two options for this requests: (1)retain current plan map designation or (2) modify map to reflect an Industrial designation for this 68 acre site. Please reference their letter for more information. This site was not discussed in any of the public forums. The existing use on the site is a gravel pit and batch plant. The pit is planning to begin reclamation in the next 1-5 years. The owner intends to retain the batch plant at this site.</i>	Retain Current Plan Map
81	18-Aug	Jack Pretti	Map	Does not know where light/heavy industrial development is going to go	Indicate where light/heavy Industrial will go	Industrial and Rural Employment Centers (light industrial) are identified on current map	Retain Current Plan Map
82	8-Sep	Larry Green	Map	Believe the designation for H Lazy F Mobile Home Park (Hwy 82 and CR 154) is appropriate as mixed use	Retain proposed designation of mixed use on property	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan map.</i>	Retain Current Plan Map
83	22-Sep	Planning Commission	28		Revise Text: Remove "Existing and Large" from Unincorporated Community Description.		Revise Text: Remove Existing, Large

Chapter 3, Section 1 - Urban Growth Areas and Intergovernmental Coordination							
	Date	Name	Page	Comment Summary	Requested Action	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Action
1	16-Aug	Town of Carbondale	35	Supports concept of coordinated planning efforts	No Action Requested	<i>Recommendation: Make negotiating IGA's a high-priority item for Implementation</i>	Implementation Matrix: Make negotiating IGA's a High-Priority
2	10-Aug	Pitkin County BOCC	35	Strongly support the plan direction to work cooperatively with municipalities within Garfield County by recognizing established urban growth boundaries and increasing coordination and communication	No Action Requested		
3	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	36	Strategy #2, Support the idea of joint town/county planning commission	Want detail worked out via an IGA, High priority action item		
4	16-Aug	Doug Pratte	35	Supports creation of IGAs and notes that the formation of these needs to be in an open and public process	No Action Requested		
5	16-Aug	Dave Sturges	36	IGAs need to be strengthened, collaborative planning is good	No Action Requested		
6	17-Aug	City of Rifle	36	Encourage city and county cooperation	No Action Requested		
7	8-Sep	City of Rifle Planning Commission	36	develop IGA for growth management promptly	Develop IGA for growth management in the UGAs promptly		
8	8-Sep	Town of Silt	36	Supports joint planning commission to be used evaluate growth around municipalities.	Further develop joint Planning Commission Concept in CP rather than deferring to IGAs		
9	8-Sep	Carbondale/Glenwood	37	Communities feel there should be a stronger statement of commitment in regards to a growth management IGA	Add Text: Make no irreversible land use decisions within the urban development areas until Intergovernmental Agreements between the County and municipalities are negotiated, approved and in-place.		
10	17-Aug	Kent Jolley	36	Issue with no representation in towns if plan has to be reviewed by municipality	Provide clarification on IGAs as they relate to projects that occur in the 3-mile area		
11	10-Aug	Pitkin County BOCC	36	Encourage strengthening all aspects of the plan that supports this direction: Need to unify purpose at broader regional basis with respect to mutual issues such as housing, social services, water	Strengthen sections dealing with regional work and cooperation.	<i>Recommendation: Strengthen the goal to "work on a broader regional basis to address mutual issues such as housing, social services, and water." Add Action: Convene a "state of the region" conference to explore common issues, potential for coordinated actions, and interest in establishing a regional forum. Add Action: Work cooperatively within the region on issues that transcend political boundaries such as housing, transit and economic development</i>	<i>Add Goal: Regional issues should be solved at a regional level and should include issues such as housing, social services, and water." Add to Toolbox: Convene a "state of the region" conference to explore common issues, potential for coordinated actions, and interest in establishing a regional forum. Add Action: Work cooperatively within the region on issues that transcend political boundaries such as housing, transit and economic development</i>
12	8-Sep	City of Rifle PC	36	Supports recommendation for cooperative economic development, affordable housing, and transportation	cooperative plan, develop and implement programs and solution for economic development, affordable housing and transportation		
13	8-Sep	Town of Silt	19, 20	Growth in Unincorporated Communities, Growth in Designated Centers and Growth of New Major Residential Subdivisions, undermine the overarching plan direction. Concerned that direction in the document will undermine development where utilities and services can be provided in and around Silt	Remove these directions from the plan	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language</i> Given the amount of development that exists outside of municipal boundaries, the County feels that additional centers will help minimize travel for convenience goods.	Retain Current Plan Language

14	8-Sep	Town of Silt	19	The CP should direct new growth to the existing municipalities and their planning area and not provide an avenue for development of unincorporated communities in	Direct growth to existing municipalities and UGAs and not to unincorporated communities		
15	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	37	Strategy #6, explain purpose of Major Street Plan in relation to 3-mile area of influence	Explain Major Street Plan	<i>Recommendation: Add CRS reference to Major Street Plan (in sidebar) and define in Toolkit.</i>	Add CRS reference to Major Street Plan (in sidebar) and define in Toolkit.
16	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	36	Strategy #8, should Major street plan be for 3-mile area of influence vs. urban growth area?	Clarify	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan language. The current text references the Urban Growth Area, which is correct</i>	Retain Current Plan Language
17	13-Aug	GSAR	36	Goal #2 and Goal #3 are perceived to be contradictory	Revise these goals to address and resolve apparent conflict	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan language</i>	Retain Current Plan Language
18	13-Aug	GSAR	36	In regards to Goal #3 and Policy #1, had county adequately considered the potential burden that these provisions could entail?	No Action Requested	---	---
19	13-Aug	GSAR	36	Policy #4, issues: unclear as to what "local community" means and if it is in addition to existing referral review	Revise to address issues	<i>Recommendation: Define in Glossary: "Local community" refers to the residents and/or elected officials of the nearby municipality or unincorporated community.</i>	Glossary: Define Local Community
20	16-Aug	Mike Blaine	36	Allow for transfer of development into urban growth areas	No Action Requested	---	---
21	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	18	Strengthen language that promotes development in areas with existing infrastructure and discourages it in areas without infrastructure, which were priorities during the public process	Strengthen language that promotes development in areas with existing infrastructure and discourages it in areas without infrastructure	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language</i> The current language conveys the strong public support for new development to provide all necessary infrastructure so as not to fiscally burden the residents of the county.	Retain Current Plan Language
22	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	36	Investing and revitalizing existing downtowns is a goal in all municipal comp plans that needs to be further supported in this CP	Add Text that indicates County's support for investing and revitalizing existing downtowns	<i>Recommendation: add Policy in Chapter 3, Section 1</i> <i>In locating county facilities, the County will place appropriate future facilities that will help support, maintain and revitalize municipal downtowns.</i>	Add Policy: In locating county facilities, the County will place appropriate future facilities that will help support, maintain and revitalize municipal downtowns.
23	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	36	County should consider creating objective scoring criteria to make the PUD process more predictable for the County and for the development community	Add Text: The County will develop an objective scoring system to help guide and expedite the PUD process and ensure that new projects are in keeping with local	<i>Retain current plan language. The ULUR provides direction on reviewing PUD applications, adding scoring criteria may reduce creativity in PUDs.</i>	Retain Current Plan Language
24	23-Sep	Planning Commission	36		Revise Action #2		Revise Text: Review the procedure for efficient, coordinated local municipal input into Planning Commission decisions prior to making recommendations to the BOCC.
25	23-Sep	Planning Commission	37		Revise Action #3		Add Text: ...next twenty years, using a tool such as URR. Include image from Page 21.

Chapter 3, Section 2 - Housing							
	Date	Name	Page	Comment Summary	Requested Action	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Action
1	21-Jul	GSAR	39	Vision: Modify Text	Revise Text: Garfield County has encouraged a diverse stock of housing available to a variety of incomes and encourages new residential development to provide a portion of affordable housing.....	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan language</i> The current inclusionary requirement is in the ULUR and was developed through a separate, prior process. If it is to be changed, it should be done through detailed reconsideration of the ULUR.	Retain Current Plan Language
2	21-Jul	GSAR	39	Issue: Add (proposed)	The current affordable housing ordinance was adopted during a time when economic conditions were fundamentally different than they are today and may not serve the needs of the community going forward		
3	21-Jul	GSAR	39	Issue: Add (proposed)	Housing is a highly complex issue that cuts across all segments of the economy	<i>Recommendation: add Issue:</i> <i>* Housing is a highly complex issue that is impacted by all segments of the economy.</i>	Add Issue: * Housing is a highly complex issue that is impacted by all segments of the economy.
4	21-Jul	GSAR	39	Issue: Add (proposed)	In the last decade, greater job growth and household formation has taken place in the western part of the county than in the eastern part which has fueled a decrease in out-commuting	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan language</i>	Retain Current Plan Language
5	21-Jul	GSAR	40	Policy: Add (proposed)	"Affordable housing" should benefit all citizens of Garfield County and should not reward certain classes of citizens to the detriment of others	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan language</i>	Retain Current Plan Language
6	21-Jul	GSAR	40	Policy: Add (proposed)	Affordable housing should solve housing problems in Garfield County and should support jobs in Garfield County	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan language</i>	Retain Current Plan Language
7	21-Jul	GSAR	39	GSAR believes that the word "development" should mean all development not just housing development and that this should be made clear in this section	Clarify meaning of "Development"	Add "residential" in front of development in bullet 3.	Revise Text: Add "residential" in front of development in Bullet #3
8	21-Jul	GSAR	40	Strategies/Actions #4	Revise Text: Encourage the development within Urban Growth Areas when those areas can best provide affordable living	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan language</i>	Retain Current Plan Language
9	21-Jul	GSAR	40	Strategies/Actions #6 should be a high priority	Make this a high priority in County's work plan	<i>Recommendation: Make this a high-priority item for implementation</i>	Implementation Matrix: Make Action 6 a High Priority
10	17-Aug	GCHA	39	Issue #3: Add Language	Add Specific Language: This inclusionary Housing program targets moderate income, working families (80% - 120% AMI). The County adopted inclusionary Housing in 2000 and expanded the program in 2009	<i>Recommendation: Add Text: "This inclusionary Housing program targets moderate income, working families (80% - 120% AMI). The County adopted inclusionary Housing in 2000 and expanded the program in 2009."</i>	Add Text: "This inclusionary Housing program targets moderate income, working families (80% - 120% AMI). The County adopted inclusionary Housing in 2000 and expanded the program in 2009."
11	17-Aug	GCHA	39	Issue #4: Change Language	Change Language to: In some cases, providing housing in an off-site location from a rural residential development is logical to help with commute, school, and shopping concerns. Affordable Housing anywhere in the Roaring Fork Valley does offer the potential of being closer to upper valley work without having to pass through the bottleneck of traffic in Glenwood Springs.	<i>Recommendation: Change text: In some cases, providing housing in an off-site location from a rural residential development is logical to help with commute, school, and shopping concerns. Affordable Housing anywhere in the Roaring Fork Valley does offer the potential of being closer to upper valley work without having to pass through the traffic bottleneck in Glenwood Springs.</i>	Revise text: In some cases, providing housing in an off-site location from a rural residential development is logical to help with commute, school, and shopping concerns. Affordable Housing anywhere in the Roaring Fork Valley does offer the potential of being closer to upper valley work without having to pass through the traffic bottleneck in Glenwood Springs.
12	17-Aug	GCHA	39	Issue #5, remove due GHA's experience thus far	Remove	Unclear at to what this expericne has been.	Retain Current Plan Language

13	17-Aug	GCHA	40	Issue #7, Add Language	Add Specific Language: The Garfield County Housing Authority has positioned itself to address housing on a regional level. GCHA would welcome involvement from county staff	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan language.</i> The County recognizes this, but can't speak for the Housing Authority.	Retain Current Plan Language
14	17-Aug	GCHA	40	Strategies/Actions #5: Add Language	Add Specific Language: ...GCHA is happy to work directly with county staff assigned to this issue		
15	17-Aug	GCHA	40	Goal #2: Add Language	Add Specific Language: Encourage a mix of housing types within a development, including affordable rental and for-sale units	<i>Recommendation: Add Goal: Encourage a mix of housing types within a development, including affordable rental and for-sale units</i>	Revise Text: Previously added "tenancy" to Goal #1
16	17-Aug	GCHA	40	Policy #3: Add Language (proposed)	Garfield County will consider expanding the current inclusionary housing regulations to address affordable rental housing	<i>Recommendation: Add a Policy 3:</i> Garfield County will consider expanding the current inclusionary housing regulations to address affordable rental housing	Add Policy: Garfield County will consider expanding the current inclusionary housing regulations to address affordable rental housing
17	17-Aug	GCHA	40	Strategies/Actions #2: Concerned because there is no clear mechanism to handle such transfers	Eliminate Strategies/Actions #2	<i>Recommendation: add text as follows to Action 2</i> Work with municipalities and GarCo Housing Authority to allow sale/transfer of affordable units...	Add text to Action 2 Work with municipalities and GarCo Housing Authority to allow sale/transfer of affordable units...
18	17-Aug	GCHA	40	Strategies/Actions #3: Indicates that moderate income families are also served by current program	No Action Request	<i>Recommendation: move Action 3 to become Policy 4 as follows</i> Place a high priority on providing affordable housing in areas where cost-effective transportation exists (as appropriate to income scale).	Move Action 3 to become Policy: Encourage affordable housing in areas where cost-effective transportation exists (as appropriate to income scale).
19	17-Aug	GCHA	40	Strategies/Actions #6: Concerned that method for monitoring and assessment is unclear	Add language that addresses mechanism for monitoring and assessing	<i>Recommendation: add text as follows to beginning of Action 6</i> Work with GCHA to develop mechanisms to...	Add text as follows to Action 6 Work with GCHA to develop mechanisms to facilitate...
20	17-Aug	GCHA	40	Strategies/Actions #7: Concerned that this action does not recognize that moderate income levels don't need as much help in locating next to transit.	No Action Requested	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language.</i> Although it is very important for lower income levels to be near transit, moderate income levels should not be excluded.	Retain Current Plan Language
21	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	40	Issue #6, is there a specific goal or policy to deal with (reduce) the inventory of these undeveloped lots?	Add Policy that addresses reducing the amount of undeveloped lots within the County	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan language</i> The CP supports the concept of resubdividing existing vacant lots in areas designated, or logical for, "centers." The only other mechanism the County could use to reduce the inventory of existing vacant lots would be to restrict future approvals thereby limiting supply and hoping there is future demand.	Retain Current Plan Language
22	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	40	Strategies/Actions #7: the city's vision for affordable housing is to distribute it widely as opposed to concentrating it within incorporated areas	Ensure that "Centers" are transit oriented that have sufficient access to services (transit)	<i>Recommendation: add goal #3</i> <i>Mixed use Rural Centers are encouraged in locations that can be served by transit.</i> It is the County's goal to have affordable housing located close to work and/or transportation--to reduce the total cost of living as well as traffic congestion. In many cases municipalities best meet these criteria. However, mixed-use Rural Centers are also suitable if they are located at intersections on major roadways. By virtue of being compact, they generally could be transit-friendly. Whether there is actual access to transit will likely be determined by RFTA or city circulator systems.	Add goal #3 Mixed use Rural Centers are encouraged in locations that can be served by transit.

23	13-Aug	GSAR	40	Provide a strategy/action that addresses Goal #2, encourage a mix of housing types within a development	Add new Strategy	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan language</i> There are a variety of means by which the CP encourages a mix of housing types in a development: inclusionary zoning, a range of densities that can be achieved by various levels of clustering, etc. We have added "mix of housing types" to the public benefits for allowing a higher density in the RH in Glossary.	Retain Current Plan Language
24	13-Aug	GSAR	40	Reclassify Strategy/Action #1	Change this to be a Policy	Retain current plan language	Move Action 1 to Policy Section
25	13-Aug	GSAR	40	Strategy/Action #2: GSAR supports this to the extent that	No Action Requested	---	---
26	27-Oct	Planning Commission			Goal #1, Add Tenancy		Revise Goal 1: To bring about a range of housing types, costs and tenancy option, that ensures for our current and future residents affordable housing opportunities in safe, efficient residential structures.
27	7-Oct	Planning Commission	39		Revise Text		Add Issue: Requiring affordable housing for more than 5 DUs works at cross purposes to the intent of encouraging small rural clusters (5-15 units) and lessens the benefits of affordable by being in a rural setting.
28	7-Oct	Planning Commission	40		Add Action: Require new lots within sensitive riparian or floodplain areas to locate lot lines outside of these areas and dedicate as public or private open space		Add Action: Explore as an incentive for small cluster development subdivisions, a higher threshold for requiring affordable housing

Chapter 3, Section 3 - Transportation							
	Date	Name	Page	Comment Summary	Requested Action	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Action
1	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	41	Section focuses mainly on transportation, expand to other transportation types	No Action Requested	<i>Recommendation: Add the following text due to current plan language not addressing other modes of transportation-related issues</i>	<i>Add Text:</i>
2	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	42	Does the County need to add bike lanes to County roads	Determine if County should add bike lanes to road construction standards and/or construct bike lanes as part of existing roadways	<p>* Bicycle transportation in the Roaring Fork Valley is provided by RFTA via the heavily-used Rio Grande trail that extends from Glenwood Springs to Aspen. The Colorado River trail is also planned to provide inter-city bicycle travel options from Glenwood to New Castle and potentially beyond. Bicycle travel is also possible on many county, state and local roads either via shared lanes or paved shoulders. (The County currently requires 8' shoulders on arterials and 6' shoulders on secondary access roads.)</p> <p>* Garfield County contracts with the Roaring Fork Transit Authority (RFTA), to provide service from Glenwood Springs to Rifle. RFTA services also extends from Glenwood Springs to Aspen/Snowmass.</p> <p>* (revise Issue #2) Automobile travel is also regional in nature. Large numbers of county residents commute from the Colorado River valley to employment in the Roaring Fork valley. This forces a significant amount of traffic through Glenwood Springs. By 2030, Hwy 82 through Glenwood Springs is projected to experience 40,000 trips per day, far above it's comfortable carrying capacity as a "main street". This will also have significant implications for other communities that depend on workers to get efficiently through Glenwood Springs. Given the physical limitations, and costs, of alternative routes, traffic solutions need to be addressed on many fronts (location of housing relative to jobs, alt. transportation modes, etc.) and on a regional basis.</p> <p>* The Garfield County Regional Airport near Rifle is an uncontrolled airport (no local tower control) with a 7,000-foot runway that can accommodate up to a 737 airliner. It currently handles approximately 20,000 takeoffs/landings per year.</p>	<p>* Bicycle transportation in the Roaring Fork Valley is provided by RFTA via the heavily-used Rio Grande trail that extends from Glenwood Springs to Aspen. The Colorado River trail is also planned to provide inter-city bicycle travel options from Glenwood to New Castle and potentially beyond. Bicycle travel is also possible on many county, state and local roads either via shared lanes or paved shoulders. (The County currently requires 8' shoulders on arterials and 6' shoulders on secondary access roads.)</p> <p>* Garfield County contracts with the Roaring Fork Transit Authority (RFTA), to provide service from Glenwood Springs to Rifle. RFTA services also extends from Glenwood Springs to Aspen/Snowmass.</p> <p>* (revise Issue #2) Automobile travel is also regional in nature. Large numbers of county residents commute from the Colorado River valley to employment in the Roaring Fork valley. This forces a significant amount of traffic through Glenwood Springs. By 2030, Hwy 82 through Glenwood Springs is projected to experience 40,000 trips per day, far above it's comfortable carrying capacity as a "main street". This will also have significant implications for other communities that depend on workers to get efficiently through Glenwood Springs. Given the physical limitations, and costs, of alternative routes, traffic solutions need to be addressed on many fronts (location of housing relative to jobs, alt. transportation modes, etc.) and on a regional basis.</p> <p>* The Garfield County Regional Airport near Rifle is an uncontrolled airport (no local tower control) with a 7,000-foot runway that can accommodate up to a 737 airliner. It currently handles approximately 20,000 takeoffs/landings per year.</p>
3	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	42, 43	Address issues about Light-Rail and RFTA's Corridor Investment Study		<p>It is not likely to be designated a commercial airport due to proximity to three existing commercial facilities — Grand Junction, Aspen and Eagle.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <p>6. Convene a work session of regional stakeholders (counties, RFTA, CDOT, municipalities, etc.) to share information about current plans, projections, issues and potential solutions.</p>	<p>Add Action: Convene a work session of regional stakeholders (counties, RFTA, CDOT, municipalities, etc.) to share information about current plans, projections, issues and potential solutions.</p>
5	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	42, 43	Address issues with the county airport in regards to transportation		<i>Recommendation: Retain Current Plan Language.</i> Unsure of what current "issues" are with the County Airport	Retain Current Plan Language

6	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	42	Add Policy	Identify opportunities to work with RFTA to address mass transit from Parachute to Glenwood Springs and to connect with Eagle County's ECO-Transit system	<i>Recommendation: add action as follows Work with RFTA to address transit throughout Garfield County and how to connect with Eagle County's ECO-Transit system.</i>	Add Action: Work with RFTA, or other transit entities, to address transit throughout Garfield County and how to connect with Eagle County's ECO-Transit system.
7	16-Aug	Dave Sturges	42	Need regional transportation planning	No Action Requested	Through the CP it was the County's position that transit service to Rifle would be addressed by a separate process that was already under way. The CP already has policies supporting regional solutions to transportation problems. What is needed are specific action steps.	
8	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	42	What strategies will the County employ to address increased traffic as a result of new development?	Explore mechanisms for the County to address increased traffic from new development (e.g. Concurrency requirements)	<i>Recommendation: add a Strategy/Action</i> Explore mechanisms for the County to address increased traffic from new development (e.g. Concurrency requirements) A major strategy is to encourage new development to occur in and adjacent to existing development. Criteria for new major subdivisions also require mitigating fiscal impacts on the County, including the fiscal impacts of building and maintaining additional roads in excess of the tax revenues generated by the development.	Add Action: Explore mechanisms for the County to address increased traffic from new development.
9	13-Aug	GSAR	43	Strategy/Action #4; is this action realistic? Opposes any	Evaluate realistic ability to implement this action	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan language</i>	Retain Current Plan Language
10	17-Aug	Doug Dennison	441	Add Issue (proposed)	Add Text: the county recognizes the cooperative efforts of the oil/gas industry to improve and maintain roads	<i>Recommendation: add Issue: * In the past, the oil/gas industry has voluntarily made significant financial contributions to the County for maintenance and construction of county roads.</i>	Add Issue: The oil/gas industry has voluntarily made significant financial contributions to the County for maintenance and construction of county roads.
11	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	42	Language supporting transit oriented development in strategic locations, transportation demand management (TDM) practices and pedestrian-oriented design strategies should be included	Add Text: Mass Transit due to the expected growth in the region over the next ten years, the County will ensure that development pays for its proportional transportation impacts. Also, the County will expand transit opportunities in the Corridor, develop and expand transit opportunities within urban areas and consider parking management strategies.	Refer to Line 3, Section 3 - proposed action #6, above	Retain Current Plan Language
12	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	42	Language supporting transit oriented development in strategic locations, transportation demand management (TDM) practices and pedestrian-oriented design strategies should be included	Add Text: Motor Vehicle The County shall consistently monitor traffic levels in the corridor, assess design standards to minimize environmental impacts and pursue traffic calming techniques.	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language</i> With regard to state highways, this is the purview of CDOT. With regard to County roads, this should be addressed by the proposed County Transportation Master Plan.	Retain Current Plan Language
13	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	42	Language supporting transit oriented development in strategic locations, transportation demand management (TDM) practices and pedestrian-oriented design strategies should be included	Add Text: Transportation Demand Management In cooperation with all municipalities, the County shall investigate a wide range of TDM strategies including parking programs, carpooling, and telecommuting.	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language</i> Not sure how effective these strategies would be in unincorporated areas, except perhaps in Unincorporated Communities. They ARE part of the plan expressly as transit oriented development locations.	Retain Current Plan Language
14	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	42	Language supporting transit oriented development in strategic locations, transportation demand management (TDM) practices and pedestrian-oriented design strategies should be included	Add Text: Bicycles and Pedestrians The County shall implement steps to encourage bicycle and pedestrian safety and expand/enhance connections between population centers.	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language</i> Given the distances involved, it is the County's strategy to support existing and proposed bike trails as a primary bike commuting facility, and to maintain current road shoulder design standards for bike use on County roads.	Retain Current Plan Language

15	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	42	Language supporting transit oriented development in strategic locations, transportation demand management (TDM) practices and pedestrian-oriented design strategies should be included	Add Text: Transportation To and From County The County should work with vendors to attract and maintain both surface and air transportation to and from Garfield County.	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language</i> Not sure who "vendors" are. The County is actively exploring airport usage and service expansion.	Retain Current Plan Language
----	-------	----------------	----	--	--	--	------------------------------

Chapter 3, Section 4 - Economics, Employment and Tourism							
Date	Name	Page	Comment Summary	Requested Action	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Action	
1	13-Aug	GSAR	45	Provide a Strategy/Action in regards to Policy #2	Add a Strategy	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language</i> The policy is intended to guide future land use decision-making. We do not feel a strategy is helpful.	Retain Current Plan Language
2	13-Aug	GSAR	46	Strategy/Action #1; Provision is vague and provides no substantive direction for promoting industrial and commercial development.	Clarify Type, size and scope of industrial/commercial development.	<i>Recommendation: Retain current plan language</i> The CP makes a preliminary allocation of land. The County is conducting a market analysis of potential uses for the Airport Industrial Park. The CP suggests expanding this study to become a joint City/County Market Analysis --that would identify other needs that should be reflected in future updates.	Retain Current Plan Language
3	13-Aug	GSAR	46	Strategy/Action #1; Unclear how land would be "reserved"	Clarify how land would be "reserved" for industrial/commercial development		
4	13-Aug	GSAR	46	Plan should have goal and strategies to attract industrial and commercial development to the County that can be implemented	Provide meaningful economic development direction		
5	13-Aug	GSAR	46	Identify specific areas of the County where tourism related development is desired	Identify specific areas (on map?)	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan map</i> The CP identifies Sunlight Ski Area, as well as trails along the Colorado River, to augment the significant tourism provided by Forest Service, BLM and State Wildlife areas, as well as the tourism generated by individual communities.	Retain Current Plan Map
6	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	46	Policy #2 Concerned with commercial nodes that <i>will</i> compete with incorporated community's sales tax collection	Define what "significantly" means in regards to sales tax revenues	<i>Recommendation: add sentence to Policy 2</i> <i>This includes large retail stores and stores that focus on passing traffic, and excludes stores who's focus is primarily local residents within a 1-mile radius .</i> The CP used the word "significant" to acknowledge that there may be some minor impact on sales taxes due to convenience shopping, but to reinforce that the County's intent is not to allow major commercial establishments in the unincorporated communities.	Retain Current Plan Language
7	16-Aug	Martha Cochran	46	Tourism is an important and large part of the local economy	Expand section on Tourism to include policies about public access, public lands and preservation of those resources that drive the industry	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language</i> This concern is addressed in the Recreation, Open Space and Trails section in Goal 2 and Policy 4.	Retain Current Plan Language
8	8-Sep	Martha Cochran	45	Tourism section is important and warrants its own section. The plan should note the quality of the tourism industry is enhanced by (1)open space and scenic vistas (2) public trails and other recreational opportunities (3)public access to public lands (4) a healthy environment and habitats for hunting and fishing (5) green belts and open area between communities (6) clean air and water (7) local foods and local produce	Address Tourism in a separate section	<i>Recommendation: Add Text to Policy #6. ...the tourism industry is enhanced by (1)open space and scenic vistas (2) public trails and other recreational opportunities (3)public access to public lands (4) a healthy environment and habitats for hunting and fishing (5) green belts and open area between communities (6) clean air and water (7) local foods and local produce. Add Action: Create a program to increase public awareness of the important linkage between tourism, natural setting, and a diversified economy.</i>	<i>Add Text to Policy #6. ...and the County recognizes that the tourism industry is enhanced by (1)open space and scenic vistas (2) public trails and other recreational opportunities (3)public access to public lands (4) a healthy environment and habitats for hunting and fishing (5) green belts and open area between communities (6) clean air and water (7) local foods and local produce.</i>
9	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	46	Tourism and recreation are under-addressed in CP	Add Text that clearly articulates the importance of protecting and creating parks and open space, trail systems, natural heritage, outdoor recreation, wildlife habitat and other aspects of our tourism economy		

Chapter 3, Section 5 - Recreation, Open Space and Trails							
	Date	Name	Page	Comment Summary	Requested Action	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Action
1	16-Aug	Michael Larime	50	Provisions for trail ROWs is important	Provide in new growth - provisions for ROWs for Trails	<i>Recommendation: amend Goal 1 as follows:</i>	Retain Current Plan Language
2	13-Aug	GSAR	49	Goal #1; unclear as to what type of development is "appropriate" for county's recreation areas	Clarify by providing greater specificity	<i>Assure that new residential development in the unincorporated areas provides trails and other recreational opportunities...</i>	
3	16-Aug	G-TLC Initiative	49	Add Issue #10 (proposed)	Add Text: Garfield County does not currently have an open space and/or trails program	<i>Recommendation: add text: * Garfield County does not currently have an open space and/or trails program.</i>	<i>Add Text: * Garfield County does not currently have an open space and/or trails program.</i>
4	16-Aug	G-TLC Initiative	49	Based on public input Add Goal #5 (proposed)	Add Text: Support the development of a county-wide land conservation program to provide voluntary tools to provide financial rewards for landowners that are interested in preserving their land	<i>And modify issue 7 * In recent public opinion surveys, the public expressed strong support for open space preservation, but did not support funding such in the current economic climate.</i>	<i>Revise Issue 7 * Strong public support was indicated in CP public meetings and in a 2008 survey for the County taking a more active role in both trails and open space. In a 2010, public opinion surveys of registered voters, the respondents again expressed strong support for open space preservation, however they did not support public funding.</i>
5	16-Aug	G-TLC Initiative	50	Based on public input Strategies/Actions # 7 (proposed)	Add Text: Work with residents, ranchers and organizations to develop an effective countywide land conservation program	<i>Add Goal 5: Support the development of a county wide land conservation program to provide tools for land owners and the public to conserve property.</i>	
6	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	50	General, the Public's response should generate a more aggressive set of actions in this plan in regards to open space planning and preservation	Add more aggressive strategies/Actions that mirror public's voiced issue of importance about open space planning and preservation		
7	16-Aug	Martha Cochran	50	Add Goal: (proposed), based from public input and values	Add Text: County will take an active role in open space preservation and securing a dedicated funding source to be used for land preservation		<i>Add Goal 5: Support the development of a county wide land conservation program to provide tools for land owners and the public to conserve property.</i>
8	16-Aug	Clark Anderson	50	Add Strategy/Action	Add Text: provide a program for the County to preserve agriculture and open space (eg. Dedicated funding and open space program)		
9	16-Aug	Larry Dragon	50	Strong public support for County taking a more active role in public open space, recreation and trails	Add Text: Create an open space, trails and recreation program in Garfield County		
10	17-Aug	Alekis Briedis	50	Plan needs to support development of a county-wide conservation program	Add Text: support the development of a county-wide land conservation program to provide voluntary tools to provide financial rewards for landowners that are interested in preserving their land		
11	18-Aug	Clark Anderson	49	County should take leadership in land conservation and trails	Add Text: Goal, County will take leadership in land conservation and trails and will work with willing landowners through a voluntary program		
12	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	50	Given public priority, a policy indicating County Leadership in developing an effective trails and land conservation program is recommended. This would be a useful tool to help the county work with willing landowners and local land trusts to achieve goals that have emerged in the CP	Add Text: Goal, Support the development of a Countywide land conservation program to provide voluntary tools to provide financial rewards for landowners that are interested in preserving their land		
13	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	50	Given public priority, a policy indicating County Leadership in developing an effective trails and land conservation program is recommended. This would be useful tool to help the county work with willing landowners and local land trusts to achieve goals that have emerged in the CP	Add Text: Strategy, Establish and maintain an open space program which: (1) Utilizes open space as a means of preserving and protecting the natural environment; (2) Uses open space as a functional design feature for shaping the county and for providing the pedestrian links within the county; (3) Provides for development and maintenance of open space areas for multiple purposes		
14	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	50	recommend the county conduct a market study evaluating a TDR program that could be administered in coordination with the County and Municipalities	Add Text: Strategy, the county conduct a market study evaluating a TDR program that could be administered in coordination with the County and Municipalities		

15	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	50	Strategies/Actions #6, what is "appropriate development"	Define or provide guidance as to what is "appropriate development"	<i>Recommendation: modify Action 6 as follows Encourage development that will contribute to the continuation and enhancement of tourism in or near recreation areas.</i>	Revise Action 6 and Move to Policy Section : Encourage development that contributes to the continuation and enhancement of commercial tourism in or near recreation areas.
16	13-Aug	GSAR	50	Strategy/Action #3; Unclear as to what are "urban density projects"	Clarify by providing greater specificity	<i>Recommendation: See Glossary</i>	Glossary: Define Urban Density Projects
17	18-Aug	Clark Anderson	50	Strategy/Action #7 (proposed)	Add Text: County should explore developing a TDR program to help conserve/protect open space	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language Refer to Strategy/Action 5</i>	Retain Current Plan Language
18	27-Oct	Planning Commission	50		Revise Text		Revise Goal #1: Assure that new residential development provides recreational opportunities for county residents that are appropriate to the density and type of development or contributes land or funding to a county-wide trail and recreation system.
19	27-Oct	Planning Commission	50		Revise Text		Revise Goal #4; Support the development of a continuous trail system within Garfield County and along both major corridors.
20	27-Oct	Planning Commission	50		Revise Text		Revise Action #3: Update the subdivision regulations to specify appropriate recreation requirements and/or fees in-lieu.

Chapter 3, Section 6 - Agriculture							
Date	Name	Page	Comment Summary	Requested Action	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Action	
1	21-Jul	GSAR	52	Policy #5 (proposed)	Add Text: Work with farmers and ranchers when estate issues threaten the break up of significant agricultural operations by providing incentives to keep such land	<i>Recommendation: add to the end of Action 2 as follows ...to preserve agriculture, including addressing estate issues to keep land holdings together.</i>	Add to the end of Action 2: ...to preserve agriculture, including addressing estate issues to keep land holdings together.
2	8-Sep	City of Rifle Planning Commission	52	Supports town-centered growth and desires stronger language to support this type of growth through the conservation of agricultural land	Add Text: work with residents, ranchers and organizations to develop an effective county-wide land conservation program The issue is largely addressed in Action 2, but the suggestion adds substance.		
3	16-Aug	G-TLC Initiative	52	Strategy #1: Change Language	Change Specific Language: The County will create a program for PDR/TDR as well as other voluntary land conservation tools to facilitate voluntary preservation of agriculture, wildlife habitat, riparian areas and other community values	All of the comments relate to means of preserving agriculture. The CP proposes (Strategy 1) to compile a "tool box" of techniques that are available, or could be developed, to assist in the protection of agriculture. The proposed Action 6 is intended to evaluate the tool box and present the most appropriate tools to the public and elected officials for implementation. This would include evaluating Transfer of Development Rights, but its feasibility needs to be tested first (as suggested by the market study suggested by one commenter).	Add Strategy: Research and present for public consideration options appropriate to Garfield County regarding agricultural protection
4	10-Aug	Pitkin County BOCC	52	Support direction to consider a program for TDR/PDR	No Action Requested		
5	10-Aug	Pitkin County BOCC	52	Recommend plan action to pursue options for development of means for Garfield County to acquire open space/recreational easements	Change Language: The County shall pursue options for development of means to acquire open space/recreational easements		
6	13-Aug	GSAR	52	Strategy #1; techniques could further the county's interest in protecting ag lands	Encourage the use of regulatory incentives and other market-based techniques in its ag protection efforts		
7	18-Aug	Clark Anderson	52	Strategy/Action #6 (proposed)	Add Text: County should undertake a market study for a countywide TDR program		
8	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	52	Add Issue #13 (proposed)	Add Language: Need to preserve and encourage food production		
9	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	52	Indicate on map prime agricultural lands between Rifle and New Castle	Modify FLUM to indicate prime agricultural lands between Rifle and New Castle *also under Chapter 2		
10	13-Aug	GSAR	52	Strategy #4, that are potential negative impacts of requiring a right to farm note on all final plats	Adopt a less intrusive means of disclosing the Right to Farm policy	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan map</i> Prime ag/farm lands are identified in Appendix 3, Map 16	Retain Current Plan Map
11	18-Aug	Clark Anderson	52	Policy #5 (proposed)	Add Text: County will support rural economic development to help sustain viable agricultural businesses	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language.</i> The County has required this type of plat note for over 30 years.	Retain Current Plan Language
						Unclear as to what "rural economic development" means.	Retain Current Plan Language

Chapter 3, Section 7 - Water and Sewer Services							
	Date	Name	Page	Comment Summary	Requested Action	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Action
1	13-Aug	GSAR	54	Provide a strategy/action in regards to Policy #2	Add new Policy	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language</i>	Retain Current Plan Language
2	13-Aug	GSAR	54	Policy #2. No strategy for implementation of this policy	How will the county continue "Strongly discourage" private water and sewer?	The wording "strongly discourage" could suggest that the County will be more favorably disposed to approve new subdivisions that are served by special districts, or that connect to an existing special district rather than create its own HOA-run system.	
3	13-Aug	GSAR	54	Policy #4; how will new development be required to mitigate impacts on existing water/sewer systems?	Clarify how the county intends to implement this policy and identify the source of its authority to require new development to mitigate impacts on existing water/sewer systems	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language</i> The county can only try to assure that, prior to approval, applications for new development disclose potential impacts and commit to mitigate them.	Retain Current Plan Language
4	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	56	CP is relatively silent on water-related issues. Include language that promotes use of "Low Impact Development" techniques which are designed to minimize urban runoff from developed areas	Add Text: The County will encourage Low Impact Development techniques, including conservation site design (preserving natural drainage systems), vegetated swales, pervious paving and other strategies	<i>Recommendation: add Strategy to Chapter 3, Section 1: recommending inclusion in GCULUR of water-conserving practices for urban scale development.</i>	Add Strategy: Include in GCULUR water-conserving practices for development of 3 DUs or more per acre.
5	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	56	CP is relatively silent on water-related issues.	include language that encourages the use of water-efficient landscaping in new development		
6	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	56	CP is relatively silent on water-related issues.	Include language promoting increased coordination between land use agencies and water providers on development and infrastructure decisions	Is this a problem? County currently includes water providers (eg. special districts) in their referral process for land use applications	Retain Current Plan Language
7	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	56	CP is relatively silent on water-related issues.	Include language about monitoring impacts from wells and septic systems	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language</i> Unfortunately, the scale of existing development only allows this to be done on a "complaint" basis. Other organizations have taken it upon themselves to identify issues with non-point source pollution	Retain Current Plan Language

Chapter 3, Section 8 - Natural Resources								
	Date	Name	Page	Comment Summary	Requested Action	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Action	
1	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	56	The two strategies listed do not adequately protect the county's significant habitat areas	More thought and detail should be given to this Section	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language</i>	Retain Current Plan Language	
2	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	55	Issue (proposed)	Identify issues or conflicts with critical habitat areas.	The County refers major land use application for comment to Federal and State agencies and attempts to incorporate their comments. Wildlife in Colorado is primarily under the purview of the State Division of Wildlife (DOW).		
3	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	56	How are bald and golden eagle nesting areas affected by increasing development along the river corridors	Add Policy and Action: Provide text that addresses how bald and golden eagle nesting areas will be protected and/or impacts mitigated from increased development			
4	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	56	Should the County partner with CDOW to reduce bear/human conflicts in outlying residential subdivisions	Add text: the County should partner with CDOW to reduce bear/human conflicts in outlying residential subdivisions			
5	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	56	Are there ways to preserve/improve the river and stream habitats for native cutthroat trout and other fish populations?	Add Policy and Actions: The county should work to preserve/improve river and stream habitats for native cutthroat trout and other fish populations.			
6	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	55	What should the county do to reduce wildlife -vehicle conflicts where elk and mule deer cross highways/roadways	The County should implement tools that will help reduce wildlife-vehicle conflicts where elk and mule deer cross highways/roadways	<i>Recommendation: add Strategy/Action as follows Work with DOW and CDOT to address highway/wildlife crossing issues.</i>	Add Action: Work with DOW and CDOT to address highway/wildlife crossing issues.	
						The highway/wildlife conflicts are generally under CDOT purview too.		
7	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	55	Should this section address water, noise and air pollution?	The county should address water, noise and air pollution	<i>Recommendation: Add Issue *The county maintains high air quality standards, however there may be a propensity for air pollutants to exist in the western part of the county Add Action: Continue to monitor air quality issues within the county.</i>	Add Issue *The county maintains high air quality standards, however there may be a propensity for air pollutants to exist in the western part of the county Add Action: Continue to monitor air quality issues within the county and respond, as necessary, if negative trends are detected.	
8	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	55	Address remaining cultural resources: archaeological sites, buildings and structures worthy of preservation	The County should address cultural resources including archaeological sites, buildings and structures of significance	This is not known to be a significant issue in the unincorporated area.	Retain Current Plan Language	
9	18-Aug	Clark Anderson	56	Add Policy #3; (proposed)	County will promote best practices for new development in regards to stormwater regulation that will protect natural drainages	<i>Recommendation: add a policy as follows The County will promote best practices for new development in regards to stormwater regulation that will protect natural drainages</i>	Retain Current Plan Language	
10	8-Sep	Town of Silt	56	Method for protecting sensitive riparian and floodplain areas is to require lot lines be located outside of riparian and floodplain areas and not extend across to the center of the river. Reserved locations should be dedicated as public or private open space and should remain in their natural state	Add Action: Require new lots within sensitive riparian or floodplain areas to locate lot lines outside of these areas and dedicate as public or private open space	We understand and agree with the protection of sensitive riparian areas, however, we are not sure that the recommended technique is the best tool to protect these areas.	Retain Current Plan Language	
11	8-Sep	Carbondale/Glenwood	49, 50	Distressed that CP did not taken into account the significance residents placed on the quality of their natural environment. Public comments called for greater open space planning and preservation of the environment in	Strengthen Goals, Policies and Strategy/Actions to be reflective of general public opinion	Refer to Section 5, Line 3, Section 6 and the balance of Section 8	Retain Current Plan Language	
12	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	56	CP is relatively silent on water-related issues.	Include language that articulates the importance of compact development patterns for protecting watersheds	Refer to Chapter 2 and the balance of Section 8	Retain Current Plan Language	
13	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	56	CP is relatively silent on water-related issues.	Include language promoting the protection of riparian areas and avoidance of flooding hazards. This language could suggest that the county evaluate current riparian and floodplain standards to determine if they are sufficient to protecting the health of local rivers and streams	<i>Recommendation: add text as follows Goal 6: protection of riparian areas and water quality Action 3: Evaluate current riparian and floodplain development standards to determine if they are sufficient to protecting the health of local rivers and streams.</i>	Retain Current Plan Language	

Chapter 3, Section 9 - Mineral Resources							
	Date	Name	Page	Comment Summary	Requested Action	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Action
1	21-Jul	Tresi Houpt	57	Change Goal #1 Language	Ensure that mineral extraction is regulated appropriately, to promote responsible energy development	<i>Recommendation: modify Goal 1 Ensure that mineral extraction is regulated appropriately, to promote responsible energy development.</i>	Retain Current Plan Language (modification was previously included)
2	21-Jul	Tresi Houpt	57	Change Policy #1 Language	Garfield County recognizes that surface and mineral interests have legal rights and privileges. We recognize the royalty owner's right to extract and develop mineral interests and we recognize the private property owner's rights to have the mineral estate developed in a reasonable manner and to have adverse land use and health impacts mitigated	<i>Recommendation: change Policy 1 as follows Garfield County recognizes that surface and mineral owners have certain legal rights and privileges, including the right to extract and develop these interests. Private property owners also have certain legal rights and privileges, including the right to have the mineral estate developed in a reasonable manner and to have adverse land use and health impacts mitigated....</i>	Revise Policy 1: Garfield County recognizes that surface and mineral owners have certain legal rights and privileges, including the right to extract and develop these interests. Private property owners also have certain legal rights and privileges, including the right to have the mineral estate developed in a reasonable manner and to have adverse impacts mitigated....
3	21-Jul	Tresi Houpt	58	Change Strategies and Actions #2 Language	...continue cooperative dialogue with the industry and property owners	<i>Recommendation: retain current plan language The focus of this action is to monitor the market conditions.</i>	See Line 7, below.
4	13-Aug	Ron Galterio	57	Add Language to Section 9, Vision and Goals	Add language that "Indicates the desire to protect the public health, safety and welfare	<i>Recommendation: add a Goal #3 as follows In working with mineral extraction project, the county will protect the public health, safety and welfare of all citizens</i>	Add Goal: In working with mineral extraction projects, the county will protect the public health, safety and welfare of its citizens
5	18-Aug	Lorne Prescott	58	Add Language to Section 9, Policy 4 (proposed)	Add specific language: Facilities that are appurtenances to natural gas development activities and are regulated by the ULUR could occur in all areas subject to the Garfield County Land Use Designations	<i>Recommendation: add a Policy 4 as follows Facilities that are appurtenances to natural gas development activities (compressors, etc.) are considered appropriate in all land uses so long as they meet the respective mitigation requirements of the GCULUR to maintain compatibility with surrounding land uses.</i>	Add Policy: Facilities that are appurtenances to oil/ gas development activities (compressors, etc.) are considered appropriate in all land uses so long as they meet the respective mitigation requirements of the GCULUR to maintain compatibility with surrounding land uses.
6	18-Aug	Lorne Prescott	58	Add Language to Section 9, Policy 5 (proposed)	Add Specific Language: In accordance with the ULUR, appropriate mitigation will occur to allow for natural gas facility appurtenances to maintain compatibility with surrounding land uses		
7	16-Aug	Lorne Prescott	58	Strategies/Action #2: Clarify how oil/gas industry would work to "monitor" market conditions	Clarify Strategy	<i>Recommendation: revise Action 2 as follows Maintain and enhance cooperation with oil/gas industry with regard to monitoring market conditions.</i>	Revise Action 2: Maintain and enhance cooperation with oil/gas industry to maintain relations and monitor market conditions. The objective is to forewarn the County of impending changes in employment and or well drilling activity.
8	19-Aug	Lorne Prescott	58	Strategies/Action #2: Unclear as to what "continue a cooperative dialogue with oil/gas industry and property owners to maintain relations and monitor market conditions	Provide clarification in regards to Action #2 and intent	How the monitoring and dialogue should occur should be determined in consultation with the oil/gas industry, but a regular update on local, regional, and national supply and demand would help. The objective is to forewarn the County of impending changes in employment and or well drilling activity.	
9	17-Aug	Doug Dennisson	58	Revise Strategy/Action #2	Revise Text: Maintain and enhance cooperation with state agencies, oil/gas industry and property owners to maintaining relations and monitoring market conditions		
10	17-Aug	Doug Dennisson	58	Add Strategy/Action #5 (proposed)	Add Text: Maintain and enhance cooperation with the state and federal agencies such as CDOW and CDPHE in regards to regulating activity and mitigating impacts	<i>Recommendation: add an Action 5 as follows Maintain and enhance cooperation with the oil and gas industry, state and federal agencies, such as CDOW and CDPHE, in regards to regulating activity and mitigating impacts.</i>	Add Action: Maintain and enhance cooperation with the oil and gas industry, property owners, state and federal agencies, such as CDOW and CDPHE, in regards to regulating activity and mitigating impacts.
11	16-Aug	Lorne Prescott	57	Policy #1, Include reference to CDOW and CDPHE and need to work cooperatively with these agencies	Add Text: Include reference to CDOW and CDPHE and need to work cooperatively with these agencies		
12	17-Aug	Doug Dennisson	57	Revise Issue #2	Revise Text: Mining and extraction operations may have significant visual impacts on the scenery of the county	<i>Recommendation: revise Issue 3 as follows Mining and extraction operations may have significant visual impacts on the scenery of the county</i>	Revise Issue 3: Mining and extraction operations may have significant visual impacts on the scenery of the county

13	17-Aug	Doug Dennisson	57	Correct Issue #3	Revise Text: Oil and Gas Conservation Commission	Revise Text: Oil and Gas Conservation Commission	Revise Text: Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission
14	18-Aug	Lorne Prescott	58	Strategy/Action #3; how will inventory be maintained?	Clarify how inventory of viable gravel and mineral resources will be maintained	<i>Recommendation: add to Action 3 the following phrase: ...using information available from the Colorado Geological Survey and permit data from Garfield County.</i>	Revise Action 3:...using information available from the Colorado Geological Survey and permit data from Garfield County.

Time for additional review							
	Date	Name	Page	Comment Summary	Requested Action	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Action
1	16-Aug	Tonya Nieslanik	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan	Extended 21 days for Written Comment	Extended Written Comment for 21 Days
2	16-Aug	Wendy Harrison	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
3	16-Aug	Brian Kline	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
4	16-Aug	Kendall Williams	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
5	16-Aug	Mary Huffine	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
6	16-Aug	Julian Hardaker	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
7	16-Aug	Deborah Sanderson	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
8	16-Aug	James Van Teylingen	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
9	16-Aug	Nancy Emerson	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
10	16-Aug	Mary Mohrlang	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
11	16-Aug	Bradley Knotts	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
12	16-Aug	Jean Walter	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
13	16-Aug	Jack Pretti	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
14	16-Aug	Mary Weaver	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
15	16-Aug	Carol Pucak	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
16	17-Aug	Cynthia Sullivan	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
17	17-Aug	Danielle Dickey	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
18	17-Aug	Linda Hansen	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
19	17-Aug	Michele DeChant	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
20	17-Aug	Bill Blanton	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
21	17-Aug	Patrick Fitzgerald	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
22	18-Aug	Patrick Fitzgerald	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 2-4 weeks	Request additional 2-4 weeks to review draft plan		
23	17-Aug	Linda Huntsman	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
24	17-Aug	LaPriel Armijo	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
25	17-Aug	Beth Cook	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
26	18-Aug	Mandy Murray	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
27	18-Aug	Town of New Castle	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan until September	Request 30-45 additional days to review draft plan		
28	18-Aug	Town of Silt	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan until September	Request 30-45 additional days to review draft plan		
29	18-Aug	Bradley Plantz	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
30	18-Aug	Jaime Maybon	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
31	18-Aug	Brandy Swanson	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan for 90 days	Request 90 additional days to review draft plan		
32	16-Aug	City of Glenwood Springs	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan	Request additional days to review draft plan		
33	17-Aug	Kent Jolley	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan	Request additional days to review draft plan		
34	18-Aug	Brett Jolley	NA	Delay final action on the Comp plan	Request additional days to review draft plan		
35	16-Aug	Dave Sturges	NA	public concerns and values not being addressed by the PC	Reflect on Public Input		
36	16-Aug	Clark Anderson	NA	public concerns and values not being addressed by the PC	Reflect on Public Input		
37	16-Aug	David Harris	NA	public concerns and values not being addressed by the PC	Reflect on Public Input		
38	8-Sep	Town of Silt	Other	Asks that a revised draft be released prior of the Sept 22/23 hearings	Issue a revised draft document prior to Sept 22/23 or extend hearing dates	<i>Recommendation: Depending on the degree of change in which the Planning Commission agrees upon, this maybe an appropriate action to consider.</i>	Redlined Matrix will be issued on October 29, Revised final Draft to be issued on November 1
39	8-Sep	Carbondale/Glenwood	general	believe issues cannot be addressed sufficiently within scheduled approval timeframe.	Request delay of the adoption of the plan and map until such a time that PC can fully consider comments and		
40	8-Sep	Clark Anderson	General	Issue a Revised draft that can be reviewed this fall and adopted before the new year	Issue Revised draft for review		
Other Issues							
	Date	Name	Page	Comment Summary	Requested Action	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Action
1	8-Sep	Rocky Shepard	Apdx #3	asks that datasets and and maps are reviewed before completion of the CP	Review datasets and maps before moving forward with plan adoption. Zoning needs to be corrected on Map 38, showing PUD per Res 2008-112	Recommendation: Check data with County GIS Department. Current data shows Residential Suburban and Commercial General for this property.	Checked for Map Errors. Retain Current Plan Map