
Minutes of the Board of County Commissioners Payroll Meeting held on August 15, 2019 at 9:00 AM in the Commissioners Board Room, 6683 County Rd 13, Conejos, CO. 81129

Call the meeting to order:

Roll Call: Mitchell Jarvies- Chairman- Present
Steve McCarroll-Vice Chair- Present
Carlos Garcia- Vice Chair-Present
Tressesa Martinez- County Admn.

Also present were Nick Sarmiento-County Attorney, Connie Ricci-HR, and AnnaBelle Gomez, Deputy Clerk and Recorder.

Pledge of Allegiance: Chrmn. Jarvies led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Prayer: Comm. Garcia gave the opening prayer.

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Agenda: Motion to approve the agenda as presented: Comm. McCarroll/Second: Comm. Garcia, all in favor.

3-0 Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve the minutes of the August 09, 2019 Regular Meeting: Comm. Garcia/Second:Comm. McCarroll, all in favor.

3-0 Motion carried.

Approval of Payroll and Accounts Payables: Comm. Garcia/Second: Comm. McCarroll, all in favor.

3-0 Motion carried.

Public Comment: None

Administrator's Correspondence

Tressesa, County Admn. presented the Single Entry Contract for the OLTC Program for Conejos and Costilla.

Nick County Attorney stated that the things that he added are the extra requirements that are required by us from the state.

Motion to approve the Single Entry Point between Conejos and Costilla County: Comm. McCarroll/Second: Comm. Garcia, all in favor.

3-0 Motion carried.

Chrmn. Jarvies stated that he is a board member to the National Heritage. They have asked for a letter of support to the Colorado Tourism Office, they are trying to do a documentary. They are asking for support from the three counties and it does not obligate them financially.

Tressesa, County Admn. presented the letter of support.

Motion to approve the letter of support as presented: Comm. McCarroll/Second: Comm. Garcia, all in favor.

3-0 Motion carried.

County Attorney-Nick Sarmiento

Rocky Mountain Estates- They met with Peggy Bell, Andrea Jones, and another person from Rocky Mountain Estates to discuss some issues. The only thing that they are going to discuss in executive session is whether they should say that the bridge disputed is not ours, should we claim the bridge and talk about the pros and cons.

Horca- He did meet with a few of the Horca residents, a few of the representatives of the board and one of the resident's attorney on Friday and they are asking them that they give them some time to resolve this before they get involved, they will discuss the pros and cons on that.

County Rd Y- He did meet with BLM and they have a great suggestion that he will discuss in executive session and the reasons why they should probably do it.

Forest Service Cattle Guard-He talked with the Colorado Parks and Wildlife; they have grants and have actually replaced cattle guards up there.

Motion to go into executive session as per 24-6-402 (b) conference with the attorney: Comm. McCarroll/Second: Comm. Garcia, all in favor.

3-0 Motion carried.

The board came out of executive session conference with the attorney at 9:38 AM and no decisions were made.

Nick Sarmiento: It is the opinion of the County Attorney that the discussion held in executive session constituted an attorney/client privilege therefore no record was kept.

Nick stated that in terms of Rocky Mountain Estates he needs the board to authorize a letter to CDOT informing them that the bridge at Rocky Mountain Estates is disputed and that we believe that it is not ours.

Comm. Garcia made the motion to allow Nick to send a letter to CDOT concerning the bridge at Rocky Mountain Estates/Second: Comm. McCarroll, all in favor.

3-0 Motion carried.

Nick needs authorization to send a letter to Horca indicating that we are giving them 90 days to resolve the dispute amongst themselves to the walking easement along the river, the two easements that are platted and also the easement that is in dispute, for them to come to a resolution, inform us of their resolution and we will take action thereafter depending on what happens.

Comm. McCarroll made the motion to allow Nick to send the letter to Horca/ Second: Comm. Garcia, all in favor.

3-0 Motion carried.

Nick requested a motion allowing Land Use to apply for an easement on BLM land, the exact dimensions to be determined by Land Use which is in the northern part of County Rd Y.

Comm. McCarroll made a motion to allow Land Use to apply for an easement on BLM land as explained by Nick Sarmiento/ Second: Comm. Garcia, all in favor

3-0 Motion carried.

On Forest Service Road 240 and the cattle guard issue across Mr. Carr's property he is asking the board to authorize a letter to Mr. Carr that we are not responsible for Mr. Carr's cattle guards but we are willing to help if there are signed agreements set forth that we are not responsible but are doing so pursuant to this agreement and that other entities also pitch in to help keep the road open since the road is vital to recreational uses and also to inform Mr. Carr that Colorado Parks and Wildlife does have funds to replace the cattle guard.

Comm. McCarroll made a motion to authorize a letter be sent to Mr. Carr concerning the cattle guards as mentioned by County Attorney Nick Sarmiento/Second: Comm. Garcia, all in favor.

3-0 Motion carried.

Mary Ann Gallegos/County Line Liquors/ Liquor License Renewal

AnnaBelle Gomez, Deputy Clerk presented the renewal liquor license for Mary Ann Gallegos/County Line Liquors, stated that Mary Ann brought the application on July 24, 2019 and posted on site on July 26, 2019, there have not been any violations, etc.

Motion to approve the renewal liquor license for County Line Liquors-Mary Ann Gallegos as presented: Comm. McCarroll/Second: Comm. Garcia, all in favor.

3-0 Motion carried.

Rainbow Supper Club LLC-Liquor License Renewal

AnnaBelle Gomez, Deputy Clerk presented the renewal liquor license for The Rainbow Supper Club LLC, stated that Betsy brought the application on July 29, 2019 and posted on site the same day, there were no violations, etc.

Motion to approve the liquor license renewal for The Rainbow Supper Club LLC: Comm. Garcia/Second: Comm. McCarroll, all in favor.

3-0 Motion carried.

Ernest Abeyta- Ambulance Report

Ernest gave his report as follows:

- Had 103 calls for the month of July, 19 were secondary they had two or more ambulances out- did have several events, they put in 2 new full time hires, and 1 part time.
- Month of July they brought in 20,817.32 which is a little lower on their end, they did have 25 cancelled calls and 14 refusals, so about 40 of those calls were not billed.
- Year to date is \$208,655.06, looking at their AR money that is still owed is \$226,572.48 that they are still trying to collect from insurances and self-pay patients, has been discussing this with their billing agency, they will be re-submitting statements. They are owed \$110,184.57 from self-pay patients; they try to work with them.
- Tressesa, County Admn. asked if he is satisfied with the billing company. Auditors felt it would be better if we did in house billing, asked if he felt okay with it for two more years.
- Ernest stated that he feels that they can do a lot better; the only thing is getting someone to do it for them, if Deborah is willing to go back but before Tamara was doing it also.
- Tressesa stated that she talked to Deborah and she felt that there are two persons from the ambulance service that would be able to help her.
- Ernest stated that now they are billing secondary insurances, but Deborah has run across some money that she has collected verses them; they have been looking at other services.
- Nick stated that he doesn't think it is a 2 year commitment; believes it is a 120 day notice.
- Ernest stated that he handed Nick a draft for an inter-county agreement which is going to affect them and other agencies in being able to do standbys in other counties, as of right now we are certified in Conejos County, not in Alamosa and Rio Grande County. We can only go into those counties if we are requested by them but we have come across the situation as well as Alamosa and, South Fork where they are having difficulty staffing special events. This would mean that it would be easier to apply in each county versus just Conejos County to do those special things. That is going through San Luis Valley RETAC.
- If it's a special event they are not covered because of the county limits.
- Comm. McCarroll stated that Nick should review it and they can approve next time.
- Comm. Garcia agreed.
- Ernest stated that a module had failed and the part for one monitor had to be replaced, the part was going to cost 5,672. He

put an emergency grant with a 10% match from the state and was approved, our share is \$500.00.

- Took one of the ambulances to Roger's Automotive and 5 out of 10 brackets were not in place, it was repaired and completed covered under warranty.
- Had a first aid booth set up at the carnival, they made \$1800 in two days; will have another first aid booth coming up at the Antonito playground.
- Will have a benefit dinner on Sept. 7th for Brooke and David Valdez either at the Opera House or the Parish Hall from 11:00-3:00. He will keep them updated with flyers. (Connie HR will send out an e-mail to all county employees also.)
- Ernest stated that they will be having the Fund with 911 the same as they had last year; they are inviting the hospital this year. Last year they made 2200 and spent 1800 but those included donations. Would like to ask for a budget of 2500.00 for activities, food, etc. Last year they had a free lunch this year they will be asking for a donation.

Motion to allow a \$2500.00 budget for said activity: Comm.

Garcia/Second: Comm. McCarroll, all in favor.

3-0 motion carried.

Ernest stated that he has had a change in the SOP, a lot of the problems they were having was with the staffing. He was basically on call 20 days out of the month and doing 4 days on the street as primary. SOP said that PRN are required to do one shift a month whether it was an event, secondary, or primary. He changed the SOP to PRN who want to pick up primary shifts must also pick up a secondary shift and has changed it from 1 to 2 a month. He used to have almost 50 opens slots a month that he was covering by himself; nursing staff would help him at times; that made a big difference so now we only have 10 open shifts a month.

Linda Land Use-Public Hearing

Chrmn. Jarvies opened up the Public Hearing at 10:00 AM and turned the time over to Linda.

Linda presented the following:

CASE NO: CCLU-2019-0002

APPLICANT: Gary Hostetter

REQUEST: Public Way Vacation- South East portion of County Road 16.9 South and North portions of County Rd W.4, and all of County Rd 17 from W.4 up to W.5.

ZONING: Rural- the surrounding areas of the proposed vacation are all rural zone district with rural/residential and agricultural uses.

BACKGROUND: An application was filed with the Land Use Office on December 18, 2018 for a Vacation of Public Way being a strip of land from the Southeast portion of County Road 16.9, another strip of land on the south side and north side of County Road 16.9 East to County Road 17 and County Road 17 from W.4 north to W.5. See attached map.

OWNERSHIP/LEGAL & SITE DESCRIPTION: The property is owned by Gary Hostetter and Hostetter Family Trust, Lorraine Ashida, and VIP Leasing. The roads are located in portions of the NE1/4 of Section 14, and NW ¼ of Section 13, Twp 35 N, Range 9 East NMPM, Conejos Colorado.

PUBLIC NOTICE REQUIREMENTS: Notices were mailed to the surrounding landowners 500' (7/11/19) from all boundaries. Notice was published in the Valley Courier, 7/13/2019 & 7/31/2019) and a notice was posted on-site by Inspector Chris. Hard copy verification is in the file and available for inspection.

APPLICABLE LAND USE CODE: Land Use Code-Article 3- Application Process, Article 14-Public Way Vacations.

REFERRAL AGENCIES & COMMENTS: Road and Bridge reviewed the application. The current road 16.9 & W.4 exists and are county maintained on the HUTF list for .14 mile. Road and Bridge made recommendations for a 28' wide road easement. The Road 17 S to W.4 is not open or maintained by the county. Don can report if you would like to hear from him.

HEARINGS: PLANNING COMMISSION: PC hearing was held on 08/07/2019. (Public comments-landowners were present and one asked if the Board of County Commissioners would make an exception to allow an evening meeting to accept comments.) The Planning Commission made a recommendation for approval of the vacation with a 28' right-of-way through County Road 16.9, W.4 and 17. Motion Tom/Felipe-unanimous vote.

Chrmn. Jarvies asked Linda if there was adequate public notice.

Linda said yes.

Chrmn. Jarvies opened it up for public comment to speak for or against; asked to state their name and address for the record.

Steve Shawcroft-17045 County Rd W.5- La Jara, CO.

Mr. Shawcroft stated that he has lived there since 1962 as a kid growing up. The road was used by the Hostetter's for their logging trucks that came from the Capulin Road. His dad rented the whole piece of property in the 1970's and used it for pasture. When Mr. Hostetter

bought the property we quit renting it. There is a power line North and South on the edge of the property, there is a ditch on the other side. When Warren Hostetter owned it we always used it as a road. When Mr. Hostetter built his house he put a fence. We own property North of this. About 25 years ago we were going to move our fences about 15 feet and we were told we couldn't, we put an electric fence. Mr. Hostetter built a house on the property line and put up a hut house and shed. I wrote a letter to Don; he came and looked at it and nothing was ever done about it. Since 1962 it was always a road.

Comm. Garcia asked how long ago was it that you wrote the letter?

Steve stated that it was around 2002.

Steve mentioned that he farms; he does the hay for Ms. Ashida. He is opposed to the vacation of road.

Comm. Garcia asked when the fences were put there were they for additional pasture.

Steve said he thought so, they were 24 or 25 feet wide, Manuel Lujan's is 60 feet wide.

Lynnae Shawcroft-17045 County Rd W.5 La Jara, CO

Lynnae: We have lived there for 37 years, stated that was it moved for grazing. Warren Shawcroft would tie the horses to our fences, but the fences would come down, we were told we had to take them down. They used to take a swather through there and there was no access it's our fence, the county put a culvert there. Ms. DeHerrera has a letter of December 2014 that was sent to Mr. and Mrs. Hostetter stating that they were in violation and there was a second letter, when this started a few months ago Donnie talked to us and took pictures. There are issues where the buildings are and also the setbacks they are not in compliance with the 40', they are strictly out of compliance. We asked for copies of the building permits and there are none. If we are not enforcing then change our rules, if we have rules then let's enforce. The school bus used to go through that road, why are we calling it County Road 17, if it's not a road. Ms. Ashida uses that access to get to her property. There is a part where the fence and buildings do not hit the setbacks.

Comm. Garcia asked: The school bus doesn't go thru there anymore?

Lynnae: We don't have kids in school anymore, but they could go around, I am against the vacation of the road.

Donald Valdez: The issue on County RD 17 which goes to Richfield, it is a county road correct?

Linda-Land Use: It is not in our inventory.

Chrmn. Jarvies asked if there was anyone that would like to speak for or anybody in favor, stated that they will give Mr. Hostetter an opportunity to address the concerns that were brought up.

Gary Hostetter: First of all I would like to thank Linda for her hard work; they have been working on this for a long time even though some people are not aware of it, has been very diligent in trying to get this. Would like to give a little history of this- there have been a lot of statements made at the Planning Commission and today that are absolutely not true, I can prove the statements that I am going to make. The first thing that I want known because this keeps being repeated even though the other night I said it 3 times somehow it just doesn't soak in and we can prove this absolutely if anybody cares but this is not county property, the county doesn't own it, we have the deed to it, we pay the taxes on it, it's our dirt. There is an easement that goes through there and nobody is disputing that but there is a difference between the easement and county owned property. They think we are trying to steal county property and that is not true. I have lived there almost all of my life and Steve said it was one piece, I call it a lane, we can argue if it's a road or not. I don't dispute that people would go through there not very much but they do go through there. There are other county roads that are graveled; sometimes the grader maintains them sometimes they don't. They are not like this piece of ground that is just dirt that people drove through. When I was young we didn't own that property, at one point Carl Stoeber fenced it off for several years to put his horses in there it seem to cause a problem it was a permanent fence on each side and he didn't even own any property there, it got rid of the weeds and also for many years Warren Shawcroft had a ditch that ran on the North side and you couldn't drive through there because there was no culvert and there was a ditch and his dad decided he wanted to go through there so they took some wood plants from the sawmill and they built a culvert and people could drive through there again. When we bought the property we owned the dirt and it was a big problem with the weeds, it wasn't one piece there was a fence that came to our lane on our side and on Warren Shawcroft's side there was a fence and lane to the middle and the weeds were a fire hazard for many years they

mowed it which would almost take the entire day. When it would rain and anybody drove through there it just made big ruts and people would get stuck and they would have to pull them out which made it really hard to mow.

In 2008 we had to move to Gunnison we put up an electric fence around 2009. In the 10 years no one came to me and said "hey we need to go through there" and if you understand how that lays, the bus did used to come through there because they would pick up our kids and once we didn't have any children there was no reason for the bus to come through there, there is no reason for anyone to come through there because there is a paved road on the North side and East side and a gravel road on the West side and there is nothing to access through there except us unless someone is out joy riding there is no reason for anyone to go through there except we had the dispute with Lorraine Ashida. They referred to this letter which was sent on December of 2014, what happened is that we had leased her property for years to hay it. It was accessed through our property, the ditch ran through the west side of her property so you couldn't come by her house and get across the ditch, we accessed both fields from our side so when she quit leasing to us then it created a problem because she did not want to go through our property which we told her she was welcome to, she could come in any time but she didn't want to. That's when she came to the county and that's when the letter came out. It has been insinuated here that since 2014 I just ignored this and Linda can attest that I immediately came to her and it was decided that I get with Lorraine and try to figure out something that would work so we have been working on this a long time. What Lorraine wanted to happen which was said the other night but I don't understand that she wanted us to put a pipeline in front of her house so that there was no ditch. It wasn't not only the problem that she couldn't cross the ditch but she could put a culvert in but she didn't want that and also every year when we irrigate since the ditch ran close to her house they would have trouble with subbing and septic system so she wanted us to put this pipe line in but it was going to be really expensive. I didn't think it was worth the cost. It was stated the other night we finally put the pipeline in at her request. She had a lawyer, we negotiated an agreement, she was to pay for half of the materials and I would pay for half of the materials plus I was to put in the labor. It cost our part 6000.00 to put the pipeline. It was stated the other night that I was harassing her and her mother. It was her idea to put the pipeline in; it was through the agreement through her attorney. He insisted that the finished product would be this vacation. How she sat here with these people and listened to these lies and never said anything. I have the signed agreement signed by her, written by her

attorney that spells out all the details. I can print it out and you can have it. How do we solve this problem, after all the expense and time. It is incredible to me that after all this time the only complaint that ever came to me about the fact that we fenced this off was that when Lorraine wanted to go through the back side we solved that problem by spending all this money so she could have her access on the other side. No one has presented here any reason that anybody needs to come through there, for what, to come to my house knowing that they have paved road and gravel road but being what it is I am not disputing the fact that in the old Mormon settlement that there was an easement there that they thought someday there would be a road. When we bought our property there were many encroachments on that easement. There were corals, buildings, fences and other things, the easements were 100 feet, almost half of my property was in the easement and again it was just a fire hazard so we moved our fences.

Steve talked about the letter that he wrote and the complaint that was made. Avelino Muniz was one of the County Commissioners, he came and met with us and some of the neighbors and we went around Richfield and we showed him the many cases or encroachments that there were and it wasn't just us, it actually helps the community. He said at that time it was alright we will make Mr. Hostetter move his fences but all of you have to move your fences, your buildings and everything that is encroaching and everybody backed off, that is the way it stood for all these years. I don't know what anybody is going to gain; our application is to do a vacation so that everything is legal and if anybody can present a good reason why they need to come through there it causes us a lot of grief and a lot of problems but there is an easement there. The proposal that came from the Planning Commission is we would like to vacate the whole thing because we will have to put up some fences and do some things because the pasture on 5 of our acres is connected to this now. We are not going to pasture that without some time and expense but if there is a need for people to come through there I am reasonable. I understand that there is an easement now but the proposal was to a 28 foot easement that way we don't have to tear down our buildings which is a great expense. That will benefit no one but maybe to get a little blood because they think we are stealing county property which we are not.

Chrmn. Jarvies asked the Board if they have any questions for Mr. Hostetter or any discussion.

Comm. Garcia: When you purchased the land did you buy all of the land that the easement calls for.

Mr. Hostetter: It is owned by three people. Our property goes half way through the easement, my sister bought the piece adjacent to us and Lorraine Ashida owns half the easement that is adjacent to her, she is part of this application. If I am harassing her then why is she part of this application to vacate this because the agreement was that when we put in the pipeline it was that we would do a boundary line adjustment and she would deed us her portion. That would be part of our compensation for all the money and the time that we put in to the pipeline.

Comm. McCarroll: Is that in your letter from the attorney; is that recorded?

Gary Hostetter: This was written by her attorney. I was pretty disturbed after the meeting the other night so I talked to him yesterday and he said he would be happy to provide anything that this commission would like on this. The other part was when they had the dispute with Duane Marquez several years ago and you are involved in that it was an identical situation; there is a right-of-way between our property. My son was building a house on our property and he protested it because he said he didn't want a house there and it's our property. We had this big dispute and it was the identical thing. There was an easement through there. We had $\frac{1}{2}$ and he had $\frac{1}{2}$ and because the county couldn't find that plat where the original easement was put they can't say there was an easement there. We ended up giving up $\frac{2}{3}$ of our half of the easement to him to settle the dispute and the whole thing was closed off. The public had a right to go through there. That had been fenced off since I was a little boy so it just seems ironic that I lost part of my property in my dispute and it was closed off and now we are going to do the reverse thing here.

Linda-Land Use Admn: Can I quickly defend my position. The Ashida Division of Land is what dedicated those easements to the public. That is why we are here going through a vacation process. I know there was a letter from Steve which triggered everything. I am not sure why I didn't keep a copy of it in my records. The commissioners asked us to address the situation so we did, we addressed it and that's when I started working with Mr. Shawcroft. There were a lot of legal issues taking place. I met with my legal team at the time which was not Mr. Sarmiento and we agreed that we would let them resolve their legal issues with the Marquez family first and then it went to the Ashida family. It has taken a very long time to get to this point; that is what we agreed to do. The other part is that on the construction permits there are several buildings that were pre-construction permitting time that were there so we didn't request and didn't have

any say in that. I do have two buildings which is the green house and the quonset building that I don't have permits on and again I will work with Mr. Hostetter and after it is all set and done regards to those structures, there is one new permit that my staff did issue not knowing about the letter and knowing that they couldn't issue for the most recent current construction on his home. I promise that I will treat everybody the same. I try to work out the situation rather than make people tear things down because that is not what I want to do. Mr. Hostetter is willing to work on it, it has just taken a long time for Mr. Hostetter to work the issues with the Marquez's and the Ashida's so that's why we are here now. Thank you.

Lorraine Ashida: My name is Lorraine Ashida. Gary is saying that I am against him and all of that. One of the agreements was in our agreement that I would not oppose to the vacation of County Rd 17 so when I come to these meetings I am here just to observe and just to listen not to make comments so the other night Gary was wondering why I didn't say anything and it's because that was our agreement that I would not say anything I am here to listen and observe. As for other people's comments I have no say so in what they say I can't dictate that they can't say anything that's their opinion. Gary thinks that their comments are my comments, they are not; I have not said a word in our meetings so I just want to clarify that. Thank you.

Chrmn. Jarvies asked anyone else for or against.

Steve Shawcroft: I have one question. Didn't the county do a lot of the work when they put the pipeline in front of the Ashida's, it looks like the county was there for a full day.

Comm. McCarroll: In front of the house, no.

Steve: But they brought in rock and covered it up.

Comm. McCarroll: We could have helped with dirt to cover it more but that was a little before my time.

Lorraine Ashida : Gary did the work on the pipeline. I asked the county to come and cover it more that's why they came.

Donald Valdez: Steve was asking a question about the culvert on the easement, yes it was installed by the county; believe it was in 2014 or 2015 that the culvert on County Rd W.5 and the 16.9 that was the culvert that was installed by the county. At that time I was leasing the Ashida's property and at that time I was irrigating the property.

Also there was not an access into the property through the Ashida's property because the ditch that runs through there either you have to access it through the Hostetter's property to go North into Ashida's property. Is there a possibility to get access through 16.5 to build a fence and a gate into Ashida's property? At that time there were concerns and more issue discussions, that's when the culvert was installed by the county on County Rd. W.5.

Comm. McCarroll: We were involved on the culvert that goes on 17. They were allowed to come in and go into Lorraine's property.

Chrmn. Jarvies: Anyone else for or against?

Russell Shawcroft: I live at 17045 County Rd which is right across. I know when Gary was talking about why would anyone need access to that roadway. I have contacted the Ashida's about purchasing the property behind so at that point I just want to know how could I have access if County Rd 17 is not there because you could go to 17 to the back of that property to build a house right there. It would be right across from my parent's house. I am going to stay here in the valley, I work at the college, this is where I have grown up and I just know there would be no way go get around to it unless I go all the way around through the Ashida's property. I am against it.

Chrmn. Jarvies: Anyone else for or against, anyone else for or against, for or against.

Chrmn. Jarvies: At this time Mr. Sarmiento there was a citizen's comment who talked to Linda asking about holding this hearing at a time when she could comment. What are our options to extend the public comment and allow her to comment? What are your feelings I don't want to leave anybody out.

Nick Sarmiento: I understand that Chair but at the same time everyone is given the same opportunity to come in and comment during these hearings. If we were to allow one comment to come in the evening then we have to start allowing everyone else and that just affects the efficiency of the process and sets out the decision a little bit out. It's within the commissioner's discretion but I am against it.

Chrmn. Jarvies: Did that person put anything in writing.

Linda: No she did not. She was present at the Planning Commission Meeting and made her comments but did not submit anything in writing.

Nick Sarmiento: What were her comments at the Planning Commission?

Linda: Stating that it was a road that the bus used to go through there when she used to ride the bus. Mr. Mickelsen used to drive them through there. She was opposed to it, stating that it was a road.

Chrmn. Jarvies: Would you go ahead and state her name.

Linda: Yes, Emilia Lujan. She is within the 500' notification circle on the North side of I believe is 17.2 Rd.

Chrmn. Jarvies closed the public comment period for the hearing, asked the board members if they are ready to make a decision. We can at this time or do they extend and study some of this stuff that has been presented to us such as the letter from Ms. Ashida's attorney.

Nick Sarmiento stated that before they make any decision, on the Land Use Code the requirements are set forth on 14.3. I believe Ms. DeHerrera has already gone through it, provided a fee, a survey plat, legal description and the adjacent owners have been notified so they move from there to the review procedure. Everything has been filed to the t, we are now at paragraph D which is the public hearing portion of it, at this point you have the right to vacate or not vacate or vacate with conditions according to our Land Use Code. According to the Colorado Revised Statutes Sect. 43-2-203 the only time that you cannot vacate a roadway as per 43-2-303(2)(a) is if no platted or deed of roadway or part thereof or un-platted or undefined roadway which exists by right of usage shall be vacated so as to leave any land adjoining said roadway without an established public road or private access easement connecting to said land or other established public road. I haven't heard any evidence today to indicate that there would be a parcel of land that would be landlocked without access if you were to vacate the roads that they are requesting to vacate. Your authority is to vacate with conditions or to deny the application.

Comm. Garcia asked if he found anything inspecting the contract.

Nick Sarmiento stated that it has set forth the history on those properties that sets forth the agreement the duties and obligations between Ashida and the Hostetter's. It does state in paragraph 17.2 (8.2)(9.2) that the Ashida will take a position during these proceedings, the contract is still in full force.

Comm. Garcia asked what did the Hostetter's give up for her (Ashida) not taking a position?

Nick Sarmiento stated that there are multiple things. The Hostetter's essentially incur some costs such as the fence cutting and irrigation. I didn't really focus on those types of issues.

Chrmn. Jarvies stated that there are a lot of developments so they come to them and that is when we have to decide and make those decisions which are never easy. It is hard if you can't find the plat.

Nick Sarmiento stated that one of the things that is being discussed is if this is a road or not. We have an easement, even when it's clearly a county road there are times when we vacate a county road based upon the application if there is a need for it. I would advise the board that they recognize this as a county road.

Comm. McCarroll suggested postponing their decision until the first meeting in September.

Nick asked the board not to seek any more information outside of what was presented here and what is of record that is due fairness to all the parties. They have come here and presented their evidence which is the only evidence that you should consider in making this decision. If anybody calls tell them that you cannot consider any other information for or against and notify him as soon as they contact you.

Comm. McCarroll made a motion to postpone their decision until the meeting on September 05, 2019. Second: Comm. Garcia, all in favor.

3-0 Motion carried.

Anna Lee Vargas- Wildlife Corridor Presentation

Anna Lee stated that she is the director project manager and community outreach with Conejos Clean Water. She is here to see if the county is interested in adopting a resolution which is reference to the Rio Grande National Forest service plan. The comment period was in 2017 when the environment statement came out and included the special interest areas which I am going to advocate for today. It is the 60 day objection period for the Rio Grande National Forest service plan that came out on special interests that we have to advocate for that weren't in the actual plan so that is what she is going to talk about today.

The first one is the Spruce Hole Toltec special interest area. This is the 36,600 acre interest area located in Conejos Peak Ranger District by the Conejos River; she did include a map shows the boundaries as

well as HWY 17 which creates the Western Boundary and the Southern Boundary which is the Colorado/New Mexico State line where the Rio Grande National Forest and the Carson National Forest meet. They want the special interest areas to be included in the management plan wildlife corridors. The special interests would enhance these corridors, this kind of habitat activity for large game species, elk, deer, big horn sheep, as well as other species of animals. There are nesting and meeting grounds. They researched migratory patterns of animals that were crossing from New Mexico into Colorado and what species were crossing. The management process is important for the vision of Rio Grande National Forest Service and how these will be managed for future generations. This is for the fragmentation. We want the animals to cross from Colorado into New Mexico with the decrease of human fragmentation that is what they are concerned with. The special interest would enhance by not allowing any more roads or private fences from the landowners. This is just to allow animals to cross like they have been for thousands of years; mentioned that the mule deer don't go around. The other is the Chama Basin Watershed which consists of 17,790 acres that they are proposing to include in the special interest for watershed protection. This was part of the patented Tierra Amarilla Land Grant. What she is doing is gaging the feelings of the communities, addressing commissioners, municipalities, and community members, etc. to see if they would be interested in protecting these wildlife corridors.

Comm. Garcia stated that there has not been a whole lot that he has heard going on about this so he is becoming informed about it at this point. You just said that you were gaging with groups to see how they feel which is great but I haven't heard from the agricultural rancher type perspective on that; if there are meetings out there he would attend.

Anna Lee stated that this is only a 60 day objection period, this does not have to do anything with Congress; it would be managed by the Forest Service. It does state in the resolution where the increase fragmentation from the roads, fences, fires and different things. We want to decrease the human fragmentation and allow all animals to come. We have avid hunters in the San Luis Valley who depend on these animals to cross. Private landowners have tags for people that can come to their land and hunt. The fragmentation would affect us. We want these animals to cross from New Mexico without interference. The plans are not updated as often as they would like. About 2/3 of the wildlife are threatened or endangered which is around 12,000 species, we have stats, migratory patterns, and numbers to show that this is a big corridor.

Comm. McCarroll asked Anna Lee if she was advocating to hold people out; that the people that are running cattle out there are no longer to be there.

Anna Lee said no that is not at all what it would be. The designation would not come from Congress at all; it would just be the way the Forest Service could manage the interest areas. It would just decrease fragmentation it would not affect cattle grazing; that is not what we want.

Comm. McCarroll stated you don't know that.

Anna Lee said there are special interests included in the resource management in the planning process already. We know from experience how these would be managed. It has nothing to do with permittees or cattle it is just adding this so the wildlife could come through.

Chrmn. Jarvies stated that they just did the whole plan.

Anna Lee stated that CPW and Natural Resources advocated for these special interests also. She has communicated with supervisor Dan Ellis why they are advocating for them but Colorado Parks and Wildlife and Department of Natural Resources also advocated for these special interest areas.

Comm. McCarroll asked Jeremiah Martinez how he felt about it.

Jeremiah stated that he doesn't know what's being advocated and where the wildlife's perspective is. They are a multi-use agency; they try to balance those uses.

Comm. McCarroll stated that he feels this sincerely. Anytime they do a designation such as this that we are working towards an end that would cause us as a people not to go in anymore. I have seen it in the past. Right now Mr. Chairman I am not for this.

Chrmn. Jarvies stated that as Mr. Garcia expressed maybe it's a little early. We probably need to get out and talk to some of our constituents. I would hate to make a decision that would hurt anyone.

Comm. Garcia asked if they need to invite Andrea Jones to come to their September 5th meeting and inform us more on this.

Donald Valdez asked if he can get a copy for Mr. Martinez from BLM.

Anna Lee stated that she did talk to Andrea and the supervisor Dan Ellis so they do know what they are advocating for. They are in communication why they have expressed concern and why they want to advocate for the wildlife connectivity. They help them with the youth program during the summer.

Comm. McCarroll asked Anna if they are suggesting that they put signs up saying this is a wildlife corridor.

Anna Lee said no it is not signage because that would cause fragmentation.

Chrmn. Jarvies stated that they appreciate the work that she is doing; let them do some more research.

Nick Barela- DSS Report

Nick stated that he would like to move the agenda so he may have his guests from Southwest Conservation Corp and Bureau of Land Management do their presentation on the Conejos Youth Program first.

Anna Hendricks regional director of the Southwestern Conservation Corp stated that they want to hi-lite something that is great that happened in your community this summer with Conejos County Youth Group Program. The Southwest Conservation Corp are an environmental non- profit that engages youth; young adults, and military vets to hand on conservation work on public lands. Their mission statement is to empower people to possibly impact their lives, communities and their environment. This is a show case of what these youth were able to do this year which is feeling empowered to develop personally and professionally to gain some really good skills and get some exposure for job opportunities, to get out there and do work that is meaningful working with public lands which has a positive impact on the community in which they live in. They put together a slide show so they could see some of the work that they did this year and passed it over to Aubrey.

Aubrey stated that she is the programs manager. She did all the hiring and project planning for this crew; she showed some photos which included the 5 weeks doing trail work on Duck Lake Trail which was approximately 3 miles. They removed logs, built drains, built a re-route that was extremely muddy, closed off some social trails.

Anna stated that this was the first year of the Conejos County Youth Program. The program was funded through the Department of Social Services which funded all 5 weeks of work which is really valuable

because it allows consistency for that crew. They have a long standing relationship with the Conejos Peak Ranger; they gave the youth something that they could really invest in. It looks like DSS is interested in funding it for next year. One of the considerations that came up and feels that it is worthy of bringing up since it is funded through federal funds through DSS as for the cost of the program is \$7200 a week which includes leadership training, tools, vehicles, gear etc. There is a cap for income which is folks with an annual income above 75,000 a year their kids are not eligible for this program. One of the considerations that they talked about was that if they wanted to open it up to those youth they would need to secure some sort of additional funding, they would come back to see if they could fund 1-2 weeks if the county wanted to support that.

Chrmn. Jarvies asked if they had limited to a small group to see how it worked out; could it potentially get bigger.

Anna stated that they were only able to fill six of the slots.

Jeremiah stated that they limit the hitches. Costilla does a late hitch and an early hitch. We did limit one kid from Conejos just to see how it went. It was highly successful, that the second hitch would be beneficial if we could have the flexibility where they could get to higher country in the later season. They hosted Costilla's about three weeks which is good because they are not exposed to public lands that much. They really enjoyed themselves. They were able to use the Red Bear Inn to take showers and grab a bite to eat. It was good to see the kids have a sense of purpose.

Carlos Garcia commented on the before and after pictures which shows what they learned and what they produced.

Jeremiah stated that they are talking about progressing the crews; they can build an actual structure. They went from working and going home to camping a week long.

Donald Valdez thanked Anna and Mr. Martinez and all those in the Youth Corp that helped out the youth. These programs keep our youth going. Thanked the DSS for engaging our youth. Not every youth has the opportunity to be on our public lands but also the structure and order in involving them in a stable and positive environment. The outdoors it not only mental and behavioral trait that we all need for recreation and peace of mind for giving these kids hope, positive manners; we need more of this. As he looked at the cost per month for this program is that enough or too much for the cost that is put in

the program. You will see how much it will change one individual to keep them on the right path, from right from wrong, doing good or bad because outside of this world there is a lot of addiction, a lot of negative aspects and it starts with us making a better world for tomorrow. He thanked Nick Barela for all he does and what he continues to do and each and every one that volunteer their time. If you get a change take a kid fishing or take the kid to the mountains, know how important that is.

Nick Barela presented a change in the agenda he would like to remove the fiscal agent request. That will no longer be needed to be discussed.

Nick presented EBT expenditures in the amount of \$267,183.82 and accounts payables for July in the amount of \$44,083.15.

Motion to approve EBT expenditures and account payables as presented by Nick: Comm. Garcia/Second: Comm. McCarroll, all in favor.

3-0 Motion carried.

Nick continued his report as follows:

- Child Support- 406 cases Adult Financial-144 cases
 - Colorado Works-53 cases Food Assistance-732 cases
 - Medicaid Assistance-1638
-
- Renewal for Family Engagement which is with Mary Susan Aldrige paid via CORE Funds- the maximum amount is up to \$5000 which will cover them through the fiscal year. This has been budgeted for with the CORE budget that he presented a couple of months ago.
 - Update of Employment First Plan which was due on August 5th 2019, what makes it hard on this is that there a lot of variables. The state wants to run the program if they can find a vendor to do so if not it falls on the burden of the county to pick up. His request to the state is if you guys pick it up and as contingency if you can't then CORE can pick it up, what makes it difficult is the amount that we get. State wide it is a 2 million dollar program. Conejos County's share of that is very small making it very difficult to entertain a part time or even a ¼ time position to securely run this program. This program is very similar to our Colorado STEPS program. One of the changes is that they are

changing it from a mandatory program to a voluntary program which means clients can choose to do it. It is a lot of effort and time to put to a voluntary program, administrative allocation would be about 20,000 which is split into 6 or 7 programs. Some is 100% and some is 80% and 50%, if they have to move forward at least 10,000 would be county funds that we would have to contribute. Some of those participants would have to do around 80 hours of work; right now the population would be around 270 clients. We don't have the resources here to put people to that type of work. He will keep them informed as to whether the state picks it up.

- Proposed Food Stamp Rule which could have an adverse impact to some of our clients in Conejos County. That increased the poverty level from 130 to 200%. This would basically change that back to and also add some requirements as far as verifying resources. This would impact about 36 clients in Conejos County. It's not all bad and is open for public comment until the second week of September. It would not be implemented until 2020.
- Got their allocation for this July federal fiscal year. They will send attestation later basically saying that they have the county funds to cover the county portion of it. He did send the information to the state.
- Received an award of excess parental fee in the amount of \$1,895.23 which can be used for Child Welfare Training. They do have some built up from the last few years which is 120,000. It is earmarked for certain expenditures.
- They did give out school supplies yesterday. They gave 210 back packs, also will be giving 20 lap tops. Thanked the Guadalupe Parish CU and the Knights of Columbus for allowing them to use their hall.
- Will be having their team building retreat on August 22nd 2019.

Rodney King- Emergency Preparedness

Rodney stated that he talked to Nathan Coombs concerning the dam. They had their 75 year inspection and it is one of the best dams in Colorado so it was approved for another 75 years. They did each section of the canyon there are 790 locations that the messages went

to, totally there are like 600, he did update the face book if they want more information, he did limit the amount of texts. They have had 3100 contacts on their face book. He does a test every month.

Chemical safety workshop went real well. Almost 50 people showed up. It was very informative but there was no one from Conejos County. They did some changes and took stuff out.

He and Teri will be coming to the SLV Commissioner's Meeting to request some funding for their EOC. Last year they didn't ask for anything because they were able to get some grant funding through EPR. They probably have anywhere from 1800-2000 in expenses this year. They will be asking for that by the end of this month. The agreement was that each county contribute to it. Once in a while the state has more money than they figure they have, this is one of those years that Emergency Management approves some special projects so they asked for 2 projects in the amount of 14,000, they agreed to be the fiscal agent. They are trying to take their IC trailer and put more stuff in it such as printers and anything they can set up in IC. The spring fire taught them a lot, they couldn't get current information, they set up at the school and it was much better. The funding for that will be part of what they had from the mitigation fund; they will have some EOC Funds. It's been a busy year but nothing drastic.

Donald Valdez had a couple of questions for Rodney. Asked if we are using the radar of the Alamosa communications and also communications from Conejos County.

Rodney stated that Nathan assures him that they are in the process of getting hooked up to the National Weather Service. Pueblo National Service says "no they can't use it". They would have to go on line to see it. I think what happened was they didn't cooperate a whole lot when they were putting it in so they just went over their head to the main guy so they assured him that they are hooked up, we should get current information. We had Everbridge for 5 years and the 911 board looked at that and said that is better than what we had so they switched us and our contract ended last November and we got an extension; we pay them 500 a year instead of 6000 a year to be part of their group.

Donald stated that communication is important because getting the vital and correct information out to individuals to make sure that they are in safe areas and safe zones is critical. His second question is going to accountability and funding. How can they at the state level help you whether it would be technology, equipment or training?

Do you know how much funding you would receive from the state and how much from the county?

Rodney stated that they have been approved \$30,000 from the state for emergency management with a 50% match. His budget has to be at least 60,000. Last year he didn't spend all of it so they had to turn in about \$1800. He got what he needed, he didn't get any big items and they didn't have anything drastic going on. He tried to be as economical as he can. He is on the council through the governor down a few levels through the funding committee to re-do how funds are giving to emergency managers. He represents the rural area. They have done 2 or the 3 parts. The state will come back on the part they have asked them to do. He is hoping to increase at least the rural part. Thanked Rodney for his service on Emergency Management here in the county.

Kat Olance- Chrmn. of SLV Museum Association- Museum Discussion

Kat stated that she is president of the SLV Museum Association and also president for the SLV Tourism Association. She presented a packet which was a donation offer to the Conejos County Museum. They are sketches of the Cumbres Toltec so it shows Antonito and different trains and engines; they are framed.

They have 2 things going with the museum association, last fall they applied for application for a workshop for a Cultural and Heritage Tourism Workshop which was held in January, about 30 people attended including representatives from Conejos County. The two outcomes that came from that were Oral Histories and Dark Skies. She went to a conference in Walsenburg. They were featuring a mobile app. called travel stories. One project is a small marketing grant for Los Caminos. They want to turn that into a driving tour, described how that will work with your blue tooth. Right now they have about 17 geo tags that they can manage with the budget that they have which is about 12,500. They want to come back in September to see what they want to add. It is about 350 per geo tag; would like to increase the budgeting market as well.

Kat stated that the information talks about the application which includes a letter of support from Huerfano County Tourism for their highway of legends. Los Caminos is just step one.

Chrmn. Jarvies asked if they have applied for any grants through the Heritage Area, also stated that Los Caminos Antiguos has a little bit of money; she can talk to Julie Chacon on that.

Kat talked about the Dark Skies. They have a Dark Skies driving tour, talked about what towns it includes; mentioned that the funds will go for marketing.

Chrmn. Jarvies mentioned that Dark Skies is for star gazing.

Kat wanted to know what would be the best way to track visitor numbers would it be on the website for the lodging tax.

Kat stated that she can put flyers to look for volunteers to help at the museum.

Kat talked about the change on the map which includes arts, culture, outdoor adventures and all national wild refugees; also has 13 walking/driving tours.

Donald Valdez, Representative- Thanked Kat for coming in and talking about tourism and museums. Tourism dollars that come in are a huge asset to the county and the San Luis Valley.

Rocky Mountain Estates-Peggy Bell and Jo Frazier

Peggy Bell from Rocky Mountain Estates FDR 250 stated that she is here to talk about the bridge.

Nick Sarmiento-County Attorney stated that they had a meeting on Friday. Ben Gibbons was there they discussed a resolution which has been going on since 1982; no one is taking ownership of this bridge. Right now the county is not obligated to maintain it; it is not in our easements and has not been properly dedicated and I know that is being disputed. There are some issues going on but we are willing to help you in anyway, shape or form with our limited resources. At this point there has been a discussion about RAC. I believe you are applying for a grant that needs to be taken today aside that there is an issue whether the county will sign on to this grant.

Tressesa, County Admn. stated that their group is applying for the grant she will be helping them and maybe they could apply for the next round, she wants to move forward with the grant and she said she would help her.

Ms. Bell stated that originally the county was going to apply for it, that individuals couldn't and it would be better if the county could apply for it; mentioned that they don't always have money and now they do. If they apply now they could get some. There is also the question of the bridge inspection.

Nick stated that CDOT inspects all the bridges. This bridge has been inspected in the past because CDOT thought it was a county bridge but if we are going to the position that this is not a county bridge then I request that the board take that position or take the position that this is a disputed bridge; that is a policy decision.

Chrmn. Jarvies stated that because of the history it would be good to get it figured out it's still a disputed bridge and we need to figure it out. CDOT would probably stop inspecting it until it is figured out.

Nick stated that he doesn't believe it's a county bridge. In 1982 it came close to becoming a county bridge. There was no follow up, no public dedication, no public acceptance by the county and yes there was a lot of work done to get to that point and everyone thought that we were going to accept and dedicate that bridge as a public bridge.

Chrmn. Jarvies stated that personally he doesn't mind Tressesa helping her with good faith from the county to see if it's possible to get it in on time.

Tressesa, County Admn. stated that they can work on it this afternoon and will do her best to submit it; mentioned that the Forest Service is also able to apply for the grant.

Chrmn. Jarvies stated that they will send a letter to CDOT stating that it is a disputed bridge; they will probably stop inspecting it.

Ms. Bell asked if they don't receive any money from the grant will the county consider helping them in a 3 way partnership which in the latest inspection it showed the bridge needs to be repaired.

Chrmn. Jarvies stated that they can have those discussions but cannot commit to it either way; they can sit with all the parties involved.

Comm. Garcia stated that the good thing that is happening right now is that you are applying for this grant, hope that they do get funded from what Andrea Jones mentioned it seems like you will get funded.

Ms. Bell stated that the latest bid is \$27,400.

Donald Valdez stated that just coming to the table like they did and continue the discussion is very important. He would like to give a letter of support for the grant process. If it does not go through and the bridge is unsafe I would like notice to be given to residents in that area that way no one gets hurt.

Donald Valdez-Repr./Report

Donald stated that it is great to be here in his home county of Conejos. The state has a lot of programs moving forward. One of the biggest issues is addiction, how do we continue education prevention and treatment. It all starts with the individual's right choices right from wrong, yes or no. This affects all of us whether it is family or friends. We have an issue on overcrowding in our jails. We need more rural education which is a guidance for the individuals and our communities. Also rural infrastructure whether it's roads or bridges, I saw two cases her today. We need to bring in broad band into our communities, the pros and cons, technology is moving fast, has engaged our youth thanked them for the Youth Corp Program that gets the youth outdoors gets them engaged at a young age. He is willing to help out in any way he can and listen. Thanked the board of their dedication to the county.

Tressesa, County Admn. stated that they appreciate Donald being here. He mentioned that he is a citizen of this county, you saw where people request things from the county every single day, our coffers are pretty dry and we are proposing a county sales tax. If the sales tax does not go through in November there will be cuts to our offices. There will be dire cuts in Road and Bridge, our ambulance service is in great danger of being cut so as a citizen of the county we appreciate if you support the sales tax. Citizens seem to want the services but they don't want to pay for them. In your capacity I would appreciate if you would support it.

Donald stated that revenue is a huge issue, Gallagher is a huge issue, if you have an answer I am ears. If you have an answer for education, for health care I am ears. I ask you guys what plan do you have to move this forward, you know where the budget is in our county. You know the issues and concerns, you know the people, what plan do we have to mark and move this forward?

Chrmn. Jarvies stated we do have a committee in plan. We are getting the word out to people, asking people from the community to get the word out. Word of mouth is the best advertisement. We are still planning public meetings, going out and talking to people so they understand the situation. We have never collected a sales tax in Conejos County. We need to get the communication out to people; that's exactly what Tressesa is talking to you about. You are in a lot of public places and different areas. We need to put a good faith effort since North Conejos is pushing for their school bond; it's going to take the community getting together.

Comm. McCarroll stated that there are people that have key positions talking against it. It will detrimental if we cut the ambulance

completely and have to rely in Alamosa or Costilla to come and pick up our people.

Donald asked if they support the referendum or initiative on the November ballot of 2.75%.

Comm. Garcia: I have seen a lot of good things come out. They attended all the town board meetings. They did open up some eyes; there was a lot of negativity. I support it 100%.

Chrmn. Jarvies: Yes I do.

Comm. McCarroll: Yes.

Donald stated that it starts with us. We don't need negative comments. We need a positive environment. Let's bring in North Conejos School District to a meeting and see how we can move them both forward and also put a plan. If we work against each other it is not going to work. It's going to take all of us.

Linda DeHerrera as a citizen: We did have a committee and we had a meeting and the school board came to talk about that there is no reason why both can't pass. We need to do this as a community to make both matters work.

Comm. Garcia stated that we already have the bond issue in South Conejos. We have a lot of people in South Conejos that are pushing for the sales tax. It will generate money from a lot of people that are passing through the town. Thanked Repr. Donald Valdez for the work that he has done locally and statewide for all of us and for attending today's meeting.

Donald Valdez-Repr.: It does take accountability. I would rather see the sales tax here. We have a lot of issues here and that revenue is essential to continue local government and local government is all of us residents and the staff. I am willing to work with you to move forward. You look at Amazon and you see what it's doing to our retail stores. Reach out to me if I can't attend I will try to phone in. Right now I am moving state wide, on the record I am your State Representative and here to represent you and the residents and I thank you for your service and let's continue to work together.

Comm. McCarroll mentioned that we were cut 300,000 from PILT. We are trying to approach our Representatives and Senators to see how we can get that money back.

Donald Valdez stated that he will call or write our US Representatives, Senators and President because it is essential.

Tressesa-County Admn. stated that they need to move forward. They cut the PILT piece from the SRS monies that they transferred over to the schools. They need help to see how they can get that back; that's just to maintain the General Fund.

Comm. McCarroll talked about the huge rock that fell a couple of weeks ago and the three washes at the Alamosa River. When it comes to public safety we are always there.

Donald-Repr. asked the board to e-mail some information on SRS and also on the incidents that Comm. McCarroll was talking about. Mentioned that we are a unique county with public and private lands, that SRS Funding is critical to our county, he will also get a letter of support.

Linda-Land Use

Linda mentioned that Josh Watters resigned from the Planning Commission and Board of Adjustments so she needs to appoint someone; she current has Armando Valdez who serves on the Planning Commission and Board of Adjustments. She can have two members serve on both. She is here to request to see if they can appoint Tom Stewart. She can get a formal letter for the record showing his willingness to serve, that would be effective August 1st.

Motion to appoint Tom Stewart to serve on the Planning Commission and Board of Adjustments: Comm. McCarroll/Second: Comm. Garcia, all in favor.

3-0 motion carried.

Special Use Permit-Louis, Mary Ann and Louis Paul Gallegos-Discussion

Linda stated that in 2008 they approved a Special Use Permit for Louis, Mary Ann, and Louis Paul Gallegos concerning impounded, disabled cars. They have been getting a lot of phone calls on this activity there on crushing of the vehicles. She did not remember parcel B, the resolution was approved but wasn't signed or recorded. She went back and checked the minutes. She is asking that they ratify Resolution 2008-20 and ask for signatures so she can get it recorded.

Nick Sarmiento stated that as long as they can provide them with the minutes they are ratifying based on the error that happened then.

Linda stated that they identified them as Parcel A which is the corner and Parcel B by Pearl Gallegos. They have disabled vehicles there that they are crushing. Chris will check because both places are temporary.

Perry Sowards-Division of Land- Discussion

Linda talked about the Perry Sowards Division of Land. She needed clarification because the land was conveyed. The application was processed under James and Mary Sowards, used the deeds that were on file when they applied. Those folks conveyed the property in October the year before but never recorded the deed. They recorded the deed after she had accepted the application. She has an affidavit from Perry and Clint Sowards stating that they were going to do the same thing. It was just lack of communication. She is here to ask that they approve the clarification and approve and Exempt Subdivision of Land for the Perry Sowards Division of Land on the E1/2 of NW1/4 of 18-34-10.

Motion to approve Resolution C-2019-027 for the Perry Sowards Division of Land: Comm. McCarroll/Second: Comm. Garcia, all in favor.

3-0 Motion carried.

There being no further business to come before the board, Chrmn. Jarvies declared the meeting adjourned.

ATTEST: _____

NATHAN RUYBAL
CLERK OF THE BOARD

MITCHELL JARVIES
CHRMN. BD OF COUNTY COMM.