

LWV AC Observer Corps Reporting Form

Meeting Attended: Archuleta County Board of County Commissioners

Date of meeting: May 6, 2014

Observer: Johnny Pickett

Attach agenda			
Feature Evaluated	Yes	No	Comments
Type of meeting --circle			<u>Regular</u> Special Public Hearing Exec Session Work Session
Did meeting start on time?	yes		
Were all members present?		no	Steve Wadley was absent due to Dr. appt.
Were members attentive?	yes		
Media coverage?	Yes		Pagosa Sun and Pagosa Daily Post
Staff present?			
Administrator Finance Legal Council Others	Yes		Director of Road and Bridge County Administrator County Attorney Airport Manager
Audience #? Special interests?	yes		Extensive public comment on nuisance ordinance complaint against Jaddice Martin and Joe Garcia
Did the members appear to have done their homework?	yes	See note below	Items involving budget commitments had been checked etc. More explanation and discussion of the two land use items would have been useful.
Were members courteous to each other and the public?	yes		
Were the Sunshine Law requirements followed?	yes		
--agenda sent/posted 24 hours before?	yes		
--agenda items clearly described what was to be discussed?	yes		
-adequate opportunity for public input?	?		A question was asked about the wording of the resolution regarding allowing dog kennels in certain zoning areas with "a conditional use permit" The question was not really adequately addressed but resolution passed anyway.
-was there the appearance that some action items were discussed in closed rather than in open session?		no	

Was background information available to public?	yes		The agenda and supporting documents were on line.
Facilities: big enough? Well lit? Could see officials? Could hear?	yes		
Decisions: "cut & dried"?	yes		
Other observations:			
Any LWV positions relevant to issues discussed?	yes		One attendee (Steve Keno) Indicated he planned to file a public records requests seeking the identity of people who filed complaints under the County's nuisance ordinance. He and Bill Hudson see a developing conflict between "old timers" who want to be left alone and new comers with different expectations. Because "nuisance" is an ill defined term they feel that there is a need to modify the ordinance. The commissioners indicated that they use a standard of "health safety and welfare" in applying the ordinance. But also indicated that if there is a specific proposal to modify the ordinance they would consider it. A community dialogue on the subject was suggested by Bill Hudson.

Note: The item related to the change in the County Land Use plan to allow Kennels in the AR, AE, C and I zoning categories with "conditional use permit" was evidently recommended by the Planning Commission in January (minutes of that meeting are not available on line). However, there was no one at the BOCC meeting to speak for or against the item including members of the commission. There was no mention of number of dogs, distance from adjoining residences or other factors that might govern the conditional use permits. There was no indication that this item was related to a specific situation or request but it seems unlikely that such a change would be suggested in the absence of a specific situation. In short, it seems that there may not have been full disclosure as to the reason for this change and, therefore, inadequate public notice and discussion.