

**Meeting with Floyd Hill MP Steering Committee
HOA representatives
Friday, June 5, 2009**

I. History Discussion (How did we get here?)

A. History of master planning in County and on Floyd Hill

1. Subregional Plan effort (Susan Pacek and Bert Weaver)
2. Legislative Action requiring CCC to prepare a County-wide master plan (occurred early in the 2000's)
3. CCC Master Plan 2030 work in 2003, adoption in Jan. 2004
4. Master Plan 2030 identified Floyd Hill as a "Mixed Use" area, due to it's location on I-70, and, hence, a "Significant Area" which recommended further master planning for the Hill because of its development potential and the general desire to maintain its current natural mountain setting.
5. BOCC instructed Staff to move forward with a subregional master planning effort on the Hill before Idaho Springs began annexation procedures
6. BOCC invited Idaho Springs to participate in the master planning effort in order to maintain one common vision for the Hill regardless of who's jurisdiction it would be in. IS declined (however, after resignation of Mayor Lunbery, County asked Cindy Condon and a member of IS Planning Commission to participate; they are currently on the Steering Committee).

B. FHMP's intent is to take an unconventional approach; process-oriented, not product-oriented.

II. Overarching Topics of Discussion

A. Cost information relating to providing certain infrastructure (water/sewer).

How accurate and effective is it? Need further explanation as to its source(s). What is the quality of the Data?

B. 3 Development Alternatives

Can we more explicitly identify some of the findings that have been made in the MP? (Example: Baseline alternative/Existing Zoning allows for higher density than Level 1 which identifies development at the capacity of the sewage treatment facility).

C. Transit Alternative/Level II Development

If this is a "transit" scenario, and it is assumed that transit is not as likely of a scenario that will occur in the future, can we isolate its discussion in the master plan to a certain area, or locate it someplace else (in Study Notes, Appendix, etc)?

D. Access

One of the few recommended action items is to construct a secondary access route to link FH with Jeffco. CR 65. Another recommended action item in the MP should be to find ways to improve the Sawmill Rd. access (ie: get CDOT to allow additional access onto I-70 during an emergency, identify a possible underpass/overpass to access U.S. 40. We need to find ways to make it a more viable access than what it is now.

E. Overarching Concept Desired in MP

There is a desire to have an overarching idea that explains that the existing community's identity, as it is now (ie; rural Mountain Residential Community), is acceptable, and that a development scenario that substantially changes existing development patterns, (such as the transit alternative) should make a case for why the existing identity should be changed.