



TOWN OF  
**BRECKENRIDGE**

**Town Council Work Session**  
Tuesday, June 23, 2020, 4:00 PM  
VIRTUAL Council Chambers

This meeting will be broadcast live, but the public will NOT be permitted to attend the meeting in person due to COVID-19 concerns. If you are interested, please monitor the meeting by joining the live broadcast available online. Log-in information is available in the calendar section of our website: [www.townofbreckenridge.com](http://www.townofbreckenridge.com).

Questions and comments can be submitted prior to the meeting to [Mayor@townofbreckenridge.com](mailto:Mayor@townofbreckenridge.com) or during the meeting using the Q&A feature in the Online Webinar.

- I. FIRC UPDATE (4:00-4:15pm)**
- II. BUILDING HOPE UPDATE (4:15-4:30pm)**  
Building Hope Memo
- III. PLANNING COMMISSION DECISIONS (4:30-4:35pm)**  
Planning Commission Decisions
- IV. LEGISLATIVE REVIEW (4:35-4:45pm)**  
St. John's Church Local Landmarking (First Reading)
- V. MANAGERS REPORT (4:45-5:10pm)**  
Public Projects Update  
Parking and Transportation Update  
Housing and Childcare Update  
Committee Reports  
Financials
- VI. OTHER (5:10-6:20pm)**  
New Year's Eve Fireworks Discussion  
Dogs on Buses Discussion  
Social Equity Advisory Commission Update  
Walkable Main Street Update
- VII. PLANNING MATTERS (6:20-6:45pm)**  
Planning Commission Decisions Call Up Hearing Procedure  
Planning Commission Vacancy Appointment Recommendation

### EMERGENT COVID MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS



#### INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this document is to summarize the financial and programming needs of Building Hope so that it can meet the projected increase in demand for mental health services caused by the COVID crisis. The community of Summit County is dealing with unprecedented economic constraints and emotional stress among our young people and adults as a result of the crisis. In the last month, the community has lost two teens to suicide, and there have been at least three additional students attempting suicide. The Colorado Crisis line reports a 57% increase in crisis calls for March/April over the same time period last year. It is anticipated that even after the economy stabilizes, there will be substantial increase in demand for mental health support services.

#### MISSION AND GOALS OF BUILDING HOPE

Building Hope is a grassroots organization whose mission is to create a more coordinated, effective and responsive mental health system that promotes emotional health, reduces stigma and improves access to care and support to everyone in Summit County. To accomplish its mission, the organization implements strategies to meet four major goals.

##### These goals are:

- (1) Reducing stigma related to mental health and accessing support;
- (2) Creating a community culture of support and awareness for mental health through education and outreach;
- (3) Developing a coordinated and accessible system of support and
- (4) Ensuring a strong administrative and governance system is in place to support our work.

## CURRENT MAJOR PROGRAMS

Building Hope offers a wide variety of activities and programs to achieve its goals. Listed below are the largest programs and the number of individuals impacted and events held. Data are totals to date starting January 1, 2019.


(This list does not include every Building Hope activity.)

PROGRAM	# IMPACTED	# EVENTS
<b>THERAPY SCHOLARSHIPS</b> Up to 12 therapy sessions provided to residents with limited access or means to pay for therapy	358	2885 (sessions)
<b>CONNECTING EVENTS</b> Face to face and virtual events designed to provide support and education to residents	908 Residents	64 Events
<b>TRAININGS/EDUCATION EVENTS</b> Delivery of a variety of trainings related to understanding mental health and how to refer friends for care	478 Residents	17 Events
<b>THERAPIST ENGAGEMENT NETWORK</b> Engages local therapists to work with Building Hope clients, expand slots and offer specialty care	61 therapists	
<b>STIGMA REDUCTION CAMPAIGN</b> Marketing campaign to reduce stigma related to mental health	488K Social Media Impressions; 1.5 Million Out of Home Impressions; 6000 Cards Distributed	Connecting Event and General Mental Health Awareness 300 ads in Daily
<b>EVENT AND ACTIVITY PROMOTION</b> Twice weekly ads in paper promoting Building Hope events as well as specific messaging for mental health awareness and suicide prevention meeting		150 ads
<b>MINI GRANTS</b> Designed to provide up to \$2,000 to professionals to continue education in mental health and offer brief mental health education opportunity for residents	12 therapists and other professionals received mini grants	
<b>SPANISH LANGUAGE EVENTS</b> Offer unique mental health training and support opportunities for spanish speaking residents	100 participants	10 education events in Spanish
<b>COMMUNITY COORDINATION/ SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT</b> Collaborate with other local agencies to improve the overall system of mental health care		250 coordination meetings

## CURRENT STATUS OF BUDGET AND RESERVE

Building Hope's board approved a balanced budget for 2020 in January.

The pie chart reflects Building Hope's revenue sources.



Until COVID 19 appeared in early March, the board felt extremely comfortable with the current budget. Due to the devastating impact of isolation, and stress related to COVID, Building Hope anticipates the need to expand services to meet the new community demand.


## ANTICIPATING FUTURE DEMAND

It is anticipated that in the next 6 months the following programs will be underfunded based on the expected demand. All of the programs listed are facing increased demand or represent a new unbudgeted program area.

PROGRAM AND RATIONAL	ANTICIPATED INCREASE DEMAND	ADDITIONAL EXPENSE
<b>THERAPY SCHOLARSHIPS</b> Offer additional mental health scholarships to residents in need of support. Demand has been consistent over the last 12 months. Experts report that demand for services will slowly grow over the next six months.	25% increase over budgeted. \$250,000 budgeted. 25% increase for six months.	\$31,250
<b>VIRTUAL CONNECT AND DECOMPRESS CAFES</b> Offer additional virtual support groups. These will be led by a licensed therapist and will be implemented across a variety employment sectors.	Support 20 groups across the community for the next 6 months. Cost per group is \$2000	\$40,000
<b>TEEN CONNECTING AND SUPPORT EVENTS</b> Deliver a wide array of in-person connecting events to local teens to ensure they feel emotionally supported during these stressful times. The focus will be on outdoor, fun activities like frisbee golf, ropes courses and hiking.	Average of 8 Teen Connecting Events per month thru 2020. Cost per event is \$730	\$41,000
<b>ACTIVITY PROMOTION/STIGMA REDUCTION MARKETING</b> Increase number of ads promoting virtual groups and youth programing in paper and other sites	Increased mental health awareness campaign - \$15,000 Kids Stigma Reduction - \$5,000 COVID general marketing - \$10,000	\$30,000
<b>COORDINATION/ADMINISTRATION</b> Increase administrative support costs to manage additional programs and coordination	Group organizing (Kellyn) - \$5,000 Spanish outreach (Melina) - \$4,000 Administrative assistant - \$4,000	\$13,000
<b>Total Anticipated Unbudgeted Expenses</b>		<b>\$125,000</b>

## CONCLUSION

Building Hope recognizes that almost every non profit in Summit County is going to experience some financial shortfalls in 2020. The intent of this document is to share programming areas where Building Hope envisions increased demands and unbudgeted expenses over the next year. The Board of Building Hope believes that supporting mental health is one of the essential community services that needs to not shrink but expand in these difficult times. Building Hope intends to ask key community organizations and individuals for additional support to expand mental health programming in Summit County.



# Memo

To: Breckenridge Town Council Members  
From: Mark Truckey, Director of Community Development  
Date: June 17, 2020  
Subject: Planning Commission Decisions of the June 16, 2020 Meeting

---

## ***DECISIONS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING, June 16, 2020:***

**CLASS A APPLICATIONS:** None.

**CLASS B APPLICATIONS:** None.

### **CLASS C APPLICATIONS:**


Alexander Residence, 468 Peerless Dr., PL-2020-0137: a 11,056 single-family residence at 468 Peerless Drive. *Continued.*

Cobb Residence Demolition and New Single Family Residence, 105 North Gold Flake Terrace, PL-2020-0136: Demolish existing residence and construct a 6,452 sq. ft. single family residence. *Approved.*

Guthrie Residence Demolition and New Single Family Residence, 131 South Gold Flake Terrace, PL-2020-0114: Demolition of an existing 4,030 sq. ft. house and construction of a new 5,836 sq. ft. single family residence. *Approved.*

**TOWN PROJECT HEARINGS:** None.

**OTHER:** Two Work Sessions were conducted. The first was for a Development Agreement for the purpose of expanding Father Dyer Church (310 Wellington Road) through an addition to the non-historic part of the existing building. The second was regarding a modification to the Building Envelope at Highlands Filing #2, Lot 67 (20 Rounds Road).




Alexander  
Residence, 468  
Peerless Dr.

Father Dyer  
Addition, 310  
Wellington Rd.

Guthrie Demolition and  
Single Family Residence,  
131 S. Gold Flake Terrace

Cobb Demolition and Single  
Family Residence, 105 N.  
Gold Flake Terrace



Highlands Filing #2, Lot 67 Building Envelope Modification, 20 Round's Rd.

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:31 p.m. by Chair Gerard. The meeting was a virtual electronic meeting through the Zoom platform, as a result of the COVID-19 crisis.

### ROLL CALL

Christie Mathews-Leidal  
Mike Giller

Jim Lamb  
Steve Gerard

Ron Schuman  
Lowell Moore

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Mathews-Leidal indicated that her last name is spelled incorrectly on pages 1, 2, and 3. Mr. Gerard noted that on page 5 it should reflect the following: *Mr. Gerard advised the applicant that they had the right to request a continuance of the Final Hearing, without penalty or prejudice to time standards, to a time when an open public hearing could be held. Mr. Gerard asked the applicant if it was their desire to waive the right to an open public hearing and proceed to a Final Hearing in virtual format? Mr. Begley stated that he wished to proceed with the Final Hearing in virtual format.* With these changes, the May 19, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the June 16, 2020 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

### PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- None

### WORK SESSIONS:

1. Father Dyer Addition, 310 Wellington Road, PL-2020-0135: Mr. Kulick presented a worksession for a Development Agreement for the purpose of expanding the Church through an addition to the non-historic part of the existing building. Staff asked the following questions of the Commission:

1. Does the Commission believe the design fails Design Standards 37, 80, 88 and 144?
2. Does the Commission feel it is important that the new addition is setback from the previous addition instead of protruding out towards the street frontage?
3. Does the Commission find the proposed glazing conforms with Design Standards 95, 96 and 148?
4. Does the Commission have any additional comments on the proposed project design?

#### *Commissioner questions:*

Mr. Moore: No real questions. Thanks Chris. The site visit helped a lot.

Mr. Lamb: No questions.

Mr. Giller: When you were talking about windows and fenestration, you talked about changing the windows for egress. Can you explain? (Mr. Kulick: On the garden level that is proposed, I believe some of the earlier feedback we had was to reduce glazing. On the lower level, it is harder to get windows that have dimensions that we would typically see in a historic application that provide egress. Additionally, coming from the intersection of Wellington Road and Harris Street to the northwest, there is 8' of elevation change and that is where the garden level comes from. The applicant can speak to the lower level windows.) I sort of doubt that the basement windows would be egress in a commercial building and so I think the windows could be modified.

(Mr. Craig: We were trying to get as much light in the lower level because it is used frequently. Granted, the proposed windows are not a historic shape, perhaps we could at least go to a square window which is seen more frequently in the Historic District. We have some square windows in other areas.) I think that would be an improvement and I want to clarify that those are not egress windows. (Mr. Craig: Correct.) So the primary elevation, the front, facing south now has a doorway and a shed roof which is not a design element that is not seen anywhere else on the building. What are the thoughts behind that? (Mr. Craig: We were trying to make it a more of secondary entrance. The shed roof came from the egress requirements. The new portion of the building is similar to the proportions of the historic, just narrower and smaller.) Can you speak to the compatibility of the shed roof with the other elements? (Mr. Craig: The door itself is similar to the current configuration. We removed the arched window that was above it and got rid of the gable. The intent is to make it subordinate to the main building. We can look at making it a gable, but we would like to leave the door in the same opening if possible.)

Mrs. Mathews-Leidal: Thank you for the report and the review of the Historic District Standards. With this addition, I'm assuming additional parking is required. Are we meeting the parking requirements on-site or is that something that needs to be included in the Development Agreement? (Mr. Kulick: It would likely need to be included in the Development Agreement, but they are still adding seven more spaces than currently exist.) You eluded to it because the structure is non-residential and within a residential character area. To help Mr. Craig and keep Planning Commission in the loop, how would setbacks and open space be assessed? (Mr. Kulick: It would be assessed as a non-residential site. With the gardens and landscaping in front and back of the building, they will likely meet the requirement. Additionally, the alley is proposed to be removed, so that will provide additional open space.) I appreciate the discussion on the glazing, but I also see the porch and door addition on the northwest elevation. I am not sure that it meets the Historic District design standards. I think this is something the applicant should look at. This is the entrance off the rear. I believe the stucco does not meet the Historic District Standards either. Please modify.

Mr. Gerard: When you look at the northern view of the structure, the ridgeline seems excessively long and the proposed addition should be setback further. (Mr. Kulick: Yes, that is similar to the concerns we have with the overall façade width that addressed under Design Standards 88 and 144.)

Mr. Craig: The reason is because we don't want the addition to dominate and the existing non-historic portion would become more of a link between the two. (Mr. Kulick: We have to avoid making the roofline overly complicated by break it up too much. On the Casey Residence, we steered the architect to simplify the roof design of the addition because the initial design was too complicated. The ridgeline is long and the façade is wide, but if we try add breaks to it, we might run into issues with it being too complicated.)

Mr. Schuman: When St. Mary's Church was renovated, they added additional kitchen area and it ended up being used more than anticipated. How would staff remedy that issue on this site? They do not want to lose one curb cut in the parking lot but if Engineering wants to see that curb cut removed, is that a done deal? (Mr. Kulick: I think it will be an ongoing discussion with Engineering. They have the authority to say yes or no, but it may be able to be addressed within the Development Agreement.)

Mr. Craig: Our biggest issue or what we are trying to do is to give the congregation enough of an indicator that they could move forward with fundraising. We are the only non-residential building in this area, and we would like input, mostly on the density. Other comments make sense, but those are things that would typically be handled with the

site plan or Class A. That process might be a year or two away.  
Mr. Kulick: I ran the parking calculations and it looks like right now, they would be slightly deficient for the new addition portion so that is something that would likely need to be included in the Development Agreement.

The Work Session was opened to public comment and there was none.

*Commissioner Comments:*

Mr. Moore: This project is close to Priority Design Standards 37, 88, and 144. With some tweaking, I think they will get there. I agree with some of the glazing and architectural comments that have been made by other Commissioners.

Mr. Lamb: I do not have any questions. I think it is going to be a good-looking building. I think what they are doing is going to be good for the congregation and the Town.

Mr. Giller: I think this is a good project. I think it is a beautiful and important building. I think it fails Priority Design Standards 37, 80, 88, and 144 but this is a worksession and we can get there. I think the new elevation should be set back more than it is. Regarding glazing, there are really too many different kinds of windows on the western elevation. It is not technically the primary facade, but it kind of acts like it. I ask that staff check on the door on the connector type of element and the shed roof. I talked a bit about making the connector more separate from the historic building. I think landscaping and plant materials could be added to further separate the massing of the historic church and the massing of the connector.

Mr. Schuman: I do believe the design fails Priority Design Standards 37, 80, 88, and 144. I think I would like to see the new addition set back a little more. I echo Mike on the concerns of the shed roof. I also agree with Mike and Christie on the glazing, but we are able to overcome those issues in the future. My biggest concern with this effort is the increased activity and intensity on the site. I think by losing the northern alley and potentially losing a curb cut, they are boxing themselves into a hole. More activity and less mobility is not somewhere you want. This is a large congregation and we are not addressing the potential problems at that corner. I think it is a good project and will help but I think we are setting ourselves up for future challenges with the increased activity.

Ms. Mathews-Leidel: I agree with Ron, if you build it, they will come. I agree with staff and believe the design fails Priority Design Standards 37, 80, 88, and 144. I think it is important that the new addition be set back from the existing addition and make it more of a differentiation. I do have concerns with that porch, double doors, and transom windows above them. I know that Mr. Craig will massage this to better meet the Historic Standards. The stucco needs to be changed. I do agree with Mike and Ron on the western façade windows and patterns. Chris, on the Milne project, we added a finding for parking separation off of the alley and that is another policy to keep on the radar.

Mr. Gerard: I think this is an important building for the Town and has an important use. We have to correct some things noted by staff. I agree it fails all four standards. I believe the addition needs to be setback further. It occurs to me that if you slid the whole design back, due to the length of the chapel, it would just disappear from the view. You might be able to lower it a foot or two because of the topographic changes and also reduce the ridge lengths. Glazing can be reduced and changes to the secondary entrance can be made to make it more like the primary entrance.

2. Highlands Filing #2, Lot 67 Building Envelope Modification, 20 Rounds Road, PL-2020-0157: Mr. LaChance presented a modification to the platted Building Envelope on this property. Staff asked the

following questions of the Commission:

1. Does the Commission find the proposed Envelope modification to comply with Subdivision Standards 9-2-4-5: Lot Dimensions, Improvements and Configurations regarding tree preservation?

*Commissioner questions:*

Mr. Moore: I don't really have any questions. I went to the site and observed the trees. I think I understand where the Envelope was. Some of the line markers were knocked down, but on the north boundary, one of the Building Envelope lines that had tape between stakes, that's the Envelope, right? (Mr. LaChance: The proposed Envelope would have had caution tape between the stakes, and the existing Envelope boundary would have been marked with stakes labeled "old Envelope".) Now I understand. Thank you.

Mr. Lamb: No questions.

Mr. Giller: No questions.

Mr. Schuman: No questions.

Mrs. Mathews-Leidal: No questions.

Ms. Suzanne Allen-Sabo, Applicant, Presented:

First, regarding the 25' front setback, we will fix that. We will follow up with the Corps of Engineers on the wetlands too. On the six remaining trees between the existing Envelope and the southern property line, the new Envelope would maximize the width of the building on this property. If the building is anywhere near the current Envelope those trees are gone due to fire mitigation. I do not think they are pertinent to the argument. In August of 2019, the owners purchased this lot. At one point, the neighbor on Lot 65 came onto the lot and illegally cut dozens of mature spruce trees for their view. This probably wiped out the wetlands as well. According to the Highlands Subdivision, the owners of Lot 65 agreed to plant new spruce trees on their lot and Lot 67. There are dozens of them. The watering system is connected back to Lot 65. We worked very hard with the Highlands Design Review Board and the adjacent neighbors to get their approval of the modified building Envelope. Regarding the new Envelope, there are still some remaining trees on the eastern side of the property. By moving the Envelope to the South, you actually are going to preserve and save more trees than the few remaining trees to the South.

Tim Sabo, Applicant, Presented:

(Mr. Sabo showed Google Earth images showing the tree removal progression over time.) Trees on the southern portions of the property in the area of the wetlands were cut down in between 2010 and 2011. On the most recent images, you can see the trees are taking root and getting bigger. To the north, the house is built along with the topography. We want to build the house similar and across the topography and not up the hill. With the existing Envelope, you end up cutting higher quality trees because of defensible space. With the new Envelope, we can save some of the larger existing trees. The positive of this brings the eastern line to the west and preserves some of the trees. It's not much of an increase east to west, but this proposed Envelope is what we were able to negotiate.

*Commissioner Questions:*

Mr. Moore: No questions.

Mr. Lamb: No questions.

Mr. Giller: No questions.

Mrs. Mathews-Leidal: No questions.

Mr. Gerard: Where would the driveway be? (Mr. Sabo: It curves from the roadway to the north, you can see it in orange on the plans.)

The Work Session was opened to public comment but none was heard.

Mr. LaChance: I would like to add one thing to the presentation: Within the staff report, I included pictures of large evergreens. I drew a line on the images to show the proposed Envelope, and you can see that at least three significant trees are just within the proposed Envelope modification. There has been some cutting and wildfire mitigation done on this property and there are several stumps. Staff finds at least three significant specimen trees are to be located within the proposed Envelope as staked by the surveyor.

*Commissioner Comments:*

Mr. Moore: The design standards that try to protect view sheds is very important. Regarding tree preservation, it appears to me that there are some new trees in the area of disturbance. I understand they want to get as wide of an Envelope as possible but I agree with staff. The modification does not comply with the Subdivision Standards.

Mr. Lamb: I am a tree hugger, but I am okay with cutting trees as long as you revegetate. In the Highlands, they drew a lot of these Envelopes without putting as much thought into them as they should have. If they are going to revegetate, I am fine with the modification.

Mr. Giller: I agree with staff that we should not do this and should not modify this Envelope because it wouldn't meet the subdivision standards.

Mr. Schuman: I agree with staff and the Envelope needs to remain.

Ms. Mathews-Leidal: I agree with staff's summary and find that the application does not comply with the subdivision standards.

Mr. Gerard: Are these three trees specimen trees? Yes, but whether that can be mitigated is another issue. Whether they will get cut down anyway for fire mitigation is also another issue. The thing we cannot do anything about is the setback issue. If you just apply the legal standard and move the line, they are impacted. Staff would decide if there is a mitigation issue on this.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

**1. Alexander Residence, 468 Peerless Dr., PL-2020-0137**

Ms. Mathews-Leidal: I traded emails with Mr. Sponable about this earlier and thought additional information would be provided. I would like to call it up so we can discuss with the Architect.

Ms. Mathews-Leidal made a motion for a call up, seconded by Mr. Schuman. The motion passed unanimously. Luke Sponable presented the project, a 11,056 single-family residence at 468 Peerless Drive.

- 1 . Ms. Mathews-Leidal: I think it is important for the Public Record that this new condition be read into the record. (Mr. Sponable: New condition added to read: The plans shall be revised to locate the window well and its rock faced walls to be inside the disturbance envelope and show the total combined area of all lawns to be no more than 500 square feet total. The grass type will be revised to show fescue and hairgrass mix. The applicant has agreed to this.)

*Commissioner Questions:*

Mr. Moore: No questions.

Mr. Lamb: No questions.

Mr. Giller: No questions.

- Ms. Mathews-Leidal: No questions.
- Mr. Truckey: Mr. Sponable mentioned sod in his presentation, which is not necessarily prohibited. But if anyone proposes any sod areas over 500 square feet it is subject to negative points.
- Mr. Don Eggers: I do not think there is anything further to add. The client is okay with reducing the sod so we do not need to mitigate additional negative points.
- Mr. Gerard: My question is why it is necessary to have the drive that goes the length of the entire lot, most of it outside of the Envelope? It seems like there is an easier way. (Mr. Eggers: The client wanted to have an accessible home with the garage on the main level of the house. If we placed the driveway on the southern side of the house, there would be no screening to the adjacent property. With the driveway in its location, it is adjacent to the neighbor's drive on the north and we can provide screening between the two.)

Mr. Gerard opened the meeting for public comment but there was none and the comment period was closed.

*Commissioner Comments:*

- Mr. Moore: No comments.
- Mr. Lamb: No comments. I think it is a good looking house.
- Mr. Giller: The house marginally meets the design code. I echo the concern about the driveway and the amount of fill and retaining walls. This is a big house for this site.
- Mr. Schuman: No comments.
- Ms. Mathews-Leidal: No additional comments.
- Mr. Gerard: I have great concern about this driveway and the impact it makes on the existing landscaping. There are 14 trees being removed and when looking at the supporting documentation for positive four points, I do not think this landscaping plan is up to a positive four points when you consider the effect of the hardscape combined with the amount of trees lost.

Mr. Schuman made a motion to approve the project with the new condition read into the record and point analysis attached but rescinded his motion due to landscaping concerns by others.

- Mr. Moore: I agree with the fellow Commissioners on the amount of landscaping proposed.
- Mr. Lamb: No further questions or comments.
- Mr. Giller: Can we discuss the retaining wall along the boundary of the property line? How closely did you look at that? There is roughly 60 feet of retaining wall and much of it is along the property line. (Mr. Sponable: This is an earlier disturbance envelope and the plat note specifically allows driveways and related retaining walls outside of the envelopes. Trees are allowed to be removed for those items as well. This project is assessed negative four points under Policy 7/R due to the amount of site grading.)
- Mr. Schuman: Considering Luke's response, I think the point analysis is appropriate and I think it is a go based on staff's analysis.
- Ms. Mathews-Leidal: I am struggling with this one and I know this policy came into effect in February 2018. The precedent shows positive points for landscaping but did the same projects receive negative four points for site disturbance? (Mr. Sponable: At least one of the precedent projects received negative points for site disturbance as listed in the staff report). (Mr. LaChance: The Chalissima Residence did not receive negative four points for site disturbance).
- Mr. Gerard: This landscaping proposed does not seem to me that it meets four points due to the amount of trees being removed for the driveway.

Mr. Gerard made a motion to amend the point analysis that the landscaping plan receive only two points (policy 22R) and not four. Mr. Schuman seconded.

- Mr. Moore: I agree with you Mr. Chairman.
- Mr. Lamb: I think this project meets the development code.
- Mr. Giller: It bothers me that there has to be so much retaining wall in order to make this driveway work. I think there are much better ways to solve that. I would support the motion.
- Mr. Schuman: I agree with the staff's analysis and do not support the change in point analysis.
- Ms. Mathews-Leidal: Mr. Gerard, is there a number of trees that you would support to get the project to positive four points? (Mr. Gerard: I think they can get there if they match precedent but I am not sure where the trees will go because the driveway is taking up most of the open space on the lot. If the point analysis is amended and the project fails, it is up to the applicant to save the project some other way. I would support additional trees but I am not sure where they will go.) (Mr. Lamb: It would be a lot of trees, and it could eventually be over landscaped. We have that problem with some projects in the Historic District. I do not know if there is a specific number.)
- Mr. Schuman: I think we are trying to solve the problem, but in our mind it either passes or it does not. And if we don't think it passes, it is up to staff and applicant to address it. (Mr. Gerard: I agree.)
- Ms. Mathews-Leidal: Should we let the applicant speak? (Mr. Eggers: If you look at the drive immediately to the north, you see retaining wall that is the entire length of the driveway within a similar site. It seems that a number of driveways require retaining walls in order to put the driveway in. I do not know if the amount here is excessive to these lots. If you look at the precedent, those three houses each had 14-18 evergreens and we are only a couple of evergreen trees and 10 or so aspens away from the same numbers. I think those trees could easily be placed along the east side of the residence and along the south side of the property if that is required.)
- Mr. Sponable: I was able to pull the Chalissima plans that shows 25-30 trees were to be removed before the residence was built. (Mr. Gerard: How many were removed for the driveway?) I am counting about six for this.
- Mr. Giller: May I speak to a clarification to the retaining wall comment made by Mr. Eggers. Obviously, there is a retaining wall on the north property, but it looks like it is 10-20 feet long and runs right along the driveway, rather than being closer to the property line. Could you describe the construction of the walls and why they do not they follow the drive closer? What is the face of the wall? (Mr. Eggers: The wall is siloam stone that is dry stacked. We pushed to property line to we can landscape along drive and have better snow storage.)
- Ms. Mathews-Leidal: I do not want to deny the project because they would have to resubmit. Should we consider a continuance? (Mr. Gerard: If a continuance is requested, I would remove my motion.)
- Mr. Eggers: Could we add a condition that we add additional landscaping in lieu of continuance. (Mr. Truckey: That is a good gesture by the applicant, but my concern is that we need to work that through a little bit so that the landscaping is enhancing the buffering along the lot boundaries. Maybe a continuance is the best way to deal with that and we can come back in a couple of weeks.) (Ms. Puester: Mr. Eggers, would you be supportive of a continuance?) (Mr. Eggers: Yes, a continuance is better than a denial.)
- Mr. Gerard: I will withdraw my motion to amend my point analysis because the applicant is requesting a continuance.

Mr. Schuman made a motion to continue the Alexander Residence and seconded by Mr. Moore. The motion passed unanimously.

**2. Cobb Residence Demolition and New Single Family Residence, 105 North Gold Flake Terrace, PL-2020-0136**

Ms. Mathews-Leidal: I would like to call up this project for discussion. I have concerns in relation to the accessory dwelling unit standards.

Ms. Mathews-Leidal made a motion for a call up, seconded by Mr. Giller. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Sponable presented the project to demolish an existing structure and construct a 6,452 sq. ft. residence. We are adding an additional condition that no washer and dryer will be added to the second floor.

*Commissioner Questions:*

Mr. Moore: No questions.

Mr. Lamb: No questions.

Mr. Giller: This site is visible from much of town. When I look at trees that were added, was there concern about screening the massing of the house. (Mr. Sponable: This site has seen a lot of disturbance and has no trees now. Ideally the trees would be closer to the house but it was not a requirement that the trees placed right by the house. The defensible space perimeter prohibits trees from being placed up against the house.)

Mr. Florio: It is true, if you are on Ski Hill Road, you can see the existing yellow house. There are almost no trees on the western side of the property right now. I think a request to put the trees closer to the house jeopardizes fire safety and impacts the views dramatically. I think it is more than what the adjacent properties have. We are adding a lot of trees, all of them along that western edge. We are not removing any trees in the process to construct this house and we are actually relocating one tree. We are trying to be the best neighbor as possible and improve this property. It has looked this way since Gold Flake Terrace was built.

Mr. Schuman: No questions.

Ms. Mathews-Leidal: Thanks for the willingness to remove the washer on the upper level. I still have concerns due to the design. This can be cut off from the rest of the house. Additions to existing homes are to have a separate connection but this is not an addition. I think it is easy to get around the accessory dwelling unit standards by labeling everything a wet bar. I do not understand why there is a separate entrance if it isn't an accessory unit.

Mr. Gerard: I am going to follow Christie on this. When I look at this, I see a lock off two-bedroom apartment. The area has all the things a separate lock off has.

Mr. Mickey Florio: The owners have adult children and they would like to have separation from them. That is the reason the door is separating the areas. There is a pathway that goes to downtown and they want to keep this path and connect an entrance to it on this part of this house. This wet bar is intended to provide separation and have a place for water. It complies with the 300 square foot code requirement of wet bars in public areas. This is not intended to be a separate apartment or accessory dwelling unit.

Mr. Gerard: Is there gas or 220 outlet proposed in this area? (Mr. Sponable: I do not have those plans submitted to me, but we can add it as a condition.) We should add it as no gas, no 220 volt outlet, and no short term rentals. (Ms. Puester: Rather than a condition of approval, I suggest a Finding stating this is not an accessory apartment and detailing out that no 220 or gas be allowed. This clarifies the area for the owners and puts future buyers on notice and it makes it easier to enforce.)

Mr. Giller: You mentioned the 300 square feet and the wet bar. Does that mean it has to be in a space smaller than 300 square feet? (Mr. Sponable: It is the opposite. Wet bars shall be in common rooms larger than 300 square feet and hallways are not counted in this

calculation.)  
Mr. Schuman: I think we are trying to skin the code here mid-hearing. I think the applicant has met the standard of the new ADU code and we are trying to raise the bar, which might be inappropriate at this point.  
Mr. Lamb: I like the idea of saying no 220 volt outlet as well as no gas. It is fair enough.  
Ms. Puester: I have a new finding #6: "There is no Accessory Apartment approved with this project. No 220 Volt, gas, clothes washer or dryer shall be installed on the second floor living area with separate entrance. Should an Accessory Apartment be desired in the future, a new application for such, shall be submitted and must be approved by the Town under the then current code regulations." Also, a new Condition #12 "Sheet A1.4 shall show the Washer and Dryer removed from the second floor living area." The remaining conditions will be renumbered.

Mr. Giller made a motion to approve the Cobb Residence with the both the newly added finding and condition that Ms. Puester read into the record, which was seconded by Mr. Lamb. The project passed unanimously.

3. **Guthrie Residence Demolition and New Single Family Residence, 131 South Gold Flake Terrace, PL-2020-0114.** Without a call up, this item was approved as presented.

**OTHER MATTERS:**

1. Town Council Update: A written summary was provided in the packet.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Moore: What happened to the tents on Main Street? (Mr. Truckey: At one time Breckenridge Tourism Office was thinking about providing tents but decided not to. We told restaurants they could provide a tent if they wanted to, subject to review for wind loads by Red, White, and Blue Fire District.)

Ms. Mathews-Leidal: On Parkway Center, it says that Council does not want to see a loss of workforce housing. What does that mean? (Mr. Truckey: I think there was confusion on this and the statement is out of context. The site is designated for commercial uses and the applicant can propose workforce housing if they choose.)

Ms. Mathews-Leidal: Can we revisit the ADU policy? (Mr. Truckey: Maybe we can schedule it as an agenda item on an upcoming meeting.)

Mr. Moore: I agree. We are having the same issues in the County.

Mr. Schuman: I think tonight's items can be training items for the staff.

Mr. Giller: Is there any sort of best practices in other jurisdictions? (Mark: We have not found any. Maybe it is something we need to work more with the STR staff for enforcement.)

Mr. Lott: We looked at some municipality and county regulations but can look even further, if need be.

Mr. Kulick: For wet bars, we looked at the Summit County's rules. In many houses, there are larger common areas where a wet bar of limited scale that the county allows is inadequate and also very unlikely to be divided into a STR. Also, secondary washers and dryers are pretty common in larger homes. It does not always make sense to have the laundry consolidated in one area of a large house. Houses above a certain square footage will likely need more than a single washer and dryer to be functional.

Ms. Puester: We just finished interviewing applicants for the recently vacated seat by Dan Schroder and we will be taking forward a recommendation to the Town Council. If everything

goes well, their first meeting will be July 7.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 pm.

---

Steve Gerard, Chair

# Memo

To: Town Council  
From: Jeremy Lott, AICP  
Planner II, Community Development Department  
Date: June 17, 2020 for meeting of June 26, 2020  
Subject: First Reading: Local Landmarking of St. John's Church, 100 South French

---

On March 24, 2020 the Town Council approved a Development Agreement for St. John's Church. As part of the Development Agreement, the Church agreed to have the Town designate the church as a historic landmark. At their May 19, 2020 meeting, the Planning Commission reviewed a proposal to designate St. John's Church at 100 South French St. as a Local Landmark and formally recommended that the Town Council adopt an ordinance designating the building as a Local Landmark.



The Commission found that the property fulfilled the criteria in Title 9, Chapter 11 *Historic Preservation* of the Development Code which includes:

- A. The improvements located on the subject property are more than fifty (50) years old.
- B. The property meets the "Architectural" designation criteria for a landmark as set forth in Section 9-11-4(A)(2)(a)(1) of the Breckenridge Town Code because the original church building is architecturally significant for its Carpenter Gothic style architecture.

- C. The “Physical Integrity” designation criteria for a landmark as set forth in Section 9-11-4(A)(3)(a) of the Breckenridge Town Code is met because property shows character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the community, region, state, or nation. The building is historically significant for its long associations with Breckenridge’s social and cultural development, due to its initial use as a Congregational Church, and for its long sustained use as St. John the Baptist Episcopal Church.

This is a first reading. Staff will be available at the meeting to answer any questions.

The Planning Commission and the Community Development Department recommend approval of the proposal to designate St. John’s Church, 100 South French St. as a Local Landmark.

1 **FOR WORKSESSION/FIRST READING – JUNE 23**

2  
3 COUNCIL BILL NO. \_\_\_\_

4  
5 Series 2020

6  
7 AN ORDINANCE DESIGNATING CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY AS A LANDMARK  
8 UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF TITLE 9 OF THE BRECKENRIDGE TOWN CODE  
9 (St. John’s Church, 100 South French Street, Lots 1 and 2, Block 4, Abbett Addition)

10  
11 BE IT ORDAINED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF BRECKENRIDGE,  
12 COLORADO:

13  
14 Section 1. Findings. The Town Council of the Town of Breckenridge finds and  
15 determines as follows:

16  
17 A. Saint John The Baptist Episcopal Church Of Breckenridge, a Colorado  
18 nonprofit corporation (“**Church**”), owns the hereinafter described real property. Such  
19 real property is located within the corporate limits of the Town of Breckenridge, County  
20 of Summit and State of Colorado.

21  
22 B. The Church filed an application pursuant to Chapter 11 of Title 9 of the  
23 Breckenridge Town Code seeking to have the hereinafter described real property  
24 designated as a landmark (“**Application**”).

25  
26 C. The Town followed all of procedural requirements of Chapter 11 of Title 9 of  
27 the Breckenridge Town Code in connection with the processing of the Application.

28  
29 D. The improvements located on hereinafter described real property are more  
30 than fifty (50) years old.

31  
32 E. The hereinafter described real property meets the “Architectural” designation  
33 criteria for a landmark as set forth in Section 9-11-4(A)(2)(a)(1) of the Breckenridge  
34 Town Code because the original church building is architecturally significant for its  
35 Carpenter Gothic style architecture.

36  
37 F. The hereinafter described real property meets the “Physical Integrity” criteria  
38 for a landmark as set forth in Section 9-11-4(A)(3)(a) of the Breckenridge Town Code is  
39 met because property shows character, interest or value as part of the development,  
40 heritage or cultural characteristics of the community, region, state, or nation. The  
41 building is historically significant for its long associations with Breckenridge’s social and  
42 cultural development, due to its initial use as a Congregational Church, and for its long  
43 sustained use as St. John the Baptist Episcopal Church.

44  
45 G. In accordance with the requirements of Section 9-11-3(B)(3) of the  
46 Breckenridge Town Code, on May 19, 2020 the Application was reviewed by the

1 Breckenridge Planning Commission. On such date the Planning Commission  
2 recommended to the Town Council that the Application be granted.

3  
4 H. The Application meets the applicable requirements of Chapter 11 of Title 9 of  
5 the Breckenridge Town Code, and should be granted without conditions.

6  
7 I. Section 9-11-3(B)(4) of the Breckenridge Town Code requires that final  
8 approval of an application for landmark designation under Chapter 11 of Title 9 of the  
9 Breckenridge Town Code be made by ordinance duly adopted by the Town Council.

10  
11 Section 2. Designation of Property as Landmark. The following described real  
12 property:

13  
14 Lots 1 and 2, Block 4, Abbett Addition, Town of Breckenridge, Summit County,  
15 Colorado; also known as 100 South French Street, Breckenridge, Colorado 80424

16  
17 is designated as a landmark pursuant to Chapter 11 of Title 9 of the Breckenridge Town  
18 Code.

19  
20 Section 3. Police Power Finding. The Town Council finds, determines and declares that  
21 this ordinance is necessary and proper to provide for the safety, preserve the health, promote the  
22 prosperity, and improve the order, comfort and convenience of the Town of Breckenridge and  
23 the inhabitants thereof.

24  
25 Section 4. Town Authority. The Town Council finds, determines and declares that it has  
26 the power to adopt this ordinance pursuant to the authority granted to home rule municipalities  
27 by Article XX of the Colorado Constitution and the powers contained in the Breckenridge Town  
28 Charter.

29  
30 Section 5. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be published and become effective as  
31 provided by Section 5.9 of the Breckenridge Town Charter.

32  
33 INTRODUCED, READ ON FIRST READING, APPROVED AND ORDERED  
34 PUBLISHED IN FULL this \_\_\_\_\_ day of June, 2020. A Public Hearing shall be held at the  
35 regular meeting of the Town Council of the Town of Breckenridge, Colorado on the \_\_\_\_ day of  
36 \_\_\_\_\_, 2020, at 7:00 P.M., or as soon thereafter as possible in the Municipal  
37 Building of the Town.

38  
39 TOWN OF BRECKENRIDGE, a Colorado  
40 municipal corporation

41  
42  
43  
44 By \_\_\_\_\_  
45 Eric S. Mamula, Mayor

46 ATTEST:

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

---

Helen Cospolich  
Town Clerk

# Memo



**To:** Breckenridge Town Council Members  
**From:** Town Staff  
**Date:** 6/17/2020  
**Subject:** Public Projects Update

---

## Fiber9600

Schedule: Fiber 9600 work in the downtown area (PON 17) is wrapping up concrete and asphalt work is 90% completed by Columbine Hills Concrete, fiber pulling by Peak Communications took place last week, and now Allo is working on splicing and QA/QC.

Trenching on Locals Lane (PON 19) was finishing last week and trenching began on Rachel Lane. There is a good chance this work will continue for one more week and then crews will start trenching on Shepherd Circle. Columbine is hoping to pave Locals Lane and ready portions on Rachel Lane next Monday.

Peak's subcontractor, J&D, started trenching Harris Street alley (PON 21) early last week and finished up at the end of the week. Columbine began trenching on Washington Street at the end of last week and will move onto Highland Terrace next, followed by High Street, and Lincoln Place. This work will continue well into the next week. Paving on Ridge Street alley will also take place in the next couple of weeks.



## River Park Phase 2

Schedule: Construction continues on Phase 2 of River Park. Additional play features, play surfacing, and the bike park were installed recently. Over the next several weeks, landscaping and the parking lot work will be completed. We anticipate the park will reopen in July.

Budget: The project has been awarded to several different contractors for different portions of construction. The plans and contracts have been modified to fit within the budget below.

Project Funding	
2020 Open Space Fund	\$ 140,000
2020 GOCO Grant	\$ 350,000
Total Budget	\$ 490,000



Construction of the "strider" bike park.



Surfacing and wooden features for the "tots" area.

# Town of Breckenridge North Water Treatment Plant

Prepared by M Petters/HDR Engineering, Inc.

*Blend Tank Shroud Roof Framing 04/14/2020*



*Administration Building South Canopy Roof 05/13/2020*



## May 2020

**Contractor:**  
Moltz Construction, Inc.

**Designer:**  
HDR Engineering, Inc.  
Tetra Tech

**Award Date:**  
December 8, 2017

**Notice to Proceed:**  
December 15, 2017

**Notice to Mobilize:**  
March 21, 2018

**Substantial Completion Date:**  
August 3, 2020

**Original Duration:** 867 Days

**Days Added by CO:** 0

**Time Percent Complete:** 92.5 %

**Cost Percent Complete:** 94.7 %

**Guaranteed Maximum Price:**  
\$42,000,000

**Change Order Total:** \$2,399,414

**Current Contract Value:** \$44,399,414


**Invoiced to Date:** \$42,047,648

**Cost Growth:** 2.6 %

**Town Initiated Improvements:** 3.1 %

**Total Cost Growth:** 5.7 %

**Schedule Growth:** 0 Days



### Schedule and Budget Status

Moltz Construction Inc. (MCI) has completed work for 94.7% of the project value within 92.5% of the available contract time. Their current schedule update shows them completing the contract on time.

Fifteen Change Orders have been issued to date on the project. There have been 27 Work Change Directives, 37 Change Proposal Requests and 34 Field Orders initiated on the project.

### COVID 19 and the Project

Construction of Critical Infrastructure is considered essential by local, county, state and federal governments. The project will continue to advance while complying with the Standing Public Health Order as issued by Summit County Public Health Director.

### Accomplishments/Highlights

### Raw Water Pump Station

Triangle installed the heat trace and surge tank control panels with associated conduits and wiring. They installed heat trace on the tank and instrument piping.

MCI passed a pressure test of the last remaining section of the raw water pipeline. This included all the process piping up to the pump isolation valves.

Triangle installed the turbidimeter and connected instrumentation.

Triangle continued installing conduits, pulling and terminating wiring in the pump station.

MCI completed the small diameter copper piping for the seal water, blower and compressed air.

MCI completed backfill, rough and final grade, spread top soil and completed the road base road to the low lift pump station.

Alpine ECO completed the wet lands construction at the low lift pump station

MCI formed and placed concrete pipe supports.

Sierra Blanca worked on natural gas piping.

Coblaco painted the process piping in the pump station room, wet well, low lift pump stations and the valve vaults

Mendoza installed the canopy over the west entry.

### Main Treatment Building

Sierra Blanca continued installing copper potable water and gas piping. MCI and Sierra Blanca installed pipe insulation.

MCI installed filter media and backwashed the filters.

Triangle Electric continued installing conduits, junction boxes, panel boxes, pulling wire and overhead lighting.

MCI continued to install door hardware.

MCI continued to install sample pump piping toward the laboratory.

Sierra Blanca installed mixing valves, emergency eyewashes and showers.

Triangle started installing heat trace. The Roofing Company prepped the roofs for heat trace.

MCI installed the exhaust pipe for the CL2 scrubber.

Mendoza installed the replacement gutter at the west eave. Triangle started installing heat trace at the west eave. They installed heat trace at the shed roof above TPO roof and on the TPO roof.

### **Finished Water Pump Station**

MCI installed the small diameter stainless steel pipe, fittings, valves and instrumentation on the surge tank. Triangle started the surge tank electrical.

MCI finished installing the finish water and backwash water process piping in the Pump Station.

MCI, Triangle and IVC Technology vibration tested two of the finish water pumps.

Mendoza worked on the structural steel for the south entry canopy roof.

### **Residuals Building**

Coblaco painted the hollow metal doors and jambs.

MCI completed installing the access hatches for the basins.

Triangle completed the heat tape at the TPO roof.

MCI installed the DI overflows in Backwash Basins 1 and 2 and completed the backwash waste process piping including concrete pipe supports.

MCI installed the stainless steel piping in the sludge equalization tank.

Triangle Electric installed overhead lighting, disconnects, conduits and pulled and terminated wires.

MCI installed the stainless steel splash guards at the TARN unloading basin.

### **Main Treatment Building**

Horizon installed intake and exhaust vents from the radiant heaters.

Coblaco continued to paint drywall walls and process piping.

MCI completed the PACL fill line and the small diameter PVC piping from the PACL tank to the PACL equipment panel. They installed the PACL piping almost to the mixing basin.

Engineered Solutions gave the TOB training on the slide gates.

MCI worked on a Chlorine Solution Equipment Panel.

MCI installed guardrail and stairs to the exterior elevated walkway.

Ambient H<sub>2</sub>O performed startup of the progressive gravity pumps.

### **Administration Building**

Sierra Blanca installed the mixing valve and emergency eyewash and shower.

Moltz installed door hardware and fire extinguishers.

Horizon worked on refrigerant piping from the condensing unit, HVAC in the men's and women's bathrooms and punch list items.

### **Residuals Building**

MCI worked on the gravity thickener and grouted the bottom.

MCI completed the installation of the gooseneck vents. Coblaco painted them.

Horizon installed exhaust fans and ductwork in the pump gallery.

MCI installed the sump pumps and the discharge piping in stairwell.

MCI installed the valve stems and Rototork operators on the backwash waste tanks plug valves.

### **Blending Tank**

Mendoza worked on the roof framing.

### **Administration Building**

Mendoza removed the structural steel for the south canopy roof, sand blasted it, recoated it and reinstalled it.

MCI installed a solid surface to some of the window sills.

Haldeman Homme worked on laboratory equipment and punch list items.

### **Site**

MCI Rough graded, placed top soil and fine graded.

2v's seeded and hydromulched north of the Clearwells and west of the Main Treatment Building.

MCI placed cobble riprap under the main treatment east eave and Administration building north eave.

Cumming and Triangle started and load tested the Main Treatment Building emergency generators.

Stan Miller and Sturgeon Electric completed excavation, laying conduit and backfilling for the overhead power reroute underground.

## Construction Progress Photos

### Town of Breckenridge – North Water Treatment Plant

05/01/2020 – Filter Effluent



05/04/2020 – Filter Backwash



### Town of Breckenridge – North Water Treatment Plant

05/04/2020 Main Treatment Building Sanitary Sewer



05/05/2020 – Gravel Sidewalk



**Town of Breckenridge – North Water Treatment Plant**

05/06/2020 – Raw Water Pump Station Painted  
Process Piping



05/07/2020 – Recycle Tank



**Town of Breckenridge – North Water Treatment Plant**

05/07/2020 – Raw Water Pump Station West Entry  
Canopy



05/08/2020 Administration Building Painting Hollow  
Metal Jambs



**Town of Breckenridge – North Water Treatment Plant**

05/11/2020 - Storm Water Detention Pond



05/12/2020 – Administration Building South  
Canopy Roof Steel Sand Blasting



**Town of Breckenridge – North Water Treatment Plant**

05/12/2020 – Residuals Gravity Thickener  
Grouting



05/13/2020 – TPO Roof Heat Trace



**Town of Breckenridge – North Water Treatment Plant**

05/14/2020 - Seeding and Hydromulched



05/14/2020 – Road Base Road to Inlet Structure



**Town of Breckenridge – North Water Treatment Plant**

05/15/2020 – Main Treatment Building Wall Painting



05/18/2020 – Raw Water Pump Station Wetlands Restoration



**Town of Breckenridge – North Water Treatment Plant**

05/18/2020 - Bike Path Grading



05/19/2020 – MTB Backfill and Rough Grade



**Town of Breckenridge – North Water Treatment Plant**

04/20/2020 – Fluoride Feed System and Water Softener



05/22/2020 – Removing Storage Tent



**Town of Breckenridge – North Water Treatment Plant**

5/26/2020 - Backwash Waste Piping



05/28/2020 – Residuals Condensing Unit  
Ductwork



**Town of Breckenridge – North Water Treatment Plant**

05/29/2020 – Raw Water Pump Station Site  
Concrete





Upcoming Activities/Milestones	Planned Finish Date
Administration Building: Horizon will install the vent in the men's and women's bathroom and the laboratory flume exhaust fan.	6/3/2020
Administration Building: Mendoza will install the south canopy roof.	06/30/2020
Residual Building: Sierra Blanca will install the potable water service, water heater and safety showers.	6/26/2020
Residuals Building: MCI will install the bridge crane.	6/3/2020
Residual Building: MCI continue working on process piping to the polymers system and to the centrifuge.	6/2/2020
Residuals Building: MCI will install the conveyor.	6/18/2020
Raw Water Pump Station: MCI and Browns Hill will start the vertical turbine pumps.	6/4/2020
Raw Water Pump Station: MCI will install the metal landings, set the elevated landing and install the stairs.	6/12/2020

Raw Water Pump Station: Coblaco will paint the PLC room and finish painting the process piping.	6/11/2020
Raw Water Pump Station: MCI will place and finish the exterior concrete.	6/5/2020
Main Treatment Building: Coblaco will continue to paint the drywall, door jambs, doors and piping.	Ongoing
Main Treatment Building: Sierra Blanca will continue installing copper piping, emergency showers and natural gas piping. Triangle Electric will continue installing conduits.	Ongoing
Filter Pipe Gallery: MCI will continue installation of the CL2 system, turbidimeters and other instrumentation.	6/19/2020
Finished Water Pump Station: Sierra Blanca will work on the potable water piping and the natural gas piping.	5/21/2020
Finish Water Pump Station: Mendoza will install the canopy roof over the south entry.	6/15/2020
Site Work: MCI will continue demobilizing the staging area west of Stan Miller Drive.	Ongoing

Site Work: MCI will import top soil fill and finish grade the site.

6/29/2020

Blend Tank: Mendoza will install the standing seam roof and the metal banding.

Ongoing

Main Treatment Building: MCI will complete the installation of the exterior landings, stairs, handrail and guardrail.

6/17/2020

Site Work: Strategic will install the fence at the Treatment site

6/10/2020

The teams goal is to put potable water into the distribution system by the end of June

# Memo



**To:** Breckenridge Town Council Members  
**From:** Haley Littleton, Communications  
Shannon Smith, Town Engineer  
**Date:** 6/17/2020  
**Subject:** Parking Structure Outreach Plan and Hyder Construction Update

## Overview:

- Develop an awareness and behavior change campaign during the construction of the new parking structure in the Town of Breckenridge. Encourage/incentivize car pooling to Breckenridge Ski Resort, and redirect parking habits to the Airport Road parking lot. Encourage people to accept and embrace that shuttling in from the outlying lot to the resort is just how it's done. Move people along a continuum of awareness, acceptance, and active engagement.
- Direct Breckenridge Ski Resort visitors toward efficient parking locations and transportation options to get to the mountain with ease. Reach the audience before they arrive in town — via comprehensive and integrated pre-visit tactics, such as highway signage, geo-targeted digital outreach, incentive programs, and partnerships.
- **Some key messages:** Many of the day skiers are used to re-directing to Airport Road lots when the South Gondola lot in town fills up. There is plenty of FREE, reliable parking on Airport Road — and potentially more spots than what we're losing on South Gondola. Park and get on the slopes in the same time as in-town paid parking. And get back on the highway faster at the end of the day. Incentives will be available at the Airport Road lots (tbd, such as food/music/uber rides/ other swag/discounts)

## Construction Messaging:

**SOUTH GONDOLA PARKING STRUCTURE**

Construction has begun on the South Gondola Lot. Here's what you need to know:

The structure will be completed in November 2021.

**Parking During Construction:**

During the construction of the South Gondola Lot Parking Structure, the Town of Breckenridge encourages all guests to park out at the free Airport Road Lot.

Employees will continue to park based on their employee permit restrictions or at the Airport Road parking lot.

The Town of Breckenridge encourages all residents, employees, and locals to utilize alternate modes of transportation, such as biking, during this time.

**Quick Facts about the South Gondola Lot Construction:**

When finished, the South Gondola lot will hold approximately 950 cars (surface lot + parking structure), with 400 net new spaces.

About **\$10.5 million** of the cost of construction (\$38 million) will stay within the community towards **local contractors, workers, and suppliers.**



The project includes pedestrian improvements for connectivity to the **Blue river, Rec Path, and the core of town.**

The logo for the Town of Breckenridge, featuring a stylized mountain peak in blue above the text "TOWN OF BRECKENRIDGE" in gold.

- **Press Release:** A press release was sent out via TOB/BSR to all local contacts and Front Range media.

- **Website:** A full construction page detailing overview, construction process and timeline, budget, and architectural details has been added to the TOB website.
- **Partner Organizations:** Information was shared with lodging association for information for pre-arrival and shared with the Welcome Center.

**Summer Content:** Focuses on the walkability and bike access from the Airport Lot to ensure that the shuttles are not struggling with capacity. Ideally, we will begin to heavily promote this message once we see in-town lots reaching capacity.



**Winter Content:** Focuses on the skier experience parking in South Gondola. This concept is flexible and may be changed due to COVID restrictions. Launch also included a template we can share for employer green commute programs.



**Outreach Plan:**

- *Budget (TOB):* 10k for distribution
- **PR placements:** leveraging pre-existing connections. Out There Colorado ( popular site & newsletter in the Front Range), OpenSnow (ads/PR as most of our FR skiers use this app, boilerplate messaging at the end of the Breck blog, parking info with inclusion in the powder alerts), VR retail stores in the front range, Ski Rex big sale (hit a lot people), Big ski sales/shows into the season, college campuses who come up to ski (CU Boulder, CC, DU, Metro), BTO mag, Mountain Town Mag.
- **Social & Digital:** Targeting an audience made up of JUST people who parked in town lots (both North Gondola and South Gondola lots) from 11/5/2019 - 3/14/2020 (2019/2020 Ski Season), and who “went home” the Front Range. This ensures that we are reaching day-trippers and not wasting impressions/ dollars on Breck locals and Destination Guests. We will build this audience by looking back and gathering all devices (cell phones) found in these parking lots last season and essentially “follow them home”. We will then target the cell phones that have returned home to the Front Range and target those device owners on the cell phones, as well as the other devices (desktops, laptops, tablets, etc.). Specifically, we will look back to devices from the 2019/2020 Ski Season in the North Lot and South Lot and match them with the “home” locations in the front range.
  - We will run this campaign straight through 11/15/20-2/15/21 (pre-season through President’s Day weekend). If we end up seeing way more scale than expected, we can pull back into specific flight dates and will keep the following peak weekends in mind when pacing: 20/21 Season Peak Weekends: 12/18-12/20; 12/24-12/27; 12/31-1/3; 1/15-1/18; 2/12-2/15 We can also be nimble and heavy-up on impressions if we get a big snow forecast and want to make sure we’re covering any potential powder day congestion.
  - This targeting will actually occur off-mountain, when people are at home, which is great because we can catch them before getting into town. This targeting will allow us to determine a qualified, Breck-skier audience, but eliminate waste on Breck locals and Destination Guests AND allow us the reach the audience when they have more time to engage with the ad/think about the messaging. Social and Display banners ads will be shown to our designated audience in Denver, Boulder, Ft. Collins and Colorado Springs If we see any issues with scale, we can also look to target the whole state of CO (minus Breckenridge locals), but we think it’s best to start with a more narrow geo and expand as necessary.
- **Partner Organizations:** Lodging Association outreach to guests (shuttles), messaging on Go-I70, and potential partnership with CDOT to get the message out.
- **Pop-Up Events:** Easing the waiting experience during the peak “red flag days” (days we know that we are going to park out). Coffee & donuts, swags, live music, discount codes, etc. Working with businesses to pitch this as a sponsorship opportunity, Broken Compass tokens. A little block party at the end of the days, snacks, food trucks, free sunscreen (get the dates) / BCA arts engagement, photos with a Yeti cutout. Potential to work with shuttle companies to have a van circling to pick up people who are willing to pay
- **Goals:**
  - Celebrate the partnership between TOB/BSR.
  - Get people to park on Airport Road clearly and easily.
  - Promote Green Commutes for residents and visitors.
  - Change behavior to cause a reduction in cars in Town (carpooling).

## Weekly Progress Report

### Schedule

#### Activities completed:

- a. Vail, Centurlink and Allo fiber trenching and relocation/installation.
- b. Survey for control, utilities and shoring wall.
- c. Site fence installation.
- d. Trailer and temp toilet delivery.
- e. Sprinkler rough-in.
- f. Light pole removal.
- g. Stormwater BMP installation and inspections.

#### Activities started:

- a. Temporary power panel assembly.
- b. Excavation for shoring wall.
- c. Site excavation.
- d. Excavation for gas relocation.

#### Activities upcoming:

- a. Shoring mobilization and drilling.
- b. Gas line relocation at South.
- c. Remaining jersey barrier delivery.
- d. Tap for fire hydrant and domestic.

### Quality Control

1. Peak Land on site for various surveying activities.
2. Utility locates and as-builts.

### Safety Focus

1. COVID-19 protocol enforcement.
2. PPE requirements.

### Project Team

1. **Rene Robledo** – Superintendent

Cell: 303-829-1331

Email: [RRobledo@hyderinc.com](mailto:RRobledo@hyderinc.com)

2. **Ian MacKinnon** – Assistant Project Manager

Cell: 720-402-4065

Email: [IMacKinnon@Hyderinc.com](mailto:IMacKinnon@Hyderinc.com)

3. **Michael Brown** – Project Manager

Cell: 817-475-2251

Email: [MBrown@Hyderinc.com](mailto:MBrown@Hyderinc.com)



## Jobsite Trailer Delivery

---



Fiber and Utility Relocation Underway



New and Relocated Fiber at West Side

---



Fiber Vaults



Fiber Trench Backfill



Shoring Wall Excavation Underway

---



Shoring Wall Excavation Underway



## Shoring Wall Excavation Progress



Temp Power Panels





## Housing Committee Notes

**Date:** June 9, 2020

**Time:** 1:30pm – 3:00pm

**Location:** Virtual GoTo Meeting

**Attendees:** Gary Gallagher, Dick Carleton, Rick Holman, Mark Truckey, Laurie Best, Nichole Rex

---

### Programs and Strategies:

- Monthly Housing Helps Report:
  - Staff has seen a growing interest in the Housing Helps program. Thirty-five (35) applications have been submitted as of June 9<sup>th</sup>. Of the 35 applications, 3 were denied as they were outside of the Upper Blue/Summit County or didn't have sufficient equity, and 8 applications were withdrawn by the applicant. The remaining 24 valid applications include 7 funded applications, 5 approved and in process, 5 applications deferred until a later date (low priority), and 7 applications are currently under review. Of the valid applications, 17 are located in unincorporated Summit County (Upper Blue Basin), 6 are in the Town of Blue River, and 1 is in the Town of Breckenridge. The average cost for a deed restriction is approximately \$74,000 (\$17K per bedroom)-the cost for all but one acquisition was split with the County. Staff advised the Committee that the County will soon reach their Upper Blue Basin budget of \$600,000, this would seriously impact the program. Dick agreed to reach out to the County in regard to their on-going support to this program. Please see Exhibit A for the detailed report.
- Monthly Buy-Down Report:
  - Since launching the program in July of 2019, 13 units have been purchased as a part of the Buy Down program. Of the 13 units, 4 have been re-sold (see Exhibit B). The committee discussed the current available buy down inventory and options for moving the inventory faster. The committee preferred not adjusting the sale price unless the market reflected the need for price reductions. The committee also discussed the need for providing a reasonable commission to realtors that would increase the visibility of the buy downs units to buyers. The committee supported not purchasing any additional buy downs until more of the existing buy down inventory is sold. Currently, the projected average Town investment per unit is \$51,048 (\$32,000 per bedroom). To review the updated buy down report, please see Exhibit B.
- FIRC Rental Assistance Report:



## TOWN OF BRECKENRIDGE

- FIRC has distributed all of the rental assistance for the Town of Breckenridge and will be presenting to the Council on the June 23<sup>rd</sup> worksession.

### Policy Updates:

- Eviction Moratorium
  - The State has not extended the moratorium on evictions. The committee discussed concerns regarding evictions increasing due to employment and income impacts from COVID-19. The Town of Breckenridge cannot implement moratoriums on evictions; this can be implemented at the County level.
- Block 11 Master Plan
  - The committee discussed the need to revisit the Block 11 Master Plan. Staff will be bringing this to the Council at a future in-person worksession.

### Development and Construction Updates:

- Parkway Center
  - The committee discussed the Parkway Center development application as it relates to housing. The Town Council has called up this project for review.

### Financials/Proforma:

### Other Matters:

- Housing Needs Assessment Discussion

Staff discussed the 2019 Housing Needs Assessment report and determined that further assessment of data collection and methodology needs to be analyzed before preparing an overview of the report, especially in regard to the % of Basin jobs that are filled by Basin residents. Staff will provide an update to the Council once the data and methodologies used have been vetted.



# TOWN OF BRECKENRIDGE

## EXHIBIT A.

### Housing Helps Program Report - June 5, 2020

Summit County/Blue River are HIGHLIGHTED

BOLD-approved by jurisdictions

Status	Case	Subdivision	Jurisdiction	Address	Type	Size	Year Built	Bed/Bath	Assessor \$	Declared Value \$	\$ Requested	% Requested	Decision Approved	% Approved*	Purchase or		Current Equity-need 25%	Status	
															Current Owner	Timing			
<b>Completed:</b>																			
Complete-Funded	2019-09	Silver Shekel	Upper Blue	781 Fairview	SF w ADU	1659	1993	4/3	\$683,685	\$835,000	\$125,250	15%	\$125,000	15%	Purchase	2019	1stbank	12/12/2019	Completed and Funded with 50/50 split
Complete-Funded	2019-11	Now Colorado	Breck	70 Now Colorado B-2	Condo	552	1974	2/1	\$297,302	\$340,000	\$51,000	15%	\$48,600	15%	Current	2020			Funded
Complete-Funded	2020-02	French Creek	Upper Blue	114 Reiling Drive	SF	1145	1979	3/2	\$429,999	\$565,000	\$84,750	15%	\$84,700	15%	Purchase	2020	1stbank		Funded
Complete-Funded	2019-01	Sherwood Forest	Blue River	128 Starlit	SF	816	1970	2/1	\$402,501	\$515,000	\$70,000	13.50%	\$70,000	13.50%	Current	2020			Funded
Complete-Funded	2019-05	Woodmoor	Upper Blue	120 Atlantic Lode #2	Condo	812	1982	2/2	\$416,805	\$450,000	\$68,000	15%	\$68,000	15%	Current	2020			25% Funded
Complete-Funded	2020-11	Woodmoor	Upper Blue	56 Hub Lode #4	TH	1356	1972	3/2	\$474,345	\$60,000	\$60,000	12.75%	\$60,000	12.75%	Current	2020			68% Funded
Complete-Funded	2020-08	French Creek	Upper Blue	50 Magnum Bonum	SF	960	1973	3/3	\$388,009	\$445,000	\$66,750	15%	\$66,750	15%	Current	2020			28% Funded-owner obtained value from several realtors-conservative estimate \$445K/loan is \$320K
<b>Approved-pending</b>																			
Pending	2019-02	Sherwood Forest	Blue River	158 Starlit	SF	1538	1967	3/2	\$462,614	\$600,000	\$90,000	15%			Purchase	2020			BR approved-in applicants court
<b>Approved: In process</b>																			
Approved-NF	2019-14	French Creek	Upper Blue	147 Bucyrus	SF	1008	1980	3/1	\$400,371	\$455,430	\$68,314	15%	\$68,314	15%	Current	2020			49% Loan is \$287 K/ County is OK at 15% of lowest realtor value
Approved-NF	2020-13	Blue River	Blue River	49 Regal Circle	SF	2496	1969	4/3	\$674,578	\$675,000	\$100,000	15%	\$100,000	14.80%	Current	2020			62% Just purchased for \$675K-BR is OK/Loan is \$325K/County is OK at 15%
Approved-NF	2020-15	French Creek	Upper Blue	144 Bucyrus	SF	1792	1981	3/2	\$485,534	\$576,555	\$84,483	15%	\$86,483	15%	Current	2020			55% County is OK at 15% of lowest realtor value-Slifer/loan is \$262K
Approved-NF	2020-17	French Creek	Upper Blue	49 Magnum Bonum	SF	960	1973	3/2	\$402,101	\$446,000	\$67,000	15%	\$67,000	15.00%	Current	2020			42% County is OK at 15%-loan is \$259K LTV is OK
<b>Reviewed and Deferred:</b>																			
deferred/pending	2019-04	Alpine Breck	Upper Blue	576 SCR 674	SF	1288	1977	3/2	\$475,676	\$550,000	\$82,500	15%			Current	Flex			Low priority-location-re-evaluate based on funding
deferred/pending	2019-06	Silver Shekel	Upper Blue	212 Fairview	SF	2788	1997	3/3	\$972,312	\$165,000		16.9%			Current	Flex			Low priority-price point-re-evaluate based on funding
deferred/pending	2019-10	Silver Shekel	Upper Blue	341 Silver Circle	SF	2425	2009	4/3	\$1,078,833	\$230,000		21%			Current	Flex			Low priority-price point-re-evaluate based on funding
deferred/pending	2019-15	Timber Creek Estab	Blue River	390 Whispering Pines	DUP	4280	2006	4/3	\$1,061,839	\$159,275		15%			Current	2019			Referred to BR Trustees-Jan 13 2020
deferred/pending	2020-07	Loma Verde	Upper Blue	203 Lake View Drive	SF	1217	2002	2/2	\$634,842		TBD				Current				Per County-Low Priority-employment-wants to build garage/loan is \$105K/
<b>New Application to be Review:</b>																			
under review	2019-17	Tyrollean Terrace	Upper Blue	303 Overlook Dr 'D 2B'	Condo	512	1970	1/1	\$238,797	\$30,000		12.5%			Current	2020			40% 4/28 price is good-loan is \$142K/LTV is good review/County OK w FROR
under review	2020-05	Silver Shekel	Upper Blue	171 Fairview	SF	1680	1980	2/2	\$451,866		TBD				Current				SF w lock off/lives in Denver rents to locals-lock off not legal
under review	2020-06	French Creek	Upper Blue	72 Reliance Dr	SF	1915	1963	3/3	\$590,955	\$72,000		12.2%			Current				40% CountyOK-price is good-loan is \$350K LTV is good-in applicants court
under review	2020-12	Blue River	Blue River	107 Peaks View Court	Condo	700	1974	2/1	\$276,000	\$308,000	\$50,000				Purchase				BR is OK-County OK at 15% of purchase price? Listed at \$308K (\$46K)-Check HOA docs
to be reviewed	2020-14	Peak 7	Upper Blue	764 Blue Ridge	SF	1247	1995	3/2	\$564,045	\$635,000	\$110,000				Current				Loan is \$298K/LTV is good-County is OK at \$95,250=15% of Dec appraisal
to be reviewed	2020-16	New Eldorado Sub	Blue River	0164 Calle DePlata	SF	2608	1994	3/3	\$773,980	\$90,000		11.6%			Current				Loan is \$310K (40% LTV)-need to send to BR
to be reviewed	2020-18	Alpine Breck	Upper Blue	107 CR 675	SF	1650	1997	3/2	\$576,761						Purchase				listed for sale at \$599K-asking for \$120K seems high-OK at 15%?
<b>Miscellaneous:</b>																			
Denied	2019-13	Denver													NO				property is not eligible
withdrawn	2019-08	French Creek	Upper Blue	95 Reliance Drive	SF	1150	1980	2/1.5	\$455,294		tbd					Purchase			back up offer-no longer interested
Denied	2020-03	Denver													NO				property is not eligible
Withdrawn	2020-01	Peak 7-Placer Acre	Upper Blue	3594 Ski Hill Rd	SF		new	4/3		\$850,000	\$127,500	15%			NEW	2020			withdrawn by applicant
Withdrawn	2019-12	French Creek	Upper Blue	95 Reliance Drive	SF	1150	1980	2/1.5	\$455,294	\$565,000	\$84,750	15%	\$84,750	15%	Purchase	2020			applicant bought 114 Reiling instead (2020-02)
Withdrawn by appli	2020-04	Blue Rock Springs	Blue River	6844 Hwy 9	SF	2592	1965	3/3	\$662,524	\$102,000					Purchase				approved by Blue River/County
Withdrawn by appli	2019-03	Ski Side Apartment Breck	Upper Blue	1001 Grandview	24 APTs	25044	1981	42/24	\$4,918,100	\$200,000			\$300,000		Current	2019			Offer made-in applicants court Cmte-OK at \$300,000/15 years
LTV too low-denied	2019-07	Wildflower	Upper Blue	304 Illinois Gulch rd B106	Condo	440	1995	1/1	\$269,804	\$315,500	\$48,999	15.5%	\$47,325	15%	Current	2019			pd \$315,500 in 2019 Cmte/County OK at 15% if HOA allows STR and LTV OK
Withdrawn by appli	2019-16	French Creek	Upper Blue	12 Magnum Bonum	SF	854	1973	3/2	\$360,379	\$400,000	\$60,000	15%	\$60,000	15%	Purchase	2019			Reviewed with County 11/12/2019-buyer will go under contract for \$400k-County OK at 15%
withdrawn by appli	2020-09	French Creek	Upper Blue	159 Bucyrus	SF	1904	1986	3/2	\$578,566	\$100,000		17.3%			Current				90% Very small loan-will pay it off. Applicant is reviewing docs and providing value document
withdrawn by appli	2020-10	French Creek	Upper Blue	144 Bucyrus	SF	1792	1981	3/2	\$485,534	\$100,000		20.5%			Purchase				will be speaking w seller to determine if this proceeds-May 1



# TOWN OF BRECKENRIDGE


## EXHIBIT B.

### Buy Downs Monthly Report 5/12/2020 (sold units-BOLD)

Unit	Acquired	Beds	Xcel Account	\$ Paid	DEED RESTRICTION		Target % Buy Down	Actual Resale Price	Actual % Buy Down	Resale Date	AMI		Gap		HOA	Listed/SCHA	MLS	Status		
					RECORDED	Resale Target					Target/ Sale	Projected or Actual*								
Val Disere 111	7/1/2019	1	53-8569223-	\$335,000.00	1221419	\$325,000.00	3.08%				128%	\$23,655.00	400					hold to determine Special Assessment timing/5		
Wildflower H201	7/12/2019	1	53-8569223-	\$265,000.00	1210272	\$255,000.00	3.92%				122%	\$19,592.00	232	9/20/2019	1/1/2020			relisted May 2020		
<b>Gold Camp 68</b>	<b>7/31/2019</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>\$430,000.00</b>	<b>1210266</b>	<b>\$395,000.00</b>	<b>8.86%</b>	<b>\$375,000.00</b>	<b>14.67%</b>	<b>11/13/2019</b>	<b>118%</b>	<b>\$72,422.50</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>10/8/2019</b>	<b>no</b>			<b>SOLD</b>		
<b>Gold Camp 132</b>	<b>7/31/2019</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>\$445,000.00</b>	<b>1210267</b>	<b>\$385,000.00</b>	<b>15.58%</b>	<b>\$385,000.00</b>	<b>15.58%</b>	<b>11/27/2019</b>	<b>121%</b>	<b>\$75,185.00</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>10/8/2019</b>	<b>no</b>			<b>SOLD</b>		
Now Colorado A8	8/1/2019	2	53-8569223-	\$305,000.00	1210269	\$285,000.00	7.02%				90%	\$30,270.00	395	9/20/2019	1/1/2020			relist in May 2020		
Now Colorado D2	8/12/2019	2	53-8569223-	\$329,000.00	1210271	\$290,000.00	13.45%				109%	\$50,270.00	395	10/8/2019	1/1/2020			relist in May 2020		
Now Colorado E8	9/26/2019	2	53-8569223-	\$339,000.00	1210270	\$290,000.00	16.90%				109%	\$65,000.00	395	10/8/2019	1/1/2020			relist in May 2020-flood damage repaired		
<b>Highlands Green 117</b>	<b>8/1/2019</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>\$395,000.00</b>	<b>1210273</b>	<b>\$365,000.00</b>	<b>8.22%</b>	<b>\$350,000.00</b>	<b>12.86%</b>	<b>12/13/2019</b>	<b>138%</b>	<b>\$58,359.00</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>9/20/2019</b>	<b>no</b>			<b>SOLD</b>		
Long Branch 219	9/26/2019	1	53-8569223-	\$405,000.00	1210268	\$350,000.00	15.71%				138%	\$68,518.00	403					relist in May 2020-flood damage repaired		
<b>Gold Camp L163</b>	<b>11/25/2019</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>\$405,000.00</b>	<b>1215180</b>	<b>\$389,000.00</b>	<b>4.11%</b>	<b>\$389,000.00</b>	<b>4.11%</b>	<b>12/31/2019</b>	<b>122%</b>	<b>\$34,930.95</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>11/26/2019</b>	<b>no</b>			<b>SOLD</b>		
Gold Camp I120	1/12/2020	2		\$440,000.00	1221420	\$390,000.00	12.82%				123%	\$63,324.00	429	3/6/2020				New Buy Down-will list with SCHA for 7 days, then MLS		
Highlands Green 205	3/31/2020	1		\$400,000.00		\$350,000.00	12.50%												New Buy Down-will list with SCHA for 7 days, then MLS	
Highland Green 309	3/21/2020	1		\$400,000.00		\$350,000.00	12.50%												New Buy Down-will list with SCHA for 7 days, then MLS	
<b>Sub-totals</b>		<b>18</b>		<b>\$4,893,000.00</b>		<b>\$4,069,000.00</b>		<b>\$1,499,000.00</b>				<b>\$561,526.45</b>	<b>4436</b>							
<i>average</i>				<i>\$376,384.62</i>		<i>\$339,923.08</i>	<i>10.18%</i>	<i>\$374,750.00</i>	<i>11.81%</i>			<i>120%</i>	<i>\$51,047.86</i>							<i>\$31,195.91 per BED</i>

Notes: PROJECTED average buy down is \$32,000 per bed  
 PROJECTED average subsidy is \$51,047.86/unit (includes carry cost and repairs)  
 PROJECTED average AMI target-120%AMI

\* Projected Gap includes buy down plus 6 months HOA dues/utility estimate/2% commission/\$1,500 closing/\$1,000 for inspection report and repairs



# Memo

To: Breckenridge Town Council Members  
From: Corrie Burr  
Date: June 17, 2020  
Subject: June 3, 2020 Child Care Advisory Meeting Report

---

The Child Care Advisory Committee held a regular meeting on June 3, 2020. Committee members present via GoToMeeting: Scott Perlow, Greta Shackelford, Laura Amedro, Jay Homola, Johanna Gibbs, Austyn Dineen. Heather Garcia, Mary Jo Zweig and Joyce Ruderman were unable to attend. Town Council representative Kelly Owens was present. Staff from the Town of Breckenridge included Laurie Best, Julia Puester, Mark Truckey and Corrie Burr. Leslie Davis also joined the meeting.

## **Applications Open**

The application opened on 5/29/2020 and we have 5 submitted applications as of today. The application will run through July 15<sup>th</sup> this year due to the delayed start. We can't go to the centers this year due to restrictions, so the committee discussed ways to get the word out to the community. Social media is still the most effective method, but looking at other options (radio, virtual session for Q&A, SDN). The committee discussed how to be more proactive with families since their income could very well be changing each month. Taxes were extended to July 15<sup>th</sup>, so applicants can be approved without 2019 taxes, but their final tuition assistance will be dependent on receiving the taxes.

Many families are not affected by unemployment because of the extra \$600 per week. The committee considered how to address families that do have an income change due to COVID. The committee recommended to review the family income based on today and not consider their prior income until they return to work. We have not had unemployment issues in previous years except for a few families that had seasonal unemployment, so this is a new situation. Normally we look at anticipated income for the entire year, but the committee recommended we look at their income as of right now to account for job loss and income reduction with the understanding that staff will reach out to families each quarter, at a minimum, to understand their income. A major component of the program is to make sure families are not cost burdened, so it is the right thing to do. This also helps the centers financially as the families can then afford to attend. As we get through this, we will need to review the profroma to see how much the fund is affected.

The committee requested to have a formal process to do quarterly check-ins with the families, which may include all families on tuition assistance. Corrie will look at options through SurveyMonkey Apply to require families to attest their income on a quarterly basis, or until such time that it does not seem necessary. For unemployed families, Corrie will be checking in monthly to see if they have returned to work. Some people will experience reduction in income even when they return. The goal is to assist

families as much as possible without compromising the program in any way. Since families are required to report changes in income, the hope is that the check-in is just a backup plan to make sure we have the most current information.

Johanna asked about social equity within the program, or if we need an anti-discrimination clause given the current situation in our world. Corrie will review the parent agreement and check with the Town attorney. The program does not ask about race or ethnicity, so there isn't any component of the program that is based on social differences. The program is solely based on income, need and child care utilization.

### **Center Update & Financial Status**

The Town paid tuition assistance for June based on the previous few months except for a few families that qualified for more assistance due to income changes. The centers are all a little different on the family copay side, but all the centers are offering programs for families that have decided not to return yet or may not return for the remainder of the summer. July will need to be addressed at the extra meeting added in June. This will be dependent on the centers being able to expand capacity and family comfort in returning. The centers will be looking at wait lists as their comfort level increases and they understand the true openings they have. The boards are meeting on a weekly or bi-weekly bases to address capacity, tuition, health etc.

Greta shared feedback on the first few days of being opened. It is going well, but it feels like a lot of kids and people in one place after being completely shut down. There is the impending fear of COVID hitting the centers and more closures. She feels it has gone as best as it can, but has only been three days. This will continue to be a discussion at our meetings and a big reason for the added June meeting.

Greta shared that waitlist families have been calling every day, so there is still high interest in new families coming into the program. Some families are choosing not to attend, but once families see their friends go back, they are more willing to utilize their center. Everyone is watching what the school district is doing since this will have an effect on child care and the ability to go back to work. Each center lost 1 to 2 staff members through the process, but feel very good about that given they have 20+ staff. Each center has around 30 kids per day, except for Breckenridge Montessori which has around 8 instead of 18. All centers are currently at less than 50% for June.

### **Additional Support Needs from the Committee**

We will have an additional June meeting in two weeks, hoping to have more information on financial status, safety in the centers, how the families are feeling, capacity etc. Kelly asked if we should be connecting with Eagle to understand their direction on child care. Corrie has a contact there and will provide it to Kelly and Greta. Boulder County has been sharing child care information as well.

Laura shared information on testing from a medical standpoint. They are sending people for testing with any symptoms. People can self-refer with Centura for testing as well. The centers will send the number out to families, 668.5584. People can call this number and get a test if you have symptoms. They are not doing asymptomatic testing yet. The Care Clinic is testing, but requires a visit with a provider.


The centers are working with Building Hope for programs for mental health for the child care workers. There is a group for the classroom staff and a separate one for the admin staff. The committee will continue to provide support for the centers as needed.

**Breckenridge Montessori Rent Request**

Breckenridge Montessori requested to have their rent forgiven for July and August due to low participant numbers and capacity restrictions. They received the PPP loan and paid for May and June with that money. April was already forgiven as part of the Breckenridge Rent Relief program. The committee recommends to proceed with the rent forgiveness for July and August and Kelly will make this recommendation to Council at the next meeting. Corrie will notify Beth of the decision after the Council has had a chance to consider the request.

The committee requested an additional meeting in two weeks, therefore the next meeting scheduled for June 17th, 2020 at 3:00.

Adjourned at 4:26 pm.



# Memo

**To:** Breckenridge Town Council Members  
**From:** Rick Holman, Town Manager  
**Date:** 6/17/2020  
**Subject:** Committee Reports

*No committee reports were submitted for this meeting.*

<b>Committees*</b>	<b>Representative</b>	<b>Report Status</b>
Summit Stage Advisory Board	Jennifer Pullen	No Meeting/Report
Police Advisory Committee	Chief Jim Baird	No Meeting/Report
CMC Advisory Committee	Rick Holman	No Meeting/Report
Recreation Advisory Committee	Scott Reid	No Meeting/Report
Breckenridge Events Committee	Shannon Haynes	No Meeting/Report
Transit and Parking Advisory Committee	Jennifer Pullen	No Meeting/Report
Communications	Haley Littleton	No Meeting/Report

**\*Note:** Reports provided by the Mayor and Council Members are listed in the Council agenda.



TOWN OF  
**BRECKENRIDGE**

**May 31, 2020**

Department of Finance



## Executive Summary

May 31, 2020


This report covers the first 5 months of 2020. May is largely reflective of April tax collections. The Town was greatly impacted by COVID-19 in April 2020, with the shut-down of many local businesses throughout the month of April.

Overall, we are approximately \$2.5M under 2020 budgeted revenues in the Excise fund. Sales tax is currently \$2M under YTD budget, and \$2M behind prior year. Accommodations tax is \$369k under budget, and \$351k behind last year. Real Estate Transfer Tax is \$243k under budget, and \$1M behind prior year.


See the Tax Basics section of these financial reports for more detail on the sales, accommodations, and real estate transfer taxes.

Expenditures are generally holding the line, with most General Fund departments tracking slightly below YTD budgeted expense amount (see General Fund Expenditures Summary for details).

**Excise YTD Actual vs. Budget - by Source**



**YTD Actual Revenues - Excise**



	YTD Actual	YTD Budget	% of Budget	Annual Budget	Prior YTD Actual	Prior Annual Actual
SALES TAX	\$ 8,108,557	\$ 10,136,633	80%	\$ 25,345,100	\$ 10,103,621	\$ 25,979,792
ACCOMMODATIONS TAX	1,600,168	1,969,018	81%	3,726,500	1,951,251	3,901,868
REAL ESTATE TRANSFER	1,823,131	2,065,898	88%	5,700,000	2,888,280	7,166,614
OTHER*	482,301	295,866	163%	886,320	299,351	1,158,166
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 12,014,157</b>	<b>\$ 14,467,415</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>\$ 35,657,920</b>	<b>\$ 15,242,504</b>	<b>\$ 38,206,441</b>




\* Other includes Franchise Fees (Telephone, Public Service and Cable), Nicotine Tax, Cigarette Tax, and Investment Income

## The Tax Basics: April 2020

### Net Taxable Sales by Industry-YTD

Description	YTD 2017	YTD 2018	YTD 2019	2019		2019/2020		2020
				% of Total	YTD 2020	\$ Change	% Change	
Retail	\$57,809,672	\$63,197,954	\$69,329,622	24.26%	\$52,612,001	(\$16,717,621)	-24.11%	23.15%
Weedtail	\$4,366,500	\$4,340,399	\$4,396,796	1.54%	\$3,768,308	(\$628,488)	-14.29%	1.66%
Restaurant / Bar	\$54,875,876	\$61,295,344	\$64,589,315	22.61%	\$45,401,178	(\$19,188,137)	-29.71%	19.98%
Short-Term Lodging	\$78,148,792	\$89,130,085	\$94,837,650	33.19%	\$78,109,324	(\$16,728,326)	-17.64%	34.37%
Grocery / Liquor	\$24,152,281	\$25,900,952	\$25,171,034	8.81%	\$23,345,052	(\$1,825,982)	-7.25%	10.27%
Construction	\$9,597,656	\$10,889,428	\$14,272,403	5.00%	\$8,665,124	(\$5,607,279)	-39.29%	3.81%
Utility	\$11,030,888	\$10,690,514	\$12,345,455	4.32%	\$14,667,992	\$2,322,537	18.81%	6.46%
Other*	\$495,704	\$327,904	\$785,657	0.27%	\$662,684	(\$122,973)	-15.65%	0.29%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$240,477,368</b>	<b>\$265,772,580</b>	<b>\$285,727,932</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$227,231,662</b>	<b>(\$58,496,270)</b>	<b>-20.47%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

\* Other includes activities in Automobiles and Undefined Sales.




#### New Items of Note:

- For the year, net taxable sales are currently behind 2019 by 20.47%.
- April net taxable sales are currently behind April 2019 by 65.09%. This is due to the COVID-19 Town-Wide business closures that were effective March 16th, 2020.
- For April 2020, there were decreases across all sectors Short Term Lodging (93.25%), Restaurant/Bar (93.17%), Retail (70.32%), Weedtail (45.64%), Construction (28.08%), and Grocery/Liquor (24.62%).
- Distribution of disposable bags experienced a decrease over prior year, the decrease was 84.71%. On March 27th, an executive order went into effect to waive bag fees during the COVID-19 pandemic.


#### Continuing Items of Note:

- In 2014, a new category was added to the Sales by Sector pages for the Weedtail sector. The category encompasses all legal marijuana sales, regardless of medical or recreational designation.
- A section on Disposable Bag Fees was added in 2014.
- A section on Short Term Rentals was added in 2018.
- Taxes collected from the customer by the vendor are remitted to the Town on the 20<sup>th</sup> of the following month.
- Quarterly taxes are reported in the last month of the period. For example, taxes collected in the first quarter of the year (January – March), are included on the report for the period of March.
- Net Taxable Sales are continually updated as late tax returns are submitted to the Town of Breckenridge. Therefore, you may notice slight changes in prior months, in addition to the reporting for the current month.
- "Other" sales relate to returns that have yet to be classified. Much of this category will be reclassified to other sectors as more information becomes available.


## Net Taxable Sales by Sector-Town of Breckenridge Tax Base




Total Net Taxable Sales					% change
	2017	2018	2019	2020	from PY
Jan	\$67,602,475	\$76,144,986	\$81,398,427	\$83,277,079	2.31%
Feb	\$64,772,287	\$70,319,034	\$75,466,232	\$79,135,089	4.86%
Mar	\$79,469,446	\$91,363,216	\$95,112,403	\$53,036,348	-44.24%
Apr	\$28,633,160	\$27,945,344	\$33,750,869	\$11,783,057	-65.09%
May	\$21,492,032	\$20,570,536	\$25,912,553	\$0	n/a
Jun	\$35,789,125	\$41,931,377	\$40,992,648	\$0	n/a
Jul	\$49,248,840	\$52,292,165	\$53,656,504	\$0	n/a
Aug	\$40,989,760	\$44,375,478	\$47,527,195	\$0	n/a
Sep	\$40,543,665	\$43,422,466	\$44,693,347	\$0	n/a
Oct	\$25,037,316	\$27,217,667	\$31,829,795	\$0	n/a
Nov	\$28,918,556	\$33,740,984	\$39,580,215	\$0	n/a
Dec	\$82,489,348	\$88,010,590	\$93,227,315	\$90	-100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$564,986,011</b>	<b>\$617,333,844</b>	<b>\$663,147,504</b>	<b>\$227,231,662</b>	




Retail					% change
	2017	2018	2019	2020	from PY
Jan	\$16,115,056	\$17,209,414	\$19,712,457	\$19,079,293	-3.21%
Feb	\$15,250,487	\$16,415,520	\$17,852,583	\$18,344,921	2.76%
Mar	\$19,216,556	\$22,361,529	\$22,604,619	\$12,468,929	-44.84%
Apr	\$7,227,573	\$7,211,490	\$9,159,963	\$2,718,858	-70.32%
May	\$4,961,041	\$5,672,962	\$6,392,006	\$0	n/a
Jun	\$9,637,104	\$10,744,214	\$11,927,740	\$0	n/a
Jul	\$12,770,431	\$12,574,061	\$13,955,154	\$0	n/a
Aug	\$9,676,543	\$11,140,142	\$12,578,851	\$0	n/a
Sep	\$11,574,425	\$12,637,778	\$13,770,949	\$0	n/a
Oct	\$6,688,217	\$8,626,684	\$8,745,930	\$0	n/a
Nov	\$8,427,286	\$10,074,660	\$11,716,664	\$0	n/a
Dec	\$21,006,238	\$23,788,641	\$26,136,968	\$0	n/a
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$142,550,957</b>	<b>\$158,457,095</b>	<b>\$174,553,885</b>	<b>\$52,612,001</b>	




Weedtail					% change
	2017	2018	2019	2020	from PY
Jan	\$1,263,370	\$1,299,492	\$1,278,628	\$1,266,253	-0.97%
Feb	\$1,076,236	\$1,077,296	\$1,143,834	\$1,155,097	0.98%
Mar	\$1,343,407	\$1,360,559	\$1,291,752	\$975,890	-24.45%
Apr	\$683,486	\$603,052	\$682,583	\$371,068	-45.64%
May	\$436,712	\$432,876	\$525,557	\$0	n/a
Jun	\$608,808	\$646,541	\$691,544	\$0	n/a
Jul	\$798,038	\$884,964	\$905,548	\$0	n/a
Aug	\$756,690	\$804,530	\$845,682	\$0	n/a
Sep	\$596,781	\$624,657	\$658,693	\$0	n/a
Oct	\$484,253	\$496,522	\$536,078	\$0	n/a
Nov	\$554,576	\$615,385	\$605,820	\$0	n/a
Dec	\$1,112,445	\$1,131,042	\$1,088,987	\$0	n/a
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$9,714,804</b>	<b>\$9,976,918</b>	<b>\$10,254,704</b>	<b>\$3,768,308</b>	




Restaurant / Bar					% change
	2017	2018	2019	2020 from PY	
Jan	\$16,276,306	\$18,113,738	\$18,862,733	\$18,601,981	-1.38%
Feb	\$15,181,858	\$17,105,472	\$17,902,023	\$17,667,598	-1.31%
Mar	\$16,595,811	\$19,308,728	\$19,848,169	\$8,587,052	-56.74%
Apr	\$6,821,901	\$6,767,406	\$7,976,390	\$544,548	-93.17%
May	\$3,448,281	\$3,635,557	\$4,574,924	\$0	n/a
Jun	\$8,089,688	\$9,485,924	\$8,944,958	\$0	n/a
Jul	\$13,124,240	\$14,352,235	\$14,288,581	\$0	n/a
Aug	\$10,631,602	\$11,842,888	\$12,227,112	\$0	n/a
Sep	\$9,211,502	\$9,446,920	\$9,607,131	\$0	n/a
Oct	\$5,227,314	\$5,536,613	\$5,844,363	\$0	n/a
Nov	\$6,000,732	\$7,424,201	\$7,827,028	\$0	n/a
Dec	\$15,895,058	\$17,163,832	\$16,542,804	\$0	n/a
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$126,504,293</b>	<b>\$140,183,514</b>	<b>\$144,446,216</b>	<b>\$45,401,178</b>	



Short-Term Lodging					% change
	2017	2018	2019	2020 from PY	
Jan	\$21,594,876	\$25,677,161	\$26,944,780	\$31,810,708	18.06%
Feb	\$21,775,651	\$23,906,805	\$24,789,164	\$29,465,860	18.87%
Mar	\$29,437,165	\$34,496,724	\$37,021,868	\$16,422,156	-55.64%
Apr	\$5,341,101	\$5,049,394	\$6,081,837	\$410,599	-93.25%
May	\$2,009,505	\$2,465,550	\$3,271,360	\$0	n/a
June	\$6,825,710	\$9,133,071	\$8,600,251	\$0	n/a
Jul	\$11,182,266	\$12,295,670	\$12,255,215	\$0	n/a
Aug	\$8,267,603	\$9,513,481	\$9,982,006	\$0	n/a
Sep	\$7,952,996	\$7,967,829	\$8,728,034	\$0	n/a
Oct	\$3,257,303	\$3,286,586	\$7,653,654	\$0	n/a
Nov	\$4,649,007	\$5,719,696	\$10,633,294	\$0	n/a
Dec	\$26,835,256	\$28,664,916	\$32,350,662	\$0	n/a
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$149,128,440</b>	<b>\$168,176,884</b>	<b>\$188,312,124</b>	<b>\$78,109,324</b>	



Grocery / Liquor					% change
	2017	2018	2019	2020 from PY	
Jan	\$6,608,924	\$8,108,346	\$6,653,945	\$6,922,182	4.03%
Feb	\$6,612,305	\$6,858,048	\$6,918,554	\$7,279,103	5.21%
Mar	\$6,672,292	\$7,172,637	\$7,480,138	\$6,039,336	-19.26%
Apr	\$4,258,760	\$3,761,922	\$4,118,397	\$3,104,430	-24.62%
May	\$3,098,290	\$3,340,611	\$5,753,955	\$0	n/a
June	\$4,439,619	\$4,746,854	\$4,448,586	\$0	n/a
Jul	\$6,059,042	\$6,474,680	\$6,385,747	\$0	n/a
Aug	\$5,817,425	\$5,681,926	\$5,986,763	\$0	n/a
Sep	\$4,621,933	\$4,553,381	\$4,568,142	\$0	n/a
Oct	\$3,807,540	\$3,652,184	\$3,935,787	\$0	n/a
Nov	\$3,726,441	\$4,245,207	\$3,950,006	\$0	n/a
Dec	\$9,924,458	\$11,003,103	\$10,901,776	\$0	n/a
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$65,647,028</b>	<b>\$69,598,900</b>	<b>\$71,101,797</b>	<b>\$23,345,052</b>	




Construction					
	2017	2018	2019	2020	% change from PY
Jan	\$2,379,108	\$2,793,781	\$4,263,101	\$2,162,140	-49.28%
Feb	\$2,078,486	\$2,270,113	\$3,720,154	\$1,932,884	-48.04%
Mar	\$3,323,526	\$3,712,943	\$3,301,054	\$2,421,040	-26.66%
Apr	\$1,816,536	\$2,112,592	\$2,988,095	\$2,149,060	-28.08%
May	\$5,475,408	\$2,891,845	\$3,360,292	\$0	n/a
Jun	\$4,265,128	\$5,308,494	\$3,962,468	\$0	n/a
Jul	\$3,055,565	\$3,567,360	\$3,649,036	\$0	n/a
Aug	\$3,712,040	\$3,456,062	\$3,811,256	\$0	n/a
Sep	\$4,318,183	\$5,764,700	\$4,819,944	\$0	n/a
Oct	\$3,434,986	\$3,869,698	\$3,117,174	\$0	n/a
Nov	\$3,377,030	\$3,463,136	\$2,653,542	\$0	n/a
Dec	\$4,904,716	\$3,107,487	\$2,887,774	\$0	n/a
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$42,140,712</b>	<b>\$42,318,210</b>	<b>\$42,533,888</b>	<b>\$8,665,124</b>	

## Disposable Bag Fees

The Town adopted an ordinance April 9, 2013 (effective October 15, 2013) to discourage the use of disposable bags, achieving a goal of the SustainableBreck Plan. The \$.10 fee applies to most plastic and paper bags given out at retail and grocery stores in Breckenridge. The program is intended to encourage the use of reusable bags and discourage the use of disposable bags, thereby furthering the Town's sustainability efforts. Revenues from the fee are used to provide public information about the program and promote the use of reusable bags.

## # of Disposable Bags Reported by Month




## Bag Fees Remitted by Month

*Net of Retained Percentage\**




\*Retailers are permitted to retain 50% of the fee (up to a maximum of \$1000/month through October 31, 2014; changing to a maximum of \$100/month beginning November 1, 2014) in order to offset expenses incurred related to the program. The retained percent may be used by the retail store to provide educational information to customers; provide required signage; train staff; alter infrastructure; fee administration; develop/display informational signage; encourage the use of reusable bags or promote recycling of disposable bags; and improve infrastructure to increase disposable bag recycling.

## The Tax Basics: Retail Sales Sector Analysis




Retail: In-Town					% change
	2017	2018	2019	2020	from PY
Jan	\$13,096,116	\$13,605,184	\$14,542,794	\$14,829,444	1.97%
Feb	\$12,636,631	\$13,199,875	\$13,996,694	\$14,854,683	6.13%
Mar	\$15,085,056	\$16,811,167	\$17,537,004	\$7,722,750	-55.96%
Apr	\$5,099,020	\$4,668,932	\$5,830,752	\$576,000	-90.12%
May	\$2,310,164	\$2,924,905	\$3,269,082	\$0	n/a
Jun	\$5,342,764	\$6,111,383	\$6,258,173	\$0	n/a
Jul	\$8,865,951	\$9,530,914	\$10,024,612	\$0	n/a
Aug	\$6,848,954	\$7,903,296	\$8,652,385	\$0	n/a
Sep	\$6,082,012	\$6,303,509	\$6,975,171	\$0	n/a
Oct	\$3,877,500	\$4,349,427	\$4,729,944	\$0	n/a
Nov	\$5,248,808	\$6,626,993	\$6,905,161	\$0	n/a
Dec	\$15,513,951	\$16,711,142	\$17,015,813	\$0	n/a
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$100,006,926</b>	<b>\$108,746,727</b>	<b>\$115,737,586</b>	<b>\$37,982,878</b>	<b>-67.18%</b>



Retail: Out-of-Town					% change
	2017	2018	2019	2020	from PY
Jan	\$3,018,940	\$3,604,230	\$5,169,663	\$4,249,848	-17.79%
Feb	\$2,613,856	\$3,215,646	\$3,855,889	\$3,490,238	-9.48%
Mar	\$4,131,501	\$5,550,362	\$5,067,615	\$4,746,178	-6.34%
Apr	\$2,128,553	\$2,542,558	\$3,329,210	\$2,142,858	-35.63%
May	\$2,650,877	\$2,748,057	\$3,122,925	\$0	n/a
June	\$4,294,341	\$4,632,831	\$5,669,567	\$0	n/a
Jul	\$3,904,480	\$3,043,148	\$3,930,542	\$0	n/a
Aug	\$2,827,588	\$3,236,846	\$3,926,466	\$0	n/a
Sep	\$5,492,413	\$6,334,269	\$6,795,778	\$0	n/a
Oct	\$2,810,716	\$4,277,257	\$4,015,987	\$0	n/a
Nov	\$3,178,479	\$3,447,666	\$4,811,503	\$0	n/a
Dec	\$5,492,288	\$7,077,499	\$9,121,155	\$0	n/a
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$42,544,031</b>	<b>\$49,710,368</b>	<b>\$58,816,300</b>	<b>\$14,629,123</b>	<b>-75.13%</b>

### Annual Retail Comparison



#### New Items of Note:

- Starting in March 2019, the Finance Department has split the Retail sector into two categories, In-Town Retail sales and Out-of-Town Retail sales. In-Town Retail sales comprise businesses that are in Town limits, the sector had an overall increase of 15.72% in 2019 as compared to 2017. The Out-of-Town Retail Sales had a overall increase in sales of 41.82% for 2019 compared to 2017.


## Real Estate Transfer Tax

### New Items of Note:

- Revenue for the month of May was behind prior year by 79.76%, and behind monthly budget by \$413,841.
- Year to date, revenue is behind prior year by 36.88%, and behind budget by \$240,212.
- Timeshare sales account for the majority of the sales (29.78%), with Single Family Home sales in the second position of highest sales (24.49%) subject to the tax. Condominium sales were in third position with (22.58%) in sales for the year.
- May 2020 churn was 28.15% below May 2019.


### Continuing Items of Note:

- 2020 Real Estate Transfer Tax budget is based upon the monthly distribution for 2018.




Total RETT						
	2018	2019	2020	% change	2020 budget	+/- Budget
Jan	\$350,102	\$536,802	\$439,913	-18.05%	\$323,732	\$116,181
Feb	\$338,813	\$441,411	\$494,762	12.09%	\$313,293	\$181,469
Mar	\$391,670	\$454,470	\$437,025	-3.84%	\$362,169	\$74,856
Apr	\$532,220	\$674,070	\$293,256	-56.49%	\$492,133	-\$198,877
May	\$618,610	\$781,528	\$158,175	-79.76%	\$572,016	-\$413,841
Jun	\$468,350	\$480,111	\$139,861	-70.87%	\$433,074	-\$293,213
Jul	\$564,797	\$510,302	\$0	n/a	\$522,256	n/a
Aug	\$778,848	\$784,245	\$0	n/a	\$720,185	n/a
Sep	\$398,296	\$684,950	\$0	n/a	\$368,296	n/a
Oct	\$622,750	\$561,093	\$0	n/a	\$575,844	n/a
Nov	\$598,966	\$604,298	\$0	n/a	\$553,851	n/a
Dec	\$500,878	\$653,338	\$0	n/a	\$463,151	n/a
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$6,164,300</b>	<b>\$7,166,618</b>	<b>\$1,962,992</b>		<b>\$5,700,000</b>	

\*June #'s are as of 06/15/2020



by Category					
Description	2019 YTD	2020 YTD	\$ change	% change	% of Total
Commercial	\$ 339,350	\$ 98,776	(240,575)	-70.89%	5.42%
Condominium	527,853	411,684	(116,169)	-22.01%	22.58%
Timeshare	763,972	543,003	(220,969)	-28.92%	29.78%
Single Family	1,013,328	446,554	(566,774)	-55.93%	24.49%
Townhome	188,481	257,165	68,684	36.44%	14.11%
Vacant Land	55,296	65,950	10,654	19.27%	3.62%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,888,280</b>	<b>\$ 1,823,131</b>	<b>(1,065,149)</b>	<b>-36.88%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

\* YTD as of May 31st






## TAXES DUE - SALES, ACCOMMODATIONS, AND MARIJUANA TAXES

### Tax Due by Industry-YTD

Description	YTD 2017	YTD 2018	YTD 2019	2019		2019/2020		2020
				% of Total	YTD 2020	\$ Change	% Change	% of Total
Retail	\$2,560,968	\$2,799,669	\$3,071,302	19.00%	\$2,330,712	(\$740,591)	-24.11%	17.97%
Weedtail	\$477,258	\$474,406	\$480,570	2.97%	\$411,876	(\$68,694)	-14.29%	3.18%
Restaurant / Bar	\$2,431,001	\$2,715,384	\$2,861,307	17.70%	\$2,011,272	(\$850,034)	-29.71%	15.51%
Short-Term Lodging	\$6,119,050	\$6,978,886	\$7,425,788	45.93%	\$6,115,960	(\$1,309,828)	-17.64%	47.17%
Grocery / Liquor	\$1,069,946	\$1,147,412	\$1,115,077	6.90%	\$1,034,186	(\$80,891)	-7.25%	7.98%
Construction	\$425,176	\$482,402	\$632,267	3.91%	\$383,865	(\$248,402)	-39.29%	2.96%
Utility	\$488,668	\$473,590	\$546,904	3.38%	\$649,792	\$102,888	18.81%	5.01%
Other*	\$21,960	\$14,526	\$34,805	0.22%	\$29,357	(\$5,448)	-15.65%	0.23%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$13,594,029</b>	<b>\$15,086,274</b>	<b>\$16,168,019</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$12,967,020</b>	<b>(\$3,201,000)</b>	<b>-19.80%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

\* Other includes activities in Automobiles and Undefined Sales.



#### Items of Note:

- The general sales tax rate includes the 2.5% Town sales tax + 1.93% County sales tax distributed to the Town.
- The Short -Term Lodging sector includes an additional 3.4% accommodation tax.
- Weedtail includes an additional 5% marijuana tax (recreational and medical). The 1.5% distribution from the State is also included in this category. While the State distribution is only due on recreational sales, the majority of weedtail sales are recreational and the distribution has been applied to the entire sector.
- Report assumptions include: applying tax specific to a sector to the entire sector, as well as assuming the same tax base across the State, County, and Town taxes due. As a result, the numbers indicated above are a rough picture of taxes due to the Town and not an exact representation. Additionally, the data is representative of taxes due to the Town and not necessarily taxes collected year to date.

# General Fund Revenues Summary

May 31, 2020

These next two pages report on 2020 year-to-date financials for the General Fund. This area contains most "Government Services," such as public works, police, community development, planning, recreation, facilities, and administrative functions.


**General Fund Revenue:** At the end of May, the Town's General Fund was at 91% of YTD budget (\$9.7M actual vs. \$10.7M budgeted).

Property tax is under budget due to the timing of collections. This is expected to even out throughout the year.


Community Development is under budget due to building permit & plan check fees being under budget. This is likely most attributable to a slow down in new permits related to COVID-19.

Public Works was over budget due to insurance recoveries. This revenue also has related expenses.

Recreation fell behind budget across the board attributable to the COVID-19 closure.



Gen. Fund YTD Revenue Act vs. Bud - by Program



## General Fund Expenditures Summary

May 31, 2020

The General Fund as of May 31, 2020 was at 106% of budgeted expense (\$10.4M actual vs. \$9.8M budgeted). The below graphs represent the cost of providing the services contained in this fund (Public Safety, Recreation, Public Works, Community Development, and Administration).


**Variance Explanations:**

The main factor in departmental variances is the timing of 2020 expenses, versus the monthly 2018 actual expenses that the budget distribution is based upon. This variance will even itself out throughout the year and is most visible in smaller departments, such as Administration & Community Development. An example in Community Development is the timing of High Country Conservation expenses that exceeded YTD budget, but not the annual budget; this will even out later in the year.


The "Other" category includes \$600k provided in relation to COVID relief to employees through the FIRC and \$900k directly to local businesses for rent relief.

**Without this expense (not yet included in the budget), General Fund expenditures are 91% of the YTD budget.**

**YTD Actual Expenses**



**Gen. Fund YTD Expenditures Act. vs. Bud. - by Program**



## Combined Statement of Revenues and Expenditures All Funds May 31, 2020

REVENUE	YTD Actual	YTD Budget	% of YTD Bud.	Annual Bud.
<b>General Governmental</b>				
1 Gen/Excise/MMJ/Child Cr/Spec Prj/P&T	\$ 18,629,687	\$ 20,631,073	90%	\$ 103,292,281
2 Special Revenue	3,755,733	6,303,978	60%	14,890,136
3 Internal Service	3,736,957	3,710,260	101%	9,484,572
<b>4 Subtotal General Governmental</b>	<b>\$ 26,122,377</b>	<b>\$ 30,645,311</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>\$ 127,666,989</b>
5 Capital Projects	201,515	16,559	1217%	10,210,260
<b>Enterprise Funds</b>				
6 Utility Fund	1,756,575	2,610,910	67%	12,779,037
7 Golf	98,175	230,459	43%	2,660,636
8 Cemetery	2,600	4,022	65%	15,900
<b>9 Subtotal Enterprise Funds</b>	<b>\$ 1,857,350</b>	<b>\$ 2,845,391</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>\$ 15,455,573</b>
<b>10 TOTAL REVENUE</b>	<b>28,181,242</b>	<b>33,507,261</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>153,332,822</b>
11 Internal Transfers	11,601,877	11,719,068	99%	48,821,982
<b>12 TOTAL REVENUE incl. x-fers</b>	<b>\$ 39,783,119</b>	<b>\$ 45,226,329</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>\$ 202,154,804</b>
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>				
	YTD Actual	YTD Budget	% of Bud.	Annual Bud.
<b>General Governmental</b>				
1 Gen/Excise/MMJ/Child Cr/Spec Prj/P&T	\$ 13,875,570	\$ 13,240,075	105%	\$ 35,245,017
2 Special Revenue	2,912,983	3,136,869	93%	8,701,644
3 Internal Service	1,955,882	3,705,510	53%	9,389,465
<b>4 Subtotal General Governmental</b>	<b>\$ 18,744,436</b>	<b>\$ 20,082,454</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>\$ 53,336,126</b>
5 Capital Projects	5,196,567	55,565,186	9%	55,565,186
<b>Enterprise Funds</b>				
6 Utility Fund	5,912,723	2,809,458	210%	9,995,990
7 Golf	580,143	662,433	88%	2,467,853
8 Cemetery	12,500	0	n/a	20,000
<b>9 Subtotal Enterprise Funds</b>	<b>\$ 6,505,366</b>	<b>\$ 3,471,891</b>	<b>187%</b>	<b>\$ 12,483,843</b>
<b>10 TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>30,446,368</b>	<b>79,119,531</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>121,385,155</b>
11 Internal Transfers	11,601,877	11,719,068	99%	48,821,982
<b>12 TOTAL EXPENDITURES incl. x-fers</b>	<b>\$ 42,048,246</b>	<b>\$ 90,838,599</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>\$ 170,207,137</b>
<b>13 TOTAL REVENUE less EXPEND.</b>	<b>\$ (2,265,126)</b>	<b>\$ (45,612,270)</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$ 31,947,667</b>

**General Governmental Funds** - General, Excise, Special Projects, Marijuana, Child Care and Parking and Transportation  
**Special Revenue Funds** - Marketing, Affordable Housing, Open Space, and Conservation Trust  
**Internal Service Funds** - Garage, Information Technology (IT), Facilities, and Health Benefits

**ALL FUNDS REPORT**

May 31, 2020

The YTD breakdown of the revenue/expenses variances is as follows:

**Governmental Funds:**

**General Fund:**

- Revenue:
  - Under budget by \$833k. Please see General Fund Revenue page for more detail.
- Expense:
  - Over budget by \$576k. See General Fund Expense page of this report for more details.

**Excise Fund:**

- Revenue:
  - Under budget by \$2.5M - see Executive Summary or Tax Basics for more information.

**Special Revenue:**

- Revenue:
  - Housing sales tax is down due to a delayed monthly sales tax payment.
  - Sales and accommodations taxes are down due to COVID-19 related declines for Marketing, Housing, and Open Space Funds.
- Expense:
  - Housing expenses are over YTD budget due to timing of expenses related to buy-down units. This will even out over the year.

**Capital Fund:**

- Revenue:
  - Ahead of budget mostly due to "Meet Me Center" reimbursement from Summit County, related to broadband.
  - The Combined Statement does not include transfers (appx. \$61.8M).
- Expense:
  - Under budget due to the timing of projects. The annual budget is assigned to January, although projects will occur throughout the year.

**Enterprise Funds:**

**Utility:**

- Revenue:
  - Plant Investment Fees are below budget.
- Expense:
  - Over 2020 budget due to timing of new water plant related expenses. However, this spending authority continues from the prior year and expenses are still below the appropriated amount.

**Golf:**

- Revenue:
  - Resident Card sales are below budget.

**Internal Service Funds:**

- Expense:
  - Under budget due to timing of garage, IT, and facility projects, in addition to health insurance claims for the year. This may even out as the year progresses.

**Fund Descriptions:**


General Governmental - General, Excise, Capital, Special Projects, Child Care, Marijuana, and Parking and Transportation

Special Revenue Funds - Marketing, Affordable Housing, Open Space, and Conservation Trust

Enterprise Funds: Golf, Utility, Cemetery

Internal Service Funds - Garage, Information Technology (IT), and Facilities


YTD Actual Revenues and Expenditures vs. Budget




The Short Term Rental Basics

Complaint Type	2019				2020			Total Calls	Percentage
	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Quarter 1	Apr-20	May-20		
Parking	17	6	15	8	16	1	0	63	23%
Trash	7	4	3	5	3	0	2	24	9%
Noise	25	6	29	11	22	1	3	97	36%
Nuisance	10	6	6	5	16	29	16	88	32%
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>100%</b>


\* "Nuisance" includes complaints not concerning Parking, Trash, or Noise.



Please note, of the 21 complaints in May 2020, 16 were for "Nuisance" calls concerning the STR Ban in Summit County




Number of Short Term Rental Licenses by Year



\* In 2014, a change in licensing of timeshares changed causing a spike.

Taxable Sales by Mgmt Type




New Items of Note:

- VRBO will begin collecting and remitting Breckenridge sales and accommodations tax for hosts on January 1, 2020.
- Annual renewal billing occurred in November 2019.
- STR sent email communication to all STR License holders and property managers in March concerning the extended STR moratorium in the county through April 30, 2020; we sent out an updated communication regarding the extended order through May 31, 2020. Finally, correspondence was sent, and the website updated, stating the STR ban was lifted as of June 1, 2020. Any STR complaints that involved possible violations of the order have been coordinated with Chief Baird and Assistant Chief Gress.

Continuing Items of Note:

- Airbnb will begin collecting and remitting Breckenridge sales and accommodations tax for hosts on October 1, 2019.
- Airbnb sales fall into all management categories.
- Certain timeshares, such as Wyndham, Woods Manor, French Corner, and French Ridge, are filed on consolidated returns under Other Management Companies.
- Total active licenses fluctuates throughout the year. We use the number of active licenses on January 1 to determine annual number of licenses.
- STR Helper Hotline began accepting calls on January 1, 2019.
- The number to lodge a complaint is (970)-368-2044.
- This report will be provided to Town Council on a monthly basis.





# Memo

**To:** Breckenridge Town Council Members  
**From:** Jennifer Pullen, Assistant Public Works Director  
**Cc:** James Phelps, Public Works Director  
**Date:** 6/11/2020 (for June 23<sup>th</sup> meeting)  
**Subject:** Non-Service Dogs on Transit Buses

---

The purpose of this memo is to review information on non-service dogs on transit buses and request that members of the Breckenridge Town Council provide feedback on the recommendations.

The Breckenridge Free Ride allows ADA service animals on buses at all times. Under the ADA, a “service animal” is a dog or a miniature horse that has been individually trained to do work or perform tasks directly related to the person's disability.

Per the Free Ride “Rider Guide”, we allow non-service, small dogs or domestic animals as long as they are under the control of a responsible guest, secured in lap-sized containers and out of the way of exits. Large pet containers are not allowed since they cannot be secured properly. No other pets are allowed on buses.

Several other transit agencies in Colorado such as; RTD, RAFTA, ECO Transit (Eagle Valley) Winter Park Lyft and Crested Butte Mountain Express share the same guidelines as the Free Ride. Vail and Avon have blanket rider information statements indicating, “No pets allowed.”

In December of 2018, the Summit Stage revised its rider information to allow well-behaved dogs on buses (no container or carrier needed). The Summit Stage is self-insured and did not need insurance approval or a policy rider to update this policy. A main reason for changing their stance on pets was to remove the burden on drivers. Often drivers would question a rider if a dog was a service dog and riders would become agitated or uncooperative. Since this change, the Summit Stage has not had any incidents with dogs on their buses. They currently do not track the exact number of dogs on their buses but they indicated that the number is minimal.

The Town is very dog friendly and those of us with dogs love to take them around with us. The Town’s insurance carrier, CIRSA, has expressed that allowing dogs on Free Ride buses can be problematic. Overall, there is an increase in liability in these situations. There are concerns with verifying all shots are current and determining the socialization level of dogs. There are many times that the Free Ride buses have been at max capacity and standing room only. In winter, buses are often loaded with skiers/riders and their equipment and items such as strollers that limit the amount of space to maneuver. In addition, we transport families with children of all ages and sizes on our buses. Many of which are at eye level to some dogs.


The Free Ride has transported over a million riders each year for the past three years. It is infrequent that any passenger is turned away from bringing a dog on our buses, as most are

identified by the owner as a service animal. It is staff's belief that obtaining additional ridership by allowing non-service dogs on our buses is negligible and the risk outweighs any increased ridership benefit.

**Recommendations:**

Based on the information above, staff recommends to Town Council to keep the current Free Ride pet guidelines.

Staff is available for questions.



# Memo

**To:** Mayor and Town Council  
**From:** Julia Puester, Assistant Director of Community Development  
**Date:** 6/17/2020 for meeting of June 23, 2020  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Appointment Recommendation

---

A sub-committee consisting of two Planning Commissioners, Stephen Gerard (Chair) and Ron Schuman, as well as two staff, Mark Truckey and Julia Puester, interviewed four applicants for the vacancy on the Planning Commission caused by the recent resignation of Dan Schroeder. The appointment will only be until the end of October, when Mr. Schroeder's term was set to expire. There will be three seats up in October, in which, the selected Commissioner for this vacated seat would have to reapply.

Interviews were conducted with the following applicants:

Gary Nyberg  
Jay Beckerman  
Tanya Delahoz  
Scott Prior

The subcommittee is recommending Jay Beckerman for appointment by the Town Council. Mr. Beckerman has four years of experience serving on the Upper Blue Planning Commission.

Staff has attached the letters of interest received for all applicants and will be available at the meeting if there are any questions.

**From:** [Gary Nyberg](#)  
**To:** [WebsiteCommDev](#)  
**Subject:** Town of Breckenridge Planning Commission Position  
**Date:** Monday, June 8, 2020 6:21:54 PM

---

To Town of Breckenridge Community Development.

My name is Garold (Gary) Nyberg and my wife Mary and I live at 31 Sunrise Point Drive in Breckenridge. We are full time residents and are registered to vote in Summit County. I am writing as I am very interested in the posted notice of a vacancy on the Breckenridge Planning Commission.

I am a retired Architect, having practiced for over 43 years and had my own Architectural, Interiors and Planning firm in Minneapolis. During that time, I was also the President of my local community, Edina, Minnesota's Historic Preservation Commission for over 20 years. My education includes a Bachelors of Fine Arts from the University of Denver, a Bachelors of Architecture from the University of Idaho, including a year studying Landscape Architecture, and a two year Masters of City Planning and Urban Design from the University of Virginia. I have a collage minor in Geography and have had my license in Real Estate.

I am very civic minded, love living in Colorado's Mountain West and feel that I could be a good asset to Breckenridge's Planning Commission.

Thank you,

Gary Nyberg  
gnyberg@gmail.com  
(612) 419-0356

# JAY BECKERMAN

26 Forest Circle Breckenridge, Colorado

970.485.0409

[jay@blueriverbistro.com](mailto:jay@blueriverbistro.com)

**June 10, 2020**

Town of Breckenridge  
Planning Commission

**Dear Recipient:**

I appreciate the opportunity to be considered for the Town of Breckenridge Planning Commission. Providing insights, supporting policy and educating others on the town's planning management is critical to creating trust within the community.

Being a business owner and full time resident in Breckenridge since 2001, I have witnessed the growth and expansion of our community, towns and county. Today brings about crucial opportunities and questions on the use and management of land and I would be proud to be a part of the planning commission providing oversight.

- 2001 – Present      Blue River Bistro; Owner and Operator
- 2016 – Present      Upper Blue Planning Commissioner
- 2015 – Present      Breckenridge Tourism Office; Board & Financial Committee Chair
- 2020 – Present      Summit School District Finance Committee Member
- 2006 – 2016        Vita Restaurant; Owner and Operator
- 2002 – 2006        Summit Lacrosse; Founder & Head Coach

Sincerely,



# Tanya E. Delahoz

---

616 Highfield Trail, POB 7892 • Breckenridge, CO • 80424  
970-333-0082 • tanya@dwells Summit.com

June 11, 2020

Dear Breckenridge Planning Commission,

I am interested in serving as a member of the Breckenridge Planning Commission and respectfully ask for your consideration and support for the seat to be vacated by Dan Schroeder. As a twenty-year local, business owner and property owner, I am passionate in my commitment to Breckenridge.

As an interested member of our Breckenridge community, I would like to provide my time, skills and talents to assist in planning the future of our Kingdom.

What has piqued my interest in seeking appointment to the Planning Commission is my deep desire to serve the community. Breckenridge is my home. It is where my husband and I have chosen to raise our two sons. It is where I have started several businesses. And, it is where my extended family resides.

In my twenty-year tenure as a Breck resident-I have had the opportunity to live almost everywhere in the town. I started my life here in French Creek, lived in the downtown historic core, moved on to Huron Heights then out to Blue River for a while and have since settled in the Highlands. I have seen the extensive changes our town has gone through and am committed to preserving the values, charm and energy Breckenridge is known throughout the world for.

I respectfully request your support in being appointed to the Breckenridge Planning Commission.

Please take some time to consider my background, attached. I am available to answer any questions you may have.

Thank you for your consideration,

Tanya E. Delahoz  
616 Highfield Trail  
PO Box 7892  
Breckenridge, CO 80424  
970-333-0082 | tanya@dwells Summit.com

# Tanya E. Delahoz

---

616 Highfield Trail, POB 7892 • Breckenridge, CO • 80424  
970-333-0082 • tanya@dwellsommit.com

## Summary of Qualifications

- Experience as a Managing Real Estate Broker
- Experience as a Sales Manager
- Experience as a business coaching trainer to medical practices
- Exceptional work ethics with the ability to work independently and a proven track record working from a virtual office environment
- Developed training programs for software and staff

## Relevant Professional Experience

- Dwell Summit Real Estate Brokerage, a concierge level boutique real estate brokerage
- Dwell Summit, Summit County's premier long term leasing company-Founder 2008
- Regional Board Member, Bright Peak Financial (a charitable giving arm division of Thrivent Financial) 2015-2017
- Mentor Worldwide, an Ethicon/Johnson & Johnson Company, Practice Specialist, April 2008-Feb 2010

## Education

- Managing Broker Real Estate License, Colorado
- Bachelor of Science, Business Administration, Ramapo College of NJ, Dec 1998
- Dale Carnegie Leadership & Training Classes

Town of Breckenridge Community Development,  
[websitecommdev@townofbreckenridge.com](mailto:websitecommdev@townofbreckenridge.com)

Please accept this letter of interest for the position on the Town of Breckenridge's Planning Commission that was recently vacated. I have spent the last five years living in Breckenridge and working as an Environmental Analyst and Planner at SE Group. During this time, I have developed a unique skill set working in recreation-centric rural communities similar to Breckenridge, and applying these skills in my own community as a member of the local planning commission would be a tremendous opportunity.

Additionally, I live in a deed-restricted home in Breckenridge's new Blue 52 neighborhood. Like many of my neighbors, I am putting down roots in Breckenridge and plan to live here long-term. As an active member in the community, I could also bring my neighbors' perspectives to the table, sharing the vision for what it means to live and work in Breckenridge for the next generation of young professionals.

As detailed in the attached resume, my work experience has taught me about the nuances of local government, stakeholders, and planning challenges that arise in communities like Breckenridge. I am constantly required to bring a thoughtful and balanced approach between conservation and development to my projects, and have a strong working relationship with the local Forest Service and ski areas. This, coupled with my vested interest in our community, would make me an asset to your team.

If I can provide you with any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me. I look forward to the opportunity to speak with you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Scott Prior

Associate Environmental Analyst + Planner



PO Box 2729 | 323 W. Main Street, Suite 201, Frisco, Colorado 80443

direct 970.262.4342 | mobile 248.229.9353

# SCOTT PRIOR

Breckenridge, CO | (248) 229-9353

sprior@segroup.com | [www.linkedin.com/in/scott-prior-b152589a](http://www.linkedin.com/in/scott-prior-b152589a)

---

## Skills Summary

Managing land planning and permitting projects in mountain communities as an Associate Environmental Analyst and Planner at SE Group has allowed me to develop a unique skill set that would make me a strong candidate for the Breckenridge Planning Commission.

---

### Problem Solving

- At SE Group I have worked on an array of projects as a project manager, environmental analyst, and planner.
- I am based in Summit County and work almost entirely on projects in recreation-centric, rural communities, which has provided me with a wealth of experience in understanding the dynamics of a community like Breckenridge.
- I am familiar with the nuances of local government, stakeholders, and planning challenges that may arise and am ready to apply the experience I have gained in other communities at home.

### Balancing Interests

- Managing projects that involve the interests of government agencies like the Forest Service and private entities that operate ski areas requires a thoughtful and balanced approach between conservation and development.
- Over the past 5 years I have managed and worked on dozens of projects that are driven by development interests in environmentally sensitive mountain environments and can successfully balance these often-competing objectives.
- As a result, I have a strong working relationship with our partners at the local Forest Service and ski areas.

### Practical Proficiencies

- Environmental Policy, NEPA Compliance, Data Management and Modeling, Public Engagement, ArcGIS and Mapping.
- 

## Relevant Work History

Associate Environmental Analyst and Planner, SE Group, July 2017 – Present

Environmental Analyst, SE Group, August 2015 – July 2017

Student and Young Alumni Fellow, Colorado College, June 2014 – June 2015

Research Analyst, Blue Canyon Partners, May 2013 – August 2013

## Education

Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Policy, Colorado College, 2010 – 2014