



Waverly Community Group, Inc.

Meeting Minutes for **Full Membership Meeting**, Saturday, September 30, 2006; 3-5:00pm
Turning Point Gymnasium at Waverly School, 10431 NCR 15

Present: Committee members: Helen Boggs, Jud Brown, Jane Clark, Sue Foster, Cate Meyer, Ron Splittgerber, George Wallace, Karl Zeller. (8/10 WAC members present)

Absent: Andy Hatch, Bob Zimdahl.

Community residents: 22 additional community residents were in attendance at the start of the meeting at 3:09, and by 3:30 there were 28.

[Several people emailed their regrets at being unable to attend, and one property owner, Janet Michaels, came from Ohio. At least one household did not get the meeting notice until the Monday following the meeting, perhaps due to priority preference given to political bulk mailings, rampant in the mails at this pre-election time.]

.....
AGENDA:

2:30 – 3:00 Survey Completion (optional): 1 survey was returned
3:00 – 3:15 Introductions
 - Who we are
3:15 – 3:45 Share Information
 - What we've done
 - What we've learned
3:45 – 4:15 LISTEN to your feedback
4:15 – 4:30 Review next steps and timeline
4:30 - 4:45 Board Elections
4:45 – Neighborly Visiting w/Snacks

Meeting Objectives

- Present information
 - What we've done
 - What we've learned from surveys
- LISTEN to additional feedback
- Outline Next steps
 - Incorporate this feedback into Results Doc
 - Socialize with other neighboring groups
- Elect new WAC members
- Socialize with our neighbors

Cate Meyer chaired the meeting and opened at 3:09 with introductions.

1. Introductions

- Who we are – “a lot like you!”
 - We are Neighbors with goals for the Waverly area who want to retain the rural feel and quality of life
 - We are a group who meets and tries to be transparent with regard to processes and results (minutes are on website, meetings are open to WCG membership)
 - At those monthly meetings we are open to feedback and additional perspectives
 - We respond to county questions and issues
 - We are information gatherers and providers
 - We are preparing to participate with Larimer County with future area plans

2. Information Sharing

What We've Done

- Designation of Waverly as Community Influence Area
- Formal and informal communications about topics of interest
- Survey Creation, Administration and Summarization
- Waverly Sub-Area Plan document research

Survey Results, or What We Learned

We received consistent feedback from across the area (72 of 400 households responding at this time, ~18% response is very good):

- Demographics
- The highest mentioned issues were
 - Maintaining rural lifestyle
 - Bypass
 - Annexation

There was a wider variability of respondents with regard to needs for :

- Open space activities
- Rural enterprise opportunities

Profile of the Waverly Resident. The “Average Respondent” is

- Over 50 years of age
- Fully employed
- Lived in Waverly more than 10 years
- Attracted by rural lifestyle
- Lives in a house more than 15 years old
- Irrigates between 10-35 acres from wells or ditches

Jane quoted some Front Range Growth Statistics documented by chambers of commerce, *The Denver Post*, and agricultural and real estate sources. She cited the following:

The Northern Front Range can expect a population growth of 43% by the year 2020. 1.3 million new homes will be needed to accommodate the state's population growth by 2030. (As of 2004 there were 1.8 million homes in Colorado.)

At this time 51% of the county land is held in private farms and ranches.

Over half of this private land will change hands in the next 20 years.

Since 1992 over 2 million acres of Colorado's agricultural lands have been removed from production and continue at a rate of 100,000 acres per year.

Survey Issues of Importance

Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important
Maintaining Waverly character	Minimizing loss of ag land & water	Information about wildlife/plants/water
Truck Bypass thru Waverly	Annexation threats	Measures to slow traffic on county roads
	Maintaining open space/natural areas	Getting high speed internet connections
	Glade & Hwy 287 relocation	Need for Waverly community center
	Road & transportation planning	
	Rural enterprise constraints and incentives	
	Help landowners understand development options	

Qualitative Feedback

- Other issues of importance (Question 2)
 - Very: traffic & roads; lot size & subdivision; land use issues, including noise & light pollution
- Commercial activities within rural environment (Question 4)
 - More clarification requested
 - Mix of supportive and concerned responses
- Historical/Cultural structures of importance (Question 5)
 - Waverly School; Moesner School
 - Miner's Lake, riparian areas in general
- Natural resource areas (Question 6)
 - Waterways, blue heron rookery, dry creek wetlands
 - Wildlife areas (Hagen, Zimdahl and Heckendorf)
 - Douglas Reservoir open space
- Waverly scenic areas (Question 7)
 - Unobstructed views of mountains/ foothills
 - Water features

3. LISTEN

Objective:

- What are your thoughts?
 - Feedback on survey/results
 - Other important items to factor in

Thoughts from the group.

Ken Dillman asked how much of our area is susceptible to development. There are already many conservation easements, and how much land is there to develop?

Mary and Harold Hagen relayed their negative experience with the county of wanting to install a mobile home on their property for a hired hand to help with their fish business. Fees were \$2000 for the added mobile home and there was another \$2000 for other things before they gave up and stopped their fish business.

There were additional comments about how hard it was to get and keep hired hands.

Jane Clark responded with a description of Kathay's task force and visit in March. There hasn't been any WCG determination about what is enough vs too much development.

Ken D. said the WCG shouldn't be working on those sorts of determinations.

How can the group be more effective?

Barb Staples made a comment about View Problems she had had at another property and that regulations were needed to protect views from new construction.

Ken D. thought that variances were the appropriate avenue for non-conforming construction and that the WCG shouldn't have a role above or beyond that of the county.

Mary and Harold would like to sell their water (2200 acre-feet) but it is non-tributary and is tied to the land. Now the court, under local pressure, says that they must prove it is non-tributary. Development is an unattractive but viable alternative for them.

John Ostheimer noted that the value of the rural community is challenged by development and annexation. What scenario can be put together for protection? Would bulk conservation easements protect us?

Jane responded that a buffer conservation easement would have developmental impact but would not protect against condemnation (as in the super slab project east of the interstate).

George Wallace mentioned that the city and county are willing to spend money on land easements for community separators although most of the survey respondents preferred non-public access to such easements.

George Reed stated that Kathay Rennels had asked what could be done to keep farmers in farming – see Mary and Harold's comments. The demographics show the age of our community to be mostly those over 50. As the local farm population ages there will be significant needs for operation assistance in order for them to remain in farming occupations.

Mary thought that the 35 acre state lot limit allows for development and leaves enough space around residential structures for wildlife.

Harold wanted the water laws to not vary or suffer change and referenced their recent problems with selling their water.

Someone mentioned that in some communities on the East coast there were a lot of benefits for Seniors.

Jane said that this is not unusual and mentioned the use by one of the Fort Collins Spanish communities as being a disadvantaged minority in avoiding the city's placement of the Bypass, which was promoted by the CFTB Initiative. Seniors and the retired community population could be defined as a retirement population.

George Reed brought up the issue of the Super-Slab and thought it would be tying back to the interstate at county road 70, and that Wellington was also looking at the feasibility of an airport north of 70. How will this impact us?

Lawrence Bosch noted that there were many issues surrounding the WCG (the Bypass, Glade Reservoir, the new dump) and it needed to focus on only one issue.

Mary mentioned that the Bypass and superslab are issues of concern.

George Reed had to leave before the close of the meeting and mentioned that he is a member of the governing board of the Northern Colorado Water Association from which most of us get our domestic water. NCWA serves 1550 households at this time, from 5 miles south of the Wyoming border down to Willox Lane in Fort Collins. George can be reached at 568-9630. If people want to get on the Glade Reservoir mailing list they should call (970) 622-2277 or go to the website at www.ncw.ncw (call George if this website is no good).

4. Next steps & Timeline

- Incorporate additional feedback from surveys – publish results to web
- Socialize survey results with other county groups
- Continue research and content collection for possible Waverly Sub-Area Plan document
- Continue conversations with County Commissioners with regard to future opportunities

Jane mentioned that Kathay Rennels wanted to see our survey results.

NOTE: On October 7th a meeting will be held by the Northern Larimer County Alliance in support of the people fighting the privately funded “**SuperSlab**”. This meeting is being held in Wellington in the old Federated Church on 3rd Street at 7pm. We are invited to attend to see how the SuperSlab will affect our community.

5. Election of new Waverly Advisory Committee (WAC) members

Harold Hagen, John Ostheimer, and Barb Staples were nominated from the floor and elected to fill existing vacancies in the WAC. The duration of individual terms for these three replacement At-Large positions will be decided at the October meeting. Jane, Ron, George, and Bob were returned for additional 3-year terms. George will continue to represent Quadrant 4.

The following Door Prizes were awarded:

Jim Vink won the Squash Basket, thanks to Grant Farms.

Janet Michaels won 10 bales of hay, thanks to George Wallace.

George Reed won a coupon good for 50% off a haircut at Gina’s Hair Salon, thanks to Gina Linde.

Margie Mathews won another coupon good for 50% off a haircut at Gina’s Hair Salon, thanks to Gina.

Cate Meyer won a dozen farm fresh eggs, thanks to Mary Ann Menoher.

Barb Staples won the deluxe bath basket, thanks to Cate Meyer.

Respectfully submitted,

Helen Boggs, Secretary

For Future Reference

Issues/ Questions which were raised at the 09-30-06 Full Membership Meeting:

1. What percentage of the WCG land is still available for development?
2. County restrictions which inhibit acquiring additional help for continuing rural enterprises (Hagen’s trout farm closed). Investigate opportunities available to aging landowners to allow reduced restrictions on housing for hired help or other senior benefits.
3. Can the area be designated as an area with a minority population of seniors to acquire better community benefits?
4. Investigate other scenarios/ options for limiting threats to rural lifestyle.
5. Future of non-adjudicated water rights, changing nature of water law.
6. View maintenance needs to be a priority.
7. Pick one issue and go for it.