



September 17, 2015

Divide Planning Committee  
info@divideplanning.org  
www.divideplanning.org

Teller County Planning Dept.  
800 Research Dr.  
P. O. Box 1886  
Woodland Park, CO 80866

Re: Teller County File SUP Z15-0028 for Resort

Dear Mr. Williams:

Per requested agency review for a Special Use Permit (SUP), Teller County File SUP Z15-0028 for Resort, for the Lodge at Elk Valley located at 602 CR-511; the Divide Planning Committee (DPC) met in public meetings, with the applicant present and participating, to discuss this topic and how this application relates to the Divide Regional Plan (DRP). We respectfully submit the following discussion points.

**Background**

*A lot of thought and bartering went into developing the DRP to reach what we believe is a good Regional Action Plan as described in the county Growth Management Plan (Master Plan); it took 2 1/2 years of monthly and more meetings to create the 1998 version. The 2006 review reaffirmed the 1998 Plan's content adding two addendum's which address criteria for amending the Divide Region Maps. The vision reflects a small town community made up of three planning areas wherein growth is managed by a phasing process. The planning areas are Town Center, Rural Residential and Rural Lands. The plan provides a method for responsibly dealing with the impacts of regional growth while remembering that the Divide Region is primarily residential.*

*One of the purposes of the this Committee is to clarify the intent of the Plan (DRP) and its contents.*

**Primary Concern**

First, we would like to point out that it is our opinion this resort SUP application is premature and that a LUR Map Change is necessary to change the land designation to Resort. Once the land is properly designated, an application for a resort SUP can be submitted. We base this

opinion on the DRP clauses:

**C5-4 New recreational developments should be required to amend the Divide Growth and Conservation Maps using map amendment criteria attached to this Plan, as well as County Regulations.**

**J1 A keystone of the implementation of the Divide Regional Plan is the adoption into the Teller County Land Use Regulations of the Divide Growth and Conservation Maps as regulatory. Therefore, since any amendment to these maps may affect implementation of the Divide Regional Plan, Teller County and all concerned parties should consider “criteria for amending Divide Town Growth and conservation map” and “criteria for amending Divide Region Growth and conservation map” for recreational uses (resort CUP). These criteria are attached to this Plan as criteria addendum “A” and criteria addendum “B”.**

Based on those clauses of the DRP and precedence of the 2013 Golden Bell expansion<sup>1</sup> this SUP application is premature and needs to be preceded by submittal and approval of a Land Use Regulations (LUR) Map Change application. This Resort SUP application should be pulled, canceled, terminated, deferred (what ever is the appropriate action) and a new application for a LUR Map Change created and submitted. Then, if the Map Change is approved, the applicant can submit for a resort SUP.

~~The Resort designation was created by the TC-PC when the DRP was approved in 1998 and upheld by the then BoCC. The citizens of the Divide Region did not establish this designation. You, or your predecessors, did this, so live with it.~~ The regulatory maps in the TC-LUR were created, approved and are maintained by the county and need to be applied uniformly, not just when an applicant or the county chooses.

To the DPC, this itself is rationale to disapprove this application; but if the Commissioners do not agree with our primary concern, we offer additional **concerns** relative to this application.

### **Application Review**

Reviewing this SUP application for a resort, we identified the following items as areas of concern.

Page 1 – under the heading: Nature of the Proposed Use two paragraphs use the phrase *includes/including; but not limited to*. Other sections of the application also use the *but not limited to* phrase. According to LUR Section 8.2.B.1.a - all uses must be listed, including those by right. This application is incomplete.

Page 5 – under the heading: 1. Consistent with Master Plan: the applicant claims close to \$5,000 in taxable income per group is brought into the county. But there is no substantiation for that claim; probably just a wild guess, it is doubtful that anyone could speculate on the how much is spent in Teller county by guests of the Lodge at gas stations or local retail stores.

The operator of the proposed lodge is the Center for SPFM (Center for Single Parent Family Ministry) a registered IRS 501(c)3 tax exempt entity. Therefore, the county does not receive tax revenue from this organization. The character and disposition of the applicants is irrelevant. A Special Use Permit stays with the land, we must consider if this resort is right for this parcel for years in the future under different ownership and operation.

---

<sup>1</sup> County File No. LUR-00040 (13); TC-PC Regular Meeting Tuesday, May 14, 2013 Staff Report

Page 5 – under the heading: 2. Compatibility, reference to section C5-3 of the DRP which states: “Existing designated recreational uses within the Divide Region should be encouraged to be successful and encouraged to improve their facilities and operations.” is not appropriate for this SUP and in fact is the one clause in section C5 that is not relevant to this application. The purpose of DRP clause C5-3 is that existing (which this is not) recreational uses maintain their properties (land and structures) so they don't get run down and impact neighbor's property values.

Page 6 – under the heading: 3. Zone District and Use Standards, the statement: "zone district uses contemplated in the future include: a group Meeting Facility and Temporary Housing. Both of these activities will increase traffic and septic system use. Temporary housing would likely provide the capability of hosting additional Overnight Guests beyond the 25 asked for. When asked what temporary housing might include, the applicant suggested caretaker quarters. But a future owner could expand that all the way up to something less than a motel operation. Motels are not permitted in A1 zone. Limits on this usage should be carefully defined and limited.

Page 6 – under the heading: 4. Design Minimizes Adverse Impact, the statement: "We believe that our proposed application for a special use can co-exist peacefully with cooperative neighbors." What kind of cooperation is expected? Giving up peace and quiet?

Page 8 – under the heading: Reasonable Hours: activities could be scheduled for weekdays and weekend days from 10 AM to 10 PM. The applicant verbally stated that events will be limited to five hours duration, sometime between 10 AM and 10 PM; the customer chooses which five hours they want their event to occur. The Colorado Noise Abatement Statute C.R.S. 25-12-103 lowers the permitted noise by 5 dB(A) after 7 PM. Can we trust the operator of the sound system to lower the sound level at 7 PM? Can we be assured that guests will terminate their celebration after five hours have elapsed? While the current applicant stated there will be only one event per day, a subsequent operator of the resort could hold multiple events in a single day.

Page 8 – under the heading: Driveways and Access: the access to the property from CR-511 was improved in 2006. Does the access permit simultaneous two direction traffic, entering and exiting, at the same time? Most residential driveways can accommodate only one vehicle at a time. This topic could be a possible issue for the Fire Dept and safety concerns. We defer to an agency review that addresses safety and emergency access and egress.

Pages 8 & 9 – under the heading External Effects: the applicant acknowledges, rightly the external effects are noise and smoke. The application then identifies plans to mitigate the causes of those potential impacts on the neighbors.

Noise: If this application is approved the applicant plans to attempt to mitigate one noise source with speaker placement. Back on page 1 the applicant states that *outdoor music played by live instruments or through electronic devices*. Judicious speaker placement could contribute to mitigation of amplified sound. Outdoor live music and voices cannot be mitigated. Musicians will likely bring and use their own equipment thus the resident sound system will not be used. Speakers placed on the north side of the building might mitigate noise to the south, dampened by the building. But what about the neighbors to the north? The building could actually amplify the sound to the north by reflecting the sound off the walls of the building.

What is not addressed, and there is little that can be done to mitigate, is noise caused by people while recreating and celebrating during weddings or other similar events. While some other event types might not create much noise from people celebrating, weddings will tend to be noisy.

Smoke: use of outdoor grills and a fire pit would be expected from such property even if this were a single family residence. The DPC defers to the Divide Fire Dept to address any fire safety concerns.

Page 10 – under the heading: Open Space: Five acres have been developed, leaving 35 acres of open space. Total Affected Acreage on page 3 of 4 of the county application form says 5 acres; yet the parcel is 40 acres. The DPC is unsure how many acres the SUP covers; is it 5 or 40 acres. If only 5 acres are covered under this SUP application – which 5 acres? Verbal answer from the applicant to the question on what acreage is the SUP for was 40. The DPC believes this SUP application is for the entire 40 acres. Thus, if this SUP were to be granted, future expansion could happen anywhere on the 40 acres in the future by whoever owns the parcel at the time, with appropriate permits.

Page 11 – under the heading: Wildlife Habitat Impact Area Statement: the application claims the potential impact on wildlife is Low. We believe the applicant misinterpreted the map in the DRP and the potential impact should be Moderate to Low reading the referenced map. The referenced map is from 1998 and was supplied by the Colorado Department of Wildlife. DRP section E2 states '...most current recommendations for wildlife habitat'. The application should have included a current wildlife impact assessment or recommendation from the Colorado Division of Wildlife and not simply referred to an out of date map. Refer to TC-LUR 6.6.B.2 for required data for Moderate Low Impact Areas pertaining to Wildlife.

### **Application Supporting Documents**

In no particular order, these are concerns to the DPC related to the supporting documents included with the application.

Regarding the letter supporting the SUP from the Stauffers (property owners): Obviously, it is in their best interests to keep the subject property leased. They also benefit from the property improvements.

Regarding the July 22nd fire code inspection. It was done under the parameters of the 2003 International Fire Code. Teller has adopted IFC 2014. A re-inspection under 2014 with all necessary compliance should be part of the SUP. Then they can make "another small" donation to the fire department.

Regarding water use. Employee water use was not included in this worksheet. Given that employee parking was considered in the vehicle traffic and parking requirements, water use should be recalculated to include employees. Further, septic capacity was calculated from a 27 year old soil percolation test. The engineering report disclaims any warranty as to "findings or recommendations", but they did state that for commercial use, this property requires the addition of a 1,000 gallon tank. The SUP should be contingent upon the completion of a current perc test, revised calculation of water use, and the installation and agency approval of all required modifications to the septic system and water well.

Although the increase in traffic is below the threshold increase for requiring a traffic study, it

should be taken into consideration that traffic from local residences is quite low. Adding 45 vehicles (one way) is still a significant increase and should be considered. The DPC requests that Cumulative Impacts be considered when addressing all potential impacts, this should include traffic. CR-5 and CR-51 feed multiple large residential developments in the Divide Region, two existing resort properties plus popular National Forest access used for day use and overnight use by campers with trailers. CR-511 is unpaved. Over the years that road's level has been reduced by repeated grading. The additional vehicle trips generated by such a resort on a dirt road raises road dust that harms the vegetation, the residents and will not take long to be **percolated** into the area's water wells.

The Divide Region Wildlife Habitat map was miss-interpreted by the applicant; probably due to the poor quality of the photocopy of the map used and included in the application and was not intentional. The subject property should be designated in the Moderate to Low category, per the 1998 map. The map (Map #3 of the DRP) was provided by the Colorado Division of Wildlife and was valid in 1998 when the Divide Plan was first developed. It is not current. The DRP Definitions (Scenic and Highly Valued Landscapes) references Resolution 3-28-96-21 which identifies Areas within one mile of a national forest, national monument, national park, state forest or state park. Therefore land within one mile of a national forest, which this subject parcel is, are considered Scenic and Highly Valued Landscapes and as such commercial operations are questionable.

### **DRP Clauses Pertinent to this Application**

Reviewing the current 2006 DRP document against this application, these are the pertinent clauses<sup>2</sup> identified by this Committee:

#### **C1.01 Rural Lands: Maintain existing uses, density, and open character.**

This property, designated Rural Lands is a 40 acre parcel with one residence and few utility outbuildings, consistent with the surrounding parcels. The existing uses should be maintained (continue), that of a single family residence on agricultural land like the surrounding properties.

A resort on the subject property would not be consistent with the density and open character of the surrounding properties.

#### **C1.03 Town Center: Includes business and residential areas, has a specific outer boundary, and additional future development is encouraged to locate within the Town Center.**

New commercial uses (such as this resort application) are expected to locate in this Town Center area where resources exist and can be isolated from rural residents. The Divide Town Center is an Urban Service Area, per the Teller County Growth Management Plan and accommodates the three Growth Functional Planning Areas identified in the Growth Management Plan.

The Town Center actually includes a property with the Resort designation awaiting a

---

<sup>2</sup> In a few instances the DRP specifies Conditional Use Permit, such as the two addendum; it must be remembered that when the DRP was last reviewed and updated there was no such thing as a Special Use Permit. The TC-LUR in effect as of Nov. 21 2005 had only Conditional Use Permits. Where the DRP specifies Conditional Use it refers to all Special Review Use Permits (chapter 8) in the current 2008 TC-LUR.

resort to locate on that parcel. Granted the Town Center Resort parcel is not as rural with natural beauty that the applicant probably desires, but the DRP has accommodation for a resort in the Town Center with services and direct access to US Rte 24.

**C1.07 Prevent commercial and industrial development outside the town center.**

The requested use is a commercial use. High participation uses are intended to be located in the town center where resources are available. Central services (water & sewer) as well as paved road access exists to accommodate higher demand users.

**C1.09 Maintain peaceful and desirous place to live, work, recreate in beautiful mountain environment.**

Operative relevant phrase being: *Maintain peaceful and desirous place to live.* Residents of Divide, where ever in the Region they live, expect and have the right to peace and quiet on their own property. The addition of a new resort between CR-5 and CR-511 will most likely prevent residents within 1.5 miles of the proposed resort from obtaining that *peaceful and desirous place to live.*

**C1.10 Exterior lighting should be downcast and shielded to prevent glare onto adjacent properties and roadways.**

In the past this has been a problem at the subject property. We understand the operator is aware and taking measures to rectify this. But this is still a concern, if the steps to mitigate light pollution succeed, fine. If residents in any direction from the subject property cannot see the Milky way on a clear night they have not succeeded.

**C4.02 Protect existing neighborhoods from the intrusion of higher intensity land use.**

Section C4 addresses Rural Residential Areas, not Rural Lands, but the character of this area (neighborhood) is residential single family homes and the distinction between those two land designations in the Growth Management Plan is fairly loose.

Any SUP, including this application, is by definition a *higher intensity land use.* Thus, the neighborhood should be protected from this encroachment.

**C5-1 Rural Lands should be encouraged to stay as they are.**

Rural Lands are designated as limited growth, per the Growth Management Plan and should remain in the character and use intended for this property and those that surround it which is residential use on agricultural land or residential land.

Many parcels adjacent and near the subject parcel are recorded with Account Type by the county assessor as Residential, some as Agricultural. Most surrounding parcels have single family homes regardless of the acreage and zoning; so the neighbors consider this area residential, inappropriate for commercial use such as a resort. These are our homes, where we live.

The larger lot size parcels (greater than 35 acres) used as residential serve a dual purpose, intended or not, of providing area owner-residents with separation from neighbors which should provide the peace and serenity but also provide buffer space for near-by smaller residential parcels. Retaining Rural Lands as they are, with existing approved use benefits more than the owners of the adjacent Rural Lands parcels. Locating a resort in the middle of properties primarily used as residential would disrupt

the peace and serenity that the area residents thought they were getting when they purchased their land.

**C5-2 Restrict new developments that could cause noise, visual blight, or noxious odors.**

New uses are not appropriate. *New developments* includes changing the approved use. A resort on this property will cause noise. Visual blight and noxious odors are of less concern for the requested resort use. The existing buildings are visible from CR-5, not from CR-511. Maybe, not visible from nearby properties to the north and south.

**C5-3 Existing designated recreational uses within the Divide Region should be encouraged to be successful and encouraged to improve their facilities and operations.**

Not appropriate for this application. As previously mentioned, this clause is for existing already approved recreational use and addresses the upkeep of the property so as to not negatively impact property values of the neighbors.

**C5-4 New recreational developments should be required to amend the Divide Growth and Conservation Maps using map amendment criteria attached to this Plan, as well as County Regulations.**

As previously stated, this is important. The Divide Region is unique within the county in that the county has identified specific lands as able to accommodate resort uses; admittedly because some resorts preceded the DRP document. Refer to TC-LUR Appendix B, Divide Region Growth and Conservation Map and Divide Town Growth and Conservation Map. A new resort use must first change the appropriate regulatory map in Appendix B of the Teller County Land Use Regulations to designate the parcel(s) to be appropriate for a resort use.

This process was recently used by the Golden Bell resort in 2013 which successfully added acreage to accommodate a new meeting facility and expand operations. That set the precedence for new resort process in the Divide Region. The DPC sees no difference in the process used by Golden Bell and what this new resort should be required to do.

There are already five resorts within the Divide Region on fifteen parcels (some resorts cover multiple adjacent parcels). We believe the Divide Region has accommodated our fair share of resort uses in the county. The Growth Management Plan says each Region of the county should accommodate their share of growth<sup>3</sup>.

**C5-5 Cumulative impacts of recreational uses should be analyzed and considered as outlined in the attached criteria for amending maps for recreational use and all Conditional Use Permits.**

For a hypothetical example: three events at different locations, each contributing 50 day vehicle trips releases each event individual center from the requirement of a traffic study, but that doesn't mean the county roads don't suffer from the degradation caused by 150 vehicle trips. Traffic is only one example of impacts on neighbors and county infrastructure and services that must be addressed.

Someone living in the Aspen Village subdivision (between Golden Bell and this proposed new resort) will potentially be subjected to the noise and other external effects

---

<sup>3</sup> Growth management plan; Section VI, Page 4. *...using functional planning areas and regions assumes the acceptance of the County's and Communities' fair share of growth.*

of both resorts.

**C5-6 New development with over a 100-participant capacity should annex into the Town Center subject to the “criteria”.**

With application stated counts of 25 overnight plus 70 day guests the resort claims that no more than 95 guests will use the resort for any given event. This does not include employees, staff, catering staff possible other supporting persons such as musicians, photographers, etc. The number of participants could reach over 100. The applicant verbally stated when asked, the day guest count includes employees, staff and supporting persons, thus the maximum people at any event will not exceed the 95 head count. Maybe, maybe not.

The numbers of participants claimed by the application is obviously derived by backing off from various limiting counts suggested by traffic study, water capacity and possibly this clause of the DRP. Will the seventy-first person showing up at an event be turned away by the resort operators? We suspect not.

100 participant facilities should be in the town center where central services are available; but it is doubtful this use can be accommodated in the town center. The users of this facility are after the advantages provided by the Rural Lands, not a town center.

**J1 A keystone of the implementation of the Divide Regional Plan is the adoption into the Teller County Land Use Regulations of the Divide Growth and Conservation Maps as regulatory. Therefore, since any amendment to these maps may affect implementation of the Divide Regional Plan, Teller County and all concerned parties should consider “criteria for amending Divide Town Growth and conservation map” and “criteria for amending Divide Region Growth and conservation map” for recreational uses (resort CUP). These criteria are attached to this Plan as criteria addendum “A” and criteria addendum “B”.**

As previously stated, for a resort use, the appropriate maps should change first. The criteria of DRP Addendum B should be applied to a LUR Map Change application. TC-LUR section 2.11 provided direction on changing the LUR, including the maps.

**DRP Addendum B Applies.**

As stated previously, at the beginning of this agency review response. The DPC believes a LUR Map Change must happen before an application for a Special Use Permit should be considered. Such is the topic of the DRP Addendum B. These are the criteria that must be met to change the Divide Region maps in the current TC-LUR Appendix B.

**Addendum “B”**

**I. EXISTING USES**

**Existing uses — should be encouraged to succeed and improve facilities and operations. This DOES NOT necessarily mean encouraging expansion.**

This clause does not apply to new uses, only existing and approved recreational use properties. It does forewarn those who do obtain approval that it is expected the properties will be maintained and not get run-down to the point of detracting from neighbor's property values.

**II. NEW DEVELOPMENT**

**New development or addition of acreage to existing uses should consider the following criteria for approval.**

**a. SCALE**

**Is the magnitude, intensity and size of a proposal appropriate for the Divide community?**

While a 95 participant event facility might be accommodated in Divide community, not at this location and with the identified uses.

**b. TRAFFIC**

**Does a new use have traffic access to Highway 24 or Highway 67 directly? Would existing use expansion to additional land have access roads appropriate for additional traffic, if any?**

Traffic access exists, but the last 1/2 mile is via unpaved road

**c. BUFFERS**

**Does the proposed new development have appropriate land buffer and or landscape buffers to protect residential areas and neighboring property from impacts?**

No, and it is doubtful adequate buffers are possible to completely mitigate external impacts due to the size and shape of the subject property.

**d. EMERGENCY ACCESS**

**Are exits from property adequate to deal with emergencies, including fire?**

We defer to fire department agency review

**e. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS (see definition)**

**Do other recreational uses add up to more-than—appropriate vehicle trips per day on a particular road? Do other recreational uses create an additional burden to infrastructure on a particular road or area? Is there significant and adequate distance between recreational uses? Is there another recreational use within a one-mile radius? Should this use annex into the Town Center? Does this recreational use over-develop rural land by significantly changing density of human activity that could occur otherwise on the property?**

We **believe** this could be significant concern. Traffic and events at other event facilities in the area will cause cumulative external impacts on residents of the area. We also believe this use would over-develop rural land by significantly changing the density of human activity.

**f. NEW DEVELOPMENT INCLUSION**

**Should the new development be annexed into the Town Center due to participant capacity as outlined in C5-6?**

maybe?

**g. COST / BENEFIT ANALYSIS**

**Would the inclusion of an applicant's land within the Town Center bring specific benefits to the Divide community? Is there a benefit to the Divide Region as defined by the goals of our Plan? Is there a compensatory trade of density or other benefits? Are there dollar costs**

**or detrimental impacts that should be considered? Does the development proposal pay its own way?**

This resort will not pay its own way. While the property remains in private ownership the county will receive property taxes on 40 acres of agricultural land, but will receive no sales tax from events held at the resort due to the 501(c)(3) tax exempt status of the operator of the resort. If ownership changes to the tax exempt operator the county will lose all tax income.

#### **h. AREA IMPACT**

**Does the proposal negatively impact Rural Residential areas? Noise, light, odors, trash, etc.?**

Yes, we believe Rural Residential areas will be negatively impacted if this resort is allowed to operate at this location.

#### **Suggestions and Conditions**

The DPC offers suggestions and possible conditions to the county and the applicant for consideration.

##### Suggestions

- Well Permit, next time please provide documentation that is legible.
- Peak summer weekend traffic counts should be conducted to determine if cumulative traffic impacts exist considering the large residential subdivisions, other resorts and National Forest access on roads north of the Divide town center. This data could help the county make decisions concerning future traffic impacts in this area. The county should perform regular traffic counts on CR-5 and CR-51 to establish baseline counts and make that data available to the public. We also suggest that 99 day trips for properties accessed by non-paved roads is not an appropriate threshold. The county should consider establishing a lower threshold for non-paved road access.
- The Divide Town Center can accommodate a Resort. There is even a parcel designated for such use in the Town Center, an urban service area. If the applicant wants to establish a new resort in the Divide region why not consider that land. Alternatively, another already designated resort in the Divide region, the Stone Creek Farmstead, with over 270 acres is believed to not being operated as a resort at this time and might consider allowing use of some of their land for the intended types of events. The goats probably won't mind. But if the Stone Creek Farmstead property has not operated as a resort for two years the resort designation must be vacated and the TC-LUR maps changed, per TC-LUR 8.2.G.2.
- The current operators of the Lodge at Elk Valley appear, from the inclusions in the SUP application, to be addressing past issues to minimize impacts on neighbors. If this application is approved, only time will tell how successful the impact mitigations are. If this application is approved, the county should monitor for all impacts and address identified issues.

- ~~There are other private properties that host events within the Divide Region. Are those properties running approved use legal businesses in the eyes of the county? They certainly contribute to *Cumulative Impacts* in the area. We suggest the county establish some dataset that inventories approved Special Review Use (per TC-LUR Chapter 8) properties integrated with the Teller County Mapping Tool and Assessors database to permit residents and prospective property owners to know what special uses exist on properties in the area.~~

### Possible Conditions

If the TC-PC even considers “~~Approve with Conditions~~” to the BoCC, the DPC desires the following conditions be considered:

- Water supply quantity and quality – due to the commercial nature of the use, periodic test should be conducted by the operators at their expense and quality reports be available to guests, at least. Who ensures the allotted amount of water is not exceeded per the Commercial Drinking and Sanitation form? A condition requiring monitoring and enforcing water quality and quantity of this commercial establishment should be considered. The Well Permit requires this, but submittal to the State only when the State requests indicates no enforcement.
- A water well capacity test should be conducted to establish, at least, the flow capacity of the existing commercial well. The Well Permit establishes what is allowed, but it is not known what the well is actually capable of providing. Can the well keep up with the drinking and sanitation needs for around 100 people? A cistern might be necessary.
- A current soil perc test should be conducted to validate the septic engineering report before a permit is issued for enhancing the waste water system.
- Have the applicant pay for paving CR-511 to provide hardtop road access from the property to US Rte 24.

~~In closing, the DPC requests the Teller County Planning Commission recommend denial of this application and the Board of County Commisioners deny this application.~~

Respectfully Yours,  
The Divide Planning Committee:

---

Mick Bates

---

Vanessa Haakenson

---

Diana Hurst

---

Jim Irving  
*Chair*

---

Bryan Johnson

---

Jeff Schlumpf

---

Allen Schultz

---

Candy Shoemaker

---

Zug Standing Bear

---

Joanne Thies

---

Brandy Williams  
*Vice-Chair*