

April 2, 2025

Steamboat Sponsor, LLC
POB 775430
Steamboat Springs, CO 80477

From: Alan Goldich

Re: PL20240088, Subdivision, Stagecoach Mountain Ranch F2
PL20240089, Special Use Permit, Stagecoach Mountain Ranch – Ski Mountain facilities
PL20240090, Zoning Change, Stagecoach Mountain Ranch Change of Zone
PL20240091, Subdivision, Stetson LPS
PL20240092, Subdivision, Cat Creek LPS
PL20240093, Conditional Use Permit, SMR – Indoor recreational facilities
PL20240094, Special Use Permit, SMR - Outdoor Recreation w/ Overnight Accommodations

The Planning Department has completed a review of the materials for the above-cited applications pursuant to the Unified Development Code Section 4.3.D. The applications are incomplete. A review for completeness should not be considered a final or complete review and is not a determination of compliance with the substantive requirements of the UDC. The following is a list of the noted deficiencies. If an item is listed with no further comment, it means the item could not be located in the submittal; or the item needs to be provided.

On March 4, 2025, you were provided with the Notice of Incomplete Application for application PL20250023, Stagecoach Mountain Ranch - 1041 Permit Level of Review. In addition to the above cited applications, this application must be deemed complete in order for the review of any application to proceed.

Missing Submittal Requirements:

PL20240088 – Preliminary Subdivision

- Narrative
 1. The actual number of units proposed is 750, as indicated at the end of section 1.1.a. This number needs to be used throughout.
 2. The Proposed Land Use Table does not provide an accurate number of units proposed. It is missing the essential and employee housing. The number of units of workforce housing does not match what is described in the last paragraph of section 1.1.a.

3. Section 1.1.a uses employee and essential housing units interchangeably as if they are the same. They are not. Please break down this section by unit type.
4. The TIS indicates 124 units (assumed to be essential and employee units) under Work Force Employee Housing in Section 1.A. The 1041 application indicates 137 essential and employee units. Please rectify.
5. In section 1.2, the Community Marketplace section and the Workforce Housing section conflict with each other.
6. The numbers in the Workforce Housing section in 3.2 conflicts with the last paragraph of section 1.1.a.
7. The section on Double Creek needs a statement that these lots already exist and no further approvals for this are required.
8. The paragraph in section 3.2.d addressing Construction Schedule and Sequence has conflicting information. It says that all essential and employee housing will be constructed during Phase I. It then goes on to say all essential housing will be constructed prior to COs on 50% of all market rate housing.
9. Section 3.3.a says that the requirements are in Chapters 2 and 3 of the UDC. They are also in Chapter 4. Please revise.
10. Section 3.3.b says that there will be three accesses for the ski mountain. The site plan shows 4.
11. Section 3.21 Employee Housing references section 3.3.d for compliance on housing. Section 3.3.d is Emergency and Fire Protection Emergency Preparedness
12. Section 3.3.J:
 - This section only mentions wetlands. It does not address waterbodies.
 - Please point out the pages in the construction drawings that show encroachments into the 50' setback for waterbodies and wetlands.
 - This section does not mention an analysis of the outer setback for waterbodies as detailed in section 3.31.D.2.b.ii of the UDC. Please provide an analysis of these criteria for all proposed encroachments.
13. The gondola application indicates that there heavy weed infestations on the property. Neither Section 4.2.d, Vegetation, nor the Wildlife Mitigation Plan mentions any weed infestations. Please detail the type and extent of weeds that are present throughout the project area.
14. Sections 3.9 and 4.2.c states that the landscape plan is part of this document. It is not as it was submitted as a separate document. Please revise to reference as an Appendix, and label the actual document as an Appendix, like all other attachments.
15. On the landscape plan, it appears that some of the lots are labeled as wetlands. Review and revise.
16. Section 4.2.c implies that all waterbodies are shown on Landscape Plan sheets L1-01 and L0-03. These sheets only show portions of the project area, not the entire project area. Please revise to indicate where a map of all the waterbodies can be found.
17. Section 4.2.f references Appendix P. Should be Q.
18. There is no parking shown on the site plan for the Mid Mountain Lodge.

19. Are references to Appendix E referring to document '4995-001 SMR F2 R1_FLT' (the plat)?
 20. One of the pages in the Engineering set (C2.29) is identified as 'Fire Station and Waste Disposal'.
The only mention of a fire station in the narrative is the Stagecoach Fire Station, which is assumed to be the existing station. Please add clarity to this subject.
 21. Section 3.2.a references an incorrect section of the UDC. Section 3.22 C.4 does not exist.
 22. Section 3.2.b references Appendix E for the park land. Other references to Appendix E in the document indicate that it may be a survey of existing improvements or it may be the proposed plat. This needs to be clarified.
 23. The structures at the base area have the square footages of the different areas of the different uses. Some are called out as 'Non-residential amenity space.' Please break these numbers down to specify how much commercial space is proposed.
 24. Communication Tower – Please provide the possible locations of this tower.
 25. Water Quality from Northwest Colorado's Council of Government's Water Quality and Quantity Committee – The County's water quality consultant is reviewing for completeness as well. They anticipate completing their review early next week. Additional details from them will be provided.
 26. Appendix E, the survey of existing improvements, is referenced but was not submitted.
 27. Appendix N was not submitted.
 28. Appendix CC was not submitted.
 29. Appendix FF was not submitted.
 30. There are two Appendix GGs, one labeled as the zoning map and the other as the snowmaking noise levels. I believe the Zoning Map should be labeled as Appendix W.
- Submittal Checklist – Needs to signed by Denise Stahl Altaffer.
 - Statement of Authority – Upload the SOAs for Stahl Investments LP and Acorn Inn
 - Wildfire – Please see the attached document detailing the additional specificity required in this plan.
 - Drainage Study – Document 'SMR Drainage (1 of 8)' was not submitted
 - Engineered water and wastewater plans with water tank locations
 - Revegetation Plan
 1. Please provide details of the seed mixes that will be used for revegetation.
 2. The plan also states, "The developer intends to utilize CPW's Seed Mix Tool in consultation with CPW Staff when developing the reclamation and landscaping plan" which indicates that additional work is to be done. Please provide additional details on this.
 - Environmental Report - As required by Section 3.33.F
 - Open Space Maintenance
 1. The document labeled 'Open Space Designation, Dedication and Maintenance Information' contains a map only and no other information.
 2. The narrative states that maintenance of the open space is in the covenants. These provision were unable to be located in the covenants. Please identify them.

PL20240089 – Ski Mountain Facilities SUP

- Statement of Authority - Needed for Steamboat Sponsor LLC
- Submittal Checklist – Authorized agent for Steamboat Sponsor LLC needs to sign
- Engineered plans for the snowmaking system
 1. Indicate the location of where the snowmaking line will run from the reservoir to the ski area and which easements will be utilized for this location.
 2. Locations of guns and other infrastructure.
- Elevations and floor plans of proposed buildings
- Narrative
 1. SOA section - Include Steamboat Sponsor
 2. In Section 4.1, it says that there are 223 acres of proposed trails and 426 acres of groomed skiing. How can there be more groomed area than trail area?
 3. What are the dates of operation of the snowmaking system?
 4. What are the locations of the hiking/biking trails?
 5. The response to criteria 2 in section 4.3 has a different number for skiable terrain than section 4.1.
 6. Criteria 3 in section 4.3 mentions 12 acres of passive parkland and a trailhead parking. Please indicate the locations of these elements on the site plan.
 7. Are the cabin colors proposed with the gondola amendment the same as the other gondola?
- Tree clearing analysis and details
- Construction staging plan
- Site plans for top and bottom lift terminals
- Visual impact analysis – As seen from Highway 131 and the southern portion of CR 14
- Site plan and profiles
- Water quality study - Analyzing the effects of using treated effluent for snowmaking.

PL20240090 – Zone Change

- Narrative
 1. SOA section - Include Steamboat Sponsor
 2. Number 1 in section 4.2 incorrectly references section 4.15.C. It should be 4.6.C

PL20240091 – Stetson Ranch LPS

- Conditional Use Permit application – The amenities proposed at this site must obtain a CUP.
- Existing Conditions
- Wildlife Mitigation Plan
- Information regarding maintenance of open space
- Narrative
 1. States that the existing conditions plan is part of the Preliminary Plan Application. It was not part of that application and was submitted separately. Please revise.
 2. Remove the land area south of CR 14 from all maps.

3. Section 4.3.3 – How was the project sited to limit impacts to adjacent ag uses?
4. Please include the site plan and development summary for amenity area from the Preliminary Plan application in this narrative.
5. Stetson Ranch site plan references a Fishing Cabin. This cabin was not shown on any site plan.
6. Section 5.0 – States that this project will be connected to the Morrison Creek Metro system. Please revise.
7. Both sections 5.0, 7.0, and 8.0 are titled ‘Site Plan’. Please revise
8. Section 6.0 is missing.

PL20240092 – Cat Creek LPS

- Statement of Authority - Needed for Steamboat Sponsor LLC
- Submittal Checklist – Authorized agent for Steamboat Sponsor LLC needs to sign
- Existing Conditions – Does not show the entire project area
- Information regarding maintenance of open space
 1. Maintenance information was not provided.
- Plat
 1. This document shows the entire area on the back side of the mountain, even the area reserved for future development. The narrative does not include the future development area in it. Either the plat or the narrative need to be revised so that they match.
 2. Please show the lots on the index pages of the plat.
- Narrative
 1. Map showing all of the land area broken into acreages for the individual uses (Lots, Remainder Parcel, Future Development Area, ROW 43.27, Ski Runs 77, Buildings 2).
 2. What is the 2 acres of buildings not counted toward the remainder parcel?
 3. Make sure all numbers in sections 4.3.6 and 4.2 match.
 4. The Open Space section of the UDC (4.51.C – 4.51.E is referenced in the narrative) is not applicable to LPS. Please remove.
- Is the EOPCC just for Cat Creek or does it include items for other areas of the project?
- Engineering plans
 1. Missing sheet 3.10.
 2. Water and wastewater plans are missing

PL20240093 – Indoor Rec Facility CUP

- Elevations and floor plans of proposed buildings
- Narrative
 1. SOA section - Include Steamboat Sponsor

PL20240094 – Outdoor Rec Facility SUP

- Elevations and floor plans of proposed buildings
- Narrative
 1. SOA section - Include Steamboat Sponsor



136 6th St., Suite 200
Steamboat Springs, CO 80487
970-879-2704

www.co.routt.co.us/Planning

Please submit the requested additional information for our review. Upon receipt of these materials, the Planning Department will conduct further review of these applications. Once the applications are deemed complete, the applications will be processed under the UDC.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink that reads 'Alan Goldich'.

Alan Goldich, Senior Planner
Routt County Planning Department

SMR – Wildfire Protection Plan – Notes

§ Existing Conditions – As written, this section provides a one-paragraph, general description of why a Wildfire Protection Plan is important. It does not detail existing vegetative/forested/topographical conditions throughout the SMR area. This section should include a detailed analysis of existing vegetative and forested conditions throughout the development. Because of the size of the development, ideally this section would break down the development into “units”, with each unit including details that provide site specific vegetative health, age class, density, and species composition, as well as slope, gradient and prevailing/dominant winds. We should be able understand what the ground fuel and canopy composition looks like and it should provide us with an adequate foundation as the site specific wildfire risk analysis unfolds later in the document, as well as protective/mitigation measures that may be implemented to reduce risk (also should follow later in the document).

§ Wildfire Protection Plan Objectives and Strategies – As written, this section provides general “template” feedback gathered from the CWPP. It identifies the 4 County priorities listed in the CWPP and lists general reasons why it’s important to a plan and strategy in place. However, similar to the rest of the document, it lacks any site specific detail that can inform the reader/community how this plan can be implemented over time to reduce wildfire risk throughout SMR. It should incorporate the existing development layout, and identify how the development plan (i.e., where are the lots located within proximity to slope/vegetation type? What strategies or objectives have been identified to reduce the risk of combustion and increase the viability of safe evacuation, should a wildfire occur?) may be utilized to increase safety and preparedness.

§ Strategies – While this section lists appropriate mechanisms that may be implemented to reduce risk, there is nothing in this section (nor later in the document) that grounds these strategies in process or conditions applicable to SMR. For example, what kind of remote sensing technologies will be used to identify high-risk areas? How will areas be prioritized for mechanical treatment and/or controlled burning? Is controlled burning even a viable option for SMR, considering liability? How will homeowners and the HOA know what qualifies as defensible space or what is “flammable vegetation”? Etc.

§ Landscape Analysis – We are provided with an overview of what a Landscape Analysis is, and why it’s important, and what factors should be considered when providing the analysis, but there is no analysis provided for SMR. This section should overlay the existing forested conditions and vegetation types with the development plan. Where does vegetation interface with infrastructure? Are there risks associated? What kind of treatment may be implemented to reduce this risk? Etc.

§ IFTDSS Maps – The maps provided from the Interagency Fuel Treatment Decision Support System should not replace substantive details of the analyzed site conditions. Modeling is one tool that may be used to supplement (not replace) existing conditions and threats on the ground. Ground truthing the SMR conditions and using that information to assess infrastructure planning is hugely critical in the viability and safety of the community with regard to wildfire threats. Additionally, that maps included from the IFTDSS site do not have an interpretive section so that the reader can understand what vegetation types exist. It provides a legend with Fuel Models listed as “FBFM5, FBFM5...” but does not interpret what kind of vegetation and density – nor the existing health – the FBFM represents. In addition, there is no assessment of ground fuel density, which is a huge contributor to wildfire severity. The results of these maps should be analyzed to interpret potential site specific threats and priorities, which should be outlined in the document.

§ Fire Behavior Potential – Similar to the other sections, this section provides general definitions with regard to fuel characteristics, topography, weather conditions, ignitions and fire history. These definitions should then be grounded in detail with regard to SMR.

§ Wildfire Risk Assessment – Similar to the other sections, this section provides a one paragraph general overview of what a Wildfire Risk Assessment is. It does not provide any assessment or analysis that reflects SMR, other than mentioning an appendix that includes maps derived from the Colorado Forest Atlas. More information is needed to make it useful.

§ Emergency Evacuation – This section provides the County Road routes in proximity to the development, but it does not provide any road systems throughout the development. The ingress/egress for the SMR area needs to be provided.

§ Required Actions, Guidelines & Procedures – This section provides references to codes that may be looked up, but does not incorporate the specs/measurements/requirements. Some details are included, but more details should be included.

§ Requirements for Access Roads – Similarly, this section should include requirements rather than reference the attached appendices for OCFPD policies.

§ Defensible Space and Structure Ignition Zone – This section provides good guidance.

§ Landscaping Guidelines – This section provides reasonable high-level feedback. As SMR develops its Design Review Guidelines, these recommendations could be elaborated upon site specifically.

§ Fuels Mitigation and Vegetation Management Plan – The “Assessment of Current Vegetation” does not provide an assessment of what is onsite, but rather provides general information with regard to vegetation types, ex: “...identify dominant vegetation types, including forests (coniferous and deciduous), shrublands, grasslands, and riparian areas.” The plan should include an identification of the SMR vegetation types throughout the development.

§ Vegetation Management Strategies – Again, the strategies provided are very general and do not include strategies specific to SMR. If this is going to help with SMR planning and preparedness, the strategies for the development should be specific to the site.

§ Emergency Preparedness – This section includes three sentences that states SMR needs an evacuation plan, that SMR should create fire breaks, and they should collaborate with fire authorities. That is it. No additional details are included.

§ Appendices (Summary) – The appendices are copied/pasted pamphlets from the Colorado State Forest Service website and discuss low-flammability landscape plants, the home ignition zone, some tips for maintenance, description of WUI, and maps generated from the CSFS Forest Atlas that depict additional modeling of fire risk and behavior types for the SMR area. The modeling should be coupled with site specific information. The only summaries included are the summaries provided by the CSFS site that provides information on how the modeling was derived... nothing that grounds us to the place.