

## Tegan Ebbert

---

**From:** Andrew Barnard <awb.blinddog@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 12, 2022 2:47 PM  
**To:** Tegan Ebbert  
**Cc:** csb.blinddog@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Uhl's proposed development off CR68

Tegan,

We live at 40300 Hill-n-Dale Rd in Canyon Valley Ranch and have reviewed the planning materials for the development proposed by the Uhl's for the 60 acre parcel on CR 68.

First, thank you for your thoughtful review of the proposal. Please forward the following comments to the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners prior to the Planning Commission hearing on February 17, 2022..

The development proposal in combination with the staff review is structured to maintain the integrity of the parcel as we know it today, which we prefer. We fully endorse all the proposed General and Specific Conditions (starting on page 8 of the staff report). They address many concerns, including the nature and limitations of the proposed agritourism experience, fire mitigation, light pollution, noise pollution, weed control, inoperative vehicles, and the limited and well-placed development area for the structures.

The biggest omission in the staff report, though, is the potential impact to the water quality in Butcherknife Creek. In our opinion, it should be stipulated in the permit that, out of due respect for landowners downstream, the water quality in Butcherknife Creek cannot be compromised due to the operation. As we have seen with the pig operation to the north, there seems to be minimal regulation (and virtually no enforcement) for small agricultural operations from an environmental standpoint. We continue to hope that the pig farm will cease operation or move, restoring Butcherknife Creek to an unpolluted, natural state. The proposed development should not be allowed to contribute to current pollution or repollute in the future if the pig farm operation ceases.

As neighbors, we are concerned about the property being open to "the public." While the Uhl's have stated that the use is primarily for friends or family, the Conditions that stipulate seasonal use, no advertising, on-site management while guests are staying on the property, and the limitation to three plumbing-free guest cabins and no additional forms of lodging are imperative.

Additionally, County Road 68 is our only access to our development and our residence. The Commissioners and County staff must recognize and plan for the increased traffic--potentially large trucks--that will impact CR68. Proper budgeting for increased maintenance and continued efforts to mitigate groundwater impacts to the road's substructure is essential.

We also hope that the Uhl's and their guests will respect our Canyon Valley Ranch properties and roads as being private. If so, we will welcome them as good neighbors.

In summary, we support the permit **only** with inclusion of all the recommended General and Specific Conditions as outlined by staff **and** an added Condition that prohibits pollution of Butcherknife Creek.

Thank you,

Cindy and Andy Barnard

## Tegan Ebbert

---

**From:** Oxbow1986 <oxbow1986@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 11, 2022 12:43 PM  
**To:** Tegan Ebbert  
**Cc:** Oxbow1986  
**Subject:** "official" input regarding Uhl "guest ranch"

greetings, Tegan   apologies for my error on your email.... i did send out a correction to everyone

As you and i discussed, my husband and I are unable to attend the meeting scheduled on the 17th, of February, but will be present at the March meeting.

I understand, this letter, is a public record.....

Our concerns, are many.....at this time, i will focus on two main points.

1) **COUNTY ROAD 68**.....the integrity of the road is an ongoing struggle even with the current traffic volume. When we were building our home, we were forced to halt progress due to the road conditions. There are several springs under county road 68 and trucks were destroying the soft road. Since then, the county has aggressively attempted to better those conditions. They have built up the road base, in an attempt to raise it above the springs, to the point that in some locations, there is at least a five foot drop off down to original grade. MANY, vehicles, including a county grader, have gotten too close to the edge while attempting to pass an oncoming vehicle, and ended up going down those embankments, necessitating a tow truck. Even with the added road base, the springs continue to seep up thru the road. If the Uhls construct structures for the public to use.....the volume of traffic will only further deteriorate an already fragile county road.

2)**WATER**.....water is a big problem, for everyone. The activity of Keatings hog operation, along county road 68, has completely taken our pond, which we have followed all legal requirements to secure water rights to water our horses. Water, longer makes its way to our pond because of Keatings destructiveness. We remain hopeful, the county will continue their quest to have Keatings thoughtless actions brought to a halt and the tiny water way, known as butcherknife creek, will once again be restored to its pristine gentle flow that always kept our little pond full. It is my understanding, Uhls intend to dig two wells, one of which is a commercial well permit, as well as place live stock fencing along the tiny creek. If that all takes place, our little pond, which is the reason we purchased this parcel in 1997, will never have water again.

I have spoken with Bill Uhl at length, on many occasions. He is very approachable and workable.....and understands our reservations.

It is our wish for all, to live in the manner in which they choose, with out impacting others. Possibly, there is a way to issue permits that do not open the door for a "guest ranch" or "agri-tourism".... and allow the Uhls to build their home, barn and out buildings for their own private use to enjoy this land, as we have for over 20 years.

kindly, Victoria L & Mark A McGuire   39700 Westridge Rd. Steamboat Springs, CO 80487

## Tegan Ebbert

---

**From:** Jenna Bowen <jenna.e.bowen@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 16, 2022 10:48 PM  
**To:** Tegan Ebbert  
**Subject:** Uhl Proposal - 480 Ranch Resident

Good Evening Tegan!

I hope this email finds you well. My name is Jenna Bowen and I own a home in 480 Ranch Subdivision on CR68 with my small family (17095 Grouse Ridge Ln). I am reaching out to you to voice our opinions about the Uhl Proposal for his "guest ranch/farm to table" property.

I will start out by saying we are not in favor of this proposal. We do not believe this proposal fits with the goals and values of our area and its residents. Specifically, we take issue with the proposal for nightly rentals that would adversely affect our community and way of life.

As a professional in the Steamboat nightly rental business, I feel moved to speak up for my family and community. In the last 7 years, I have worked with Resort Group as a Sales Manager (500 unit inventory, low to high end) and currently The Porches of Steamboat (17 unit inventory - very high end). I am always amazed at how disrespectful tourists can be and the way they conduct themselves in our town. They all expect to do whatever they want at the expense of all of us.

I will always be thankful for the tourism that Steamboat brings as it puts food on our table BUT I do not want it in my backyard. We own a townhome in downtown Steamboat and lived there for years before moving to the county. We decided to build our forever home in 480 Ranch to distance ourselves from the impact of tourism. It is our objective to protect our little slice of heaven from ventures such as the Uhl development proposal.

Here are our main concerns -

- Wildfire - It is going to be yet another dry year in this historic drought we are facing. We don't trust any outsiders to make good decisions for our community. The risk is too great. The Uhl property borders the only road providing access to numerous homes across two subdivisions. If someone at their property starts a fire neither 480 Ranch nor CVR will be able to evacuate effectively - it would be disastrous.
- Water Usage - I understand Mr. Uhl already has a commercial well permit. This will allow him to take 108,000 gallons of water per year for his operation in addition to the usage of his domestic well. Excessive water usage could adversely affect the water table and impact the existing wells and property owners in the area.
- Trespassing - It is likely that nightly rentals will improve the odds of visitors trespassing on adjacent lands, trails and roads. No degree of oversight by the property manager or owner will effectively prevent this.
- Roads - Nightly rentals will further increase traffic on CR68, worsening road conditions and adding to the need for county maintenance and dust mitigation.
- Community Spirit - If a special use permit is granted with numerous conditions of approval (COA's), this is setting up our community for inevitable conflict. There doesn't seem to be any simple way to monitor or enforce the conditions of approval aside from area residents filing complaints after the fact. It is unclear how difficult it might become to hold the property owner responsible for violations of the COA's on the special use permit. It seems likely that conflict

would eventually arise which could be avoided if the special use permit is not granted for commercial use and nightly rentals.

We have heard from neighbors who have spoken to Bill Uhl personally, as well as from county officials that the main goal of the Uhl family is to provide a retreat for their family rather than profit commercially from nightly rentals. If this is truly the objective, we do not see why this proposal would include any plans for commercial use or nightly rentals. Furthermore, we feel that it would be a great disservice to ourselves and our neighbors to approve a proposal stating these intentions regardless of any conditions of approval for the special use permit. In fact, adding multiple conditions of approval would seem to verify that the proposal itself does not fit with the goals or values of the rural area surrounding the Uhl property.

We find it concerning that the Uhl's plan to prioritize the building of the commercial aspect of their operation before their primary residence. It seems feasible that upon approval, this could become simply a commercial operation without the primary residence ever being constructed.

We also worry about what might come to pass in the future if the property is sold after the permit is granted and these various structures are built.

If the Uhl family wants to conduct a commercial operation including nightly rentals, they should find a location that is zoned for such an operation. If they truly want a farm to host family and friends only, their proposal should be denied and resubmitted or amended to reflect this and only this.

We have absolutely no objection to the Uhl family creating a family compound and farm to table operation under the current Routt Co codes as long as they respect our shared natural resources under the same rules and regulations as the rest of us. Perhaps there is another way the Uhl family can meet their goals for housing and entertaining their friends and family without commercial operations and nightly rentals.

Warmest Regards,  
Jenna Bowen

## Tegan Ebbert

---

**From:** Eileen Hill <dublin12eileen@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 15, 2022 1:18 PM  
**To:** Tegan Ebbert  
**Subject:** Bill Uhl nightly rentals on cr 68 & hwy 40

Tegan,

My husband and I moved to Canyon Valley Ranch many years ago.

I am not so concerned about the nightly rentals as we are about what Mr Bill Uhl proposes to do at this Ranch.

Shooting range, skiing , race track & absolutely no way to keep people off of our private roads.

Concerned about trespassing , trash, traffic on an already bad road , 68.

We are afraid that it's going to turn out to be a lot more then nightly rentals.

Thank you for your time  
Milton & Eileen Hill

## Tegan Ebbert

---

**From:** Jim Michels <Jim@michelsmachinery.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 13, 2022 9:15 AM  
**To:** Tegan Ebbert  
**Subject:** Uhl Special use permit

Tegan,

We have property at 40000 Valley Dr (including lots 3, 4.&22) in Canyon Valley Ranch and have reviewed the planning materials for the development proposed by the Uhl's for the 60 acre parcel on CR 68.

First, thank you for your thoughtful review of the proposal. Please forward the following comments to the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners prior to the Planning Commission hearing on February 17, 2022..

The development proposal in combination with the staff review is structured to maintain the integrity of the parcel as we know it today, which we prefer. We fully endorse all the proposed General and Specific Conditions (starting on page 8 of the staff report). They address many concerns, including the nature and limitations of the proposed agritourism experience, fire mitigation, light pollution, noise pollution, weed control, inoperative vehicles, and the limited and well-placed development area for the structures.

The biggest omission in the staff report, though, is the potential impact to the water quality in Butcherknife Creek. In our opinion, it should be stipulated in the permit that, out of due respect for landowners downstream, the water quality in Butcherknife Creek cannot be compromised due to the operation. As we have seen with the pig operation to the north, there seems to be minimal regulation (and virtually no enforcement) for small agricultural operations from an environmental standpoint. We continue to hope that the pig farm will cease operation or move, restoring Butcherknife Creek to an unpolluted, natural state. The proposed development should not be allowed to contribute to current pollution or repollute in the future if the pig farm operation ceases.

As neighbors, we are concerned about the property being open to "the public." While the Uhl's have stated that the use is primarily for friends or family, the Conditions that stipulate seasonal use, no advertising, on-site management while guests are staying on the property, and the limitation to three plumbing-free guest cabins and no additional forms of lodging are imperative.

Additionally, County Road 68 is our only access to our development and our residence. The Commissioners and County staff must recognize and plan for the increased traffic--potentially large trucks--that will impact CR68. Proper budgeting for increased maintenance and continued efforts to mitigate groundwater impacts to the road's substructure is essential.

We also trust that the Uhl's and their guests will respect our Canyon Valley Ranch properties and roads as being private.

In summary, we support the permit **only** with inclusion of all the recommended General and Specific Conditions as outlined by staff (emphasizing the noncommercial use) **and** an added Condition that prohibits pollution of Butcherknife Creek

Thank you,

Jim Michels

Michels  
Machinery Co., Inc.



**Jim Michels**

**Mailing Address:**

5841 E. Charleston Blvd, #230

Las Vegas, NV 89142-1049

[jim@michelsmachinery.com](mailto:jim@michelsmachinery.com)

Michels  
Crane Sales, Inc.



Off: 702-459-9311

Fax: 702-459-9351

Cell: 702-378-3693

[www.michelsmachinery.com](http://www.michelsmachinery.com)

**Equipment Yard:** (Call First)

5900 N Shatz Street \* Las Vegas, NV 89115



## Tegan Ebbert

---

**From:** Jim Michels <Jim@michelsmachinery.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 13, 2022 9:18 AM  
**To:** Tegan Ebbert  
**Subject:** Uhl Special use permit

Tegan,

My husband and I have property at 40000 Valley Dr (including lots 3, 4.&22) in Canyon Valley Ranch and have reviewed the planning materials for the development proposed by the Uhl's for the 60 acre parcel on CR 68.

First, thank you for your thoughtful review of the proposal. Please forward the following comments to the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners prior to the Planning Commission hearing on February 17, 2022..

The development proposal in combination with the staff review is structured to maintain the integrity of the parcel as we know it today, which we prefer. We fully endorse all the proposed General and Specific Conditions (starting on page 8 of the staff report). They address many concerns, including the nature and limitations of the proposed agritourism experience, fire mitigation, light pollution, noise pollution, weed control, inoperative vehicles, and the limited and well-placed development area for the structures.

The biggest omission in the staff report, though, is the potential impact to the water quality in Butcherknife Creek. In our opinion, it should be stipulated in the permit that, out of due respect for landowners downstream, the water quality in Butcherknife Creek cannot be compromised due to the operation. As we have seen with the pig operation to the north, there seems to be minimal regulation (and virtually no enforcement) for small agricultural operations from an environmental standpoint. We continue to hope that the pig farm will cease operation or move, restoring Butcherknife Creek to an unpolluted, natural state. The proposed development should not be allowed to contribute to current pollution or repollute in the future if the pig farm operation ceases.

As neighbors, we are concerned about the property being open to "the public." While the Uhl's have stated that the use is primarily for friends or family, the Conditions that stipulate seasonal use, no advertising, on-site management while guests are staying on the property, and the limitation to three plumbing-free guest cabins and no additional forms of lodging are imperative.

Additionally, County Road 68 is our only access to our development and our residence. The Commissioners and County staff must recognize and plan for the increased traffic--potentially large trucks--that will impact CR68. Proper budgeting for increased maintenance and continued efforts to mitigate groundwater impacts to the road's substructure is essential.

We also trust that the Uhl's and their guests will respect our Canyon Valley Ranch properties and roads as being private.

In summary, we support the permit **only** with inclusion of all the recommended General and Specific Conditions as outlined by staff (emphasizing the noncommercial use) **and** an added Condition that prohibits pollution of Butcherknife Creek

Thank you,

Ronda Michels

## Tegan Ebbert

---

**From:** Jim Michels <Jim@michelsmachinery.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 13, 2022 6:30 PM  
**To:** Tegan Ebbert  
**Subject:** Uhl Special Use Permit

Tegen,

I wanted to clarify our letter, We (my wife Ronda and I) are in favor according to our letter with the stipulation that there would be for "NONCOMMERCIAL USE ONLY" (no short term rentals as stipulated in the rest of the county).

Regards,

Jim



**Mailing Address:**

5841 E. Charleston Blvd, #230  
Las Vegas, NV 89142-1049  
jim@michelsmachinery.com

**Jim Michels**



Off: 702-459-9311

Fax: 702-459-9351

Cell: 702-378-3693

www.michelsmachinery.com

**Equipment Yard: (Call First)**

5900 N Shatz Street \* Las Vegas, NV 89115

## Tegan Ebbert

---

**From:** Wendy Nadolny <rwnadolny@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 13, 2022 9:01 PM  
**To:** Tegan Ebbert  
**Subject:** UHL 68 Guest Ranch Concerns

Tegan,

I am unable to attend the meeting on the 17th. I have expressed my concerns in writing below. Please share this with all involved parties. I hope that my concerns will be taken into consideration regarding this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me via email or phone (970) 846-0492.

My husband and I are property owners at Canyon Valley Ranch. We have owned our lot since 2008 and hope to build soon. We moved to the Yampa Valley over 20 years ago.

We bought our lot because of the isolated location. If you haven't been to the proposed location, I would encourage that you take a look. It is down a short dead-end canyon road. Up each side of the canyon there are two different private, residential neighborhoods. It is truly a little slice of heaven. What makes it heaven for me is the night sky, the abundance of wildlife, the quiet, the sense of peace, and no tourist. We bought it to escape. We can often be found camping, hiking, and snowshoeing on our property.

As everyone considers this proposal, I think that it's important to look at the reasons why Planning Commissioners should deny this proposal. Per the UHL Staff Report SUP, it is to be denied if "the proposed use is not compatible with the immediately adjacent and nearby neighborhood properties and uses." I would argue that it is not compatible with nearby neighborhoods because it negatively impacts the safety of their residents, and its use conflicts with the use of the private communities. It is the complete opposite use: tourist recreation facility vs. private residential. My safety concerns are related to wildfires, wildlife, and trespassing. They are addressed below.

First, I think it is important to briefly draw attention to these conflicting uses. Both surrounding neighborhoods are closed to the public. Tourists are not allowed. With all the recent press across the country related to "over tourism", I think that we can all agree that there is a difference between homeowners and tourist. There is often a difference in their behaviors and respect for the outdoors.

Now let's explore my safety concerns. We'll start with wildfires. Living in the valley, I have seen so many potentially dangerous situations related to fires. I have watched campers leave for the day with their fires raging or leave permanently without putting out their fires. I have watched them toss their lit cigarettes on the ground while hiking during fire bans. During an extremely dry season I stopped to help a mountain biker put out a fire that was caused when he laid down his bike to take a break. His breaks were so hot that they ignited the weeds.

All it takes is one such incident and we will have a wildfire in our area. Having a recreational area that is open to the public and designed to attract tourist increases such fire opportunities. Some of our area is considered a "high wildfire risk zone". I would imagine that any such fire would spread very quickly through the area as it is heavily populated with trees, brush, and grasses. The recreational facility land is located near the entrance of our neighborhood. If there were to be a fire there, it could block the only exit. We wouldn't be able to leave. Due to ignorance of tourist regarding wildfires, the high fire danger in our area, and the proximity of the land to our only exit, I am concerned about an increase in fire danger if this plan is approved.

In addition, I am concerned about the impact tourist will have on wildlife. Due to the low population density, it is common to see elk, deer, bear and even mountain lion. I hike a lot. With this, I have seen tourist behavior that negatively impact wildlife. I've seen littered campsites, people throwing their trash intentionally on the trail, people leaving coolers and trash out overnight, and people feeding animals to get pictures. When this happens, animals change their behaviors. They begin to identify people and homes as sources of food. They begin to lose their fear. This results in aggressive animals that sometimes confront humans and break into people's homes. In addition, they can become sick and aggressive from eating too much trash. This also increases negative human-animal contact. We do not have a wildlife problem now. A

tourist attraction in a residential area will likely change this. As a side note, many people own lots in our area because they enjoy hunting. The sounds of mountain bikes, increased noise on hiking trails, and whatever else they choose to allow at their recreation facility has the potential to scare off the animals that property owners hunt. Please remember that the location is at the bottom of a canyon which amplifies sound.

My final concern is related to trespassing. Canyon Valley Ranch is a private subdivision with privately maintained roads. Over the years, I have received emails from neighbors related to individuals trespassing, missing items, and possible squatters. I have seen people who do not live in our subdivision scouting for elk, driving around, and even sledding down one of our main roads. I am concerned that bringing tourist to a residential dead-end road will create even more curiosity related to our area. This curiosity will lead to increased incidents of trespass. Maybe they are looking to see if there is a through road or if any houses are for sale. Maybe they are hoping to find some more private trails to access. Whatever the case may be, it will increase curiosity and trespassing. It is a bit uncomfortable to ask people what they are doing and to tell them to leave. Sometimes people don't listen and get aggressive. This is a safety concern for me.

The bottom line is that you can't control the behavior of a tourist. You can put multiple inclusions in this plan to try to restrict certain tourist behavior to minimize my safety concerns, but we are still talking about tourist. They have a different mentality than homeowners. A piece of paper, a sign, even a person telling them not to do something cannot control their behaviors. The only way to prevent this from happening is to not grant this special use permit which encourages tourist to come to a residential area. The UHL Staff Report SUP states that you will not have the ability to enforce who are friends/family and who are not. Thus, any such inclusion related to this is not helpful.

Mr. and Mrs. Uhl had choices that they could make when trying to reach their goals. They could have bought a piece of property properly zoned for their desires. They didn't do this. Instead, they are trying to circumvent the law with this proposal.

If you approve this permit, it will have a lasting impact on a small and large scale. It will negatively impact me. It will negatively impact my neighbors. In addition, setting this precedence, to allow for nightly rentals or changing the zoning to allow for additional cabins, will impact the county when others press you to do the same for them. It will open Pandora's box. I am asking you to set a strong precedence that Routt County will not create loopholes that allow people to circumvent the law and jeopardize the wellbeing of their neighbors. This tourist attraction does not belong on a dead-end road between private, residential areas.

I am asking you to keep my neighbors and me safe by voting against this special use permit to create a tourist attraction in a residentially zoned area. The laws were put in to place for many reasons. We should honor our roots and rural traditions guiding these laws. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,  
Wendy Nadolny

## Tegan Ebbert

---

**From:** Tegan Ebbert  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 10, 2022 12:09 PM  
**To:** 'Tegan Ebbert (tebbert@co.routt.co.us)'  
**Subject:** Uhl PL20210018 concerned neighbor letter

**From:** Todd Thrasher <[tthrash78@gmail.com](mailto:tthrash78@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 9, 2022 1:38 PM  
**To:** Tegan Ebbert <[tebbert@co.routt.co.us](mailto:tebbert@co.routt.co.us)>  
**Subject:** Re: Uhl PL20210018 concerned neighbor letter

Tegan,

I have spoken with Bill again and have the following thoughts that are okay to share with the County Planners. My biggest concern is related to the potential commercial use and nightly rental proposition presented. The intended use varies from this and is primarily for family and friends and not as a pure commercial endeavor. As a result there may be a way to provide a limited use situation as you have described at Sidney peak. I understand that it is not practical to try to limit use to only family and friends because it is not possible to manage this from the county's perspective. It may however be possible to limit use to family and friends by providing wording in the special use permit that would prohibit marketing the property. If this were the case I would be more comfortable that the Uhl family will stick to their intended purpose of a family retreat. When the property is managed in this way, in combination with some of your other additions, many of the concerns stated in my initial letter are reasonably mitigated. In my conversation with Bill he indicated that he would agree to have language prohibiting marketing the property as a nightly or vacation rental included in the proposal.

Thank you  
T.J. Thrasher

## Tegan Ebbert

---

**From:** Corey Larsen <corey@dimensionfinehomes.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 1, 2022 9:43 AM  
**To:** Tegan Ebbert  
**Subject:** Uhl Development Proposal

Hi Tegan,

My partner, Elizabeth Coleman and I own three lots that make up the eastern border of the proposed development. That being said we are both opposed to the development for many reasons. As a builder I have been asked to do similar projects by several clients. None of which went through, but rather decided to build a larger primary structure for their friends and family. I have no problem with the Uhls doing the same, but the thought of multiple cabins raises great concern for me as to who would actually be using them and the impact it would have on my property as well as the rest of Canyon Valley Ranch. It sounds more like we'd be giving permission to operate a guest ranch and that's what concerns me even if it isn't the Uhls intent, it could become someone else's. I moved to Canyon Valley Ranch for the seclusion, wildlife and generally the love of the outdoors. We really love it here and don't want to see the adjacent property used for something it wasn't meant for. Hopefully, this makes sense to everyone.

Thank You!!

Corey Larsen