<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Attendee(s)</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Ed Finger / Linda Angell</td>
<td>Community Corrections Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Norman Wright / Kristin Sullivan</td>
<td>Community &amp; Economic Development Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Norman Wright / Kristin Sullivan</td>
<td>Landscaping and Administrative Relief Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Norman Wright / Kristin Sullivan</td>
<td>Synergy Oil &amp; Gas Discussion and COGCC Rulemaking Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Todd Leopold</td>
<td>Administrative Item Review / Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Heidi Miller</td>
<td>Executive Session pursuant to C.R.S. 24-6-402(4)(b) and (e) for the purpose of receiving legal advice and negotiation discussions regarding Eisenhower Case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALL TIMES LISTED ON THIS AGENDA ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.
DATE: December 15, 2015

SUBJECT: Community Corrections

FROM: Ed Finger, Deputy County Manager

AGENCY/DEPARTMENT: County Manager’s Office, Community Corrections

ATTENDEES: Ed Finger, Deputy County Manager; Linda Angell, Community Corrections Coordinator

PURPOSE OF ITEM: To present a brief report and receive direction from the BoCC on a possible RFP for Community Corrections Operations

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: That the BoCC provide direction on a possible RFP for Community Corrections Operations

BACKGROUND:

In August, 2015 staff presented a report on operational alternatives for Community Corrections. Because of the time that has elapsed, staff intends to briefly cover the same report, cover additional developments and discuss a potential request for proposal.

AGENCIES, DEPARTMENTS OR OTHER OFFICES INVOLVED:

County Manager’s Office
Community Corrections

ATTACHED DOCUMENTS:

PowerPoint presentation
Statement of Purpose

• What are We Trying to Do:
  • Support alternative sentencing programs, including community corrections, that:
    • Are comprehensive and coordinated;
    • Reduce correctional costs and incarcerated populations;
    • Strengthen the “Continuity of Care” to increase successful rehabilitative outcomes for individuals in the criminal justice system, and provide vital programs and services for offenders; and,
    • Ensure the overall safety of the residents in Adams County.
  • Restore the operational capacity of the current community corrections system with an eye towards meeting future programmatic requirements.
  • Improve the quality and stability of future operations.
Intent

- There is more than one possible path to success. We want to make an informed, collaborative decision.

- Our intent is to incorporate and represent the interests of our many stakeholders in the county and the criminal justice system, including the Community Corrections Board.
Does the County want to be a Property Owner of a Community Corrections Facility? (Previous Decision Point)

County Managed:

- **Positives**
  - Facility condition control
  - Better vendor transition control
  - Break-even/revenue opportunity
  - Eliminate alternative correctional facility uses
  - CUP with no end date (if existing facility is acquired)
  - Expansion capacity (if existing facility is acquired)
  - Facilitates possible future transition to county operations

- **Concerns**
  - Capital investment / financial risk
  - Maintenance and repair

Vendor Managed:

- **Positives**
  - Vendor financial liability and facility maintenance

- **Concerns**
  - Control of facility condition
  - Vendor transition limitations (separate owner condition)
Does the County want to have a Role in Managing the Program and Service Delivery of Community Corrections Programs? *(Pending Decision Point)*

**County Managed:**

- **Positives**
  - Program / profit focus more balanced
  - Collaborative opportunities with other entities
  - Operational stability (staffing)
  - Program development flexibility
  - Possible revenue generation depending on size/bed space/program

- **Concerns**
  - Higher cost (staffing)
  - Possible subsidy depending on size/bed space/program
  - Longer program implementation timeframe

**Vendor Managed:**

- **Positives**
  - Developed programmatic experience and expertise
  - Existing vendor community in place
  - Financial liability on vendor

- **Concerns**
  - Different profit / program balance
  - Reduced operational / program control
Comprehensive Strategy

• Alternative Sanctions Subcommittee
  • Opportunities to strengthen and diversify all alternative sanctions and diversion options within Adams County (i.e., community corrections, probation, pretrial services, juvenile services).
  • Offices involved: County Manager, Judiciary, Sheriff, Probation, Public Defender’s Office, District Attorney’s Office, Community Corrections, Victim Services, Criminal Justice Planning.
  • Six-month project plan.
Community Corrections Strategy

• What are We Trying to Do:
  • Oversee community corrections, that:
    • Reduce correctional costs and incarcerated populations;
    • Create successful rehabilitative outcomes for individuals in the criminal justice system by providing vital programs and services for offenders; and
    • Ensure the overall safety of the residents in Adams County.
  • Restore the operational capacity of the current community corrections system with an eye towards meeting future programmatic requirements.
  • Improve the quality and stability of future operations.
Analysis

• What we’ve done:
  • Facility analysis and purchase negotiations.
  • County-run operational staffing analysis, financial pro-forma and needs analysis.

• What other information is being / could be compiled:
  • Committee long-term alternative sanctioning strategy.
  • Staffing analysis / financial pro-forma could be fleshed out with implementation strategy.
RFP

• Previous staff recommendation to issue RFP while developing longer-term alternative sanctions strategy.

• Threshold question for today’s study session:
  - Has BoCC received adequate information to make the decision to issue an RFP or not, or is additional information/analysis desired?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>December 15, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT:</td>
<td>Department Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROM:</td>
<td>Norman Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY/DEPARTMENT:</td>
<td>Community and Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTENDEES:</td>
<td>Norman Wright, Kristin Sullivan, Joelle Greenland, Andrea Berg, Eric Guenther, Nana Appiah, Justin Blair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURPOSE OF ITEM:</td>
<td>Provide an update on the initiatives and progress underway with the new Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</td>
<td>No recommendation; this item is information only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BACKGROUND:**

Three months have passed since the formation of the Community and Economic Development Department. In that time, our staff has embraced a new culture, new mission, and new standard for performance. This presentation highlights the fruits of the team’s labor in the realms of process improvement, customer service, and new collaborations.

**AGENCIES, DEPARTMENTS OR OTHER OFFICES INVOLVED:**

**ATTACHED DOCUMENTS:**

Presentation
FISCAL IMPACT:

Either mark (X) _X_ if there is no fiscal impact or provide the following information for the recommended action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund(s):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost center(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-generated / dedicated revenues:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual operating costs:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual net operating (cost) / income:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital costs:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure included in approved operating budget:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure included in approved capital budget:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New FTEs requested:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPROVAL SIGNATURES:

Todd Leopold, County Manager
Raymond H. Gonzales, Deputy County Manager

Ed Finger, Deputy County Manager

APPROVAL OF FISCAL IMPACT:

[Signature]
Budget / Finance
Department Update

Community and Economic Development

Norman Wright
Origins of the New Department

“Single point of contact”

“Expedited review process”

“Front-facing citizen services”

“Accountability for entire process”

“Procedural changes, not just staffing changes”

“Better government through better customer service”
Priorities and Values

- Create goals
- Be transparent about it
- Challenge a team to achieve it
- What gets measured gets managed
- No "Us versus Them"
Process Improvement

- Workshops in July and August
  - Conceptual review process
  - Residential building permits
- Map processes
- Apply LEAN process tactics
- Achieve consensus for change
- Establish goals
- Make improvement
Conceptual Review Process

Process Mapping Exercise

Formal Process Improvements
Priorities and Values

• Create goals *We can make this better!*
• Be transparent about it *Map the process for how*
• What gets measured gets managed *Measure and report the results*
• No "Us versus Them" *Think like the customer*
Conceptual Review Process

Before

Week 1: Application submitted
Week 2: Processing and scheduling
Week 3: --
Week 4: Meeting held
Week 5: Research and coordination
Week 6: Summary letter drafted
Week 7: Summary letter reviewed
Week 8: Summary letter reviewed
Week 9: Summary letter mailed

After

Week 1: Application submitted
Week 2: Internal review complete
Week 3: Meeting held
Week 4: Summary letter emailed

Results:
- Reduction of five weeks
- Quality and coordination improvements, elimination of conflicting comments
- Improved quality of application submittals
- Applicant better prepared before Conceptual Review meeting is held
Land Use Case Process

- Planner
- Engineer
- Building
- ROW

- Similar concepts applied to this process
  - Referral start date < 14 days from submittal
  - Consolidated comments sent to applicant at end of referral
  - More formal comment and response process

- Results:
  - Less wasted time at onset of cases
  - Better internal review coordination
  - Earlier and more complete reviews
Building Permit Review Process

Key Issues:
- Process mapping identified excessive waste because of consecutive reviews stacked end to end
- Implementation of concurrent review of electronic plans on October 13, 2015
- Over The Counter (OTC) Plans Examiner hired in October 2015
Building Permit Review Process

Before

Day 1: Application submitted
Day 5: Review 1
Day 10: Review 2
Day 20: Review 3
Day 25: Review 4
Day 30: Review 5
Day 35: Review 6
Day 36: Review Complete or Resubmittal Required

After

Day 1: Application submitted
Day 10: No Resubmittal Required

Day 10: All Reviews Complete, Comments Sent
Day 10: No Resubmittal Required

Results:
- First ever month with 100% of plan reviews completed in less than 30 days
- After October 13th changes, average review times dropped from 35 days to 10 days
Results So Far

98% of all reviews done within our 10 days standard.

20% of reviews completed in 1 day
Customer Service

- Unified Team at the Front Counter
  - Planning
  - Building Safety
  - Engineering
  - Stormwater
  - Code Compliance
- Need for information sharing
- Need for common standard of service
- Eagerness to help each other
Priorities and Values

• Create goals *We can make this better!*
• Be transparent about it *Recognize what is missing*
• What gets measured gets managed *Find a way to judge the customer’s experience*
• No “Us versus Them” *Every team member responsible for every customer*
Customer Satisfaction

Method to measure

Results for October 2015

Please rate your customer experience today.

92% Positive
Total feedback: 200

Very Positive 84%, Positive 8%, Negative 3%, Very Negative 5%
Customer Satisfaction

Low scores only when staff availability was low (e.g. lunch time).

The team is exploring scheduled lunch hours, committed to the goal of 95% satisfaction.

Forgot to bring the unit in afterhours.
Website, Phone Number & Front Counter

- Consolidated website
  - Two clicks to what matters most for people
- Phone tree - #6800
  - Simple number for ~4,200 calls, effective channeling
- New Plans Examiner at the front counter.
  - Skilled technical assistance available without appointment

### Division | Monthly Calls
---|---
Planning/Dev. Review | 638
Building Safety | 2365
Stormwater | 541
Transportation Permits (Mark) | 550
Code Compliance | 101
Total | 4,195
New #6800 Structure

Results:
- Reduced voicemails
- Quick channeling of common calls
- Stronger collaboration with staff
Next Steps: Enhanced Collaboration

Neighborhood Services, Economic Development, Development Services, and County Attorney’s Office

- Zoning analysis
- Potential legal action
- Cleanup and abatement
- Marketing with developers
Enhanced Collaboration

- Economic Development and the Customer Center
  - Developer Handbook
  - Stakeholder Meetings
  - "Development Assistance" program
Enhanced Collaboration

Economic Development, Neighborhood Services, Development Services, and Community Development

The “cleanup crew”
- Blight clearance
- Condemnations
- Brownfield assessment
- Marketing with Developers
- Regulatory changes for land utilization
Customer Feedback

From Bob Fleming, Local Developer: Current Projects

+ “Process is more efficient, predictable, and clear.”
+ “It’s a lot better.”
- “Don’t get recommendations very quickly”
+ “Recommendations fair and reasoned”
Customer Feedback

From Jim Sanford, Brookfield Homes:

+ “Inspectors are fair and reasonable”
+ “Things are going very well”
- “Inspections occasionally are 3-4 days out”
+ “Adams County has been fantastic”
Customer Feedback

From George Hanlin, Local Developer:

+ “Breath of fresh air”
+ “Couldn’t be more pleased”
- “Hopes to see a speedier approval process for building permits”
+ “Professionalism reflected in the people on staff”
Customer Feedback

From Ann Sperling, Trammell Crowe: Globeville
+ “Our entire team is so appreciative of this new process and quick turnaround”
+ “Thank you both [Kristin and Justin] for the incredibly speedy review of our submittal”
"Just stay the course now"  
+ old topics aren't being revisited anymore  
+ Noticed that meeting notes are much better and  
+ fix the process  
+ "Very competent people in place; just needed to  
contact person for a project"  
+ Definitely better experience once we had one

From Paul Vantorno, Wedly Business Park:

Customer Feedback
Origins of the New Department

“Single point of contact”

“Expedited review process”

“Front-facing citizen services”

“Accountability for entire process”

“Procedural changes, not just staffing changes”

“Better government through better customer service”
Results of the New Department

“It’s a lot better”
“Breath of fresh air”
“Things are going very well”
“Definitely better with one contact person”
“Process is more efficient, predictable, and clear”
“Our entire team is so appreciative of this new process”

“Just stay the course”
DATE: December 15, 2015

SUBJECT: Review of current landscaping ordinance and administrative review policy

FROM: Norman Wright

AGENCY/DEPARTMENT: Community and Economic Development

ATTENDEES: Norman Wright, Kristin Sullivan, Nana Appiah

PURPOSE OF ITEM: Review of information and guidance on recommendations for further study

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of request to examine surrounding municipal standards and develop improvements to Adams County’s standards.

BACKGROUND:
Members of the board recently requested a presentation on the County’s current standards for landscaping and administrative review. During the development of the presentation, staff identified several needs that warrant special attention. In particular, the use of a “one size fits all” approach to landscaping regulations creates inflexibility and real challenge to many projects that seek to satisfy our requirements. Likewise, when flexibility is necessary, we provide it through an administrative relief process that is open to a degree of discretion that may (or may not) be warranted. Guidance from the Board is needed as staff explores improvements to the current standard.

AGENCIES, DEPARTMENTS OR OTHER OFFICES INVOLVED:

ATTACHED DOCUMENTS:

Presentation
FISCAL IMPACT:

Either mark (X) _X_ if there is no fiscal impact or provide the following information for the recommended action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund(s):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost center(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-generated / dedicated revenues:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual operating costs:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual net operating (cost) / income:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital costs:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure included in approved operating budget:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure included in approved capital budget:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New FTEs requested:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPROVAL SIGNATURES:

Todd Leopold, County Manager

Raymond D. Gonzales, Deputy County Manager

APPROVAL OF FISCAL IMPACT:

[Signature]

Budget / Finance

Ed Finger, Deputy County Manager
Landscaping Regulations & Administrative Relief

Community and Economic Development
Norman Wright
Outline

• Overview of regulations
  – Basic requirements
  – Areas for improvement

• Administrative relief
  – Origins
  – Recent activity
  – Pros and cons
Landscaping Regulations

• Why do we require landscaping?
  – Section 4-16-01, Purpose:
    • Enhance and promote unique image for Adams County
    • Protect the public health, safety, and welfare
    • Conserving water resources by promoting drought tolerant plantings
    • Ensuring landscaping is an integral part of site design and development
Landscaping Regulations

• When do we require a property to meet current landscaping requirements?
  – New development
  – Existing development meets the definition of a Change-In-Use
    • Change from one principal use to another
    • Active and continuous operations are not carried on for a period of six months or greater
    • In cases of multi-building or multi-tenant properties, the gross floor area of the building expands 50% or more; or the required parking expands 25% or more

• Agricultural uses do not require landscaping
Landscaping Regulations

- What do we require on site:
  - 10% of total site area
  - ½ of all landscaping along ROW
- Five options for buffer yard along ROW:
  1. 25-foot depth; 1 tree / 2 shrubs per 40 ft.
  2. 20-foot depth; 1 tree / 2 shrubs per 40 ft
  3. 10-foot depth; 2 trees / 5 shrubs per 40 ft
  4. 5-foot depth; 1 tree / 2 shrubs per 40 ft and a 30” high decorative wall
  5. Berm two feet in height; 1 tree / 5 shrubs per 60 ft.
Landscaping Regulations

- Bufferyard landscaping
  - Landscaping along exterior boundaries that depend on the adjacent use
  - Bufferyards A, B, C, and D vary from 5-15 feet in depth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Residential Uses</th>
<th>Commercial Uses</th>
<th>Industrial Uses</th>
<th>Institutional Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Buffer Yard “D”
Landscaping Regulations

- Parking lot landscaping
  - When 10 or more parking spaces are required, internal parking lot landscaping is required
  - This can satisfy the 10% total requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Parking Stalls</th>
<th>Required Landscaped Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-25</td>
<td>15 sq. ft. per stall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>18 sq. ft. per stall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-99</td>
<td>25 sq. ft. per stall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 or more</td>
<td>35 sq. ft. per stall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Landscaping Regulations

• Landscaping areas must contain 75% living material
• This regulation motivates many applicants to install sod or other water-intensive ground cover
• 25% may be non-living such as rock, mulch
• In Eastern Adams County, living material is reduced to 50\%
Living material is costly and difficult to maintain.
Maintenance not always sustainable
Analysis

• Adams County landscaping standards are set at a lower standard compared to surrounding municipalities.

• The benefit
  – Lower cost to developer

• The cost
  – Less benefit to surrounding properties
  – Less ability to “enhance and promote a unique image”

• Dilemma
  – Less upfront cost does not prevent long term costs (lack of maintenance, water consumption)
Recommendation

• Further examine standards of surrounding municipalities and raise standard to something equivalent

• Move to a context sensitive standard instead of a “one size fits all”, unique standard for different project types, land uses, or zones

• Consider text amendments to the zoning ordinance that will allow proper xeriscaping and incentives for low impact development (LID) features
Administrative Relief

• 4-16-21, Administrative Relief
  – Purpose is stated to add flexibility when a standard is inapplicable or inappropriate to a specific use or design proposal
  – Does not mean that a requirement is reduced without compensation
Origins

- Removed in 2003 regulations
- Reinstated on 2010
- Purpose is provide an option to expedite site plan approvals
Administrative Relief

• Written request submitted to Director
• Include justification
• Decision made within 10 days
• An appeal may be made to the Board of Adjustment
• BOA may approve the appeal, modify the administrative decision, or deny the appeal
Administrative Relief

The Director of Planning and Development must make all of the following findings in order to grant administrative relief:

1. The strict application of the regulations in question is unreasonable given the development proposal or the measures proposed by the applicant or the property has extraordinary or exceptional physical conditions or unique circumstances which do not generally exist in nearby properties in the same general area and such conditions will not allow a reasonable use of the property in its current zone in absence of relief;

2. The intent of the landscaping section and the specific regulations in question is preserved, and;

3. The granting of the administrative relief will not result in an adverse impact upon surrounding properties.
Administrative Relief

1. The County recognizes the specific landscape requirements in this section cannot and do not anticipate all possible landscape situations. In addition, the County recognizes the specific regulations of the landscape standards, but were not anticipated in the specific regulations. Therefore, the County may grant administrative relief in the event of these situations.

2. The County recognizes a proposed development of a relatively small commercial expansion or remodeling or an existing commercial site may present unusual difficulties in complying with the current requirements. Therefore, the County may grant administrative relief in the event of these situations and proposals.
Administrative Relief

Policies (cont’d)

3. The County shall attempt to balance the reasonable use of such a lot with the provisions of required landscaping. This balance will be affected by the site’s characteristics, as well as the proposed development plan.

4. The County recognizes in order to allow reasonable development, there should be an upper limit to the amount of the site, which is required to be landscaped. As a general guideline for relatively small commercial or industrial lots (1 acre or less), the requirements should not exceed 25% of the site.
Analysis

• Administrative relief is driven by a desire to create flexibility and expedited review option
• Flexibility difficult with a one-size-fits-all regulation
• Both administrative relief and variances in general deserve discussion. How much flexibility is really appropriate?
Option 2 for redevelopment site
Recommendation

- Revisit the policy and replace with an Alternative Compliance option
  - Enhanced, objective criteria
  - "If then" situational standards
  - Based on physical hardships, factual
  - Limit to specific project types
  - Continue to provide approval to minor changes without a BOA variance request
DATE OF STUDY SESSION: December 15th, 2015

SUBJECT: Synergy Oil and Gas Discussion and Rulemaking Update

FROM: Norman Wright, Director of Community and Economic Development

AGENCY/DEPARTMENT: Community and Economic Development

ATTENDEES: Norman Wright, Kristin Sullivan, Jen Rutter

PURPOSE OF ITEM: To provide information and status update on current projects/activities

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: No recommendation; this is a status update

BACKGROUND:

In the arena of Oil and Gas operations, two major activities are of particular interest to the County: the potential application for a Large UMA Facility known as “Wadley Farm”, which is a project under development by Synergy Resources Corporation and the COGCC rulemaking hearings that have been underway since November. Both activities have potential impact to the County and both are still very much in a state of development where information changes frequently and no certain outcomes are known.

As a result, staff from the Community and Economic Development department will provide an update with the latest information on both fronts. In summary, there is no new information regarding the Wadley Farm submittal as of October 3rd when a Study Session was last held on the topic. Meanwhile, with the COGCC rulemaking hearings, the only update thus far is that of the seven topics under consideration, only two have been fully vetted at this point. Additional hearings are being scheduled for December 7th and a time-to-be-determined in mid-January. Staff will provide brief notes on what has been discussed thus far. No official actions have been taken.

AGENCIES, DEPARTMENTS OR OTHER OFFICES INVOLVED:

Community and Economic Development

ATTACHED DOCUMENTS:

There are no attachments
**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Either mark X ☒ if there is no fiscal impact or provide the following information for the recommended action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund(s):</th>
<th>Cost center(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-generated / dedicated revenues:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual operating costs:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual net operating (cost) / income:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital costs:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure included in approved operating budget:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure included in approved capital budget:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New FTEs requested:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Note:**

There is no fiscal impact. This is an update on existing legislative and regulatory efforts.

**APPROVAL SIGNATURES:**

Todd Leopold, County Manager

Raymond H. Gonzales, Deputy County Manager

Ed Finger, Deputy County Manager

**APPROVAL OF FISCAL IMPACT:**

[Zhang Dun] Budget / Finance