

A REPORT OF THE 1983
LOCAL LAND USE SURVEY

July, 1983

Background

The Colorado Division of Local Government and the Colorado Land Use Commission have continued the practice of periodically conducting a land use survey of Colorado municipalities and counties. The purpose of the survey is to monitor the status and progress of local government land use planning and regulations. The last survey was conducted in 1981, by the Colorado Division of Planning, in cooperation with the Colorado Land Use Commission and the Colorado Department of Agriculture. The first survey was conducted in 1976 by the Colorado Land Use Commission.

In March 1983, the Division of Local Government, in conjunction with the Colorado Land Use Commission, resurveyed all Colorado counties and municipalities. A follow-up questionnaire was sent to non-responding localities in May 1983. Copies of the county and municipal survey questionnaires are attached to this report as Exhibits A and B, respectively.

Introduction

The survey questionnaire was distributed to a total of 329 localities, encompassing 62 counties (the City and County of Denver was counted as a municipality) and 267 municipalities. A total of 281 localities responded for a combined response rate of 85 percent. The response rate for counties was 92 percent, and it was 84 percent for municipalities. Only 5 counties and 43 municipalities failed to respond.

Survey Results

An Adopted Comprehensive Plan:

All localities were asked whether they had an adopted comprehensive or master plan. For a summary of county and municipal plans and regulations see Charts I and II at the back of this report. The survey results were as follows:

An Adopted Plan

LOCALITY	YES		NO	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Counties	41	(72)	16	(28)
Municipalities	121	(54)	103	(46)
All localities	162	(58)	119	(42)

A clear majority of the responding municipalities and nearly three-quarters of the responding counties reported to have adopted a comprehensive or master

plan. A further 44 percent of the responding counties and 11 percent of the responding municipalities without an adopted plan have adopted one or more elements of a plan. Furthermore, 5 of 16 counties and 36 of 103 municipalities without an adopted comprehensive plan have a plan in progress. Therefore, 80 percent of the responding counties and 70 percent of the responding municipalities either have adopted or have in progress a comprehensive plan.

Adopted County Regulations:

A portion of the questionnaire surveyed the land use related regulations adopted by counties. Charts I and II at the back of the report show a summary of the results, county by county, including a breakdown of 1041 items. The survey results on county regulations were as follows:

Adopted County Regulations

ITEM	YES	NO
	No. (%)	No. (%)
Zoning ordinance	46 (80)	11 (20)
Subdivision regulations	57 (100)	0 (0)
Building code	36 (63)	21 (37)
PUD provisions	43 (75)	14 (25)
Transmission line		
siting regulations	29 (51)	28 (49)
H.B. 1041 regulations	36 (63)	21 (37)
Non-H.B. 1041 natural		
hazard regulations	37 (65)	20 (35)

The results show that over three-fourths of the counties have zoning regulations and PUD provisions, and nearly two-thirds have a building code, H.B. 1041 regulations and non H.B. 1041 natural hazards regulations. A majority of the counties have transmission line siting regulations and as a result of S.B. 35 of 1971, all counties have subdivision regulations. The survey results demonstrate that the counties employ these items extensively to regulate their land use matters.

Adopted County Policies:

The county questionnaire surveyed county agricultural preservation and subdivision exemption policies with the following results:

Adopted County Policies

ITEM	YES	NO
	No. (%)	No. (%)
Agricultural land or water retention policies	19 (33)	38 (67)
Water or sewer line ex- tension policies in agricultural areas	11 (20)	46 (80)
Policies for the granting of subdivision exemptions under S.B. 35	45 (79)	12 (21)

Approximately one-third of the responding counties have adopted policies on the retention of agricultural land or water for agricultural purposes, while one-fifth have adopted policies concerning the extension of water or sewer lines into agricultural areas. Since there is no statutory requirement for such policies, the counties have taken the initiative in responding to a locally perceived need.

Colorado statute (30-28-101, CRS 1973) enables counties to exempt from subdivision review certain lands. Over three-fourths of the counties have taken advantage of this statute by adopting exemption policies rather than granting ad hoc exemptions.

Adopted Municipal Regulations:

Chart III at the back of this report indicates a municipality by municipality breakdown of surveyed land use regulations. A summary of municipally adopted land use regulations is presented here:

Adopted Municipal Regulations

ITEM	YES		NO	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Zoning Ordinance	167	(75)	57	(25)
Subdivision regulations	135	(59)	91	(41)
Building code	181	(81)	43	(19)
PUD provisions	108	(48)	116	(52)
H.B. 1041 regulations	15	(7)	209	(93)
Non-H.B. 1041 natural hazard regulations	96	(43)	128	(57)
Other non H.B. 1041 regulations	29	(13)	195	(87)
Policies or plans for retention of agricultural land and water	15	(7)	209	(93)

According to the survey results, municipalities seem to utilize the land use tools of zoning ordinances and building codes to a large extent, while approximately one-half have a PUD provision. The number of municipalities with adopted subdivision regulations is considerable, given that adoption of such regulations at the municipal level is voluntary. The survey indicates that only a very few municipalities utilize H.B. 1041 regulations; however, a large number of municipalities utilize other means to regulate natural hazard matters. Nearly one-half of the municipalities have some regulation dealing with this matter. Floodplain regulations are clearly used by these municipalities as shown on the municipality by municipality breakdown on Chart III at the back of this report.

An Adopted Capital Improvements Plan:

All localities were asked whether they have adopted a capital improvements plan or multi-year capital improvements budget. Charts I and III at the back of this

report show a respective breakdown of county and municipal results on a locality by locality basis. A summary of the survey results is as follows:

An Adopted Capital Improvements Plan

LOCALITY	YES	NO
	No. (%)	No. (%)
Counties	16 (28)	41 (72)
Municipalities	76 (34)	148 (66)
All localities	92 (33)	189 (67)

The results indicate that counties utilize a capital improvements plan to a lesser extent than municipalities. Although one-third of all localities make use of a capital improvements plan, further study could show a larger percentage of use by the more populated localities.

Interjurisdictional Agreements:

Colorado statute enables local governments to enter into interjurisdictional agreements for a multitude of functions. The survey results show the number and percent of responding localities that have entered into land use related agreements.

Interjurisdictional Agreements

LOCALITY	YES	NO
	No. (%)	No. (%)
Counties	25 (44)	32 (56)
Municipalities	43 (19)	181 (81)
All localities	68 (24)	213 (76)

The survey results show that Colorado general purpose governments have made only limited use of interjurisdictional agreements. More than twice as large a percentage of counties as municipalities have taken advantage of this management tool. Most of this difference is accounted for by county agreements with federal agencies for the mutual review of plans. The county agreements were typically between a county and federal agencies or a municipality; the municipal agreements were typically with a county or a neighboring special district.

Planning Services:

The survey contained questions regarding the source of planning services, including whether the locality had a professional planner and whether the locality had allocated money in their budget for planning services. Charts I and III at the back of this report indicate some detail on these two matters. Summaries of these matters follow:

Professional Planner

LOCALITY	YES	NO
	No. (%)	No. (%)
Counties	39 (68)	18 (32)
Municipalities	83 (37)	141 (63)
All localities	122 (43)	159 (57)

The survey results indicate that approximately two-thirds of responding counties and one-third of the responding municipalities employ one or more professional planners or a professional planning consultant. The discrepancy between the two is probably due to the disproportionate representation of small municipalities among the responding towns. It appears that localities with larger populations tend to devote a greater share of resources to planning than ones with a smaller population.

Many localities receive planning assistance from councils of governments (COG) and regional planning commissioners (RPC). Below are the results of a question concerning assistance received from COGs or RPCs.

COG or RPC Planning Assistance

LOCALITY	YES	NO
	No. (%)	No. (%)
Counties	25 (44)	32 (56)
Municipalities	77 (34)	147 (66)
All localities	102 (36)	179 (64)

The results show that counties are more likely to receive assistance from COGs or RPCs than municipalities; however, over one-third of all localities appear to utilize a COG or RPC for planning assistance.

Stephen Ellis
June 30, 1983

Attachments

COUNTY PLANS/REGULATIONS
June, 1983

[illegible]

COUNTY PLANS/REGULATIONS (cont)

COUNTY	COMP PLAN/YEAR	ZONING	SUBDIVISION RECS	BUILDING CODE	ELECTRIC TRANS SITE	PUD	CIP	1041 RECS	OTHER RECS	INTER-GOV AGREEMENT	STAFF	BUDGET (in thousands)
Grand	'70	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	3	100.
Gunnison	'77	X	X	X				X	X	X	1	51.
Hinsdale		X	X	X		X			X		0	0.
Huerfano	'63	X	X	X	X	X		X			1	15.
Jackson	'68	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	1	35.
Jefferson	'80	X	X	X		X		X	X		22	922.6
Kiowa												
Kit Carson	'77		X						X		5	0.
Lake	'80	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		0	1.5
La Plata	'80		X	X		X		X	X	X	3	71.5
Larimer	'78	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	104	332.6
Las Animas	'78	X	X	X	X	X			X		1	32.5
Lincoln		X	X		X	X	X	X	X		0	8.7
Logan	'78	X	X		X	X	X		X		2	30.
Mesa	'82	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	16	150.
Mineral	'77	X	X			X			X		1	16.3
Moffat	'82	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	3	93.
Montezuma			X		X	X	X	X	X	X	3	50.
Montrose		X	X	X				X			2	
Morgan		X	X		X	X		X	X		1	25.
Otero	'76	X	X	X		X		X	X		3	58.
Ouray		X	X	X		X			X	X	2	6.
Park	'75	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	1	10.
Phillips		X	X		X	X		X			14	12.
Pitkin	'66	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8	125.
Prowers		X	X	X					X		0	25.

COUNTY PLANS/REGULATIONS (cont)

COUNTY	COMP PLAN/YEAR	ZONING	SUBDIVISION RECS	BUILDING CODE	ELECTRIC TRANS SITE	PUD	CIP	1041 RECS	OTHER RECS	INTER-GOV AGREEMENT	STAFF	BUDGET (in thousands)
Pueblo	'80	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	5	166.6
Rio Blanco	'76	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	1	
Rio Grande		X	X			X		X			1	21.3
Routt	'81	X	X	X	X	X		X			6	156.
Saguache			X		X	X		X	X	X	2	35.
San Juan	'74		X	X				X	X		2	10.
San Miguel	'78	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	2½	42.
Sedgwick	'70	X	X			X					1	9.
Summit	'81	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	5	153.8
Teller	'76	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	1	27.
Washington	'82	X	X					X	X		0	.2
Weld	'73	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		6½	175.
Yuma			X					X	X		1	2.

COUNTY 1041/OTHER NATURAL HAZARD REGULATIONS

1041 REGULATIONS																			OTHER REGULATIONS
COUNTY	HISTORICAL/ARCHAEOLOGICAL/ NATURAL AREAS	GEOLOGICAL HAZARDS	FLOOD HAZARDS	WILDFIRE HAZARDS	SITE SELECTION/ WATER AND SEWER SYSTEMS	SITE SELECTION/ SOLID WASTE	SITE SELECTION/ AIRPORTS	SITE SELECTION/ HIGHWAYS	SITE SELECTION/ MAJOR FACILITIES/ PUBLIC UTILITIES	NEW COMMUNITIES	WILDLIFE HABITAT	NUCLEAR DETONATIONS	AVAILANCIE AREAS	MINERAL RESOURCE AREAS	SUBSIDENCE AREAS	EXPANSIVE SOILS AREAS	STEEP SLOPES	USE OF WATER PROJECTS	SITE SELECTION/ HAZ TRANSIT
Adams																			Floodplain, mineral conservation
Alamosa		X		X							X								Sewage system, road sign, mobile home regs
Arapahoe																			Floodplain
Archuleta																			Building permit regs
Baca																			Dev. activities regs (early warning)
Bent																			Floodplain, trailer park specs
Boulder										X									Floodplain
Chaffee		X	X	X										X					
Chevenne																			
Clear Creek		X	X																
Conejos																			
Costilla																			Floodplain
Crowley		X	X											X					
Custer		X	X							X						X			
Delta									X										Floodplain
Denver																			
Dolores																			Mobile home parks
Douglas			X				X												Airport influence area
Eagle																			
Elbert																			
El Paso																			Floodplain, slopes, landslides, subdiv. criteria manual
Fremont																			Floodplain
Garfield																			Floodplain, fiscal impact mitigation
Gilpin																			
Grand					X														Minor subdiv. regs
Gunnison		X		X						X		X	X						Floodplain, agriculture areas
Hinsdale																			Floodplain, avalanche
Huerfano		X	X	X	X					X				X					
Jackson																			Mineral resource, wildlife, geologic, floodplain
Jefferson		X		X			X							X	X	X	X		Floodplain, oil & gas abandonment, abandoned landfills, methane standards, land dev. guidelines, industrial radiation

COUNTY 1041/OTHER NATURAL HAZARD REGULATIONS (cont)

1041 REGULATIONS																			OTHER REGULATIONS	
COUNTY	HISTORICAL/ARCHAEOLOGICAL NATURAL AREAS	GEOLOGICAL HAZARDS	FLOOD HAZARDS	WILDFIRE HAZARDS	SITE SELECTION/ WATER AND SEWER SYSTEMS	SITE SELECTION/ SOLID WASTE	SITE SELECTION/ AIRPORTS	SITE SELECTION/ HIGHWAYS	SITE SELECTION/ MAJOR FACILITIES/ PUBLIC UTILITIES	NEW COMMUNITIES	WILDLIFE HABITAT	NUCLEAR DETONATIONS	AVAILABILITY AREAS	MINERAL RESOURCE AREAS	SUBSIDENCE AREAS	EXPANSIVE SOILS AREAS	STEEP SLOPES	USE OF WATER PROJECTS	SITE SELECTION/ MASS TRANSIT	
Kiowa	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Kit Carson																				Floodplain
Lake			X										X	X						Hazard areas, preserve open space, mobile home, trailer res.
LaPlata		X												X						Floodplain
Larimer																				Geologic haz., flood- plain, wildfire, mobile home, fire code
Las Animas																				Floodplain
Lincoln		X	X													X				Building permits Expansive soil & rock, floodplain
Logan																				Exemption policy
Mesa																				Geologic haz., flood- plain, wildfire, mineral resources
Mineral																				
Moffat																				Floodplain
Monteruma									X											Floodplain
Montrose							X													Floodplain
Morgan									X											Floodplain
Otero			X																	
Ouray																				Mobile home, RV. and campsite res.
Park				X							X									
Phillips			X				X				X									
Pickin	X	X	X	X							X									Land use code, scenic qual., growth manage- ment, timesharing
Prowers																				Floodplain, fragile land
Pueblo	X	X	X	X	X				X					X						Floodplain
Rio Blanco																				
Rio Grande		X												X						
Routt					X						X									
Saguache		X		X					X					X						Floodplain, sewage disposal
San Juan		X	X	X							X		X	X						Sign code, mobile homes, camper park
San Miguel									X											Floodplain impact
Sedgwick																				
Summit					X				X											Floodplain, road and bridge res.
Teller		X		X																Floodplain
Washington									X											
Weld		X	X				X													Mineral extract
Yuma			X						X		X									Flood damage prevention ord., economically sensitive areas

CHART III

MUNICIPAL PLANS/REGULATIONS
June, 1983

MUNICIPALITIES	COMP PLAN/YEAR	CIP	ZONING	SUBDIVISION RECS	BUILDING CODE	PUD	INTER-GOV AGREEMENT	STAFF	BUDGET (in thousands)	1041 RECS	NON 1041 RECS	OTHER RECS
Aguilar	'80		X		X			0	0			
Akron			X		X			0	0		Floodplain	
Alamosa	'82	X	X	X	X		X	0	20.			
Alma												
Antronico					X			0	0			
Arriba								0	0			
Arvada	'73	X	X	X	X	X	X	18	504.5		Floodplain	
Aspen	'66	X	X	X	X	X	X	8	250.		Floodplain	Green line view plane
Ault			X	X	X	X		0	0			
Aurora	'83	X	X	X	X	X	X	23	916.2			
Avon			X	X	X			1	66.			
Basalt	'82		X	X	X	X	X	0	0		Floodplain	Water rights ded. ordinance
Bavfield	'82	X		X	X			6	12.5		Floodplain	Mobile home
Bennett	'82	X	X		X	X	X	0	2.		Floodplain	
Berthoud	'81		X	X	X	X	X	9	4.			
Berhune								0	0			
Black Hawk			X		X	X		1	1.6			
Blanca												
Blue River			X		X	X	X	0	0			
Bonanza City												
Boone		X		X			X	0	0		Floodplain	Mobile home
Boulder	'58	X	X	X	X	X	X	20	600.		Floodplain	
Box Mar	'58		X		X			0	0			
Branson								0	0			
Breckenridge	'78	X	X	X	X	X	X	5	200.			
Brighton	'82		X	X	X	X		1	40.		Floodplain	
Brookside								0	0			
Broomfield	'73	X	X	X	X	X		24	98.		Floodplain	
Brush City	'76		X	X	X	X		1	0		Floodplain	
Buena Vista	'81	X	X	X	X	X		0	1.		FEHA	
Burlington												
Calhan								0	0			
Campo								0	0			
Canon City	'80	X	X	X	X	X	X	1	9.6		Floodplain	

MUNICIPAL PLANS/REGULATIONS (cont)

MUNICIPALITIES	COMP PLAN/YEAR	CIP	ZONING	SUBDIVISION REGS	BUILDING CODE	PUD	INTER-GOV AGREEMENT	STAFF	BUDGET (in thousands)	1041 REGS	NON 1041 REGS	OTHER REGS
Carbondale	'76		X	X	X	X		1	24.		floodplain, geo. hazards	Energy manage- ment
Castle Rock	'80	X	X	X	X	X	X	1	36.2	Floodplains, Nat.haz.(slope)	Floodplain	
Cedaredge		X						0	0			
Center	'74		X		X			0	0			
Central City	'75	X	X		X	X		8	3.		Floodplains, landslide	
Cheraw								0	0			
Cherry Hills Vll												
Cheyenne Wells		X			X			0	0			
Coal Creek					X			0	0			
Cokedale								0	0			
Collbran												
Colorado Spgs	'75	X	X	X	X	X		23	650.		Slope mining	
Columbine Vll.	'80	X	X	X	X	X		0	6.		Floodplain	
Commerce City	'77	X	X	X	X	X		5	186.	Air quality, Water quality	Floodplain	Growth, land use
Corral	'73	X	X	X	X	X		0	.1		Floodplain	Metro thorough- fare
Craig	'76	X	X	X	X	X		0	0		Open space haz.	
Crawford		X			X			1	18.			
Creede		X	X		X			1	1.5		Unstable terrain, floodplain	
Crested Butte	'75	X	X		X			1	15.			Historic guides
Crestone		X	X		X			0	0			
Cripple Creek	'71	X	X		X			0	0			
Crook					X			0	0		Floodplain	
Crowley												
Dacona	'77		X	X	X	X		0	1.2		Floodplain	Subsidence
DeBeque												
Deer Trail		X						0	0			
Del Norte												
Delta	'81	X	X	X	X	X		1	25.		Floodplain	
Denver	'75	X	X	X	X	X		23	850.		Floodplain	
Dillon	'83		X	X	X	X		2	17.8			
Dinosaur			X		X			0	0			
Dolores	'79	X	X	X	X	X		0	0		Floodplain	
Dove Creek			X					1	2.			
Durango	'72		X	X	X	X	X	4	102.		Floodplain	
Eads								0	0			
Eagle	'76	X	X	X	X	X	X	1	2.		Floodplain	

MUNICIPAL PLANS/REGULATIONS (cont)

MUNICIPALITIES	COMP PLAN/YEAR	CIP	ZONING	SUBDIVISION RECS	BUILDING CODE	PUD	INTER-GOV AGREEMENT	STAFF	BUDGET (in thousands)	1041 RECS	NON 1041 RECS	OTHER RECS
Eaton			X	X	X	X		0	0		Floodplain	
Eckley	'79		X		X			0	0			
Edgewater												
Elizabeth	'79		X		X	X		0	0		Floodplain	
Empire		X	X	X	X	X		0	0	Watershed ordinance		
Englewood	'69	X	X	X	X		X	4	326.6	Geological hazard, solid waste	Flood ins. reg.	
Erie	'76		X	X	X	X		0	4.6			
Estes Park	'78		X	X	X	X		.1	6.5		Floodplain	Develop. plans, Spec. review for hospitals, nursing homes, amusements
Evans			X	X	X	X		0	4.4		Floodplain	
Fairplay			X		X	X		0	0		Floodplain	
Federal Heights	'75	X	X	X	X	X		0	35.		Floodplain	
Firestone			X	X	X			0	0		Floodplain	
Flagler	'76	X	X					0	0			
Fleming												
Florence												
Fort Collins	'67	X	X	X	X	X	X	124	287.		Floodplain	Land dev. guide
Fort Lupton	'68		X	X	X			0	0		Floodplain	
Fort Morgan			X	X	X	X	X	0	0			
Fountain			X	X	X			0	0			
Fowler			X	X				0	0			
Fraser	'80		X	X	X	X		2	7.			
Frederick	'78		X	X	X			0	0		Floodplain	
Frisco	'81	X	X	X	X		X	1	150.5		Water and sewer, FEMA	
Fruits												
Garden City		X			X			0	0			
Genoa								0	0			
Georgetown												
Gilcrest			X		X		X	1	2.			
Glendale	'73		X	X	X	X		0	0			
Glenwood Spgs	'81	X	X	X	X	X	X	2	70.		Floodplain	
Golden		X	X	X	X	X		11	109.		Floodplain, slope, landslide	
Granada												
Granby		X	X	X	X			.4				
Grand Junction		X	X	X	X	X	X	8	210.		Floodplain, geo. hazard	
Grand Lake			X	X	X	X		.4	10.			

MUNICIPAL PLANS/REGULATIONS (cont)

MUNICIPALITIES	COHP PLAN/YEAR	CIP	ZONING	SUBDIVISION RECS	BUILDING CODE	PUD	INTER-GOV AGREEMENT	STAFF	BUDGET (in thousands)	1041 RECS	NON 1041 RECS	OTHER RECS
Grand Valley	'81		X	X	X	X		1	15.			
Greeley	'71	X	X	X	X	X		5	144.5			
Green Mtn Falls	'82		X	X	X	X		0	0		Floodplain	
Greenwood Vll.	'71		X	X	X	X			49.		Floodplain	
Grover			X		X			0	0			
Gunnison	'64		X	X	X	X		1-1/3	45.5		Floodplain	
Gypsum			X	X	X	X		0	0		Floodplain	
Hartman								0	0			
Haswell												
Haxtun					X			0	0			
Havden			X	X	X	X		0	0		Floodplain	
Hillrose												
Holly		X						0	0		Floodplain	
Holyoke	'64		X	X	X			1	0		Floodplain	
Hooper												
Hot Sulphur Spgs			X		X			0	0			
Hotchkiss		X			X			1	18.			
Hudson	'78		X					0	.5			
Hugo			X		X			0	0		Floodplain	
Idaho Springs												
Ignacio												
Iliff												
Jamestown	'81				X		X	0	0			
Johnstown	'72		X	X	X	X	X	0	0			
Julesburg			X		X			0	0			
Keenesburg	'72		X	X	X	X		0	0			
Keota								0	0			
Kersey	'78		X	X	X	X		0	0			
Kim								0	0			
Kiowa			X		X			0	0			
Kit Carson								0	0			
Kremmling	'63		X	X	X			0	0			
La Jara	'77		X	X	X			0	0			
La Junta	'69	X	X	X	X		X	0	40.		Floodplain	
La Salle	'78		X	X	X	X		0	0			
La Veta			X		X			0	0			

MUNICIPAL PLANS/REGULATIONS (cont)

MUNICIPALITIES	COMP PLAN/YEAR	CIP	ZONING	SUBDIVISION REGS	BUILDING CODE	PUD	INTER-GOV AGREEMENT	STAFF	BUDGET (in thousands)	1041 REGS	NON 1041 REGS	OTHER REGS
Lafayette	'81	X	X	X	X	X		3	60.	Subsidence		
Lake City												
Lakeside												
Lakewood	'73	X	X	X	X	X		9	409.		Flood Manage- ment Ordinance	Neighborhood activity ctrns., major street plan
Lamar	'68		X	X	X			0	0		Bldg. elevations, floodplain	
Larkspur			X	X	X	X		0	0			
Las Animas			X	X	X			0	0			
Leadville					X			0	0			
Limón	'68		X	X	X			0	0			
Littleton												
Lochbuie			X	X	X	X		1	1.5			
Log Lane Village			X		X			0	0			
Longmont	'74	X	X	X	X	X		4	116.		Floodplain	
Louisville	'73	X	X	X	X	X	X	2	80.	Geological hazard	Floodplain	
Loveland	'82		X	X	X	X	X	2	133.	Oil & gas wells, sand & gravel	Floodplain	
Lyons	'76		X	X	X	X		1	20.		Floodplain	
Manassa	'74				X			0	0			
Mancos	'78		X	X	X	X		0	0		Floodplain	
Manitou Springs	'74		X	X	X	X		0	0			
Manzanola		X	X					0	0			
Marble			X		X			0	0			
Mead	'79		X	X	X	X		1	1.	Land use		
Meeker	'80	X	X	X	X	X	X	2	50.8			Mobile home
Merino			X		X			0	0			
Milliken			X	X	X			0	0		Floodplain	
Minturn			X		X			0	0			
Moffat		X						0	0			
Monte Vista	'80	X	X	X	X	X		0	0		Floodplain	
Montrose	'78		X	X	X	X	X	1	24.		Floodplain	
Monument			X	X	X	X		1	2.			
Morrison	'75	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0		Floodplain	
Mt. Crested Butte			X	X	X	X	X	1	19.			Land use guide
Mountain View			X		X			0	0			
Naturita					X			0	0		Flood insurance	
Nederland	'78	X	X	X	X	X		1	4.		Mining, floodplain	

MUNICIPAL PLANS/REGULATIONS (cont)

MUNICIPALITIES	CONF PLAN/YEAR	CIP	ZONING	SUBDIVISION	BUILDING CODE	PUD	INTER-GOV AGREEMENT	STAFF	BUDGET (in thousands)	1041 REGS	NON 1041 REGS	OTHER REGS
New Castle	'82		X		X	X		1	17.			
Northglenn	'72	X	X	X	X	X		3	153.3		Floodplain	Landscape, soil disturbance and grading
Norwood			X	X	X			1	17.			
Nucola					X			0	0			
Numm			X		X			0	0			
Oak Creek	'80	X			X			0	0			
Olathe	'78		X	X	X			2	.5		Floodplain	Sewer extension
Olney Springs	'82		X	X	X			0	0	Floodplain	Floodplain	
Oohir			X		X			0	0			Mobile home
Orchard City		X		X				0	0			
Ordway	'79		X	X	X	X		0	0		Floodplain	
Otis					X			0	0			
Ouray												
Ovid								0	0			
Panosa Springs												
Palisade	'81		X	X	X	X		0	0		Floodplain	
Palmer Lake	'82		X	X	X	X		1	0		Flood insurance, Floodplain	
Paoli			X					0	0			
Paoni	'83	X	X	X	X	X	X	1			Slopes, floodplain	Sign ordinance, mobile home
Parker			X	X	X	X	X	1				Sign code
Peetz								0	0			
Pierce	'76		X	X	X			0	0			
Pitkin												
Platteville	'80		X	X	X	X	X	0	0			
Poncha Springs								0	0			
Pritchett												
Prospect Hts					X			0	0			
Pueblo	'80	X	X	X	X	X	X	10	192.		Water & sewer ext., floodplain	
Ramah		X						0	0			
Rangely	'76	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	1		Floodplain	Mobile home
Ravner												
Red Cliffs					X			0	0			
Rico								0	0			
Ridgway												
Rifle	'81	X	X	X	X	X		2	70.		Floodplain	Sign, mobile home, dev. code
Rockvale			X	X	X	X		0	0		Floodplain	

MUNICIPAL PLANS/REGULATIONS (cont)

MUNICIPALITIES	COMP PLAN/YEAR	CLP	ZONING	SUBDIVISION REGS	BUILDING CODE	PUD	INTER-COV AGREEMENT	STAFF	BUDGET (in thousands)	1041 REGS	NON 1041 REGS	OTHER REGS
Rocky Ford	'67	X	X	X	X		X	0	0		Floodplain	
Romeo								0	0			
Rosedale		X			X			0	0			
Rye								0	0			
Saguache	'74						X	0	0			
Salida												
San Luis								0	0			
Sanford												
Savoie			X		X			0	0			
Sedwick	'76	X	X	X	X	X		2			Floodplain	
Seibert												
Severance	'78		X	X	X	X		1	1			
Sheridan Lake								0	0			
Sheridan City	'78	X	X	X	X	X		0	0	Mining, floodplain		
Silt	'82		X	X	X	X		1	26.3			
Silver Cliff												
Silver Plume												
Silverthorne	'79		X	X	X	X	X	3	122.3		Floodplain	
Silverton	'74		X	X	X	X		2	10.		Floodplain	Sign code, mobile homes, trailer parks
Simla					X			0	0			
Snowmass	'78		X	X	X	X		2.5	77.			
Springfield	'69	X	X	X		X		0	0			
Starkville												
Steamboat Sprs	'81	X	X	X	X	X		4	220.6		404/202 permits, wetlands	
Sterling			X	X	X			1	36.		Floodplain	
Stratton												
Sugar City								0	0			
Superior	'75	X	X	X	X	X		1/2	1		Floodplain	
Swink			X		X			0	0			
Telluride	'75		X	X	X	X	X	1/2	14.5	Flood and geologic haz.	Historic and architecture	
Thornton	'75		X	X	X	X		5	162.5	Mineral resource, historic, water/ & sewer, nat. haz., transport.	Floodplain	Arch. review, landscape, public lands
Timnath			X	X				0	0			
Trinidad												
Two Buttes								0	0			
Vail		X	X	X	X	X	X	4	225.		Slope, avalanche, floodplain	Design review

MUNICIPAL PLANS/REGULATIONS (cont)

MUNICIPALITIES	COMP PLAN/YEAR	CIP	ZONING	SUBDIVISION RECS	BUILDING CODE	PUD	INTER-GOV AGREEMENT	STAFF	BUDGET (in thousands)	1041 RECS	NON 1041 RECS	OTHER RECS
Victor City												
Vilas								0	0			
Vona												
Walden	'76	X		X	X	X		1	2.8		Floodplain	Annexation
Walsenburg	'72		X	X	X	X		0	0		Floodplain	
Walsh								0	0			
Ward				X	X			0	0			
Wellington												
Westcliffe												
Westminster	'58	X	X	X	X	X		6	178.1		Floodplain	Growth management
Wheat Ridge	'76		X	X	X	X		54	161.	Gravel resource	Floodplain	
Wiggins												
Wiley												
Williamburg			X	X	X			0	0			
Windsor	'73		X	X	X	X	X	0	2			
Winter Park	'80	X	X	X	X	X		3	56.		Floodplain	Street cut regs. sign ord., impact fee
Woodland Park	'69	X	X	X	X	X		1	27.		Floodplain	Eng. specs
Wray	'78		X	X	X			0	0		Floodplain	
Yampa	'80		X	X	X	X		0	0		Floodplain	
Yuma	'79	X	X	X	X			1	1.	Airport clear zones		