

Memorandum

Date: February 5, 2026
To: Douglas County Board of County Commissioners
Through: Douglas J. DeBord, County Manager
From: Kati Carter, AICP, Director of Community Development
CC: Brett Thomas, AICP, Chief Planner
Curtis J. Weitkunat, AICP, Long Range Planning Manager
Steven E. Koster, AICP, Assistant Director of Planning Services
Subject: **Sterling Ranch Planned Development, 15th Amendment**
Project File: **ZR2025-014**

Planning Commission Hearing:	January 12, 2026 @ 6:00 p.m.
Board of County Commissioners Hearing Continued:	January 27, 2026 @ 2:30 p.m.
Board of County Commissioners Hearing:	February 10, 2026 @ 2:30 p.m.

The attached correspondence was received after the addendum to the staff report for the Board of County Commissioners was finalized on January 23, 2026.

ATTACHMENTS	PAGE
Applicant Response Letters	2
Home Builders Association	7
Plum Valley Heights HOA	9
Chatfield Community Association.....	12
Public Correspondence	16



February 4, 2025

Brett Thomas, AICP Chief Planner
Douglas County Department of Community Development
100 Third Street
Castle Rock, CO 80104

**Re: Additional Public Comment, Sterling Ranch Planned Development 15th Amendment
Project File # ZR2025-014**

Dear Brett,

Thank you for providing additional Public Comment for the proposed 15th Amendment to the Sterling Ranch Planned Development and offer the following responses:

Plum Valley Heights HOA

COMMENT:

<reference full referral letter for details>

RESPONSE:

Thank you for your additional feedback.

Regarding development timelines and studies. Sterling Ranch is committed to thoughtful and well-planned development. As such, we have been working on land use applications, studies, data collection, and have held numerous community meetings related to this property since 2024. Over the course of these two years, Sterling Ranch has been continuously meeting with stakeholders and the community to obtain feedback and considerations. This included distinct meetings with the Plum Valley Heights HOA in 2024 and the overall Plum Valley Heights community in 2025. Even through 2026, we have continued meeting and corresponding with residents.

Sterling Ranch is also committed to detailed study and research related to the impacts of development. In this multi-year process, we have completed studies to include: a 2050 Transportation Master Plan update to anticipate traffic impacts;



multiple environmental studies to ensure we can develop in-harmony with nature and wildlife; and wildfire assessment studies to be able to mitigate fire risks.

Over the course of this process, we have also been meeting regularly with Douglas County Office of Emergency Management, South Metro Fire Rescue Authority, and One Roxborough – which includes West Metro Fire Rescue. We are committed to prioritizing safety in both the short and the long term.

Regarding traffic concerns, specifically. As Douglas County has updated their 2050 Transportation Master Plan, Sterling Ranch has also updated our 2050 Transportation Master Plan. Doing so has allowed us to be in lockstep with Douglas County when it comes to analyzing current traffic conditions, updating our future traffic forecasts, identifying critical infrastructure improvements, and planning for the funding/construction of those improvements. These studies do indeed take into account the full buildout of the Chatfield Basin and identify the upgrades required to maintain an acceptable Level-of-Service (LOS). The Douglas County 2050 Transportation Master Plan was approved unanimously by the Planning Commission on February 2, 2026.

Between Sub-Areas 1 and 13 of the 2050 TMP, there are over \$288 million of improvements planned for the region. Sterling Ranch is actively contributing its fair-share to these improvements through multiple mechanisms such as fee contributions to the County, infrastructure agreements, and construction scopes. Many of these improvements are in-process or under-construction currently.

Sterling Ranch and Douglas County Engineering staff are confident that we are planning for the future and providing for satisfactory and safe traffic flow in Sterling Ranch and the Chatfield region.

Regarding water and wastewater service concerns. Sterling Ranch meets the requirement for zoning with the Dominion Water and Sanitation Wholesale Water and Wastewater Service Commitment letter for Waterton Business Park which states that Dominion Water and Sanitation District have adequate water and wastewater supply to serve the Waterton Business Park. This has been reviewed by the engineering experts at the Colorado Division of Water Resources with no concerns.



Regarding environmental conditions. The Waterton Business Park property formerly hosted the Chemours–DuPont Facility, which has undergone decades of remediation & corrective action. The site received a Conditional Closure Letter in 2022 from the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE), clearing it for future development. The Conditional Closure – which was compiled and closely reviewed by some of the top environmental scientists in the industry – states that the former contaminants of concern for the site do not pose a threat to human health and environment.

To further safeguard against any environmental concerns, the site is strictly regulated under CDPHE through several measures including a Materials Management Plan (MMP) and a Notice of Environmental Use Restriction (NEUR). Sterling Ranch is subject to ongoing annual monitoring of the site. Additionally, CDPHE is required to be notified prior to any subdivision activity on the property. Indeed, during Sterling Ranch’s ownership, several more environmental testing reports have been initiated in partnership with CDPHE to ensure safety is always prioritized.

On behalf of Sterling Ranch and the project team thank you for your time and consideration. Please feel free to contact me at kevin.johnk@sterlingranchcolorado if you have any questions or need any additional information.

Sincerely,

Kevin Johnk, PE
Director of Entitlements and Engineering
Sterling Ranch Development Company



February 5, 2025

Brett Thomas, AICP Chief Planner
Douglas County Department of Community Development
100 Third Street
Castle Rock, CO 80104

Additional Public Comment, Sterling Ranch Planned Development 15th Amendment
Project File # ZR2025-014

Dear Brett,

Please accept the response to the latest correspondence from the Chatfield Community Association regarding Wastewater Treatment Services for the Sterling Ranch Planned Development 15th Amendment Project File # ZR2025-014.

Applicant Response

The 15th Amendment meets and exceeds 1520.05 and 1503.10 of the Douglas County Zoning Resolution.

The 15th Amendment conforms with Section 18A, Water Supply - Overlay District, of the Zoning Resolution. This new area will be subject to the Sterling Ranch Water Appeal as amended in 2021. All required documents have been submitted.

The County's Water Consultant, Applegate, has reviewed the 15th Amendment and has no concerns.

The Colorado State Water Engineer shared no concerns related to the proposed rezoning: "CDWR will provide comments related to the Sterling Ranch Water Supply at Subdivision." (Colorado Division of Water Resources Referral Letter, January 12, 2026)

The Douglas County Health Department has reviewed the application and shared no concerns after reviewing the provision of sanitation by Dominion.

All documents required have been submitted. They include

- Dominion the wholesale Water and Wastewater, and Sterling Ranch CAB the retail provider, commitment to serve the new land with water and sanitary services.

- Dominion’s Water Supplies Report previously approved by Douglas County Commissioners (2024) No new water supply is necessary with this application.
- Dominion Water And Sanitation District Letter-Re: Water Supply Adequacy and Availability for 15th PD Amendment for Sterling Ranch December 1.2025

At the Preliminary Plan, when we better understand the acreage of land, how much of it is open space, what type of housing, retail or commercial will be included, the State Engineer will review the application and water portfolio and “issue an opinion” on the adequacy of water and wastewater services.

Sincerely,

Susan Beckman

Zoning and Rezoning Director

Sterling Ranch Development Company



HOME BUILDERS
ASSOCIATION
of
METRO DENVER®

January 27, 2026

Douglas County
100 Third Street
Castle Rock, Colorado 80104

Dear Douglas County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners:

The Home Builders Association of Metro Denver (HBA) respectfully submits this letter in support of the Sterling Ranch 15th PD Amendment.

The HBA of Metro Denver represents over 550 homebuilders, developers, remodelers, architects, mortgage lenders, title companies, subcontractors, suppliers, and service providers in the eight metro-area counties we serve. The HBA of Metro Denver represents many builders and developers currently active in Douglas County.

Recent studies by the HBA and the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) identify housing supply and affordability as two of the most pressing challenges facing Colorado. Housing affordability, in particular, remains a critical concern. According to NAHB's latest analysis, 74.9% of U.S. households are unable to afford a median-priced new home in 2025. At a median price of \$459,826 and a 30-year mortgage rate of 6.5%, approximately 100.6 million households are priced out of the market—before accounting for any further increases in home prices or interest rates. NAHB's analysis further shows that for every \$1,000 increase in the median price of a new home, an additional 115,593 households are priced out nationwide. In Colorado, 80.1% of households are currently unable to afford a median-priced new home.

A primary driver of this affordability crisis is a significant shortage of housing supply. The Colorado State Demography Office's 2025 report estimates a statewide housing deficit of approximately 106,000 units.

The Sterling Ranch 15th PD Amendment directly addresses these challenges by facilitating the development of additional housing in Douglas County, including housing types that can help meet the needs of a growing and diverse population. Increasing housing supply is one of the most effective tools available to help stabilize prices, expand homeownership opportunities, and support the local workforce. This amendment represents a thoughtful and proactive step toward addressing the region's housing shortage while maintaining Douglas County's long-term economic vitality. For these reasons, the HBA of

Metro Denver respectfully urges your support and a favorable vote on the Sterling Ranch 15th PD Amendment.

Sincerely,



Ted Leighty
Chief Executive Officer
Home Builders Association of Metro Denver

Plum Valley Heights Homeowners Association

7560 W. Trail South Drive

Littleton, CO 80125

Dear Douglas County Board of County Commissioners,

On behalf of the Plum Valley Heights (PVH) Homeowners Association and the 29 families and homes we represent, we submit this letter for the public record regarding land use actions affecting the Chatfield Basin / Chatfield Master Plan area, including: (1) the County's October 2025 land transfer resulting in 23.8 acres designated for commercial development near Moore Road adjacent to Plum Valley Heights, and (2) the active Sterling Ranch Planned Development Major Amendment 15 request (ZR2025-014), which proposes up to 4,000 additional homes and higher density in the residential areas.

We are writing as a neighborhood focused on public safety. **These actions will have significant impacts on roads, water, and emergency access, and will likely create substantial costs for Douglas County taxpayers.** Together, they increase development intensity in the Moore Road corridor and will directly affect traffic, evacuation conditions, and long-term infrastructure demand for residents across the Chatfield Basin.

We are not opposed to responsible growth, and we recognize Douglas County will continue to develop. **Our request is simple: slow down and ensure that infrastructure, environmental conditions, and emergency planning are evaluated with the rigor a project of this scale requires.**

This feels rushed.

Our concern about speed is based on documented County communication and the pace of subsequent actions. **On August 15, 2025, the Douglas County Department of Community Development (Planning Resources Division) stated in writing that there was "no current land use submittal in place" for the Moore Road parcels** across from PVH. Since then, the land swap and rezoning activity have moved forward at an accelerated pace.

According to the Douglas County rezoning guide, the applicant's average time for the rezoning process is 224 days. As **ZR2025-014 is a Major Amendment involving significant density and complex infrastructure and environmental considerations**, the review timeline should allow for thorough vetting of cumulative impacts—not be compressed into a short window that limits independent analysis and meaningful public understanding.

We want to be clear: we are not assuming bad intent. However, when major land decisions move quickly, the public deserves transparency regarding what is being approved, what safety analysis is being relied upon, what mitigation is required, and cost to Douglas County Taxpayers. Trust requires visibility.

Safety and infrastructure items require independent analysis and review.

Given the combined impact of these actions, the Plum Valley Heights HOA respectfully requests that the Board slow the approval timeline and require independent review and public disclosure in the following areas:

1. Roads, traffic, and emergency evacuation safety:

More homes and commercial activity will increase daily traffic and directly affect emergency response times and evacuation feasibility during emergency and wildfire events. We request a comprehensive Traffic Impact Study (TIS) that includes a Level of Service (LOS) analysis for all primary and secondary egress routes. This study must address peak-hour conditions, school traffic, commercial/delivery traffic, bottlenecks, and—critically—evacuation-specific modeling based on projected future populations at full Sterling Ranch build-out. We also request an enforceable plan identifying required roadway improvements, timing, and funding, with all safety-related improvements completed before additional traffic is introduced.

2. Water supply, sanitation/wastewater capacity, and source transparency:

Growth of this scale requires documented long-term capacity. We request independent, expert-backed documentation confirming long-term water sufficiency and sanitation/wastewater capacity for full build-out scenarios, including required upgrades, timing, and financial responsibility. In addition, for the Moore Road commercial development, residents request a clear answer to a basic question: What water sources will serve this commercial development, and how will long-term supply be guaranteed?

3. Environmental conditions and potential health risk:

Public reporting and a 2023 County-authorized site investigation have identified soil contaminants in nearby areas associated with the former DuPont site, including PFAS (“forever chemicals”), lead, and asbestos-containing materials. Independent verification and plain-language disclosure are essential before major development proceeds near existing neighborhoods. We request independent environmental and soil testing, public disclosure of results, and confirmation that required safeguards and mitigation are defined prior to final approvals.

4. Cost to Douglas County and taxpayers:

Residents are requesting transparency on the full public cost of these actions and the infrastructure they require. Before any final approval, the County should disclose a clear estimate of total costs to Douglas County, including expected public contributions for roads, utilities, and supporting infrastructure, as well as the timing and funding mechanism for those costs. The public deserves to know the extent of the financial burden being placed on taxpayers to facilitate this development.

Request for action.

Before any final decision on ZR2025-014 and actions enabling commercial development near Moore Road adjacent to Plum Valley Heights, the Plum Valley Heights Homeowners Association respectfully requests that the Board:

- **Slow the approval process** to allow for a complete, independent safety, and infrastructure review.

- **Require independent analysis and public disclosure** for traffic/evacuation, environmental conditions, and water/sanitation capacity.
- **Provide transparency into total public costs**, funding mechanisms, and who pays for required infrastructure.
- **Provide written justification for the Moore Road commercial site selection and timing.**
- **Hold a community meeting for impacted neighborhoods** with County and applicant representation to answer questions on the record.

Thank you for your time and service to Douglas County. Please include this letter as part of the permanent public record for ZR2025-014 and the related Moore Road commercial land actions.

Sincerely,

The Plum Valley Heights Homeowners Association

Brett Thomas

From: Chatfield Community Association <chatfieldcommunity@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 1, 2026 10:20 AM
To: Brett Thomas <bthomas@douglas.co.us>
Subject: Referral ZR2025-014 Sterling Ranch Planned Development, 15th Amendment

Caution: This email originated outside the organization. Be cautious with links and attachments.

Brett,

We want to make a clarification on the Sterling Ranch 15th Amendment wastewater treatment services. The county has already approved more units than Dominion can provide services for Sterling Ranch. Dominion has received an approval for a **site location** only. Dominion has **not** received a permit for the wastewater treatment plant.

Andrea Cole, Dominion Water and Sanitation District
Regulation 22 Increase in Design Capacity for an Existing Site Location Approval -
Chatfield Basin Water Reclamation Facility Refurbishment
SA# 226718

January 20, 2026
Page 2 of 3

3. As a result of the project, the following processes will be utilized at the proposed treatment plant:
 - Liquid Process: influent pumping, mechanical screening, grit removal, flow equalization, membrane bioreactor activated sludge treatment, and chlorine disinfection.
 - Solids Process: Waste solids are pumped and treated at the South Platte Renew Water Resource Recovery Facility.
4. All conditions of the original site location application No. 3821 apply except as modified in this approval.

This site location approval does not constitute design approval for construction. In accordance with Regulation 22, Section 22.13(1), in addition to approval of the site location application the applicant must obtain approval of the design of the treatment works from the Division prior to beginning construction.

This site location approval will expire on July 10, 2027. If construction has not commenced by this date, the approval will expire and a new application for site location approval may be required. Construction is defined as entering into a contract for, or for in-house work forces, initiation of any action towards the erection or physical placement of materials, equipment, piping, earthwork or buildings which are to be a part of a domestic wastewater treatment works.

In accordance with Regulation 22, Section 22.4(12), this site location approval is subject to appeal pursuant to the State Administrative Procedures Act.

This approval does not relieve the owner from compliance with all local, state, and federal regulations prior to construction nor from responsibility for proper engineering, construction and operation of the treatment plant.

The following performance requirements must be completed before proceeding to construction and subsequent operation of the treatment plant:

Further, Dominion's present application for the wastewater treatment plant is not adequate to serve the present 12,050, let alone an additional 4000 units. There are many reasons this application should not be approved, but the lack of wastewater services is a critical reason not to approve. Approval not only violates county regulations, but it violates Colorado State and Federal regulations. **This application should be denied.**

Respectfully submitted,

Team CCA

January 20, 2026

Andrea Cole, General Manager
Dominion Water and Sanitation District
9250 E. Costilla Ave, Suite 400
Greenwood Village, CO 80112

Subject: Increase in Design Capacity for an Existing Site Location Approval
Regulation 22 Site Location Approval No. 3821 (226718)
Dominion Water and Sanitation District, Chatfield Basin Water Reclamation Facility Refurbishment
Colorado Discharge Permit System (CDPS) No. CO0041645
Douglas County

Dear Andrea Cole:

The Water Quality Control Division (Division) has received and reviewed the site location application for the Dominion Water and Sanitation District's Chatfield Basin Water Reclamation Facility Refurbishment Project. The current hydraulic and organic capacity ratings for the treatment plant are hydraulic, 0.6 million gallons per day (MGD) and organics 1,200 lbs. BOD₅/day. Site location approval number 3821 was issued for the existing treatment plant in May 1987. The treatment plant is located as follows: The NW and NE 1/4 of the SE 1/4 of Section 34, Township 6S, Range 69W, Douglas County. The treatment plant will continue to discharge to South Platte River.

The site location application has been found to be in conformance with the Water Quality Control Commission's *Site Location and Design Regulations for Domestic Wastewater Treatment Works, 5 CCR 1002-22* (Regulation 22) and is approved. This site location approval addresses the following summary of the proposed design and the associated conditions:

1. Based upon application information, the treatment works will be designed to receive the following:

Hydraulic Design Capacity (Maximum Month Average) - 0.90 million gallons per day (MGD)

Organic Design Capacity (Maximum Month Average) - 2,860 lbs. BOD₅/day

This approval also addresses the following treatment plant modifications/improvements:

- Preliminary Treatment: Refurbish existing coarse screening and grit removal and add a new fine screen.
- Flow Equalization: Repurpose existing aerated sludge storage tank for flow equalization ahead of the secondary treatment process.
- Secondary Treatment: Convert the existing secondary treatment process to a membrane bioreactor activated sludge system for biological nutrient removal and solids separation.
- Chemical Systems: Upgrade existing chemical feed systems to support nutrient removal.
- Solids Management: Pump waste solids generated by the treatment process to a downstream regional facility for treatment and disposal.
- Odor Control: Install odor control system.

2. The treatment works will be designed to achieve effluent limitations at the following outfalls:

- a. South Platte River, in accordance with the *Colorado Discharge Permit System Regulations, 5 CCR 1002-61* (Regulation 61), at the following design capacity:

Maximum Month Average Daily Design Capacity - 0.90 MGD



3. As a result of the project, the following processes will be utilized at the proposed treatment plant:
 - Liquid Process: influent pumping, mechanical screening, grit removal, flow equalization, membrane bioreactor activated sludge treatment, and chlorine disinfection.
 - Solids Process: Waste solids are pumped and treated at the South Platte Renew Water Resource Recovery Facility.
4. All conditions of the original site location application No. 3821 apply except as modified in this approval.

This site location approval does not constitute design approval for construction. In accordance with Regulation 22, Section 22.13(1), in addition to approval of the site location application the applicant must obtain approval of the design of the treatment works from the Division prior to beginning construction.

This site location approval will expire on July 10, 2027. If construction has not commenced by this date, the approval will expire and a new application for site location approval may be required. Construction is defined as entering into a contract for, or for in-house work forces, initiation of any action towards the erection or physical placement of materials, equipment, piping, earthwork or buildings which are to be a part of a domestic wastewater treatment works.

In accordance with Regulation 22, Section 22.4(12), this site location approval is subject to appeal pursuant to the State Administrative Procedures Act.

This approval does not relieve the owner from compliance with all local, state, and federal regulations prior to construction nor from responsibility for proper engineering, construction and operation of the treatment plant.

The following performance requirements must be completed before proceeding to construction and subsequent operation of the treatment plant:

1. The treatment plant design must be based upon the target treatment goals stated in the engineering report "Chatfield Basin Water Reclamation Facility Refurbishment Project" dated December 2025. Changes to the design as a result of a new/renewed permit, permit certification, or a Water Quality Planning Target may require submittal of a request to amend this approval or submittal of a revised site location application.
2. Any discharge from the treatment plant must be covered by a CDPS individual discharge permit or general permit certification which includes the final conditions and discharge limitations that are specific to the treatment plant. A complete application for a new or modified individual discharge permit or general permit certification must be made as soon as possible but at least 180 days prior to the planned date that discharge will commence. Please refer to the [Division's Permit Section web page](#) for specific information about the permitting application process. This condition does not prevent installing/constructing the process improvements once design approval is obtained from the Division.
3. The applicant/owner must be aware that added chemicals included in the treatment process will need to be considered under Regulation 61 and the individual discharge permit or general permit certification. Added treatment chemicals that could significantly change the nature or increase the quantity of pollutants discharged will be evaluated by the Permits Section and may result in additional or modified effluent limitations in the next permitting action. The chemical evaluation process is part of the permit application/routine review and is separate from the site location application and design review, and does not prevent installation/construction of the treatment process once design approval is obtained from the Division. The permittee is encouraged to begin the evaluation and coordinate with the Permits Section as soon as the treatment plan and chemicals are known. Please refer to the [Division's Permit Section web page](#) for specific information about the permitting application and chemical evaluation processes. If the chemical evaluation results in the addition of effluent limitations

and subsequent modification to the treatment process, then an amended site location application may be needed.

The Engineering Section is interested in collecting feedback about your experience during the review process. Please take a moment to fill out our [survey](#).

If you have any questions, please contact J.C. Acuña at either 303-691-4012 or jc.acuna@state.co.us.

Sincerely,

Clayton Moores, P.E.
Engineering Section Manager
Water Quality Control Division
Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment

cc: Evan Bahn, Dominion Water and Sanitation District
Pamela Grover, Dominion Water and Sanitation District
Lisa Dietrich, Dominion Water and Sanitation District
Matthew Reimann, Stantec
Nathan Brown, Stantec
Diane Kielty, Chatfield Watershed Authority
Terence Quinn, Douglas County
Skyler Sicard, Douglas County Health Department
Paul Kim, WQCD Engineering Review Unit Manager
Marty Quinn, WQCD ES Work Group Lead
David Kurz, WQCD ES Lead Wastewater Engineer

Brett Thomas

From: Jodi Messenich <zumasrocks@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2026 12:58 PM
To: BOCC <BOCC@douglas.co.us>
Cc: Brett Thomas <bthomas@douglas.co.us>
Subject: Ammendment 15

Caution: This email originated outside the organization. Be cautious with links and attachments.

Respectfully request that this be added to the Amendment 15 records.

Best,

Jodi Messenich
Founder- Zuma's
7745 Moore Rd
Littleton, CO 80125
720-635-2331
www.zumasrr.com
Book Lessons
<https://zumasrescueranch.as.me>



Dear Commissioner [Last Name],

I am submitting this letter as a **formal objection** to the process used in advancing **Sterling Ranch Planned Development 15th Amendment**, and as a request for a **comprehensive review of Douglas County's land-use policies and procedural safeguards** as they relate to amendments of this magnitude.

Amendment 15 was advanced without adequate public notice, without sufficient time for meaningful review, and without providing affected parties the opportunity to prepare or respond prior to referral. Our organization is a designated referral agency under County procedures; however, we did not receive notice, referral materials, or an opportunity to comment before the application was transmitted to other agencies. This failure represents a material procedural deficiency.

Given the **scale, intensity, and foreseeable impacts** of Amendment 15, the proposal warranted a **new and complete traffic impact study** and a **full reassessment of water resources and infrastructure capacity**. Proceeding without updated technical analyses raises significant concerns regarding compliance with established planning standards, as well as the adequacy of the evidentiary record supporting the amendment.

More broadly, the handling of Amendment 15 exposes systemic weaknesses in the County's current review framework. Accelerated timelines, limited notice, and constrained public comment opportunities effectively impair meaningful participation by citizens and stakeholders. Such conditions create the appearance—and potentially the reality—of a process that disproportionately favors applicants while diminishing the role of public input, contrary to principles of transparency, procedural fairness, and due process.

Land-use amendments of this scope carry long-term consequences for transportation systems, water availability, public services, and quality of life. Accordingly, they require heightened scrutiny, rigorous technical review, and robust public engagement. The County's current procedures, as applied in this instance, failed to meet that standard.

I respectfully request that the Board of County Commissioners:

1. **Suspend further action** on Sterling Ranch Amendment 15;
2. **Require a full, updated impact analysis**, including traffic and water resources;
3. **Initiate a comprehensive assessment** of County land-use policies, notification requirements, referral protocols, and public participation procedures to ensure compliance with best practices and legal standards.

Restoring public confidence requires a transparent, equitable, and defensible process—one that affords all affected parties adequate notice, time, and opportunity to be heard.

Respectfully submitted,

Jodi Messenich

Brett Thomas

From: Jodi Messenich <zumasrocks@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2026 5:53 PM
To: Brett Thomas <bthomas@douglas.co.us>
Subject: Re: Ammendment 15

Caution: This email originated outside the organization. Be cautious with links and attachments.

Brett,

I have several questions regarding the processing of **Sterling Ranch Amendment 15**, and I am requesting written clarification from Planning.

First, why is Planning recommending that Amendment 15 be processed as a **PD amendment** when the **Douglas County Zoning Resolution requires any change to zoning boundaries or the addition of land to be processed as a rezoning**? The regulations are clear on this distinction, and I am asking Planning to explain the legal and procedural basis for deviating from that standard in this case.

Second, why was **public input closed prior to the amendment hearing**? Closing the intake before the hearing creates the appearance of bias and limits meaningful public participation. Given the size, scope, and impacts of this proposal, it would seem appropriate—and less prejudicial—to allow the community every reasonable opportunity to be heard.

Related to this, the fact that Amendment 15 was processed in approximately **28 days over the holiday period** is already concerning. Being notified that documents submitted after an early cutoff will not be considered further compounds that concern. Many working residents with families simply do not have the ability to absorb and respond to complex land-use applications on an accelerated, holiday-driven timeline.

Additionally, limiting public testimony to **two minutes per speaker**, while allowing the applicant unlimited time to present, creates an inherently unbalanced process. Developers and their consultants work full-time preparing these applications; residents and taxpayers—who ultimately bear the long-term financial and infrastructure impacts—deserve adequate time to review information and respond meaningfully at hearings.

I have raised these procedural concerns with the **Attorney General's office**, and I am now asking you, as a planner, to explain how this process aligns with the County's obligation to apply its regulations consistently and to conduct a fair, unbiased public review.

I look forward to your response.

Regards,
Jodi

Brett Thomas

From: Jodi Messenich <jodi@messenich.com>
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 2:14 PM
To: Brett Thomas <bthomas@douglas.co.us>
Subject: Re: Ammendment 15

Caution: This email originated outside the organization. Be cautious with links and attachments.

Ok Brett,

This feels like you are towing the county line with pad answers, without answering my main questions

In your tenure at Douglas County, have you ever seen a PD with 4000 new homes go through an amendment process without re-zoning?

Have you ever seen a PD with 4000 new homes be approved in, let's just say 30 days?

Have you ever seen a PD with 4000 homes push through without a NEW traffic study, not a letter from an outdated traffic study?

Have you ever seen a PD on know contaminated land not got through a complete environmental study, again, not a letter using very vague language. A full new study?

Have you ever seen a PD with 4000 new homes run through without a complete NEW water study? Dominion stating they have the water and more than 50% of that water being NONRENEWABLE sources that are finite. That plan as you know is very risky for the longevity of this development and the home owners .

Why did these three commissioners vote to limit public input and reduce it to, "the community can make appointments to meet with commissioners instead of allowing equal time for public comment at the PUBLIC meetings, these meeting are for the PUBLIC however these three commissioners have hijacked the process and all the time allowed is for the developers to plea their case without equal time for the PUBLIC.

This process has become so obviously bias toward the commissioners pet projects and the preferred developers that the public has lost faith of the entire process.

Lastly, it would sure appear that there is some benefit to the county for this very biased approach to governing, who do those in the county work for, the developers or the tax base?

Please do me the courtesy of answering my questions. Please don't send me the regulations and that they are acting within the regulations, because you and I both know there is more than meets the surface here.

Peace,

Jodi Messenich
Zuma's Rescue Ranch

Animal Welfare Advocate

Please pardon typos sent from my iPhone

On Jan 26, 2026, at 12:38 PM, Jodi Messenich <zumastrocks@gmail.com> wrote:

Hey can you respond to these “facts” and send me the proper response .

Thanks

Peace,

Jodi Messenich
Animal Welfare Advocate

Please pardon typos sent from my iPhone

Brett Thomas

From: Sudee Floyd <sudeefloyd@me.com>

Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 9:00 PM

To: Brett Thomas <bthomas@douglas.co.us>

Cc: BOCC <BOCC@douglas.co.us>; Ann Sheflin <ann07345@gmail.com>; Katie Michels <katiebarga@gmail.com>; Sara Davenport <djsarasmile@hotmail.com>; James Peyrouse <jamespeyrouse@gmail.com>; calvindowns1 <calvindowns1@gmail.com>; Lora Thomas <lora@lorathomas.org>; Jodi Messenich <jodi@messenich.com>; Doug Chesnutt <teamdoug2@live.com>; Amy Attwood <amy@amyattwood.com>

Subject: January 27th Land Use Meeting/Public Hearing

Caution: This email originated outside the organization. Be cautious with links and attachments.

Brett & BOCC,

I am very discouraged this evening since I heard no response from the BOCC today on the Agenda for tomorrows meeting about there not being a line item for public comment. I have heard multiple times the commissioners never return emails, I guess it is true.

I would like it on record even though late that I am opposed to Amendment #15 & would like the BOCC to vote no or to hold off. Reading through the comments or referral responses received are the same topics over and over that residents have issues with, traffic, road improvement, water, wildlife & a feeling that this is all being rushed through and not following the correct protocol. It seems the only ones not opposed have something to gain from the rushed proposal.

The BOCC continually say the word transparent, but the actions say something very different. The consistency of who you actually allow to speak and for what time period. Actually having arguments with citizens and not allowing them to speak because they disagree with the BOCC. Thinking this is a great project to build commercial, retail & residential on the East side of Moore road when there is a horse community directly west on Moore, yet you disagreed with an apartment building going in off Lucent that would over look c470 because it sort of block some views from the UC hospital ? Your choices seem to personal & emotional rather than in concern for the citizens of Douglas County and the county itself.

The growth will come it is a question of how will it come. Fast, rushed with hidden agendas of people who have the most to gain or slow, smart and in everyone's best interest. What will the 3 of you be remembered for, the sloppy corrupt growth that ruined the county or the thoughtful well designed ideas that make the county a great space for people to want to continue to live in. I believe it the first, you are on a road to destruction, but no one will see how bad it is until you are gone, people will remember you and it will be for what you have done, sadly it will be too late.

I ask you to stand for the right thing and slow this down. Take time to get traffic studies that are meaningful, make Dominion get there water situation under control, bring the roads up to the standards they need to be at to meet the growth Sterling Ranch wants to have. It might cost more for Sterling Ranch to do it right, but isn't doing it right the real objective.

Is what you are being promised worth the risk of getting this all wrong even if it does happen after you gone? I dare you to stand up to Sterling Ranch and rethink what is being asked. If it is right, it will be right later when you have actually traffic studies and Dominion has a valid water plan & a sanitation plan.

Do the right thing, vote no.

Sudee Floyd, a resident of Plum Valley Heights Sent from my iPad

Brett Thomas

From: Katie Michels <katiebarga@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 12:04 PM
To: Rachel Hales <rhales@douglas.co.us>
Subject: Moore Road Commercial Development and ZR2025-014

Caution: This email originated outside the organization. Be cautious with links and attachments.

Hi Rachel,

Thanks again for speaking with me this morning.

I am surprised to learn that in Douglas County, commissioners aren't allowed to meet with their constituents directly to discuss major community development items like this. Do you know why this is? In the meantime, I will reach out to Brett Thomas.

Would you please pass the note below along to Commissioner Kevin Van Winkle and make sure it's included in the public record for ZR2025-014 and the related Moore Road actions?

I appreciate your assistance!

Katie

Dear Commissioner Van Winkle,

My name is Katie Michels, and my husband, our two young kids, and I live in Plum Valley Heights near Moore Road. I'm writing to you directly as our District 3 County Commissioner.

I'm not opposed to growth. I'm writing because I'm concerned about public safety—traffic, evacuation feasibility, water/wastewater capacity, and environmental conditions—given the scale of what's being proposed in a limited-access corridor.

This feels rushed. On August 15, 2025, Planning Resources emailed me that there was “no current land use submittal in place” for the Moore Road parcels. Since then, the timeline has progressed quickly. Douglas County's rezoning guide states the applicant's **average rezoning timeline is 224 days.** For a **Major Amendment with significant infrastructure implications, I'm asking the County to slow the timeline enough to allow independent verification and meaningful public understanding.**

Before final approvals, I respectfully request:

Roads + evacuation: A comprehensive Traffic Impact Study (TIS) including Level of Service (LOS) analysis for all primary and secondary egress routes, plus evacuation-specific modeling based on future, full build-out populations—and a clear, enforceable plan for road improvements (timing, funding, and “improvements first” sequencing).

Water + sanitation: Independent, third-party documentation confirming long-term water sufficiency and wastewater capacity for full build-out scenarios, including required upgrades, timing, and who pays. For the Moore Road commercial development specifically: what water sources will serve it, and how is long-term supply guaranteed?

Environmental conditions: Independent testing and plain-language disclosure of environmental findings and required safeguards before construction proceeds near existing homes.

Taxpayer cost: A clear estimate of total public costs and taxpayer exposure for roads, utilities, and supporting infrastructure, including the proposed funding mechanism.

Thank you for your time and service to our community. I recognize these decisions are difficult and not everyone will agree or be happy with the outcome. **My request is simply that we prioritize safety first, with independent verification, full transparency, and community input, before permanent approvals move forward.**

Sincerely,

Katie Michels

From: Norman Joslyn <josranch25@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 11:20 AM
To: BOCC <BOCC@douglas.co.us>
Subject: 4000 new homes;e

Caution: This email originated outside the organization. Be cautious with links and attachments.

I understand that Douglas County is going to approve an application for 4000 homes in Sterling Ranch without the normally required studies.

Traffic Study

Environmental Study

Water availability etc.

This is a crime imposed on the residence of Douglas County as traffic is out of control, Hwy 85 From Sedalia to Castle Rock is a death trap for anyone trying to access

the highway from the east and west. Th Dupont property is most likely contaminated.

I would like to have this filed as of record on this project.

Norman Joslyn county resident.

From: Colleen Costigan <ccostigan9192@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2026 4:56 PM
To: BOCC <BOCC@douglas.co.us>
Subject: Stearling Ranch studies needed before expansion approved

Caution: This email originated outside the organization. Be cautious with links and attachments.

I am a Sterling Ranch resident. Please do not approve the expansion of Sterling Ranch without appropriate studies on evacuation, water and environmental impact.

I am not opposed to expansion. I simply want to ensure appropriate planning is taking place before expansion is approved.

Colleen

Colleen Costigan