

**Teller County Board of Review
September 3, 2025
Meeting Minutes**

I. Convene. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m.

II. Roll Call. Those present were:

Jeff Smith
Lee Chapin
Bert West

Staff: Janine Snyder, Building Official
Colton, Berck, Planning Director
Paul Hurcomb, County Attorney
Lisa Hoekman, Board of Review Secretary

Lee Chapin was appointed by Bert West as a voting member of the Board of Review for this meeting.

III. Review and Approve minutes from the August 6, 2025, meeting.

Jeff Smith moved to approve the August 6, 2025, minutes. Lee Chapin seconded.

Roll call vote:
Jeff Smith – Yes
Lee Chapin – Yes
Bert West – Yes
The motion carried.

IV. General Class Contractor License Applications

Bert West explained the Board of Review process to the contractors in the room where each will be called on to give their full name, company name, the reasons for requesting a contractor license in Teller County, and the type of license for which they are applying.

A. Basecamp Construction, LLC, Ty Gordon, Class A

Bert West disclosed a conversation that he had with Mr. Gordon's spouse yesterday at coffee, but did not believe he has a conflict of interest and needed to recuse himself, but if Mr. Gordon wanted him to recuse, he would do so. Mr. Gordon stated that he was fine with Mr. West hearing his application and did not want him to recuse.

Ty Gordon stated he is 50% owner of Basecamp Construction. The company was founded in January 2021 and is currently active in the Pikes Peak region. He is the license holder for the company and currently holds a Class B license in El Paso County. He is also licensed in Park and Douglas Counties. The company specializes in a wide range of residential construction, including remodels, custom homes, decks, and garages. They are currently managing approximately 25 active projects. Mr. Gordon clarified that his only commercial work experience was the KRDO TV station addition and remodel, where he served as project manager and lead framer.

Board Discussion: The Board discussed the scope of the Class A license versus the applicant's current experience, including his work on a commercial project. A suggestion was made to issue a Class B license instead, based on the applicant's experience and regional demand. The Board discussed the appropriate license classification and agreed that starting with a Class B license would be more suitable for Base Camp Construction at this time.

Mr. Gordon voluntarily amended his application with his initials and date to change his request from a Class A to a Class B license.

Building Official report and recommendation: Mr. Gordon has had a Class C license in Teller County since 2020. We would support a Class A or Class B license based on history and qualifications.

Public comment: None

Lee Chapin made a motion to grant Basecamp Construction, Ty Gordon as the examinee, a Class B license. Jeff Smith seconded.

Roll call vote:

Jeff Smith – Yes

Lee Chapin – Yes

Bert West – Yes

The motion carried.

B. Hurley Construction, LLC, Caleb Hurley, Class B

Caleb Hurley introduced himself. Mr. Hurley stated he started Hurley Construction in 2017. His construction background includes heavy structural framing, concrete, and ironwork. He is a certified structural welder with extensive experience across commercial and residential sectors. His work experience includes the Cog Railway project (site fabrication), Air Force Academy (superintendent), and manufactured home installation (Champion, Clayton Homes). He is licensed in multiple counties (Fremont, Chaffee, Aurora, Jefferson, El Paso), with significant experience in

residential, multifamily, and light commercial construction. Currently he holds a Class C license in Teller County and is seeking a Class B license.

Board Discussion: The Board discussed the applicant's extensive experience, particularly in commercial construction, and felt that a Class B license was more appropriate than a Class C. Lee Chapin noted that Caleb Hurley had previously worked with him on the Air Force Academy project and had demonstrated competence and professionalism in handling commercial work.

Building Official report and recommendation: Supports a Class B license.

Public comment: None

Jeff Smith made a motion to grant Hurley Construction, Caleb Hurley as examinee, a Class B license. Lee Chapin seconded.

Roll call vote:

Jeff Smith – Yes

Lee Chapin – Yes

Bert West – Yes

The motion carried.

V. Contractor Complaint, Jerry Nichols v. Doug Decker, Doug Decker Construction

Mr. West explained the Board of Review process for complaints. All remarks are to be directed at the Board. The public may not comment without permission. The Board of Review can only act on building code issues, not civil disputes. Each party would have the chance to present starting with Mr. Nichols, then Mr. Decker. The Board would then have a chance for discussion and questions, then rebuttals could be heard.

The Complainant, Mr. Nichols, introduced himself, then presented the following information.

- Windows
 - Windows installed by Decker Construction were left dirty, with silicone residue.
 - Mr. Nichols claims cleaning was not completed despite paying for new windows.
 - Snow and air infiltration noted around certain windows.
- Jobsite Trash
 - Alleged construction debris and personal trash from workers were left on site.
 - Logs rolled down hill; Mr. Nichols claims cleanup never occurred.
- Retaining Wall
 - Original quote: \$2,000; final charge: \$6,325.

- The retaining wall failed during heavy rains; water entered basement three times.
- Mr. Nichols repaired the wall himself; believes Mr. Decker failed to take responsibility.
- The retaining wall is approx. 8–10 ft.; would have required engineered drawings and permit.
- Labor Arrangement
 - Mr. Nichols worked approximately 40 days on the log installation to reduce costs but claims no actual savings.
- Contract & Permits
 - Contract envisioned Mr. Decker transferring permit mid-project so Mr. Nichols could complete interior.
 - The permit transfer never occurred until near the project completion.
 - Mr. Nichols believes he has no warranty or recourse for defects.
- Requests:
 - Wanted acknowledgment of poor workmanship.
 - Expressed interest in reimbursement for labor and/or corrective measures.

Respondent Doug Decker with Doug Decker Construction, LLC, introduced himself, then presented the following information and response.

- Scope of Work
 - Mr. Decker shared he was responsible for foundation through roof; Mr. Nichols was to finish the interior for cost savings.
 - Mr. Decker provided subcontractors and equipment at cost.
- Retaining Wall
 - The retaining wall was stepped/terraced; per the Building Official it did not require permit.
 - Additional wall near entry porch increased cost.
- Windows
 - Silicone required by manufacturer; residue occurs during installation.
 - Cleaning is included only in turnkey projects but not shell builds.
 - Final disagreement with Mr. Nichols occurred on October 16 over window cleaning when Mr. Nichols kicked him off the property. Mr. Decker left site permanently.
- Presence on Site
 - Mr. Decker admitted he was not on-site as often as ideal, partly due to his foot surgery.
 - Mr. Decker asserted that an experienced crew handled log construction with help from subcontractor Pete Zandri.
- Trash
 - Mr. Decker claims he personally assisted with cleanup despite injury.
- Permits
 - Mr. Decker believed the work was inspected and approved.
 - Mr. Decker stated this is the first formal complaint against him in 37 years as a contractor.

Janine Snyder, Building Official, provided the Building Department report:

- Main House Permit:
 - Originally under Decker Construction, it was later changed to Mr. Nichols.
 - The permit was administratively closed due to lapses in inspections; it is not finalized.
 - Approximately 22 inspections were not officially completed.
 - Final certificate of occupancy (CO) not issued. Mr. Nichols is living in the house without a CO.
- Garage Permit:
 - Separate permit; still under Decker Construction.
 - Also administratively closed.
 - Some inspections completed (including framing, possibly electrical), but not final.
- Estimated fees for reactivation of permits:
 - Main house: ~\$200 (reinspection fees).
 - Garage: ~\$250.
 - Total: approximately \$450–\$600 to reopen and complete inspections.

Public comment: None

With no public comment, Mr. West allowed for rebuttals to be presented.

Mr. Nichols' rebuttal:

- He denied Mr. Decker's claim about window cleaning agreement.
- He reiterated Mr. Decker never removed trash.
- He clarified he fixed the retaining wall by regrading and redirecting water flow.
- He confirmed his willingness to allow Building Department to reinspect for a CO.
- In response to a question from County Attorney Hurcomb, Mr. Nichols stated that he has not filed a lawsuit against Mr. Decker and is waiting for the Board of Review to act.

Mr. Deckers' rebuttal:

- He reiterated disagreements are civil matters, not code related.
- He agreed to pay permit reactivation fees so inspections can be completed and transferred to homeowner.

Board Discussion:

- Most issues raised were contractual/civil, not building code violations.
- Main building code issue is permits not finalized, preventing issuance of a CO.
- Windows and retaining wall cleaning disputes fall outside Board authority.
- The Board discussed Section 107.b.II as a possible Board action

Mr. West asked Mr. Nichols if he would consent to having Mr. Decker pay the fees to reopen to permit to allow Mr. Nichols to close out the permits.

Mr. Nicholas stated he will agree to allow Mr. Decker to pay to reopen the permits. Mr. Decker agreed to pay the fees, approximately \$400-\$600, to reopen the permits and transfer them to MR. Nichols.

- Consensus:
 - Decker Construction will pay reactivation fees for both house and garage permits.
 - Permits to be transferred into Nichols' name.
 - Building Department to conduct compliance/final inspections.

Mr. Hurcomb read a proposed motion as follows:

A motion pursuant to Section 107.b.II of the Teller County Building Code that, Doug Decker, with Doug Decker Construction, with the consent of Mr. Jerry Andy Nichols, will pay all of the necessary fees to reactivate the permits for both the shell structure and the garage, the permit on the garage will be transferred to Mr. Nichols, and the Building Official will report back to the Board of Review before the Board takes any action or makes a decision on the complaint.

Jeff Smith made the motion as presented. Lee Chapin seconded.

Roll call vote:

Jeff Smith – Yes

Lee Chapin – Yes

Bert West – Yes

The motion carried.

VI. Contractor Complaint, Penny Mandeville & Teller County Building Department v. LoneStar-361

Mr. West explained the same process for the Board of Review would apply to this complaint. The public may not comment without permission. The Board of Review can only act on building code issues, not civil disputes. Each party would have the chance to present starting with Ms. Mandeville, then Teller County and finally Mr. Rogers. The Board would then have their chance to for discussion and questions, then rebuttals could be heard.

Complainant Ms. Mandeville introduced herself, then presented the following information.

- Mr. Rogers did not have a Teller County license, and no permits were pulled for work performed.
- The bathroom remodel was left unfinished, with poor workmanship (tile issues, incomplete plumbing, concerns over water damage).
- The greenhouse is leaking significantly through large glass panes and framing.

- Mr. Rogers left construction debris and trash, resulting in additional expenses for cleanup.
- Homeowners Association also lodged complaints regarding trash and unfinished work.
- Ms. Mandeville has paid Mr. Rogers approximately \$33,000; balance of \$1,600 remains, but complainant withheld \$400 for cleanup costs.
- Ms. Mandeville received estimates from other contractors which indicated an additional \$6,000+ needed to remediate and complete the work.

Requested Resolution:

- Ms. Mandeville is willing to allow Mr. Rogers to complete work only if he obtains the proper Teller County license and permits. Otherwise, Ms. Mandeville intends to pursue completion through other contractors and possible civil action.

Respondent Randy Rogers with Lone Star 361 introduced himself, then presented the following information and response.

- **Licensing and Permits:**
 - Mr. Rogers acknowledged he did not have a Teller County contractor license and did not pull any permits.
 - Mr. Rogers claimed he misunderstood he needed to pull permits and stated he believed the homeowner was handling permits.
 - Mr. Rogers admitted that his business registration with the State for his DBA had lapsed but has since been renewed.
- **Workmanship Issues:**
 - Bathroom: Claimed only a shower pan was installed and did not realize it required a permit. Defended tile installation but admitted material shortages and uneven finishes.
 - Greenhouse: Constructed with corrugated plastic roof and glass panes supplied by homeowner. Admitted leaks remain but attributed some to untreated lumber and design limitations. Believes flashing would resolve issues.
- **Employees/Subcontractors:**
 - Mr. Rogers initially stated he had no employees; later admitted using several workers and subcontractors.
 - Mr. Rogers claimed plumbing and electrical work was to be subcontracted to licensed trades, though documentation was unclear.
- **Resolution Proposal:**
 - Mr. Rogers expressed willingness to complete the work if allowed to do so under another licensed contractor or after obtaining proper licensing.

Janine Snyder, Building Official, provided the Building Department report:

- Concerns Identified:
 - Work performed (attached greenhouse and bathroom remodel) required permits and inspections.
 - Plumbing and electrical work were conducted without proper permits or licensed contractors.
 - Contractor has not submitted an application for a Teller County license, despite being asked to do so prior to this hearing.
 - DBA expired at the time of the work; currently operating as a sole proprietorship.
 - The Building Official has strong reservations about Mr. Rogers continuing to work in the County without proper licensing and is concerned about ongoing unlicensed activity and public risk.

Board Discussion:

- The Board expressed concern over repeated unpermitted work and lack of licensing.
- The Board noted that work attached to the home with headers, LVLs, and flashing clearly required permits and engineering.
- The Board acknowledged homeowner's desire for Mr. Rogers to finish the project, but emphasized legal requirements for licensing, insurance, and trade compliance.
- The Board considered options for allowing completion under strict conditions versus barring the contractor from future work.

Mr. West requested Ms. Mandeville answer follow-up questions about her statement that she would allow Mr. Rogers to complete the work. In response to Mr. West's questions, Ms. Mandeville confirmed her preference for Mr. Rogers to finish the project due to quality of work completed so far, agreed that timing (several months' delay while licensing is processed) was acceptable, and she understood that engineering, inspections, and licensed subcontractors would be required moving forward.

Public comment:

- Base Camp Representative: Clarified that his company was not directly involved in Mandeville's project; the homeowner likely confused him with another contractor.

Mr. Hurcomb read a proposed motion as follows:

A motion pursuant to Section 107.b.II of the Teller County Building Code that, with the owner's consent, Randy Rogers dba Lone Star 361, must, on or before September 17, 2025, apply for and receive a C-1 Special Limited License restricted solely to the Mandeville project, that no work may be performed until both license and permits are issued, that all subcontractors must be properly licensed in Teller County and carry required insurance/workers' compensation, and that all inspections shall be coordinated with the Teller County Building Department.

Lee Chapin made the motion as presented.

Mr. West supplemented the motion to add that pursuant to Section 107.b. II, the Building Official shall report back to the Board of Review prior to any final action or decision being made. Jeff Smith seconded the motion as supplemented.

Roll call vote:

Jeff Smith – Yes

Lee Chapin – Yes

Bert West – Yes

The motion carried.

A brief break was requested by Mr. West at 3:50 p.m.

Meeting called back to order at 4:00 p.m.

VII. Board Discussion

Permit Expiration and Fees Discussion – Proposed Amendments to the 2021 Teller County Building Code

Staff Report – Janine Snyder

- Background provided on previous discussions (July/August 2025).
- Current 2021 Code language requires work to commence within 180 days of issuance and allows written extensions of up to 180 days each, upon justifiable cause.
- Proposed amendment deletes the 180-day rule and establishes:
 - Permits valid for 1 year.
 - One written extension of 1 year (total of 2 years).
 - Projects not started or lacking a foundation inspection must comply with the current code when extended or reactivated.
- Comparison with 2015 Code:
 - 2015 allowed permits up to 2 years with the possibility of two 1-year extensions (total of 4 years for some permits).
 - Extensions required compliance inspections and payment of reactivation fees.

Board Discussion – Permit Expiration

- Concern expressed that large, complex homes and certain commercial projects often require up to 4 years for completion.
- Consensus emerged that:
 - New residential and commercial construction should have an initial 2-year permit, with the option of two 1-year extensions (total of 4 years).
 - Single-trade permits (roofs, decks, siding, minor remodels) should remain at 1 year with the option of one 1-year extension (total of 2 years).
 - This approach prevents long delays in closing out small permits while providing flexibility for larger projects.
- Clarification requested regarding homeowner-builder permits and remodels; consensus to allow extensions when justifiable but keep general limits consistent with above.

Board Discussion – Permit Reactivation

- Proposed new section 105.5.1 establishes requirements if a permit expires without a timely extension request:
 - Written request from owner with justifiable cause.
 - Completed reapplication form and \$100 fee.
 - Compliance inspection required (\$100 each for building and electrical).
 - Reactivation fees based on remaining inspections at \$50 per inspection.
 - Change orders required if project deviates from approved plans (\$100 each).
 - Extensions are free if requested prior to expiration.
 - Discussion emphasized avoiding “double-charging” contractors. Only one reactivation fee per inspection cycle would apply, not per reinspection unless egregiously unprepared.
 - Agreement that projects reactivated after significant time may need to comply with updated codes (e.g., snow or wind load changes) if early in construction.

Legal and Procedural Considerations

- Attorney Hurcomb confirmed proposed language provides adequate discretion for building officials to deny unjustified extensions.
- Recommendation made to prepare a redlined version of the proposed changes (showing current vs. amended language) for commissioner review.

Jeff Smith made the motion to continue discussion of permit expiration and reactivation amendments to the October 1, 2025 meeting, with staff to provide a redlined draft for Board review and potential recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners. Lee Chapin seconded.

Roll call vote:

Jeff Smith – Yes

Lee Chapin – Yes

Bert West – Yes

The motion carried.

VIII. Adjournment: Mr. West adjourned the meeting at 4:32 p.m.

Minutes reviewed and approved by the Board of Review on October 1, 2025.



Board Secretary