

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP SUMMARY**  
**November 18, 2019**

**Meeting Convened:** 6:05 p.m. in the City Hall Auditorium

**Meeting Adjourned:** 8:28 p.m.

**City Councilmembers present:** Councilmembers Kraig Andrews, Chuck McDaniel, Phyllis Norris, Phil Pe'a, Anna Stout, Duke Wortmann, and Mayor Rick Taggart.

**Staff present:** City Manager Greg Caton, City Attorney John Shaver, Senior Assistant to the City Manager Greg LeBlanc, Public Works Director Trent Prall, Utilities Director Randi Kim, Community Development Director Tamra Allen, and City Clerk Wanda Winkelmann.

---

Mayor Taggart called the meeting to order.

**Agenda Topic 1. Discussion Topics**

**a. Redevelopment Area Discussion**

As part of the recent decision on transportation impact fees, Council requested review of the Redevelopment Area that currently provides for a significant reduction of transportation impact fees within the core area of the City.

Resolution 87-04 outlined areas and potential forms of City involvement in providing incentives for infill and redevelopment. In 2013, the City adopted Resolution 15-13 that amended the redevelopment boundary map and created a formula for reducing the required transportation impact fees within the area. The purpose was to encourage infill development as well as redevelopment of underutilized parcels within the designated boundaries as development in this met the following purpose(s):

- Make more efficient use of existing infrastructure including streets, water and sewer lines and other public facilities and services;
- Provide opportunities to reduce commuting distance and automobile dependency;
- May help to provide affordable housing within the City; and
- Reduces the demand for and impact from "end of the road" suburban sprawl.

For projects within the Redevelopment Area, the fee is calculated based on the following formula and is variable depending on the number of building floors (except for single-family units).

$$rTCP = (tTCP/n) * .5$$

Whereby:     rTCP = Reduced Transportation Capacity Payment  
                  tTCP = Total Transportation Capacity Payment  
                  n = number of floors

Councilmember Kraig Andrews provided a redevelopment map with expanded boundaries for consideration.

Discussion ensued about the amount of the fee, the boundaries of the Redevelopment Area, incentivizing infill, affordable housing, area median income (AMI), commercial growth, capping the number of floors for certain types of projects, and using the Comprehensive Plan to drive the boundary.

Support was expressed for staff to return on December 2 with options that consider the use of the property when applying a formula to fees.

**b. Discussion regarding the request by GJ Maverick, LLC to Disconnect from the City and be Excluded from the Persigo 201 Service Area Boundary**

Ms. Allen stated that the City has received a request by GJ Maverick, LLC to consider disconnection from the City and exclusion from the Persigo 201 Service Area Boundary of their 17.5-acre property located at 2428 H Road. The Owner says that due to the expense of extending sewer service to the Property and the approved zoning density of one dwelling unit per acre, development is not financially feasible.

The Owner timely filed his request for disconnection and the City Council could make findings to disconnect the Property. If the City does not de-annex the Owner could file a court action.

The City Council may schedule the Owner's requests for debate or decision by the City Council and/or consult with the Persigo Board regarding scheduling with that body.

The Council can consider several options, not limited to the following:

1. Schedule a hearing with the City Council for the disconnection of the GJ Maverick Property followed by a subsequent meeting with the Persigo Board to consider exclusion of the property from the Persigo 201 Service Area Boundary.

2. Schedule a meeting with the Persigo Board to consider exclusion of the property from the Persigo 201 Service Area Boundary followed by a subsequent hearing with the City Council for the disconnection of the GJ Maverick Property.

Support was expressed to honor the applicant's request. Staff will schedule the appropriate meetings to start this process.

### **c. 521 Drainage Authority Update**

The 5-2-1 Drainage Authority (521) was created by an Intergovernmental Agreement on June 14, 2004, pursuant to CRS 29-1-204.2 by and between Mesa County, the Town of Palisade, the City of Grand Junction, the City of Fruita and the Grand Valley Drainage District to provide stormwater related services with and across their respective jurisdictions.

Since 2008, the 521 has provided stormwater management services related to stormwater quality and is responsible for National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) compliance in the areas it serves within Mesa County. The 521 holds the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit, complies with NPDES and other environmental regulations and informs the public about stormwater quality.

The original intent of the 521 was to impose a fee and evolve into a functional organization to manage stormwater quality and quantity concerns. Heretofore the 521 has not adopted a fee but instead has relied on general fund transfers from each of the partnering organizations. Earlier this year the 521 invested \$85,000 on a study to investigate the appropriate governance model and funding source. The study concluded that the 521, as opposed to GVDD, would be an appropriate governance model and a fee will be used to help fund stormwater quality/quantity concerns. There are over 3200 stormwater utilities across the United States and has been a solid funding source addressing drainage needs for many entities.

The 521 Board is hesitant on moving forward with a fee at this time and therefore is contemplating for 2020 the following options to address just stormwater quality:

- A. 521 Continues with scope limited to stormwater quality compliance and either 1) Hires own staff; 2) Contracts with Mesa County, or 3) Contracts with City (as has been done since 2010). Keeping the 521 in place leaves the option for a valley wide fee at some point in future.
- B. Dissolve 521 and each entity move forward independently in regards to stormwater compliance.
- C. Dissolve 521 and each entity "upload" their stormwater quality permit to Mesa County for stormwater compliance - similar to how the County handles building department permitting. Advantages are that it would be carried out by a dedicated, focused staff and not just an added duty to current employee(s).

The stormwater quality workload consists of public education and public outreach, stormwater construction permitting, post-construction monitoring/oversight and in the very near future development of plans to address the new Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for a few of the Grand Valley's drainages. Option A2 or C means the 521 (or Mesa County) is intact to handle those requirements holistically for the Grand Valley while Option B would require each entity to meet those state mandated requirements on their own.

Mesa County's current proposal would serve as either Option A2 (521 stays intact and contracts directly with Mesa County) or Option C (521 dissolves and each entity contracts directly with Mesa County). The 521 board is looking for preference from each entity. The next 521 board meeting will be the week of December 2.

Support was expressed for the City to withdraw from the 521. This information will be conveyed at the next board meeting.

### **Agenda Topic 2. Next Workshop Topics**

City Manager Caton noted that the discussion on the Redevelopment Area will continue at the December 2 Workshop.

### **3. Other Business**

Mayor Taggart stated the ice arena is for sale. An Executive Session will be scheduled for November 20 at 4:45 p.m.

### **Adjournment**

The Workshop adjourned at 8:28 p.m.