

To access the Agenda and Backup Materials electronically, go to [www.gjcity.org](http://www.gjcity.org)



**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA  
IN-PERSON/VIRTUAL HYBRID MEETING  
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 250 N 5<sup>th</sup> STREET  
TUESDAY, JULY 9, 2024 - 5:30 PM  
*Attend virtually: [bit.ly/GJ-PC-7-9-24](http://bit.ly/GJ-PC-7-9-24)***

---

**Call to Order - 5:30 PM**

**Consent Agenda**

1. Minutes of Previous Meeting(s)

**Regular Agenda**

1. Consider Amendments to Title 21 Zoning and Development Code to Remove the Requirement for New Development to Underground Existing Utilities.
2. Consider Amendments to Title 21 Zoning and Development Code to Create a New Land Use Category for Interim Housing, to Create Temporary Use and Structure Standards for Interim Housing, and to Create a New Public Hearing Process for an Extended Temporary Use permit.

**Other Business**

**Adjournment**

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**June 25, 2024, 5:30 PM**  
**MINUTES**

The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Commissioner Scissors.

Those present were Planning Commissioners; Shanon Secrest, Kim Herek, Keith Ehlers, and Orin Zyvan.

Also present were Jamie Beard (City Attorney), Niki Galehouse (Planning Supervisor), Dave Thornton (Principal Planner), Tim Lehrbach (Senior Planner), Madeline Robinson (Planning Technician), and Jacob Kaplan (Planning Technician).

There were 0 members of the public in attendance, and 0 virtually.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

---

**1. Approval of Minutes**

---

Minutes of Previous Meeting(s) from June 11, 2024.

Commissioner Ehlers moved to approve the consent agenda.  
*Commissioner Secrest seconded; motion passed 5-0.*

**REGULAR AGENDA**

---

**1. Circulation Plan, Comp Plan & Neighborhood Plan Amendments **CPA-2024-265****

Consider a Request by the City of Grand Junction to Approve Minor Amendments to the One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan (Comprehensive Plan), which includes the Grand Junction Circulation Plan, and to Repeal the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan, Pear Park Neighborhood Plan, and Redlands Area Plan.

**Staff Presentation**

Dave Thornton, Principal Planner, introduced exhibits into the record and provided a presentation regarding the request.

**Questions for staff**

*There were no questions or comments for staff.*

**Public Hearing**

*The public comment period was opened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 18, 2024, via [www.GJSpeaks.org](http://www.GJSpeaks.org).*

*There were no public comments.*

*The public comment period was closed at 5:56 p.m. on June 25, 2024.*

**Discussion**

Commissioner Ehlers noted that the lack of questions or comments was indicative of Staff's thoroughness with amending and consolidating these plans.

Commissioner Zyvan thanked staff for their efforts and commented that consolidating these plans would bring them into modernity and make them easier to use moving forward.

Commissioner Scissors echoed the previous Commissioner's comments.

**Motion and Vote**

Commissioner Zyvan made the following motion "Mr. Chairman, on the request to amend the *One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan* and repeal the *Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan*, *Pear Park Neighborhood Plan*, and *Redlands Area Plan*, City file number CPA-2024-143, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council with the finding of fact as listed in the staff report."

*Commissioner Secrest seconded; motion passed 5-0.*

**OTHER BUSINESS**

---

**ADJOURNMENT**

---

Commissioner Ehlers moved to adjourn the meeting.  
*The vote to adjourn was 5-0.*

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.



**Grand Junction Planning Commission**

**Regular Session**

**Item #1.**

---

**Meeting Date:** July 9, 2024  
**Presented By:** Niki Galehouse, Planning Supervisor  
**Department:** Community Development  
**Submitted By:** Niki Galehouse, Planning Manager

---

**Information**

**SUBJECT:**

Consider Amendments to Title 21 Zoning and Development Code to Remove the Requirement for New Development to Underground Existing Utilities.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of this request.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The Zoning and Development Code requires that any existing overhead utilities be installed underground except when the development has less than 700 feet of frontage, in which case the director can accept cash payment in lieu. The burden of undergrounding an overhead utility line is borne fully by the property owner on which the power poles have been installed, and it is generally perceived by the development industry that the requirement to underground along frontages less than 700 feet puts an unfair burden on development that happens to have overhead utilities along the property frontage. For development with frontage less than 700 feet, with the option to pay the in-lieu fee, the rate was established in 2005 and is set at \$25.65 per linear foot. The actual estimated average cost for undergrounding utilities is approximately \$300 per linear foot.

In 2018, participants in the City's ad hoc Development Roundtable identified the issue of existing overhead utility undergrounding requirements as a development challenge to staff. Over the course of the past five years, staff have worked intermittently with the roundtable to identify an approach that would address the community's needs. Discussion continued on this topic until as recently as June 2022, when the Code Committee took up this issue as a part of the Zoning and Development Code update. As expected, the Code Committee recommended the requirement be removed from the Code. This recommendation was supported during the review and recommendation process by the Planning Commission and Community Development staff, while the



consultant team (Clarion Associates) recommended “maintaining the current undergrounding requirement while pursuing a policy discussion at the City Council level to determine whether City participation in the undergrounding costs for some projects would provide an overall benefit to the community.” Ultimately, the City Council’s adopted code update maintained the requirement to underground existing overhead utility lines. Staff was directed to bring the topic of electric utility undergrounding to a City Council workshop for additional policy discussion and direction in early 2024.

In 2024 a series of workshops with City Council and meetings with the roundtable were held to work through a range of policy options. This proposed ordinance brings forward a final recommendation to remove the requirement from the Zoning and Development Code.

## **BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:**

### **BACKGROUND**

#### **Existing Overhead Utility Underground Requirement**

The Zoning and Development Code requires that all new electric utility lines be undergrounded and that any existing overhead utilities be installed underground except when the development has less than 700 feet of frontage, in which case the Director can accept cash payment in lieu. The requirement to underground, as currently written, applies only to streets and does not include alleys. More specifically, the code provides:

Section 21.05.020(d)(3) Utilities. All new electric utilities shall be provided and paid for by the developer and shall be installed underground. Above-ground facilities associated with new installations (e.g., pedestals, transformers, and transmission lines of 50kv capacity or greater) and temporary overhead lines may be allowed if deemed necessary by the Director. All existing overhead utilities along streets contiguous with the development shall be installed underground prior to street construction. When the development has less than 700 feet of frontage along a street, the Director has discretion to accept a payment of cash in lieu of requiring the developer to underground the existing overhead utilities. The payment amount shall be determined as set forth in the adopted fee schedule.

#### **Undergrounding Or Payment In Lieu Fee**

The burden of undergrounding an overhead utility line is borne fully by the property owner, who has installed the power poles in an easement or right of way adjacent to a property. It is generally perceived that the requirement to underground overhead utility lines along frontages of 700 feet or more puts a disproportionate burden on development that happens to have overhead utilities along their property frontage. For example, if a property has a large frontage with a significant voltage line overhead, they are required to cover the full cost of the undergrounding. Meanwhile, the property across the street or down the road is not required to participate in this oftentimes significant expense of which the adjacent properties are beneficiaries due to the improved aesthetic.

Meanwhile, if a property has overhead utility lines but has a frontage of less than 700

feet, the property owner may pay a fee in lieu of the actual undergrounding. The current fee in lieu of undergrounding is set at \$25.65. This fee was established at least 20 years ago (~1997) and was intended to pay for the cost for the City to underground utility lines in conjunction with major street projects. The current fee is inadequate to cover the cost of undergrounding. Xcel Energy estimates the cost for undergrounding lines at an approximate average of \$250 to \$300 per lineal foot for Secondary lines, \$350 to \$500 per lineal foot for Primary lines and \$600 to \$800 per foot for Feeder lines. The cost can be variable, dependent upon the size of the line and the related voltage the lines carry.

Engineering revisited the 700-foot threshold with both Xcel and Grand Valley Power (GVP) in 2022. The input received from both entities advised that 700 feet, or roughly one city block, is an appropriate threshold as the intent is to avoid unsightly piecemeal segments of underground and overhead lines that increase costs for converting short segments of overhead to underground later. Termination points from the overhead to the new underground (called terminal poles) are costly and unsightly due to all the termination equipment, switching, and guy wiring. The companies noted that it can be very difficult to find suitable locations for these poles that allow enough room for guy wiring while providing accessibility for crews and do not adversely impact the property owner due to pole placement. In general, longer distances also allow for increased cost savings on a per lineal foot basis.

**Relationship To Franchise Agreements**

Franchises for service providers are voter-approved. Voters passed the current franchise agreements for both Xcel and GVP in April 2011 as People’s Ordinance 37, and they are in effect until May 31, 2031. It is possible, with an affirmative vote by the People, that the agreements could be amended in the next municipal election. The current franchise requires that all newly constructed electrical distribution lines in newly developed areas of the city underground their utilities. The agreement does not speak to existing overhead utility lines.

Article 11 of the franchise agreements (GVP and Xcel) includes a provision for an underground fund ("Fund") in which Xcel and GVP are required to budget and allocate an annual amount equal to one percent of the preceding year’s electric gross revenues for the purpose of burying overhead utility lines as requested by the City. The Fund can only be used for facilities that are located in the public right-of-way and are public projects. The franchise agreements also allow for the City to require Xcel or Grand Valley Power to underground above-ground facilities at the City’s expense. The one percent Fund has historically been used in conjunction with the City’s capital projects. The one percent allocation is customary across Colorado.

GVP, whose service area covers about 10 percent of the City area, collects approximately \$90,000 per year, while Xcel, whose service area covers the remainder of the City, collects approximately \$560,000 per year. Both Xcel and GVP draw on these funds for eligible projects upon request from the City.

If the City is interested in completing underground for a significant project, the City, through the Franchise agreements, can draw on future revenues up to three years in advance to complete a project. Recent projects that the City has drawn on these funds include Orchard Avenue between Cannell and 12th Street, 1st Street from North Ave to Ouray, 7th Street from Center Ave to Tope Elementary, and 24 Road from Mojo south to F ½ Rd. Older projects that utilized these funds include I-70B from 24 Road to Rimrock and the Riverside Parkway.

### **Relationship To Transportation Capacity Payment Program**

The undergrounding policy was developed prior to the most recent revisions of the City's Development Standards, at a time when developers were responsible for the construction of all half-street improvements adjacent to the property being developed. The development standards now only require the developer to pay for the improvements necessary for access and the safe ingress and/or egress of traffic to the development and do not require the developer to construct all the adjacent half on-street improvements (including curb, gutter, and sidewalk). Staff reached out to several communities in Colorado and found a handful of communities have a similar program that requires undergrounding of existing overhead utility lines, including Pueblo and Fort Collins. Both Pueblo and Fort Collins exempt higher voltage lines (30 kV and 40 kV, and Fort Collins exempts short runs of less than 400 feet). All communities contacted require the undergrounding of new utilities. Most cities require new development to improve/construct the street and, at the same time, underground all overhead utilities.

### **Why Underground Utilities?**

There are many drawbacks to having overhead distribution lines. Most importantly, they are susceptible to outages from falling trees and limbs, especially during storms. The poles are a roadway safety concern as they are a non-forgiving obstacle for drivers to avoid. The aesthetics of overhead lines are also often a concern to the public.

Underground distribution lines offer some notable benefits. While underground outages do occur, they are rare. In addition, lines provide better public safety since there are no exposed lines or falling poles. Underground systems are also hidden from view, and according to an American Planning Association publication, property values tend to be higher in neighborhoods with underground lines than in comparable neighborhoods with overhead lines. There are, however, inherent issues with lines that are undergrounded, mainly because they may be less visible and more susceptible to being hit while digging/boring and, in some cases, are more difficult to maintain. Xcel staff concur with the issues identified above.

### **Policy Options Explored**

Over the past several years, staff along with various members of the development community have explored numerous options for policy changes including concepts such as increasing the lieu fee, requiring only undergrounding of secondary lines, requiring cost share agreements, creating reimbursement agreements, forming an Underground Conversion Local Improvement District, among others.

The City Council held several workshops on this item with the last being held on June 17, During discussion at this workshop, following written communication from the Housing & Building Association of Western Colorado and the Grand Junction Area Realtor Association as well as communication from Habitat for Humanity and Housing Resources of Western Colorado, Staff was given direction to proceed with an amendment to the Zoning & Development Code. The draft ordinance removes all language in Section 21.05.020(d)(3) that requires existing overhead electric utilities to be placed underground.

### **NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS**

Notice was completed as required by Section 21.02.030(g). Notice of the public hearing was published on June 30, 2024 in the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel. An online hearing with opportunity for public comment was held between July 2 and July 8, 2024 through the GJSpeaks platform.

### **ANALYSIS**

The criteria for review are set forth in Section 21.02.050(d) of the Zoning and Development Code, which provides that the City may approve an amendment to the text of the Code if the applicant can demonstrate evidence proving each of the following criteria:

#### **(A) Consistency with Comprehensive Plan**

The proposed Code Text Amendment is generally consistent with applicable provisions of the Comprehensive Plan.

Undergrounding of overhead utility lines is mentioned in several places within the Comprehensive Plan:

Plan Principle 3: Responsible and Managed Growth, Strategy 3.e. ELECTRICAL SERVICE. Evaluate current policy for undergrounding overhead utility lines and in lieu of payments. Continue to require new and existing electrical lines to be buried.

Principle 5: Strong Neighborhoods and Housing Choice, Goal 4.d. INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS. Prioritize infrastructure improvements, such as traffic calming enhancements, sidewalk repairs, bikeways, street tree plantings, and undergrounding of overhead utilities to improve safety and quality of life for neighborhood residents based on documented deficiencies.

Chapter 4, Area Specific Policies, Commercial Areas/Employment

Centers/Streetscape: Streetscape elements should include pedestrian signage, benches, and street trees. A high priority should be placed on the undergrounding of utilities, wayfinding signage, sidewalk connectivity, and other improvements that enhance the streetscape functionality and safety.

While there is certainly a priority placed on undergrounding utility lines for aesthetic purposes and to encourage greater safety, the method by which this is accomplished is not prescribed by the Comprehensive Plan. The City can still implement the second half

of the strategy by requiring overhead utilities to be installed underground at the time of a capital or public project that qualifies for the use of Xcel undergrounding funds instead of at the time of subdivision or other associated land development activity.

Plan Principle 3: Responsible and Managed Growth, Where We Are Today, Housing and Services. Concerns related to new development include increased demand for housing and a waning supply of attainable housing.

Plan Principle 3, Goal 2. Encourage infill and redevelopment to leverage existing infrastructure.

The Comprehensive Plan provides a strong emphasis on the need for housing within the community, especially at attainable and affordable levels. There is also a high priority is placed on infill development and redevelopment through strategies that focus on this as well as the creation of the Tiered Growth Plan for annexation. Leveraging existing infrastructure, especially when referring to above-ground electric utilities, can assist in keeping the cost of development low. Requiring these facilities to be relocated underground can preclude the provision of additional units at values that facilitate or implement these goals.

Plan Principle 11, Goal 3, Strategy e. Equitable Considerations. Include considerations for equity in decision-making processes across the City organization to ensure that the benefits and/or burdens of City actions or investments are shared fairly and do not disproportionately affect a particular group or geographic location over others.

Plan Principle 11, Goal 4, Strategy b. Service Providers. Coordinate closely with – and promote coordination among - service providers in needs assessments, facility siting, and other matters to ensure continuous delivery of effective, equitable, and efficient services.

One of the concerns that has been raised consistently throughout the discussions on this topic has been the equitability of the provisions. For example, if an overhead line exists on one of a road, one property owner is burden with the cost to bury the line while the other reaps the benefit of the undergrounding without any financial investment in the work. Plan Principle 11 encourages an effective and transparent government through collaboration and regular evaluation of policies to ensure that regulations do not cause undue burden to one user over another  
Staff finds this criterion has been met.

**(B) Consistency with Zoning and Development Code Standards**

The proposed Code Text Amendment is consistent with and does not conflict with or contradict other provisions of this Code.

The proposed amendments to the Zoning & Development Code are consistent with the rest of the provisions in the Code and do not create any conflicts with other provisions in the Code. New utilities will still be required to be placed underground. Staff finds this criterion has been met.

**(C) Specific Reasons**

The proposed Code Text Amendment shall meet at least one of the following specific reasons:

- a. To address trends in development or regulatory practices;
- b. To expand, modify, or add requirements for development in general or to address specific development issues;
- c. To add, modify or expand zone districts; or
- d. To clarify or modify procedures for processing development applications.

The removal of the requirement to underground existing utilities modifies a requirement that addresses a specific development issue. The requirement to underground existing utilities can be cost-prohibitive and may create inequities in its application methods. By removing the requirement, the burden is removed from the individual property owners and will instead be borne at time of undergrounding at a citywide level. Staff finds this criterion has been met.

### **RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT**

After reviewing the proposed amendments, the following findings of fact have been made:

In accordance with Section 21.02.050(d) of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, the proposed text amendments to Title 21 are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning & Development Code Standards and meet at least one of the specific reasons outlined.

Therefore, Staff recommends approval of this request.

### **SUGGESTED MOTION:**

Mr. Chairman, on the request to amend Title 21 Zoning and Development Code of the Grand Junction Municipal Code, City file number ZCA-2024-396, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council with the findings of fact listed in the staff report.

### **Attachments**

1. Utility Undergrounding Draft Ordinance
2. Public Comment Combined -7.01.2024

**CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

**ORDINANCE NO. \_\_\_\_\_**

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTIONS OF THE ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE (TITLE 21 OF THE GRAND JUNCTION MUNICIPAL CODE) REGARDING UNDERGROUNDING UTILITIES**

Recitals

The City Council desires to maintain effective zoning and development regulations that implement the vision and goals of the Comprehensive Plan while being flexible and responsive to the community's desires and market conditions and has directed that the Code be reviewed and amended as necessary.

When the Zoning & Development Code was repealed and replaced on December 20, 2023, the topic of requiring electric utilities to be placed underground at the time of new development was left unresolved. Staff has subsequently conducted additional workshops with City Council and determined that the provision should be removed to facilitate attainable and affordable housing and to increase equity in code requirements.

After public notice and public hearing as required by the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, the Grand Junction Planning Commission recommended approval of the proposed amendments.

After public notice and public hearing, the Grand Junction City Council finds that the amendments to the Zoning & Development Code implement the vision and goals of the Comprehensive Plan and that the amendments provided in this Ordinance are responsive to the community's desires, encourage orderly development of real property in the City, and otherwise advance and protect the public health, safety, and welfare of the City and its residents.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION THAT:**

**The following sections of the zoning and development code (Title 21 of the Grand Junction Municipal Code) are amended as follows (deletions ~~struck through~~, added language underlined):**

...

**21.05.020 REQUIRED IMPROVEMENTS**

---

...

**(d) Standards for Specific Improvements**

...

**(3) Utilities**

All new electric utilities shall be provided and paid for by the developer and shall be installed underground. Above-ground facilities associated with new electric utility installations (e.g., pedestals, transformers, and transmission lines of 50kv capacity or greater) and temporary overhead lines may be allowed if deemed necessary by the Director. ~~All existing overhead utilities along streets contiguous with the development shall be installed underground prior to street construction. When the development has less than 700 feet of frontage along a street, the Director has discretion to accept a payment of cash in lieu of requiring the developer to underground the existing overhead utilities. The payment amount shall be determined as set forth in the adopted fee schedule.~~

...

**INTRODUCED** on first reading this 7<sup>th</sup> day of August 2024 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

**ADOPTED** on second reading this 21<sup>st</sup> day of August 2024 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_

Abram Herman  
President of the City Council

\_\_\_\_\_

Selestina Sandoval  
City Clerk



**From:** Jane Quimby <[jquimby@laplatallc.com](mailto:jquimby@laplatallc.com)>

**Sent:** Sunday, April 14, 2024 8:54 PM

**To:** Randall Reitz <[randallr@gjcity.org](mailto:randallr@gjcity.org)>; Anna Stout <[annas@gjcity.org](mailto:annas@gjcity.org)>; Cody Kennedy <[codyken@gjcity.org](mailto:codyken@gjcity.org)>; Scott Beilfuss <[scottb@gjcity.org](mailto:scottb@gjcity.org)>; Dennis Simpson <[denniss@gjcity.org](mailto:denniss@gjcity.org)>; Jason Nguyen <[jasonn@gjcity.org](mailto:jasonn@gjcity.org)>; Abe Herman <[abeh@gjcity.org](mailto:abeh@gjcity.org)>

**Subject:** Monday work session on undergrounding

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

I understand there is a Council work session on Monday regarding the undergrounding of existing powerlines. As you know – this is an important issue to the development community, and it has major implications for Redlands 360. Unfortunately (or fortunately) I will be heading to New Zealand on Monday for 3 weeks, so I will miss the Council work session. I appreciate several of you going on a Redlands 360 site visit back in December - I just wanted to share some of my more recent thoughts in advance for your consideration in preparation for Monday's discussion.

I included my historical email below which outlines many of the issues we discussed during previous site visits. We did have a Developer's Roundtable meeting on the 27<sup>th</sup> where Xcel was present. They seemed to share many of our concerns – and they clearly have challenges regarding the undergrounding framework set forth in the current code as recently adopted. The new code kept the old code intact – Underground lines are more difficult to service and maintain.

It was clear from the Roundtable discussion that the preferred alternative is to eliminate the undergrounding requirement across the board. There was discussion about having different standards for different types of lines (primary vs secondary vs feeder etc) – but ultimately this creates further uncertainty and confusion about which lines do/don't need to be undergrounded and what are the associated costs. I think it is important to note that the Development Code Committee AND STAFF both recommended the undergrounding requirement be eliminated. There was consensus on this issue. This got lost during the Council's discussion and subsequent adoption of the Code back in December. The Committee was incredibly disappointed and perplexed when Staff failed to clearly CONFIRM Staff's recommendation to Council. The consultant was the lone supporter of keeping the undergrounding requirement. This is a key question for the work session – What was STAFF's original recommendation regarding changing the previous undergrounding policy in the (OLD) Code ? Any response other than "We supported elimination of the requirement" is disingenuous and inaccurate. The issue of undergrounding has repeatedly been characterized as worthy of a "policy discussion" - which is where we appear to be currently.

Just the analysis alone for undergrounding adds one more layer of review (and DELAY) in the City planning process, not to mention in the development process. For example, it already takes over a year to get a subdivision project approved, and if undergrounding is required Xcel will typically not do it until the subdivision has been platted. The plat is required by the lender, and that presumes development will proceed IMMEDIATELY, which allows for timely repayment of the loan as houses are built. If I get my subdivision platted, and then have to wait for Xcel to get around to doing the undergrounding – my actual construction could be delayed for weeks/months???? We do not control the scheduling of Xcel and are already subject to their whims as far as when they show up, how quickly they work, and how

much it ultimately costs. In our most recent filing at Redlands 360 – it took Xcel TWO MONTHS to complete the required internal undergrounding. Adding the time for planning, alignment and construction for additional undergrounding of adjacent lines will create even further delay before the subdivision even gets started – and could jeopardize funding from a lender. This is the type of real world impact this policy creates. . .

On a small subdivision in the middle of nowhere with no adjacent impacts – it might be more straightforward, but the reality is that many of the existing infill sites are surrounded by already developed parcels, or adjacent to County parcels that are NOT subject to the City code. As noted on our site visit – undergrounding lines adjacent to parts of our project would be for short stretches, only to go above ground at our boundaries because those poles are in the County. This actually creates an even more undesirable aesthetic as the lines would potentially go down then up then back down then back up. This also creates a maintenance headache for Xcel.

The idea that there are ever going to be City “funds” available for undergrounding of a private development is a pipe dream. Greg Caton made it clear to us that the only time the franchise fee funds will be used is for PUBLIC PROJECTS (like 24 Road). Totally understandable. The idea that any other adjacent (future or former) development that benefits from undergrounding would ever contribute to the initial undergrounding costs by the original developer is completely unrealistic. In addition, paying a “fee in lieu” of undergrounding EXISTING lines puts a disproportionate burden on the developer who is unlucky enough to have those historical power lines installed through no fault of their own. Raising the current fee may seem like a reasonable compromise - but again, that added fee will contribute to increased housing costs.

In many cases the existing lines were established long ago without regard to parcel boundaries or City vs County ownership. A great example is the power line running on the north side of Redlands Parkway at S. Camp. It runs for several hundred yards along S. Broadway (Redlands Parkway) until making an arbitrary crossing to the south side (which borders our property), then travels several hundred feet to the northeast before crossing onto Redlands Water and Power property and then continuing back across S. Broadway to the north, with a separate extension southeast up and over Redlands 360. The arbitrary nature of the alignment creates an undue burden on the parcel owner. Technically under the current code, we would be required to underground that section of line along Redlands Parkway/S. Broadway adjacent to our development – which would require mitigation of wetlands that are present PLUS the elimination or realignment of the existing bike path – which is already situated on our property via an easement granted to the City. This is but one illustration of how a policy has unintended or unforeseen consequences and implications for future development. And in this particular case, Xcel has already told us they have absolutely no desire or intention to underground due to all of those considerations.

A second example is the powerline currently running along the west side of 23 Road from Highway 340 to the south. This is a County Road that they desperately want the City to annex. This road is NOT adjacent to our property for much of 23 Road, but it extends beyond S. Broadway to the south on 23 Road (which does border our property) until the road dead ends, then extends onto adjacent (non-R360) property. If those poles had been on the other side of the street – we would not be required to underground. Those poles currently feed county residents with above ground lines connecting to the east. If those poles are buried – how do those residents get served ? Are we then expected to dig lateral undergrounding to those (County) residents across the street ? At what cost ? And the length of that stretch is likely under the required distance for Xcel – so we could essentially be stuck with above

ground lines anyway. Another example of the real world repercussions of a policy that hampers development.

Do I think it is fair to make developers underground NEW lines within their developments ? Yes- absolutely. Do I think undergrounding of the existing powerlines is aesthetically desirable ? Yes. If the aesthetics of undergrounding are a priority for Council – then the City should find the funding to do it in appropriate circumstances. Do I think voters would be willing to support a tax increase to help fund undergrounding of existing powerlines ? NOOooooo.

I want to stress that this has never been about just the added expense of undergrounding. It goes far beyond the expense. It is the uncertainty of that cost, the added layer of review by planning and the subsequent delay in the approval process, the lack of control or influence over Xcel – their scheduling, quality of work, costs, unpredictability of construction and completion – ALL of which contribute to additional burdens and costs of development – which WILL BE PASSED ON to the eventual commercial tenant or home buyer.

I will summarize my key takeaways with the following bullet points regarding EXISTING power lines:

- After extensive review and analysis, the recommendation by the Code Committee AND staff was to eliminate the undergrounding requirement.
- The added expense of undergrounding is significant – and in some cases may kill a potential project – and in all cases adds to the cost of housing
- Developers are required to underground all NEW lines; IF there is a “benefit” to undergrounding the existing lines – that should be at the discretion of the developer
- The unpredictability of Xcel regarding scheduling, alignment, costs and completion of construction is problematic; The City and developer have no control over the timing and costs associated with undergrounding by Xcel.
- Operation and maintenance of overhead lines is easier for Xcel, despite the “safety issue” of overhead powerlines frequently cited by those that prefer undergrounding; the clay/rocky soils in many infill areas make undergrounding particularly challenging (and prohibitively expensive)
- The development process is already painfully slow – the undergrounding requirement creates another layer of review and coordination with Xcel which will create additional delays that impact the economic feasibility of a project.
- Infill sites have additional complications because the surrounding properties often do not have undergrounding requirements (City adjacent to County)
- Existing powerlines were established without regard to parcel boundaries and City/County location; this creates a disparate impact on the developer that happens to have power lines on his side of the road – which may benefit existing and future development without any means for cost recovery.
- As a policy matter – how important is “undergrounding” to the quality of life ? Particularly in outlying areas that are surrounded by existing powerlines that will NEVER be undergrounded ? IF this is something the Council deems is essential to the quality of life – they should be willing to pay for it.

I appreciate the opportunity to share my thoughts prior to your discussion. This is a multi-faceted issue that has far reaching implications for responsible future development projects. . . Thank you for your consideration. JQ



Jane Quimby, Project Manager—Redlands 360  
jqimby@laplatalc.com

LA PLATA COMMUNITIES, INC.  
9540 Federal Drive, Suite 200 | Colorado Springs, CO 80921  
m: 970.712.0006 | [laplatahome.com](http://laplatahome.com)

**From:** Jane Quimby  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 21, 2023 4:57 PM  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Zoning Code - undergrounding of power lines

As a follow up to comments last night re: the zoning code as it relates to the under grounding of existing power lines, I am reaching out to see if you would be interested in a site visit to our Redlands 360 project. I would welcome the opportunity to provide you with actual data as it relates to the parcel(s) we are currently in the process of trying to develop. One of the things missing in the discussion last night was what I consider the “elephant in the room” - Xcel Energy. We have had extensive discussion with Xcel Energy regarding the technical, practical and economic aspects of under grounding the power lines surrounding our property - and I would love to share that information with you.

In addition, we have already had internal discussions with City staff and the City Manager regarding the potential for (future) cost sharing on the under grounding of power lines related to our development. The primary Redlands feeder line runs directly through the northern portion of Redlands 360. As you may or may not know, there is an under grounding fee collected by Xcel as part of every City utility bill. This fund is available to the City for under grounding projects within the City. My understanding is that this fund has been used for “public projects” throughout the City (24 Road for example), and that the balance of these funds are already allocated for future City projects. As Redlands 360 is not a “public project”, and under grounding would primarily serve our (future) residents, reimbursement or cost sharing was not an option based on our informal conversation with the City.

During the initial stages of our development, our desire was to underground all of the existing power lines - we recognize the aesthetics and potential impact(s) on future lot sales. In a perfect world - the absence of visible power lines is highly desirable from a development perspective. However - the economics and technical feasibility of under grounding existing lines that run across our property would essentially be a dealbreaker for a project of our magnitude. The cost estimate provided by Xcel for minor *realignment* of a limited number of existing poles is over \$750k. Under grounding was quoted (approximately 2 years ago) at \$600-900 *per foot* - and that was based on normal (not rocky) soil conditions. In addition, phasing would not be permitted - the entire line would have to be undergrounded up front - before we have any lot sales to offset that initial cost.

The other reality is that as a “rural” City infill project located adjacent to the County, our development is currently surrounded by County roads and residences. The vast majority of these lines are all above ground. Power lines at the boundary of our property will all remain above ground, which creates a funky aesthetic as the lines would transition from above to below back to above - all within the same

view shed. This is another unanticipated consequence of a policy that has “good intentions” but real world practical limitations.

The under grounding issue received significant attention during the zoning code committee process, and based on the fact that staff supported the change in the code (as recommended by the DCC), I was taken aback by the direction of the Council to reject the proposed change to the code. However, I do respect your decision and justification. In retrospect, I should have taken the opportunity to address the Council specifically regarding this issue during the comment period of the public hearing. I especially appreciate your thoughtful perspective and willingness to continue the conversation on an expedited schedule as part of the “adjacent issues” list. I hope to be a participant in those future policy conversations, which will inform future decision making by the Council.

I know we are in the throes of the holiday season, but I am available at your convenience in the coming days/weeks should you be willing to take me up on the offer of a site visit. I will offer the same opportunity to your fellow Council members. I look forward to a response at your earliest convenience. Thank you for your consideration and Happy Holidays to you and your family.

Respectfully,  
Jane Quimby



June 17, 2024

Grand Junction City Council  
Via email

Dear Councilmembers -

On behalf of Housing Resources of Western Colorado and Habitat for Humanity of Mesa County, we are writing to share our thoughts on the question of undergrounding power lines.

The current policy and many of the options for revision raise concerns about the impact on costs of construction and the fairness of that cost burden. Both of our organizations agree with the general concept that developments should "pay their way", meaning they should mitigate negative impacts *caused by* the new development. However, undergrounding of existing lines does not fit this concept. Overhead power lines are existing conditions, not newly created negative impacts of development. Development projects neither cause the overhead lines to be installed, nor benefit uniquely from their undergrounding.

The biggest challenge to affordable housing in the current market is the cost of construction. As a rule of thumb, we estimate \$350,000 per new unit in hard costs (not including a developer fee), and some developments are coming in far higher. This leaves a massive gap to fill and there is not enough public subsidy to fill that gap at the scale needed to address the community's shortage of housing units. We will not get ahead of this problem unless we can get back to a market in which traditional builders can construct new units at prices affordable to the typical resident.

Requiring the undergrounding of longer lines and the fee-in-lieu for shorter lines adds significant cost to developing new units, exacerbating the existing problem. The fee-in-lieu is particularly galling in that it requires developments to pay into a fund which will eventually be used to underground lines on someone else's property.

Housing crises are not felt equally across the community. Those who are already homeowners or have higher incomes are insulated from the pain. The crisis is borne by the

most vulnerable: renters, low-income households, new homebuyers, and newcomers. Requiring new developments to pay for the undergrounding of lines, directly or via a fee-in-lieu, unfairly places the burden of a community-wide benefit on a small portion of residents who did not cause the problem.

If the community as a whole feels strongly enough about burying these lines, the community should pay for this work via their general taxes. If the community balks at using tax funds to bury the lines, it indicates that this is not a high enough community priority. A small group of residents should not then be asked to carry that burden for community members who would benefit but are unwilling to pay.

The City Council has consistently reiterated its desire to improve housing affordability and we are grateful for the support both of our organizations have received. Please consider the negative impacts of the undergrounding policy on housing affordability and search for a solution that fairly spreads the costs across all beneficiaries.

Sincerely,



Emilee Powell  
Executive Director  
Housing Resources of Western Colorado



Laurel Cole  
Executive Director  
Habitat for Humanity of Mesa County



6/3/2024

RE: City Undergrounding Policy

Mayor Herman and Members of City Council,

The Housing and Building Association of Western Colorado (HBA) wishes to share our perspective regarding the existing and proposed undergrounding policy alternatives. We appreciate the City's narrow focus on this item, as this has been an ongoing issue for many years. The HBA supports the existing policy regarding the undergrounding of new electrical and communication distribution facilities within the City of Grand Junction.

We believe the policy of requiring new developments to underground EXISTING facilities 1)negatively affects housing affordability, 2)limits housing supply, 3)decreases predictability in the delivery of new housing 4)is contrary to the City's comprehensive plan, and 5) is illegal.

City staff has done a great job of compiling the many years of the history and issues of the with the existing policy in the January 23, 2024 summary which is attached for reference. In regards to this summary, we believe the section Relationship to the Comprehensive plan is missing reference to the Comprehensive Plan Principle 11.3.e Equitable Considerations:

*“Include considerations for equity in decision-making processes across the City organization to ensure that the benefits and/or burdens of City actions or investments **are shared fairly and do not disproportionately affect a particular group or geographic location over others.**”*

To put in the context of housing, development should pay its own way, a standard that we agree with.

Its also important to note that while the referenced plan principles may support requiring or prioritizing the undergrounding of existing utilities, they do no specify that new housing must pay for them. We recognize there are benefits to undergrounding utilities, especially aesthetics, but this is a broader public benefit and a “public burden which, in all fairness and justice, should



be borne by the public as a whole”. It is either unfair or unfeasible to square this cost on only a small minority.

Another important point that is reiterated in the staff summary is that the Zoning and Development Code Committee AND Staff recommendation was to remove the requirement to underground existing utilities.

We’d also like to share with the you attached memo dated May 28<sup>th</sup> by Shelly Dackonish of Dufford Waldeck Law(“Undergrounding Memo”) considering the legality of both the undergrounding requirements as well as the fee-in-lieu requirement. Its is the HBA’s opinion, based on the Undergrounding Memo, that both the requirement and its fee in-lieu do is “an improper exercise of the City’s land-use police power because governmental interest is not sufficiently linked to development impacts.”

As the staff summary recognized, this has been an issue for our housing providers for many, many years. With no current alternative that addresses the legality, fairness, and the high-cost on housing of this policy, we are asking that you consider amending the code per City of Grand Junction Staff and Zoning and Development Code Committee recommendation to remove the undergrounding requirement.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Shayna Heiney', with a large, loopy flourish at the end.

Shayna Heiney, Executive Officer

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Hogan Peterson  
Western Colorado Housing and Building Association (“HBA”)

**FROM:** Shelly S. Dackonish  
Dufford Waldeck Law

**RE:** Utility Undergrounding Fees / Requirements

**DATE:** May 28, 2024

Partners

Barbara R. Butler  
Shelly S. Dackonish  
William S. DeFord  
Nathan A. Keever  
Michael A. Kuzminski  
Christopher G. McAnany\*  
Annie D. Murphy\*~  
Lauren F. O’Dell\*  
John R. Pierce+  
Sam D. Starritt◇

Of Counsel

J. David Reed  
Richard B. Tuttle

Associates

Rachel Awalt  
Scott D. Goebel  
Diane O. Long  
Thomas L. Long^  
Arie R. Mielkus  
William T. Raley\*

Retired Partners

William H.T. Frey  
Richard H. Krohn  
Laird T. Milburn

D. J. Dufford  
(1919-1998)

William G. Waldeck  
(1923-2009)

^ Also admitted in California  
+ Also admitted in Oregon  
\* Also admitted in Utah  
~ Also admitted in Wisconsin  
◇ Also admitted in Wyoming

---

**ISSUE**

The City of Grand Junction requires all new utilities to be installed underground within new developments and, in addition, the City requires developers to underground, at the developer’s expense, existing overhead utility lines that are “along streets contiguous with the development.” When the “development has less than 700 feet of frontage along a street,” the Director can accept a payment of “cash in lieu” of undergrounding.

HBA members are concerned about the economic impact of this requirement on home building within the City and are wondering whether the undergrounding requirement comports with applicable law.

**APPLICABLE LAW AND ANALYSIS**

1. **Undergrounding Requirements for Development**

The Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code (Code) requires as follows:

**(3) Utilities**

All new electric utilities shall be provided and paid for by the developer and shall be installed underground. Above-ground facilities associated with new installations (e.g., pedestals, transformers, and transmission lines of 50kv capacity or greater) and temporary overhead lines may be allowed if deemed necessary by the Director. All existing overhead utilities along streets contiguous with the development shall be installed underground prior to street construction. When the development has less than 700 feet of frontage along a street, the Director has discretion to accept a payment of cash in lieu of requiring the developer to underground the

existing overhead utilities. The payment amount shall be determined as set forth in the adopted fee schedule.

Code, Section 21.05.020(d)(3). The level of the fee is established by the City Council from time to time.

## 2. Development Exactions and Constitutional Protections<sup>1</sup>

Development exactions (fees and other conditions which impact private property) must comply with the constitutional standards articulated by the courts regarding taking of private property. A development “exaction” occurs when a local government conditions the approval of a development permit on:

- the dedication of land (including fee simple interests, easements, licenses, leases, or other interests in land), or
- the payment of money (such as impact fees and fees in lieu), or
- the provision of materials or services (such as construction of public improvements whether on- or off-site).

Exactions by local governments in connection with land use regulations, whether such exactions are *ad hoc* or legislative in nature, are subject to the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution (“Takings Clause” or “Fifth Amendment”). *Sheetz v. County of El Dorado, California*, 2024 WL 1588707. The Fifth Amendment provides:

"[...] nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

The Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution is extended to the states and local governments by virtue of the Fourteenth Amendment, which provides:

“[...] nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law...”

Development exactions are also subject to the Colorado Constitution, which provides in pertinent part:

Private Property shall not be taken or damaged, for public or private use, without just compensation.

Colorado Constitution: Article II, Section 15.

---

<sup>1</sup> Both the U.S. and the Colorado Constitutions protect private property from takings by the government without just compensation. This Memo only addresses federal constitutional jurisprudence, primarily because I think it is more protective of private property rights in this context. However, if a claim is brought under the Fifth Amendment, a state constitutional law claim should be brought simultaneously; so if you would like to know more about the extent of Colorado’s constitutional protections against development exactions, let me know and I will supplement this Memo.

A local government can take private property for a public purpose as long as the property owner is compensated at fair market value for the property taken. U.S. Const. Amend. 5. A local government also exercises its general police power in the context of development by adopting and enforcing regulations in relation to the development of property within its jurisdiction. The property owner's right of just compensation and the government's power of land-use planning co-exist and are interpreted together to give effect to both. *Sheetz v. County of El Dorado* 2024 WL 1588707 (U.S. Sup. Ct. 2024).

The Takings Clause saves individual property owners from bearing "public burdens which, in all fairness and justice, should be borne by the public as a whole." *Armstrong v. United States*, 364 U.S. 40, 49.

A development exaction is authorized where it is "reasonably necessary to the effectuation of a substantial government purpose;" however, it rises to the level of a taking where it saps too much of the property's value or frustrates the owner's investment-backed expectations. *Penn Central Transportation Co. v. New York City*, 438 U.S. 104, 123, 127 (1978). In other words, the Fifth Amendment is violated when land use regulation does not substantially advance legitimate state interests or denies an owner economically viable use of his land. *Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council* 055 U.S. 1003, 1016 (1992)

Although I am unaware of any case exactly on point, undergrounding of overhead utility lines almost certainly furthers a legitimate governmental interest, and so meets the threshold standard which allows government to "take" property at all. To name just a couple of the public benefits of the policy, it reduces visual clutter and promotes fire safety.

However, in the specific context of development exactions, the governmental purpose must be related to the impacts of the development on which the exaction is to be imposed. "When the government withholds or conditions a building permit for reasons unrelated to its legitimate *land-use interests*, those actions amount to extortion." *Sheetz* (emphasis added).

So, in addition to a legitimate governmental purpose, a development exaction must meet two additional standards. First, it must have an "essential nexus" to the government's land-use interest, ensuring that the government is acting to further its stated purpose, not leveraging its permitting monopoly to exact private property without paying for it. *Nollan v. California Coastal Comm'n*, 483 U.S. 825, 841. Second, it must have "rough proportionality to the development's impact on the land use interest and may not require a landowner to give up (or pay) more than is necessary to mitigate harms **resulting from the new development**." *Dolan v. City of Tigard*, 512 U.S. 374, 391, 393 (emphasis added). This is known as the *Nollan-Dolan* test for the constitutionality of development exactions.

The existence of overhead utility lines **does not in any way** result from the new development. It is an existing condition that the development does not cause or impact the overhead utilities. Therefore, based on Fifth Amendment jurisprudence, the undergrounding of existing overhead

utilities is, to quote the U.S. Supreme Court, a “public burden which, in all fairness and justice, should be borne by the public as a whole.” *Armstrong v. United States*, 364 U.S. 40, 49.

In *Sheetz*, the government argued that impact fees are not subject to the *Nollan-Dolan* test because they are legislative and not ad hoc, and the U.S. Supreme Court rejected that argument, specifically holding that impact fees must pass the *Nollan-Dolan* test. The *Sheetz* decision did not, however, evaluate the validity of the impact fee in question in that case, nor did it decide whether a permit condition imposed on a class of properties must be tailored with the same degree of specificity as a permit condition that targets a particular development. (*Sheetz*, Kavanaugh dissent.) For that, we look at Colorado’s Impact Fee Statute.

### 3. Development Fees and Statutory Protections

In Colorado, any impact fee and “other similar development charge” by a municipality must comply with C.R.S. §29-20-104.5 (“Impact Fee Statute”).<sup>2</sup> Impact fees and other similar development charges are authorized by the Colorado legislature “to fund expenditures . . . on capital facilities needed to serve new development.” C.R.S. §29-20-104.5(1). The fee must be legislatively adopted, generally applicable to a board class of property, and intended to defray the projected impacts on capital facilities *caused by proposed development*. C.R.S. 29-20-104.5(1).

In addition, the local government must “quantify the reasonable impacts of proposed development on existing capital facilities and establish the impact fee or development charge at a level no greater than necessary to defray such impacts *directly related to proposed development*.” C.R.S. 29-20-104.5(2)(a).

Moreover:

**No impact fee or other similar development charge shall be imposed to remedy any deficiency in capital facilities that exists without regard to the proposed development.**

C.R.S. 29-20-104.5(2)(a).

As mentioned above, the new development has no causal relationship with the fact that existing utility lines are overhead. Moreover, the fact that existing utility lines are overhead is by definition a deficiency in existing capital facilities. The City can remedy that deficiency, but it must do so out of the general fund, and not by extorting developers.

### 4. Landowner Remedies.

---

<sup>2</sup> While the City is calling the fee a “fee in lieu” and not calling it an impact fee, I think that the Impact Fee Statute still applies to the undergrounding fee because of its broad language and failure to define “impact fee” in any limiting way.

Local governments impose conditions on development that lack a sufficient connection to a legitimate land-use interest, even though the conditions amount to “an out-and-out plan of extortion.” *Nollan* at 837. This is primarily because landowners have not had any reasonable recourse or means to enforce the constitutional limitations on development exactions. They have been “likely to accede to the government’s demand, no matter how unreasonable,” just to be able to complete their project. *Koontz v. St. Johns River Water Management Dist.*, 570 U.S. 595, 605. However, some strides toward balancing the scales have been made within the last few years, at least in terms of federal constitutional jurisprudence.

In 2018, for example, *Knick v. Township of Scott*, the U.S. Supreme Court held that someone whose property has been taken by a local government has a claim under 42 U.S.C. §1983<sup>3</sup> for deprivation of a right secured by the Constitution (namely, the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment) that can be brought in federal court. Prior to *Knick* (decided in 2018) a property owner had to first exhaust remedies available for inverse condemnation in state court proceedings. After *Knick*, this is no longer required. A landowner can pay a fee or perform the exaction under protest so that the development project can move forward, and maintain the federal court action without it being mooted by the pursuit or completion of the development.

Additionally, because the cause of action is pursuant to §1983, the landowner can recover its attorneys fees under 42 U.S.C. §1988 if it prevails on the taking claim. These tip the scales slightly and make it somewhat more possible for a landowner to challenge this form of governmental overreach.

## 5. Conclusion

I think it is more likely than not that a court would find that the undergrounding requirement and fee in lieu are an improper exercise of the City’s land-use police power because governmental interest is not sufficiently linked to development impacts.

---

<sup>3</sup> 42 U.S.C. §1983 provides that:

“Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law . . . .”

## APPENDIX 1 Case Law Summaries

### Summary of the Facts of U.S. Supreme Court Cases on Development Exactions

*Nollan v. California Coastal Commission*, 483 U.S. 825 (1987). The Nollans owned beach-front property, and sought a permit to rebuild a home that had been damaged. The California Coastal Commission required, as a condition of the permit, a public easement over their private beach. The U.S. Supreme Court held that the condition was invalid and violated the taking clause because it lacked an “essential nexus” to the alleged harmful impact. The impact was an increase in blockage of the view of the ocean, contributing to a “wall” of residential structures that would prevent the public “psychologically” from realizing a stretch of coastline exists nearby that they had a right to visit.

*Dolan v. City of Tigard*, 512 U. S. 374, 392 (1994). Florence Dolan sought a permit to expand her plumbing and electrical supply store. The City required her to dedicate some of her land for flood-control and a bicycle path. The U.S. Supreme Court held that even though there was an essential nexus, there was no proportionality between the required exaction and the nature and extent of the impact of the proposed development, so the condition of approval was a taking in violation of the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment.

*Koontz v. St. Johns River Water Management District* 570 U.S. 595 (2013). Florida law protecting wetlands; Koontz owned 14.7 acres and he proposed to develop 3.7 acres of it and to give the District a conservation easement over the remaining 11 acres. The District rejected his offer and instead required Koontz to either (1) give a conservation easement over a larger area of his property or (2) pay for improvements to District wetlands miles away.

*Knick v. Township of Scott*, 139 S.Ct. 2162 (2019). Burial plots on Knick’s property. Town passed an ordinance requiring cemeteries to be open to the public during the day, and defining a cemetery as place or area of ground on public or private property utilized as a burial place for deceased human beings. Court found that the landowner could bring a takings claim in federal court under §1983 and receive compensation for a taking of their property.

*Sheetz v. County of El Dorado, California*, 2024 WL 1588707. George Sheetz wanted to construct a modest modular home on property in El Dorado County. The County had a traffic impact fee that was based on a rate schedule that took into account the type of development and its location within the County. The fee was \$23,420 for Mr. Sheetz’ property. Sheetz paid the fee under protest and filed a lawsuit in state court, claiming the fee was an unlawful exaction in violation of the Takings Clause and the *Nollan-Dolan* test. The County claimed that the fee was not subject to the *Nollan-Dolan* test because it was a legislative program rather than an ad hoc exaction. The Supreme Court disagreed with the County, held that the impact fee is subject to the *Nollan-Dolan* test, and remanded.

### Summary of the Facts of Regulatory Takings Cases

*Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council*, 505 U.S. 1003 (1992) - A state law prohibited the plaintiff from building residential structures on two beachfront lots. The court held that, if a regulation results in either a "physical invasion" or a "total taking (a denial of all economic use of the land)," the owner has suffered a per se taking and is entitled to just compensation regardless of the public interest advanced in support of the restraint, unless the government can

identify "background principles of nuisance and property law" that prohibit the uses the owner intends under the circumstances in which the property is presently found.

*City of Monterey v. Del Monte Dunes*, 526 U.S. 687 (1999) - The city denied a permit application for an oceanfront development based on environmental impacts and access issues. The developer claimed that the city's permit denial had deprived it of all economic use of its property. The Court recognized the right to a jury trial in a regulatory takings case, and it upheld a \$1.45 million jury award to the landowner based on loss of economically viable use of its property. The Court characterized the Dolan test of rough proportionality as inapplicable to a takings claim based on unconditional denial of a development permit.

*Agins v. Tiburon*, 447 U.S. 255 (1980) - In a challenge to a city ordinance that limited development of the Agins' five-acre lot to between one and five homes, the Court adopted a two-part test for regulatory takings challenges. The application of a general zoning law to particular property is not a taking if the regulation substantially advances legitimate state interests and does not deny an owner economically viable use of his land.

### **Physical occupation of property**

*Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp.*, 458 U.S. 419 (1982) - A state law required that landlords allow the installation of cable television on their property and limited the payment from the cable company to no more than an amount determined by a state commission to be reasonable. The Court ruled the statute unconstitutional, holding that a permanent physical occupation of real property is a taking to the extent of the occupation, without regard to whether the action achieves an important public benefit or has only minimal economic impact on the property owner. The Court reasoned that, to the extent that the government permanently occupies physical property, it effectively destroys the owner's rights to possess, use, and dispose of the property.

### **Temporary takings**

*First English Evangelical Lutheran Church of Glendale v. County of Los Angeles*, 482 U.S. 304 (1987) - The county adopted an "interim ordinance" that barred construction or reconstruction of buildings within an interim flood protection zone. The Court determined that "temporary" regulatory takings that deny landowners all use of their property are not different in kind from permanent takings for which the Constitution clearly requires compensation. Invalidation of the regulatory ordinance without payment of fair value for the use of the property during the period of the taking is a constitutionally insufficient remedy.



**APPENDIX 2**  
**IMPACT FEE STATUTE**

**C.R.S. §29-20-104.5**

(1) Pursuant to the authority granted in section 29-20-104 (1) (g) and as a condition of issuance of a development permit, a local government may impose an impact fee or other similar development charge to fund expenditures by such local government or a fire and emergency services provider that provides fire protection, rescue, and emergency services in the new development on capital facilities needed to serve new development. No impact fee or other similar development charge shall be imposed except pursuant to a schedule that is:

- (a) Legislatively adopted;
- (b) Generally applicable to a broad class of property; and
- (c) Intended to defray the projected impacts on capital facilities caused by proposed development.

(2) (a) A local government shall quantify the reasonable impacts of proposed development on existing capital facilities and establish the impact fee or development charge at a level no greater than necessary to defray such impacts directly related to proposed development. No impact fee or other similar development charge shall be imposed to remedy any deficiency in capital facilities that exists without regard to the proposed development.

(b) A local government shall confer with any fire and emergency services provider that provides fire protection, rescue, and emergency medical services in a new development, together with the owner or developer of the development, to assess and determine whether there should be an impact fee or other similar development charge imposed to defray the impacts to the fire and emergency services provider.

(c) If a local government, in its sole discretion, elects to impose an impact fee or other similar development charge to fund the expenditures by a fire and emergency services provider for a capital facility, then the local government and fire and emergency services provider shall enter into an intergovernmental agreement defining the impact fee or other similar development charge and the details of collection and remittance.

(d) A local government that imposes an impact fee or other similar development charge to fund the expenditures by a fire and emergency services provider for a capital facility shall pay the impact fees or other similar development charges collected to the fire protection and emergency service provider.

(3) Any schedule of impact fees or other similar development charges adopted by a local government pursuant to this section shall include provisions to ensure that no individual

landowner is required to provide any site specific dedication or improvement to meet the same need for capital facilities for which the impact fee or other similar development charge is imposed. A local government shall not impose an impact fee or other similar development charge on an individual landowner to fund expenditures for a capital facility used to provide fire, rescue, and emergency services if the landowner is already required to pay an impact fee or other similar development charge for another capital facility used to provide a similar fire, rescue, and emergency service or if the landowner has voluntarily contributed money for such a capital facility.

(4) As used in this section, the term "capital facility" means any improvement or facility that:

(a) Is directly related to any service that a local government or a fire and emergency services provider is authorized to provide;

(b) Has an estimated useful life of five years or longer; and

(c) Is required by the charter or general policy of a local government or fire and emergency services provider pursuant to a resolution or ordinance.

(5) Any impact fee or other similar development charge shall be collected and accounted for in accordance with part 8 of article 1 of this title. Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, a local government may waive an impact fee or other similar development charge on the development of low- or moderate- income housing or affordable employee housing as defined by the local government.

(6) No impact fee or other similar development charge shall be imposed on any development permit for which the applicant submitted a complete application before the adoption of a schedule of impact fees or other similar development charges by the local government pursuant to this section. No impact fee or other similar development charge imposed on any development activity shall be collected before the issuance of the development permit for such development activity. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a local government from deferring collection of an impact fee or other similar development charge until the issuance of a building permit or certificate of occupancy.

(7) Any person or entity that owns or has an interest in land that is or becomes subject to a schedule of fees or charges enacted pursuant to this section shall, by filing an application for a development permit, have standing to file an action for declaratory judgment to determine whether such schedule complies with the provisions of this section. An applicant for a development permit who believes that a local government has improperly applied a schedule of fees or charges adopted pursuant to this section to the development application may pay the fee or charge imposed and proceed with development without prejudice to the applicant's right to challenge the fee or charge imposed under rule 106 of the Colorado rules of civil procedure. If the court determines that a local government has either imposed a fee or charge on a

development that is not subject to the legislatively enacted schedule or improperly calculated the fee or charge due, it may enter judgment in favor of the applicant for the amount of any fee or charge wrongly collected with interest thereon from the date collected.

(8) (a) The general assembly hereby finds and declares that the matters addressed in this section are matters of statewide concern.

(b) This section shall not prohibit any local government from imposing impact fees or other similar development charges pursuant to a schedule that was legislatively adopted before October 1, 2001, so long as the local government complies with subsections (3), (5), (6), and (7) of this section. Any amendment of such schedule adopted after October 1, 2001, shall comply with all of the requirements of this section.

(9) If any provision of this section is held invalid, such invalidity shall invalidate this section in its entirety, and to this end the provisions of this section are declared to be non-severable.

4871-8700-9730, v. 6

4871-8700-9730, v. 6



**Grand Junction Planning Commission**

**Regular Session**

**Item #2.**

---

**Meeting Date:** July 9, 2024  
**Presented By:** Niki Galehouse, Planning Supervisor  
**Department:** Community Development  
**Submitted By:** Niki Galehouse, Planning Manager

---

**Information**

**SUBJECT:**

Consider Amendments to Title 21 Zoning and Development Code to Create a New Land Use Category for Interim Housing, to Create Temporary Use and Structure Standards for Interim Housing, and to Create a New Public Hearing Process for an Extended Temporary Use permit.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of this request.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

As part of the Unhoused Needs Assessment, the community has identified that interim housing in the form of temporary shelter may serve as an important part of the housing continuum and is not a land use or structure contemplated by the existing Zoning & Development Code. An Interim Housing strategy has two primary components - regulations and programming. The current Zoning & Development Code does not contemplate Interim Housing as a use. Before the City can delve into programming, which includes considerations related to funding, location, and day-to-day site operations, regulations must be established so the use category (which will be defined by and through the regulations) may be considered.

**BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:**

**BACKGROUND**

**Interim Housing Work Group Recommendation**

As part of the Unhoused Needs Assessment, the community has identified that interim housing in the form of temporary shelter may serve as an important part of the housing continuum and is not a land use or structure contemplated by the existing Zoning & Development Code (ZDC). An Interim Housing strategy has two primary components - regulations and programming. The current ZDC does not contemplate Interim Housing

as a use. Before the City can delve into programming, which includes considerations related to funding, location, and day-to-day site operations, regulations must be established so the use category (which will be defined by and through the regulations) may be considered.

It is important to note that “transitional housing” has evolved as a term to identify the programmatic goals and supportive services designed to act as a bridge between temporary and permanent housing. This term is not generally related to a specific housing type and can include anything from typical “brick and mortar” multifamily housing facilities to safe camping areas. The term “interim housing” is now being utilized by many government agencies and the housing sector to identify shelter types like sanctioned camping, safe parking, and temporary shelters that often are not permanent facilities and that often either don’t meet or are not required to meet building codes for permanent residential use. Interim housing may or may not have transitional programmatic services. Due to the evolution of terminology and because “brick and mortar” facilities are already allowed under the ZDC, the City will be using the term “interim housing.”

During the adoption of the 2023 ZDC, the Development Code Committee identified that the topic of interim housing warranted more extensive community input and discussion for more detailed recommendations to be made. At the City Council Workshop on December 4, 2023, City Council agreed that interim housing be considered urgently. As such, staff contracted with Clarion Associates (“Clarion”) to facilitate the process and provide recommendations. Clarion has experience in developing regulations on this subject with other communities.

Staff and Clarion recommended a working group be formed to provide direct input and offer insight into Grand Junction's needs and preferences in addressing this topic. Members of the working group have been playing a critical role in discussing and developing any land use changes that may result, serving as a sounding board that reflects a diverse set of perspectives. This group comprises 20 members, varying from nonprofit, financial, development, and community backgrounds.

**Interim Housing Work Group (IHWG)**

Since January 16, 2024, the Interim Housing Work Group (IHWG) has met seven times. The IHWG discussed many aspects of the issues and reviewed five case study communities for best practices and code language. From there, the IHWG drafted regulations by working through fourteen major issues:

- Definitions
- Zone district appropriateness
- Buffers
- Transportation to support services
- Permitted shelter types
- Setbacks and internal spacing
- Screening
- Sanitary facilities and waste disposal

- Site amenities
- Vehicle parking and bicycle storage
- Occupancy limits
- Operational entities and on-site management
- Management plan; and
- Procedure for approval.

### **Overview of Draft Regulations**

The draft regulations address Interim Shelter Sites, which would allow temporary structures for shelter. The use is proposed to require an Extended Temporary Use review, modeled after the Conditional Use Permit but approved by City Council, in Mixed-Used, Commercial, Industrial, and Public zone districts. They are not permitted in residential zone districts.

The draft regulations provide standards for setbacks, spacing of individual units, provision of sanitary facilities, waste disposal, and vehicle parking for the Interim Shelter Sites. A significant portion of the use-specific standards for interim housing is dedicated to the operations of the site. These requirements include the type of organization that may operate one of these sites, a requirement for continuous on-site management by a trained staff member and the provision of a management plan. The management plan must include information about on-site management, staff training, pet allowances, resident intake screening, fire safety and emergency access, evacuation plans, a resident code of conduct agreement, lights out and quiet hours, and security measures.

The draft regulations provide for a maximum of 30 shelters per site, with a minimum of 150 square feet per shelter and 10 feet of spacing required between shelter units. Only 20% of these may be available for double occupancy. The number of shelter units may be increased after six months of successful operation, as defined by the regulations. An Interim Shelter Site must provide amenities including a designated smoking area, pet relief area, and sufficient community space to serve resident needs. Secure bicycle storage must be provided.

Individual units that may be used on an Interim Shelter Site must be provided by the managing entity and can include prefabricated shelters and micro-shelters. These facilities are temporary and, as such, cannot be connected to water or sewer.

Interim Shelter Site managers would be required to provide support services, such as educational and job training or case management, on-site or have a plan to provide transportation for its residents.

The draft regulations propose that Interim Shelter Sites are exempt from density requirements, as the shelters are not permanent dwelling units, lot coverage standards, landscaping requirements, site and structure development standards, and off-street parking standards, except where those are made specifically applicable.

The use-specific standards would be considered as part of the Extended Temporary Use (ETU) review criteria, in addition to those provided in the ETU process standards, which include compliance with the Zoning & Development Code, compatibility in scale and design with surrounding uses and consideration of adverse effects, and evaluation of risk to public health and safety. The ETU also allows for additional ease of enforcement should there be issues that arise with noncompliance with any of the required standards or nuisance to the surrounding neighborhood.

An ETU, if issued, would be valid for two years on initial approval, with the ability to request an extension from the City Council if the Site demonstrates need and/or a history of positive outcomes by the number of residents moved into permanent housing. A request for an extension must consider the existence and frequency of sustained Code Enforcement complaints, calls for service to Police and Fire, documentation of transitioning residents into long-term or stable housing, and other documentation as deemed necessary by the Director.

During the Planning Commission workshops, it was recommended that the regulations limit the operation period, including any extensions, to three years. The Commission also recommended that to ensure the community could anticipate any impacts from the proposed use that if there was to be a request to expand the number of units allowed these be provided in a phasing plan with the initial approval or that the addition must come through an entire new submittal to allow for public participation.

**NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS**

**Public Outreach**

In April, Community Development gathered public input about a possible interim housing use(s) within City limits. Information was added to EngageGJ.org, a virtual meeting was held on April 10, 2024, an in-person open house took place at the Lincoln Park Barn on April 18, 2024, and City Staff was present at Southwest ArborFest with information and demonstration models. City Staff also conducted outreach with the unhoused population at the Resource Center on May 1, 2024.

Event	Date	Participation
Virtual Meeting	April 10, 2024	97
Open House	April 18, 2024	116
ArborFest Booth	April 27, 2024	184
Resource Center	May 1, 2024	30

At the April 18th open house seven boards were displayed allowing for public input using dot stickers and comment sticky notes. The detail of responses is attached to this agenda item. Of note the question was asked "should Grand Junction allow interim shelter sites?" to which the response, out of 62 participants, was 82 percent yes (41) or yes, but only in certain areas (10). It was also asked "should Grand Junction allow interim parking sites?" to which the response, out of 65 participants, was 72 percent yes

(36) or yes but only in certain areas (11).

Notice was completed as required by Section 21.02.030(g). Notice of the public hearing was published on June 30, 2024 in the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel. An online hearing with opportunity for public comment was held between July 2 and July 8, 2024 through the GJSpeaks platform.

## **ANALYSIS**

The criteria for review are set forth in Section 21.02.050(d) of the Zoning and Development Code, which provides that the City may approve an amendment to the text of the Code if the applicant can demonstrate evidence proving each of the following criteria:

### **(A) Consistency with Comprehensive Plan**

*The proposed Code Text Amendment is generally consistent with applicable provisions of the Comprehensive Plan.*

The proposed amendments to the Zoning & Development Code (ZDC) are generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Plan Principle 5 speaks to rising homelessness and calls for permanent, supportive housing as part of the solution. While permanent housing is the desired long-term goal, the desired outcome includes reduced time in homelessness. Permanent supportive housing takes a significant lift to construct, so the provision of interim housing aides in getting people off the streets and providing support services to transition to permanent housing. Goal 1, Strategy d. encourages planning for populations with specialized housing needs, while Goal 2, Strategy c. supports working cooperatively with regional partners in matters related to affordable housing, including supportive housing for at-risk and homeless populations. Staff finds this criterion has been met.

### **(B) Consistency with Zoning and Development Code Standards**

*The proposed Code Text Amendment is consistent with and does not conflict with or contradict other provisions of this Code.*

The proposed amendments to the ZDC are consistent with the rest of the provisions in the Code and do not create any conflicts with other provisions in the Code. The existing ZDC does not contemplate interim housing, so the proposed new use is not inconsistent with a previous prohibition. It is not unprecedented that a temporary use be allowed to exist for longer than the standard of 120 days, which is typical for most temporary uses. Temporary parking lots and temporary low-traffic storage yards are permitted for up to 24 months, and mobile food vendors are exempt from the waiting period between temporary use permits, so may be extended for multiple periods exceeding the 120 days. The three years proposed for interim housing shelter sites is not out of line with these, especially given the added public hearing process to approve the use.

The establishment of interim housing as a temporary use sets it aside from traditional development that requires permanent infrastructure and site improvements as part of the development process. When considering that this use



will not exist for a period longer than three years, it is not logical to require permanent infrastructure that will add significant time and cost burdens to the operation. The exemption offered within the temporary use standards for interim housing is appropriate to allow this use to establish in a timely manner to meet the needs of the community and maintain consistency with the ZDC. Staff finds this criterion has been met.

**(C) Specific Reasons**

*The proposed Code Text Amendment shall meet at least one of the following specific reasons:*

- a. To address trends in development or regulatory practices;*
- b. To expand, modify, or add requirements for development in general or to address specific development issues;*
- c. To add, modify or expand zone districts; or*
- d. To clarify or modify procedures for processing development applications.*

The addition of the interim housing use expands the use allowed in the zone districts. Establishing the use is the first step in the process of allowing interim housing to exist within City limits. The use-specific standards add requirements for a specific development issue. The creation of these standards allows for the use to coexist with surrounding uses in a managed way to mitigate any potential impacts. The addition of the extended temporary use process creates a new procedure for processing development applications. This new process allows for public input and places the approval at the City Council level as opposed to approval by Planning Commission if it were to remain a Conditional Use Permit process. Staff finds this criterion has been met.

**RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT**

After reviewing the proposed amendments, the following findings of fact have been made:

In accordance with Section 21.02.050(d) of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, the proposed text amendments to Title 21 are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning & Development Code Standards and meet at least one of the specific reasons outlined.

Therefore, Staff recommends approval of this request.

**SUGGESTED MOTION:**

Mr. Chairman, on the request to amend Title 21 Zoning and Development Code of the Grand Junction Municipal Code, City file number ZCA-2024-397, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council with the findings of fact listed in the staff report.

**Attachments**

- 1. GJZDC\_Interim Housing\_07.05.24 (1)
- 2. IH Open House Boards
- 3. IHpublic comment 7.1.24



**CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

**ORDINANCE NO. \_\_\_\_\_**

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTIONS OF THE ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE (TITLE 21 OF THE GRAND JUNCTION MUNICIPAL CODE) CREATING A NEW LAND USE CATEGORY FOR INTERIM HOUSING, CREATING TEMPORARY USE AND STRUCTURE STANDARDS FOR INTERIM HOUSING, AND CREATING A NEW PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS FOR AN EXTENDED TEMPORARY USE PERMIT**

**Recitals**

The City Council desires to maintain effective zoning and development regulations that implement the vision and goals of the Comprehensive Plan while being flexible and responsive to the community's desires and market conditions and has directed that the Code be reviewed and amended as necessary.

Whereas, when the Zoning & Development Code was repealed and replaced on December 20, 2023, the topic of interim housing was warranted more extensive community input and discussion for more detailed recommendations to be made outside of the general code update process. Staff has subsequently worked with a consultant and a working group to provide direct input and offer insight into this complex topic.

Whereas, as part of the Unhoused Needs Assessment, the community has identified that interim housing in the form of temporary shelter may serve as an important part of the housing continuum and is not a land use or structure contemplated by the existing Zoning & Development Code (ZDC). The proposed regulations address the establishment of the use, process for approval, standards for compatibility with surrounding uses, and health and safety requirements.

After public notice and public hearing as required by the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, the Grand Junction Planning Commission recommended approval of the proposed amendments.

After public notice and public hearing, the Grand Junction City Council finds that the amendments to the Zoning & Development Code implement the vision and goals of the Comprehensive Plan and that the amendments provided in this Ordinance are responsive to the community's desires, encourage orderly development of real property in the City, and otherwise advance and protect the public health, safety, and welfare of the City and its residents.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION THAT:**

The following sections of the zoning and development code (Title 21 of the Grand Junction Municipal Code) are amended as follows (deletions struck through, added language underlined):

...

**21.02.020 SUMMARY TABLE OF REVIEW AND DECISION-MAKING BODIES**

<b>Table 21.02-1: Summary Table of Review and Decision-Making Bodies</b> R= Recommendation D = Decision A = Appeal						
Section	Procedure	Director	Plan Comm.	HPB	City Council	ZBA
<b>Applications Requiring a Public Hearing</b>						
...						
<u>21.02.050(h)</u>	<u>Extended Temporary Use</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>R</u>		<u>D</u>	
...						

...

**21.02.030 COMMONLY APPLICABLE PROCEDURES**

...

<b>Table 21.02-2: Summary Table of Commonly Applicable Procedures</b> * = Optional ✓ = Required Gray Box = Not Applicable PDIM = Proposed Development Information Meeting NCM = Neighborhood Comment Meeting						
Section	Procedure	General Mtg	Pre-App Mtg	Applic. Outreach Mtg	Public Notice	Public Hearing
	Detailed requirements in GJMC:	21.02.030(b)(1)	21.02.030(b)(2)	21.02.030(c)	21.02.030(g)	
<b>Applications Requiring a Public Hearing</b>						
...						
<u>21.02.050(h)</u>	<u>Extended Temporary Use</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>NCM</u>	<u>✓</u>	<u>✓</u>
...						

...

<b>Table 21.02-3: Summary Table of Public Notice Requirements</b> Date/Distance/Yes = Required Notice Gray Box = Not Applicable				
Section	Procedure	Published Notice	Mailed Notice	Sign Notice
<b>Applications Requiring a Public Hearing</b>				

Table 21.02-3: Summary Table of Public Notice Requirements Date/Distance/Yes = Required Notice Gray Box = Not Applicable				
Section	Procedure	Published Notice	Mailed Notice	Sign Notice
<u>21.02.050(h)</u>	<u>Extended Temporary Use</u>	<u>7 days</u>	<u>Owners within 500 feet</u>	<u>Yes</u>

...

## 21.02.050 APPLICATIONS REQUIRING A PUBLIC HEARING

### (a) Overview

Major development applications are reviewed and decided on by the Planning Commission or City Council. The following application types are major development applications:

Table 21.02-4: Major Development Application Summary		
Application Type	Purpose	Additional Application Requirements
...		
<u>Extended Temporary Use</u>	<u>Review requested for a temporary use for a period of time exceeding 180 days</u>	<u>21.02.050(h)</u>
...		

...

**(g) Conditional Use, Extended Temporary Use, and Special Dimensional Permit Amendment, Termination, or Revocation**

**(1) Purpose**

This section is intended to allow the post-approval review of Conditional Use Permits, Extended Temporary Use Permits, and Special Dimensional Permits for amendment, termination, or revocation.

**(2) Interested Party**

Any interested party may apply to the City for the amendment, termination, or revocation of a Conditional Use, Extended Temporary Use, or Special Dimensional Permit. For purposes of this section, "interested party" shall include the following:

- (i) The original applicant or successor in interest, or the current owner or lessee of the property for which the conditional use was granted (permit holder);
- (ii) The City; and
- (iii) Any owner or lessee of property that lies within 500 feet of the property for which the Conditional Use Permit was granted.

**(3) Preliminary Criteria**

An applicant for amendment, termination, or revocation of a Conditional Use, Extended Temporary Use, or Special Dimensional Permit must establish the following to the satisfaction of the decision-maker before the requested change(s) can be considered by the decision-maker:

**(i) Permit Holder**

A Conditional Use, Extended Temporary Use, or Special Dimensional Permit may be amended or terminated at the request of the permit holder as follows:

**(A) Grounds for Amendment**

- a. The permit holder shall show that a substantial change in circumstance has occurred since the approval of the permit that would justify a change in the permit.
- b. An Extended Temporary Use permit may only be amended in accordance with GJMC 21.02.050(h)(6)(i).

**Common Procedures for Major Development Applications**

**1** General Meeting or Pre-Application Meeting  
Sec. 21.02.030(b)

**2** Application Submittal & Review  
Sec. 21.02.030(d) and 21.02.030(e)

**3** Complete Applications with Changed Status  
Sec. 21.02.030(f)

**4** Public Notice | Sec. 21.02.030(g)

**5** Planning Commission Recommendation or Decision  
Sec. 21.02.030(h)

**6** City Council Decision  
Sec. 21.02.030(h)

**7** Post-Decision Actions  
Sec. 21.02.030(i)

**(B) Grounds for Termination**

The permit holder shall show that the use is an allowed use in the zone district in which it is now established or that the use has ceased to exist.

**(ii) Other Interested Party**

A Conditional Use, Extended Temporary Use, or Special Dimensional Permit may be revoked at the request of any other interested party if one or more of the following is established:

- (A) The permit was obtained by misrepresentation or fraud;
- (B) The use, or, if more than one, all the uses, for which the permit was granted has ceased or has been suspended for six months;
- (C) The permit holder has failed to comply with any one or more of the conditions placed on the issuance of the permit;
- (D) The permit holder has failed to comply with one or more of the City regulation governing the conduct of that use;
- (E) The permit holder has failed to construct or maintain the approved site as shown on the approved Site Plan;
- (F) The operation of the use or the character of the site has been found to be a nuisance or a public nuisance by a court of competent jurisdiction in any civil or criminal proceeding.

**(4) Due Process**

- (i) No Conditional Use, Extended Temporary Use, or Special Dimensional Permit shall be revoked without first giving the permit holder an opportunity to appear before the decision-maker and show cause as to why the permit should not be revoked.
- (ii) Revocation of the permit shall not limit the City's ability to initiate or complete other legal proceedings against the holder or user of the permit.

**(5) Review Procedures**

- (i) All applications for amendment or revocation of a Conditional Use, Extended Temporary Use, or Special Dimensional Permit shall be processed in the same manner and based on the same review criteria as a new request for a Conditional Use or Special Dimensional Permit.
- (ii) All applications for termination of a Conditional Use or Extended Temporary Use Permit shall be reviewed and decided on by the Director.
- (iii) Any person or entity, other than the City, seeking to amend, terminate, or revoke an approved Conditional Use, Extended Temporary Use, or Special Dimensional Permit shall pay a fee in the amount established for an original application for a Conditional Use or Special Dimensional Permit.

**(h) Extended Temporary Use Review**

**(1) Purpose**

The purpose of this section is to provide an opportunity for an applicant to request review of a temporary use for a period of time exceeding 180 days.

**(2) Applicability**

This section shall apply to any use that is classified as an Extended Temporary Use in Table 21.04-1: Principal Use Table or Table 21.04-2: Accessory Use Table.

**(3) Review Procedures, General**

Applications for Extended Temporary Use review shall meet the common review procedures for major development applications in GJMC 21.02.050(b), with the following modifications:

- (i) A neighborhood meeting is required.
- (ii) Site plan review and approval (pursuant to GJMC 21.02.040(k)) can occur either before or after the approval of an Extended Temporary Use. In either case, the applicant shall submit a site sketch showing all site design features that are proposed or necessary to mitigate site and neighborhood impacts and/or enhance neighborhood compatibility in sufficient detail to enable the Planning Commission to recommend on or the City Council to make findings on the Extended Temporary Use criteria.
- (iii) The Planning Commission or City Council can request additional information from the applicant if it deems the site sketch is insufficient to enable it to make a determination on the criteria.
- (iv) In any subsequent site plan review, the Director shall determine that all mitigating/enhancing site features approved or made conditions of approval by the City Council are depicted on the approved site plan.

**(4) Public Notice and Public Hearing Requirements**

The application shall be scheduled for a public hearing before the Planning Commission and City Council, and shall be noticed pursuant to GJMC 21.02.030(g), unless the application is for a minor expansion or change of an Extended Temporary Use approval in accordance with GJMC 21.02.050(h)(6), below.

**(5) Review Criteria for Extended Temporary Use**

The Planning Commission shall review and recommend and the City Council shall decide on an Extended Temporary Use application in light of the following criteria:

**Common Procedures for Major Development Applications**

- 1** General Meeting or Pre-Application Meeting  
Sec. 21.02.030(b)
- 2** Application Submittal & Review  
Sec. 21.02.030(d) and 21.02.030(e)
- 3** Complete Applications with Changed Status  
Sec. 21.02.030(f)
- 4** Public Notice | Sec. 21.02.030(g)
- 5** Planning Commission Recommendation or Decision  
Sec. 21.02.030(h)
- 6** City Council Decision  
Sec. 21.02.030(h)
- 7** Post-Decision Actions  
Sec. 21.02.030(i)



- (i) The proposed use complies with the applicable requirements of this Code, including any use-specific standards for the use in GJMC Chapter 21.04.
- (ii) The proposed use is of a scale and design and in a location that is compatible with surrounding uses.
- (iii) Potential adverse effects of the use will be mitigated to the maximum extent practicable.
- (iv) The proposed use does not pose an unreasonable risk to public health or safety.

**(6) Post-Decision Actions**

**(i) Major or Minor Change or Expansion**

If the applicant proposes to change or expand a structure or other feature of a site that is subject to an Extended Temporary Use approval, the Director shall determine whether the expansion/change is major or minor as follows:

**(A) Determination of Major or Minor Status**

- a. A major change or expansion is one that:
  - 1. Affects, changes, removes, or eliminates a site feature or condition that was approved or imposed for the purpose of mitigating neighborhood impacts or enhancing neighborhood compatibility;
  - 2. Increases the intensity of the use, the off-site impacts such as noise, light or odor, or the hours of operation; and
  - 3. Results in a substantial change to the features shown on the site sketch which formed the basis of the City Council's approval of the Temporary Extended Use.
- b. All other expansion/changes shall be considered minor.

**(B) Application Process**

- a. A major change or expansion shall be reviewed by the City Council in accordance with the criteria for an original application for an Extended Temporary Use.
- b. A minor expansion/change shall be reviewed by the Director in accordance with the applicable site plan review criteria and conditions of the Extended Temporary Use approval.

**(ii) Revocation or Termination**

Extended Temporary Use approvals may be revoked or terminated pursuant to GJMC 21.02.050(g).

**(7) Period of Validity**

The approval of an interim shelter site may, pending compliance with all applicable standards, be valid for a period of two years from the issue date of the Planning Clearance. One extension for a two-year period may be granted by the City Council, not to exceed a cumulative period of four years.

**(8) Criteria for Extensions of Approval or Expansion of the Site**

- (i) The City Council may extend the term of an approval in the case of inclement weather, natural disaster, state or federal disaster, or other public emergency, including limited availability of interim shelter sites, necessitates the continued use of the site.
- (ii) The City Council will consider the following when reviewing a request for an extension of the Extended Temporary Use permit or expansion of the number of units on a site:
  - (A) The continuing need for the site as shown through continuous applications for residency and low to no vacancy rates;
  - (B) The number of life safety code complaints pursued by the Code Enforcement division on the subject property during the duration of the interim shelter site operation;
  - (C) The number and type of calls placed to police or fire that result in charges or arrest due to disruptions by on-site residents, not including personal medical incidents not caused by another resident;
  - (D) Documentation of the transitioning of residents into other long-term or more stable housing; and
  - (E) Other documentation related to the outcomes of residents, site conditions, and operations as deemed necessary based on experience with interim shelter sites in Grand Junction.

**(9) Expiration of Approval**

The approval for an interim shelter site shall expire if the interim shelter site:

- (i) Is voluntarily vacated prior to the expiration date and terminated in accordance with GJMC 21.02.050(g), or
- (ii) Does not receive an extension.

**(hj) Institutional or Civic Facility Master Plan**

...

**21.04.020 PRINCIPAL USE TABLE**

---

**(a) Organization of the Table**

- (1) In Table 21.04-1, land uses and activities are classified into ~~five~~ six general use categories: (1) Residential; (2) Public, Institutional, and Civic; (3) Commercial; (4) Industrial; ~~and~~ (5) Temporary, and (6) Extended Temporary. Specific uses are organized within the general use categories, based on common functional, product, or physical characteristics such as the type and amount of activity, the type of customers or residents, how goods or services are sold or delivered, and site conditions. This provides a systematic basis for assigning present and future land uses into appropriate zone districts and for avoiding overlaps and inconsistencies between similar land uses.

...

**(c) Abbreviations Used in the Table**

...

**(4) Extended Temporary Uses**

An "E" indicates the use is only allowed through the Extended Temporary Use permit process of GJMC 21.02.050(h), subject to specified conditions.

...

**(e) Use Table, Temporary Uses (excerpt)**

<b>Table 21.04-5: Principal Use Table</b>																				
A= Allowed Use    C= Conditional Use    E = Extended Temporary Use																				
Zone Districts	R-R	R-ER	R-IR	R-2R	RL-4	RL-5	RM-8	RM-12	RH-16	RH-24	MU-1	MU-2	MU-3	CG	I-OR	I-1	I-2	P-1	P-2	Use Stds
<b>Temporary Uses</b>																				
Emergency Shelter, Temporary	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
...																				
<b>Extended Temporary Uses</b>																				
<u>Interim Shelter Site</u>											E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	21.04.050 (b)

...

**21.04.060 EXTENDED TEMPORARY USES AND STRUCTURES**

**(a) Interim Shelter Site**

**(1) Purpose**

- (i) These standards allow for and encourage the creation of temporary housing for people experiencing homelessness or are at risk of becoming homeless. Interim shelter sites are intended to provide a stable and safe living option for people that may not be able to or are not prepared to move into other temporary, semi-permanent, or permanent housing.
- (ii) These standards are intended to promote the public health, safety, and welfare of residents within the site and surrounding area.

**(2) Shelter Types**

- (i) Interim shelters may include either of the following shelter types, both of which shall be provided and installed by the managing entity, subject to this section and the conditions of the site approval:
  - (A) Prefabricated shelters, or

- (B) Micro-shelters.
- (ii) Interim shelters shall not be individually connected to water or sewer and are not considered dwelling units.
  - (iii) Each individual shelter shall be designed to meet minimum wind loads and snow loads with proper anchoring in accordance with GJMC 15.12 as determined by the Chief Building Official.
  - (iv) Functional smoke and carbon monoxide alarms shall be included within each individual shelter.
  - (v) Individual shelters shall be provided with an approved address identification. Each character shall be a minimum of 4 inches tall with a minimum stroke width of ½ inch and visible from the fronting street or road. A permanent weatherproof site map identifying the address numbers/letters shall be provided at each entrance of the Interim Shelter Site. The site map information shall match the identifications of each shelter.
  - (vi) Shelters must comply with any other requirement set by the Chief Building Official and/or the Fire Marshal.

**(3) Maximum Number of Shelters and Maximum Occupancy**

- (i) The maximum number of shelter spaces permitted on a site is calculated by dividing the square feet of usable shelter site area by 150, which is the minimum square footage of area per space required. All fractional measurements are rounded down. For example, a 2,500 square foot site could have 16 shelters (2,500/150 = 16.6).
- (ii) The initial maximum number of shelters per interim shelter site is 30, up to 20% of which may be double occupancy shelters.
  - (A) An applicant may request multiple interim shelter sites (increments of 30 shelters) on a single parcel that may be added in phases, up to a maximum total capacity that is approved in the Extended Temporary Use approval.
  - (B) When the initial phase meets the following criteria, the applicant may request an amendment to the Extended Temporary Use approval for an increase in the number of shelters:
    - a. The commencement of operations.
    - b. Continuous capacity at or over 80 percent for two consecutive months, and
    - c. A showing of successful operation.
  - (C) The City Council will consider the review criteria in GJMC 21.02.050(h)(8)(ii) in determining the success of the operation and may approve the increase based on available space on the site and the ability of the expanded site to meet the terms of the initial approval.
  - (D) Phased approvals must be requested with the original application. If an applicant seeks to expand a site without a phased approval, a new Extended Temporary Use application is required.

- (iii) The total maximum occupancy of a 30-shelter site is 30 adults. If an interim shelter site has double occupancy shelters, the maximum adult occupancy may be increased to 36 to account for double occupancy of those shelters. Interim shelter sites that allow household pets shall detail pet accommodation provisions in the management plan.

**(4) Location and Site Layout**

**(i) Mixed-Use and Nonresidential Zone Districts**

Sites may be located in mixed-use and nonresidential zone districts on the same property as an existing principal use, including nonconforming uses, or may be allowed on properties without a principal use.

**(ii) Setbacks**

The interim shelter site, including all shelters and other structures used as part of the site, shall meet the required principal structure setbacks. The City Council may allow a lesser setback if it determines there is sufficient fencing, vegetation, topographic variation, or other site conditions that block the view of the site from abutting properties.

**(iii) Spacing**

All shelters on an interim shelter site shall be separated by a minimum of 10 feet from any other structure. The minimum separation between a shelter and any building which includes a kitchen shall be 20 feet.

**(iv) Location on the Lot**

Interim shelters shall only be located on the portion of the lot approved for interim shelter use. Shelters may not be placed outside of the approved site perimeter.

**(v) Fencing**

An interim shelter shall be secured as described in the site security plan, including temporary fencing on all sides. Temporary fencing used to screen an interim shelter site shall be exempt from the requirements of GJMC 21.05.090 provided the fence is constructed of acceptable materials such as wire, wrought iron, plastic, wood, and other materials with a similar look. Unacceptable materials include glass, tires, razor wire and concertina wire, or salvaged or similar materials.

**(vi) Sanitary Facilities**

Interim shelter sites shall maintain connections to public water and public sewer systems or provide portable on-site facilities that are adequate to meet state and local standards. Only potable water shall be supplied to plumbing fixtures that provide water for drinking, bathing, or cooking purposes. A potable water supply system shall be designed, installed, and maintained in such a manner to prevent contamination from non-potable liquids, solids or gases being introduced into the potable water supply through cross connections or any other piping connections to the system.

- (A) The application for interim shelter site approval shall include a sanitation plan that specifies the number, location, and hours of accessibility of toilet, drinking water, handwashing stations, and shower facilities. These facilities may be located

in a permanent structure on the site provided access is available at all times the interim shelter site is in use.

**(vii) Waste Disposal**

- (A) Spillage, overflow, drainage, or wastewater from sanitary facilities and potable water sources shall be discharged to approved drains or otherwise designed to prevent impoundment of water, creation of mud holes, or other nuisance conditions.
- (B) Durable, water-tight, easily cleanable refuse containers, sufficient to contain all refuse from the site, shall be provided. Safe needle disposal containers (sharps containers) shall be provided. Provision of recycling containers for separation of plastic, glass, metal, and aluminum containers is recommended.
- (C) The storage of junk, waste, discarded, or salvaged materials, or items customarily associated with indoor use (e.g., upholstered furniture or indoor appliances), is prohibited.

**(viii) Fire Safety**

- (A) The minimum distance from a shelter to a fire hydrant is 600 feet as measured by a route approved by the Fire Marshal. The Fire Marshal will determine the necessary number of hydrants and fire-flow for an Interim Shelter Site.
- (B) The minimum distance from the furthest point of a shelter to a fire department access road approved by the Fire Marshal is 200 feet.
- (C) A fire department access lanes that exceeds 150 feet in length and dead-ends, shall be provided with an approved fire department turn-around.
- (D) No recreational fires or open burning are allowed on an Interim Shelter Site.
- (E) Outside storage of combustible materials and hazardous materials, including aerosols and propane, between shelters is prohibited.

**(ix) Vehicle Parking**

- (A) Parking shall be provided in accordance with Table 21.08-2. All parking spaces shall be designed in accordance with GJMC 21.08.010(e).
- (B) If the interim shelter site is located on the same lot as an existing principal use, the required parking for the principal use may be reduced if the property owner can demonstrate that the displacement of parking spaces will not cause significant off-site traffic or result in insufficient parking for the principal use, as determined by the Director.

**(x) Bicycle Storage**

Secure bicycle storage, such as bicycle racks or an enclosed structure, shall be provided on-site. Bicycle storage may be located within a shared area on the site or provided for each of the shelter spaces. The managing entity shall provide a secure means of locking bicycles.

**(xi) Site Amenities**

The following site amenities shall be provided:

- (A) One designated smoking area.
- (B) If pets are allowed on the site, one pet relief area.
- (C) Sufficient community space for the provision of meals or cooking, services, and gathering with other residents within an enclosed structure that meets fire, electrical, and health safety standards, and that may be located in a permanent structure on the site.

**(5) Operations**

- (i) The managing entity and residents of the site shall ensure compliance with all local and state regulations concerning, but not limited to, drinking water connections, solid waste disposal, human waste, and electrical systems.
- (ii) At a minimum, one trained staff member shall be identified for each interim shelter site for continuous (24 hours per day/7 days per week/365 days per year) on-site management.
  - (A) An additional trained staff member for on-call assistance shall be provided for sites with an anticipated occupancy of more than 30 residents.
  - (B) Persons acting as the on-site manager shall be awake and available to site residents while on shift.
  - (C) The trained staff member shall perform the security tasks described in the management, including, at a minimum: regularly monitoring the security of the site, providing entry and exit access to residents as needed, and contacting police and/or other emergency responders if the need arises.
- (iii) All interim shelter sites shall maintain a management plan that shall be updated annually. The management plan shall address, at a minimum, all of the following factors:
  - (A) Provision of on-site management from a trained staff member.
  - (B) Provision of staff training from a program that meets City specifications.
  - (C) Intake screening of residents to ensure compatibility of services provided at the facility.
  - (D) Transportation plan or on-site provision of transportation services.
  - (E) Fire Safety Plan, to include at a minimum:

- a. Emergency vehicle ingress and egress;
- b. Emergency evacuation routes; and
- c. Site map that outlines the following, to be made available in each shelter unit:
  - 1. Areas of refuge;
  - 2. Assembly points; and
  - 3. Location of portable fire extinguishers.
- (F) Detailed site security measures.
- (G) Resident code of conduct agreement addressing acceptable conduct for residents both at the interim site and in the surrounding neighborhood.
- (H) Keeping of or prohibitions on household animals, including capacity limitations and a plan for maintaining the pet relief area.
- (I) Lights out and quiet hours.

**(6) Code Exemptions**

Interim shelter sites are temporary uses and are exempt from the following standards provided they are otherwise met by the principal use on the site or exempted by the principal use's nonconforming status:

- (i) Minimum or maximum density requirements;
- (ii) Lot coverage standards;
- (iii) Landscaping, buffering, and screening requirements except as provided in this section;
- (iv) Site and structure development standards except as provided in this section; and
- (v) Off-street parking requirements except as provided in this section.

...

**21.08.010 OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING**

...

<b>Table 21.08-6: Minimum Off-Street Vehicle Parking Requirements</b>	
GFA = Gross Floor Area	
	<b>Minimum Vehicle Parking</b>
...	
<b>Extended Temporary Uses</b>	
Interim Shelter Site	2 per 30 shelter units
...	



## 21.14.020 DEFINITIONS

---

...

### I

#### Interim Shelter Site

A location on a lot for the temporary residential occupancy of multiple relocatable temporary structures for people experiencing homelessness. An interim shelter site may include other temporary structures that contain sanitary facilities and support services including administration, security, food preparation and eating areas, or other communal amenities.

...

### M

...

#### Managing Entity

The person or group of persons or entity responsible for the management of an interim shelter site.

...

#### Micro-Shelter

A moveable and typically modular shelter with an internal area of less than 400 sf that is designed to be installed quickly and affordably. Micro-shelters are not pre-fitted with beds, electricity, or heating and air conditioning.

...

### P

...

#### Prefabricated Shelter

A relocatable structure made from aluminum and composite panels or other durable materials that is prefabricated off-site and shipped to the end user. Prefabricated shelters are pre-fitted with a variety of features including, but not limited to beds, outlets, heating and air conditioning, and storage space.

...

**S**

...

**Support Services for Interim Shelter Sites**

Support services for interim shelter sites include, but are not limited to, healthcare facilities, mental and behavioral services, educational and job training, case management, and other similar uses.

...

**INTRODUCED** on first reading this 7<sup>th</sup> day of August 2024 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

**ADOPTED** on second reading this 21<sup>st</sup> day of August 2024 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

ATTEST:

---

Abram Herman

President of the City Council

---

Selestina Sandoval

City Clerk

April 18, 2024

Interim Housing Community Meeting

Public Comments

The following tables display the amount of sticker dots, representing a “vote”, each section got on the public feedback boards.

Directly below them are the comments written onto sticky notes expanding on their inputs.

-Note- Some comments also received sticker dots as “votes” to represent agreement with the statement. Each sticker dot on these comments are represented by a “ \* “.

**What types of interim housing types should be considered in Grand Junction?**

	Tents (provided by managing entity)	Pallet Shelters	Micro-Shelters	Parking
In low-density residential districts, only if located on the same site as a civic use (e.g., a church)	18	21	15	18
In high- density residential districts, only if located on the same site as a civic us (e.g., a church)	15	15	15	14
In high-density residential districts	6	11	10	8
In nonresidential zoning districts	17	17	17	18

-Note- Some comments also received sticker dots as “votes” to represent agreement with the statement. Each sticker dot on these comments are represented by a “ \* “.

- Not only no but HELL NO!
- “Church” as civic use may be too restrictive. “Housing First”

- Whatever is practical, safe, and in close proximity to the resources needed by the unsheltered. \*\*
- The pallet shelter makes the most logical sense in terms of longevity, heat, A/C, and being all inclusive. It will withstand all types of weather. \*
- Helping the unhoused get into homes will make them tax payers!
- I would prefer you use our resources for the taxpayers – This is not for us!
- Are we helping people in our community only?
- Management needed to move forward to a permanent solution!
- Yes, people deserve to have safe places to exist, especially when there is no/little affordable housing. \*
- Our unsheltered neighbors need to weigh in as well. They still need to be near services just like any of us – grocery store, bus stop
- Workforce housing on Horizon Drive update
- Minimum wage and inflation make it really hard to stay in permanent housing. Different options are needed!
- YES!
- I say: No
- The unhoused are already our neighbors – we should treat them as such. \*\*\*
- Shipping containers or box cars. Metal is fireproof, easy to clean, harder to damage. Think : ½ sizes
- This is a wonderful solution I support All options!
- This is a pipe dream, trying to shift responsibility to the private and philanthropic community and away from city responsibility
- LAS COLONIA PARK NORTH/EAST CORNER RIVERSIDE PARKWAY AND WINTERS AVEE. WITH NATURAL PRIVACY FENCING ALONG RIVERSIDE PARKWAY NON RESEDENTIAL CLOSE TO DOWNTOWN
- Parked vehicles need to be searched to ensure there are no drugs, weapons, NO mobile meth labs like we see everywhere in Denver
- Important to consider what our houseless neighbors need: proximity to resources? transportation hubs? All weather protection? Sanitation, etc?

**What is most important to you?**

	Dots	Comments
Safety	38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Safety for whom? The unhoused or the housed? **</li> <li>- Perceived safety is also important, by people using the housing and people using facilities nearby (ie schools, daycares)</li> <li>- Please follow Draft Interim Housing created by Interim Housing Workgroup</li> </ul>
Management	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concern that is mind springs goes under, what service providers will we have *</li> <li>- Safety for those needing shelter. Location so that they are near services. <u>Free bus passes!</u></li> <li>- I hope that there will be robust data collection and evaluation element, so the public can know if this idea(s) are doing what is intended/ i.e. is it working? are goals achieved?</li> </ul>
Funding	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Toiletries bathrooms should be accessible</li> </ul>
Appearance	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- why not start a vacancy tax on non-residential use of residential property to fund housing shelters (STRs and 2<sup>nd</sup> homeowners)</li> </ul>
Location	18	
Other		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No curfew no nightly check in time if a person is gone for 72 hours then give away their space currently if you are not at the shelter by 6pm then you can't go in It's January 10<sup>th</sup> it's 7pm your on sidewalk with nothing. you find sheets, blankets, plastic, cardboard, but if you leave it un-attended it is gone. are this is how and why camps are created</li> <li>- I hope the target population gets to share their opinion on the type of interim shelter chosen *</li> <li>- Dignity and shelter for our unhoused neighbors *</li> <li>- The solution needs to be <u>temporary</u>, <u>voluntary</u>, and there must be a strong, constant effort to get the residents <u>out</u> of the program. it <u>must not</u> be easy for someone who prefers by choice to be homeless. I'm all for helping those who are helping themselves.</li> <li>- Proximity to <u>resources</u> outreach programs, and <u>transportation</u> hubs are <u>important!</u> no more shuffling our houseless neighbors from park to park to...?</li> </ul>

**Should Grand Junction allow interim shelter sites?**

	Dots	Comments
Yes	41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Only when non-scrip drugs and weapon are 100% prohibited, drug testing and sobriety assistance required</li> <li>- I've know people to die before they got in housing, so this is a great need and priority. *</li> <li>- Stop shuffling our houseless neighbors from park to park to "par" to literally dodging traffic on I70B. Give them a space to <u>live</u> and let them be. Whitman park or figure something out.</li> <li>- interim shelters make a difference <u>NOW</u> not in 1-3 yrs.</li> <li>- <u>No Means – testing</u> house people, even if they aren't sober. Public safety will still improve *</li> <li>- Agree</li> </ul>
Yes, but only in certain areas	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes!! 43% increase due to housing shortage and inflation. We have to help. If not in shelters, then where?</li> <li>- Yes, because we literally can't build <u>affordable</u> units fast enough *</li> <li>- We have 60+ churched in the valley... if 30 did the "Godly thing", this would be solved. WWJD?</li> <li>- Yes, people need safe places to live. Even if we started building tomorrow there won't be affordable homes for years</li> </ul>
No	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Let them have Whitman park back. *****</li> <li>- We think you shouldn't provide this</li> </ul>

66% Yes, 82% Yes or Yes w/Conditions, 18% No

**Should interim shelter sites be allowed...**

	Dots	Comments
In low-density residential districts, only if located on the same site as a civic use (e.g., a church)	29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please avoid lawsuits and allow churches to do their work</li> <li>- Central locations for housing, near resources</li> <li>- Wherever is practical, safe, and gives access to the necessary resources! **</li> <li>- Don't necessarily feel it needs to be on the same site as a provider.</li> <li>- If we don't do this are we saying that some citizens are better than others and discriminating against the economically disadvantaged *</li> <li>- Need central facility with emergency shelter, case management, dining, etc. <u>with</u> interim housing.</li> </ul>
In high-density residential districts, only if located on the same site as a civic use (e.g., a church)	28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Remember: The churches have to agree, and they also struggle to work together. City officials find answer first. Their job!</li> <li>- Only allowed if there is ZERO tolerance for non-prescribed drugs and weapons. residents need to be checked for sobriety.</li> <li>- Sobriety and rehab assistance for drug users to ensure they aren't using, distributing or manufacturing drugs</li> <li>- the appropriate location is where residents have access to services</li> <li>- ideal areas are those where 1. services can be provided efficiently</li> <li>- residents can participate in social norms</li> <li>- Our neighbors (housed or not) deserve a safe, stable place to call "home", regardless of what shape that takes. -proximity to resources</li> </ul>
In high-density residential districts	18	
In nonresidential zoning districts	31	
I so not support interim shelter sites in GJ	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- impact on property values</li> </ul>

**Should Grand Junction allow interim parking sites?**

	Dots	Comments
Yes	36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes, people need safe places to park w/ services.</li> <li>- Yes!!! Please provide those needed options.</li> <li>- We Cannot Ignore this problem These are all viable solutions *</li> </ul>
Yes, but only in certain areas	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes – small shelter and tiny homes (workforce housing)</li> <li>- No</li> </ul>
No	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IF YOU BUILD IT, THEY WILL COME... <u>IN DROVES</u></li> <li>- We have grown our unhoused over 200%!</li> <li>- I FEEL Like we are inviting Problems</li> </ul>

55% Yes, 72% Yes or Yes w/Conditions, 28% No

**Should interim parking sites be allowed...**

	Dots	Comments
In low-density residential districts, only if located on the same site as a civic use (e.g., a church)	23	
In high-density residential districts, only if located on the same site as a civic use (e.g., a church)	23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- vehicles are unfortunately the only affordable option some have left</li> <li>- Possibly use the new rec center parking lot?</li> </ul>
In high-density residential districts	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cars are safe spaces for residents</li> <li>- Somewhere near downtown care, van, truck, etc. Far more humane than sidewalk park etc.</li> </ul>
In nonresidential zoning districts	24	
I so not support interim parking sites in GJ	14	



## Resolving my Concerns

Creating a Safety Plan	10	
Site is managed 24/7 by professional	30	
Utilities/Trash/Showers On-site	34	
Limits on Occupancy	2	
Having Fencing / Security Barriers	6	
Registration / Intake / Background Checks required	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NO</li> <li>- <u>Zero</u> tolerance for weapons and non-prescribed drugs</li> </ul>
Site limits visitors	3	
Supportive Services (mental health, housing navigation, etc) MUST be provided	36	
Participant has behavioral expectations agreement	19	
Creating a Neighborhood Committee for addressing issues	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- From the people who live there</li> </ul>
Regular Site Inspections	14	
Regular reporting (calls for emergency, moves into		

permanent housing, services accessed)	9	
Direct Complaint Line to the Service Provider	3	- Denver reported 61% drop in service calls once an interim shelter went in. Shelter work!
Limited Site Location (example: less than 2 years)		- Fixed locations- why move sites after any period of time. Let providers have a lottery for the management of 3 or 4 locations in the city.
Limited terms of Stay (example: less than 1 year, unless making strides)	12	- People have died waiting for housing here. Limited stay is unreasonable. **
Other		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mental Health Resources *****</li> <li>- Make these people do their own lawn maintenance etc. Just putting them in a fancy jail cell with a cell phone creates LAZY! [deleted personal information]</li> <li>- My concern: ANYONE can houseless Golden Rule *</li> <li>- Agree, 0 drug tests. Sobriety does not equal right to shelter. *</li> <li>- Limit barriers for use, allow dogs, no drug tests *</li> <li>- The <u>least</u> city can do is provide trash containers and removal. and toilets with water!! <u>Also Free Bus Passes</u> **</li> <li>- Single units until screened for mental health barriers. Homeless need alone time. Family units? Heating? Vandalism costs? (reduce by design!)</li> <li>- How does this work in the long term and how do we know where the money is going?</li> <li>- Are these services for our community members</li> <li>- Why can't zoning be the same as a work- release or a jail?</li> <li>- All community concerns @ the issue are the same, and so are the zoning issues. It's the same diff. People that need a place to go , for a time.</li> <li>- Must have a board of directors of which the <u>majority</u> of them actually live on site (are homeless) say a board of 9, 4 council appointees, 5 residents</li> </ul>

## Interim Housing Virtual Meeting Comments - April 10, 2024

[Wednesday 6:48 PM] Gabby Hart (External)

[https://jamboard.google.com/d/1SpnBh\\_peAsrDcf3Li-qGn3mECKhNmBstSLBg96G1o-Y/viewer?f=2](https://jamboard.google.com/d/1SpnBh_peAsrDcf3Li-qGn3mECKhNmBstSLBg96G1o-Y/viewer?f=2)

Grand Junction Interim Housing Community Meeting - Google Jamboard

[Wednesday 6:49 PM] Leah Rice

Why aren't we using BLM land for these?

[Wednesday 6:49 PM] Leah Rice

Camp grounds?

[Wednesday 6:51 PM] Marilee Aust (External)

I see the votes, but not the sticky notes

[Wednesday 6:51 PM] Joyce

Not working

[Wednesday 6:51 PM] Marilee Aust (External)

Looks like we can see everyone moving the pages around the screen

[Wednesday 6:52 PM] Virginia Brown

The background is moving around, making the location of my vote not where I placed it

[Wednesday 6:52 PM] Marilee Aust (External)

Agreed to Virginia (same here)

[Wednesday 6:52 PM] Rebekah Mendrop (External)

This is horrible ineffective. I've been emailing Tamra

[Wednesday 6:52 PM] Leah Rice

My vote is no but can't put my dot.

[Wednesday 6:52 PM] Rebekah Mendrop (External)

I thought this was public comment. Where do we leave that?

[Wednesday 6:53 PM] Rebekah Mendrop (External)

Rebekah Mendrop, RE/MAX 4000 and AMGD chair

Support around interim housing. Yes. This allows things we're not comfortable with. We have emergency housing and we have transitional shelters. Why do we need anything more?!? These folks that are tent camping currently are doing so because they choose to. Not because they don't have other options.

This will reduce property values of surrounding areas. This will negatively affect the surrounding property uses - residential or commercial.

I need someone to work for me. But no one will.

Why can't we use staff resources in different ways. We need education and job growth not housing. This further promotes the unhoused situation by NOT making these folks get a job and get out of their situations.

We don't need housing work. We need education and motivation for these folks to be employed.

Who in the IHWG did you have from the property valuation sector?

Denver tent camping is NOT my ideal for grand junction. Is this yours?? For the record this is public comment and I do not want to be like Denver. This is not okay.

So are you considering tent camping at the new GJ rec center?  
like 1

[Wednesday 6:53 PM] Cory Ward  
Mine is no can't figure out the dot

[Wednesday 6:53 PM] Craig Stout

Can't work anything

[Wednesday 6:53 PM] Kpete923 (Guest)  
My vote is NO but I can't post a sticky note\  
[Wednesday 6:53 PM] CharlieQ (Guest)

Sorry. This has been a waste of time.

I empathize with what you are trying to do. But this is so out of sync with this community.

[Wednesday 6:53 PM] Julie Berg - Keller Williams Realtor

Isn't working for me either

[Wednesday 6:53 PM] Ashley Chambers

BLM land is for recreational use only and has very short limits to time able to stay on it.

[Wednesday 6:54 PM] Marilee Aust (External)

Yes; poll might be better

[Wednesday 6:54 PM] Rhonda Massey

NO big NO

[Wednesday 6:54 PM] Craig Stout

I vote no. More work needed.

[Wednesday 6:54 PM] William Rice

No

[Wednesday 6:54 PM] Andrea Hamilton (Guest)

Thank you for trying the Jamboard, I think it was a good idea but just didn't work in this format

[Wednesday 6:54 PM] Rhonda Massey

No

[Wednesday 6:54 PM] Kpete923 (Guest)

I live in north of G Road.

[Wednesday 6:55 PM] Toni L Heiden

no

[Wednesday 6:55 PM] Cory Ward

No I live on 26 rd

[Wednesday 6:55 PM] Kpete923 (Guest)

Why is this a City of Grand Junction responsibility?

[Wednesday 6:56 PM] Lisa Mullen

No across the board.

[Wednesday 6:56 PM] Craig Stout

I currently live in the Loma area. What do you have planned for outer areas than Grand Junction?

[Wednesday 6:56 PM] Rhonda Massey

you show these pretty painted houses but what doesn't show is the shopping carts and garbage and mess that will surround them.

[Wednesday 6:56 PM] William Rice

No across the board

[Wednesday 6:56 PM] Andrea Hamilton (Guest)

Yes, I would like to have both interim parking and interim shelter. I currently live near Chipeta and 20th

[Wednesday 6:56 PM] Marilee Aust (External)

"Maybe" to parking in very specific public areas -- a huge amount of work is needed before I could ever vote yes -- even just for parking

[Wednesday 6:56 PM] Sean Crocker

No at this time. More work and community involvement on the work group.

[Wednesday 6:56 PM] Leah Rice

I'm concerned that this is how the housing will work. Good idea... bad implementation.

No to all. Where do the cars go during the day? Where do the unhoused go during the non shelter hours?

[Wednesday 6:56 PM] Toni L Heiden

i live in the North area no to parking and intermit housing

[Wednesday 6:56 PM] Sandra Zoldowski

Who will be paying for these services?

[Wednesday 6:59 PM] Virginia Brown

I understand the need to be looking at these options. I feel the location of interim housing and camping to needs to be very carefully looked at It is not clear on the map as to WHERE you are looking due to differences in computer colors. The super light yellow colors on my screen are frequently R-4 housing. I know we have some large properties that are historically vacant that might be good for interim housing. I feel strongly that any location needs to have additional safety features, with 24/7 management. Additionally I would be very upset if there was a site that was just over my back fence line.

[Wednesday 6:59 PM] Marilee Aust (External)

Agree with Mr. Goodman above. Tax burden questions are huge.

I also understand that City of GJ currently does not have a zoning rule, regulation or requirement for any interim housing. This should be put up for a vote.

[Wednesday 7:00 PM] Marian Brosig

Undecided but I am aghast what a mess these homeless people have around their tents and the garbage they leave behind. How would this be taken care of if you had both the parking and the temporary shelters?

[Wednesday 7:00 PM] Kpete923 (Guest)

What communities are you talking about?

[Wednesday 7:00 PM] Virginia Brown

The link to the GIS map you are using should be shared, with what the areas your are looking adding a zoning layer to add interim housing/camping areas.

[Wednesday 7:00 PM] Ashley Chambers

Zoning map will be available on the Engage GJ platform.

[Wednesday 7:00 PM] Kaitlin Pettit, Toilet Equity

Kaitlin here from the local nonprofit Toilet Equity. Yes, this is a needed response to what the Grand Junction community is facing. If done in a regulated way such as described here, it would help alleviate some of the problematic side effects that others are noting throughout town. We have a dedicated and energetic group of nonprofits in town who would be able to help get a project like this off the ground and address some of the concerns others are sharing here.

[Wednesday 7:00 PM] Chamaine

Looking at sites that have reported success addresses issues of concern for the community

[Wednesday 7:01 PM] Andrea Hamilton (Guest)

One question I do have is whether there are any entities who are currently interested in managing these sites?

[Wednesday 7:01 PM] Craig Stout

Does Grand Junction currently have a site that they are looking at for interim housing or parking?

[Wednesday 7:01 PM] Kimberly Clemmer

No to interim housing and parking.

Agree with issues brought up about who is funding this, tax burden, etc.

[Wednesday 7:01 PM] Kelsay Heath (External)

How are all these people "surveying" these communities to know that it's working there? There is no true statistics. So you know.

[Wednesday 7:01 PM] Ian

What are we doing to reduce the population? I understand it's increasing but do we understand why and are we addressing that issue?

[Wednesday 7:02 PM] Marian Brosig

I believe that Delta had a temporary parking area and they closed it down within a year due to safety issues. Have you talked to them what went wrong??

[Wednesday 7:02 PM] Rhonda Massey

If a camper has to leave daily-who pays for that gas? who makes sure they are out of a lot by 8am daily???

[Wednesday 7:02 PM] Ashley Chambers

Ian, yes. We are working on all of those things concurrently. The cost of housing is the number one reason.

[Wednesday 7:03 PM] Hogan Peterson

I'm seeing a pretty significant number of commenters who have had to leave the meeting or been on and off multiple times, or unable to comment effectively because of this meeting format. Given the level of interest and range of comments and the technical difficulties this meeting really warrants a do-over to fairly create input opportunity. Maybe an additional comment session or workshop.

[Wednesday 7:03 PM] Toni L Heiden

the mental issues and drug use is big

like 1

[Wednesday 7:03 PM] Virginia Brown

I have serious concerns about tax burden for providing these services.

like 2

[Wednesday 7:03 PM] Sherrie Knez

Sherrie Knez, 31 Rd. There needs to be more Close to Central High School. There needs to be more specific rules on location and who the people are. With all the problems of illegal immigrants won't this bring more homeless rather than less along with crime. Needs to be very specific,

[Wednesday 7:03 PM] Kimberly Clemmer

I agree with Hogan.

[Wednesday 7:03 PM] Rhonda Massey

So many questions? Who is this staff that mans this? Who pays for ALL OF THIS????

like 1

[Wednesday 7:03 PM] cloverproperties@me.com (Guest)

Is the presentation you just ran available on line to view again?

[Wednesday 7:04 PM] Leah Rice

What is an email address that I can formally ask my questions and get clear answers?

[Wednesday 7:04 PM] Sean Crocker

Delta closed their interim housing after a year due to an large increase in crime and public safety issues.

like 2

[Wednesday 7:04 PM] Joyce



No to any interim housing--anywhere in Mesa County. We need to take care of our own homelessness. Interim housing is going to draw more!

like 1

[Wednesday 7:04 PM] Mary Thompson (External)  
North 261/2 and G

How will the unhoused qualify for these temporary homes? Where will they go after the 2 year limit?

[Wednesday 7:04 PM] Gabby Hart (External)

**cloverproperties@me.com (Guest)**

Is the presentation you just ran available on line to view again?

Yes, the presentation will be available on the EngageGJ page.

[Wednesday 7:04 PM] Kelsay Heath (External)

Please read the "assignments" and surveys. How can you get the data?

[Wednesday 7:08 PM] Betsy Smith

someone must be monitoring and screening comments

[Wednesday 7:08 PM] Rhonda Massey

NO NO NO to all of this and will our input actually matter? Is this pre decided no matter what we comment?

[Wednesday 7:09 PM] Ron A

No to this, quit dismissing what we see and know.

[Wednesday 7:09 PM] regina stout

I am wondering if there are support services that will be provided and required to participate in with the homeless who will be utilizing the interim housing? If we give them shelter that is only 1 step in the making sure these citizens dont remain homeless and we enable them to live in these shelters in perpetuity.

[Wednesday 7:10 PM] Paula Rohr

No on interim housing and no to parking. There needs to be a better way.

[Wednesday 7:10 PM] Virginia Brown

Churches will be sponsor of sites?

[Wednesday 7:10 PM] Ashley Chambers

Yes, Regina - that is part of the managed site format.

[Wednesday 7:10 PM] Leah Rice

Can the homeowners around those sites have a vote on that location  
like 1

[Wednesday 7:11 PM] Toni L Heiden

City Council is supposed to improve our community which I think is phenomenal. creating these interim housing and parking is going to downgrade our way of living.

like 3

[Wednesday 7:11 PM] regina stout

So where do the grants come from? Federal govt? Local or state govt or private funds?

[Wednesday 7:11 PM] Tamra Allen

Comments can be sent to [housing@gjcity.org](mailto:housing@gjcity.org) or at engagegj.org

[Wednesday 7:11 PM] Betsy Smith

Why does the council believe they can do it better than everyone else who has tried this? In a community where over 30% are already on some form of government assistance, it doesn't make sense that this council think they can do it better with such a smaller tax base

like 2

[Wednesday 7:11 PM] Gene

How will each person be vetted? I am concerned about registered sex offenders blending in with families that are being housed as well in these temporary locations.

like 2

[Wednesday 7:12 PM] Leah Rice

Will those sites that are responsible for management also be responsible for food for those staying there?

like 1

[Wednesday 7:12 PM] Ashley Chambers

Yes, that is correct Leah.

like 1 surprised 1

[Wednesday 7:13 PM] Ashley Chambers

More opportunities to provide comments through:[Interim Housing \(Alternative Housing Options\) | Engage GJ](#)

Interim Housing (Alternative Housing Options)

The City of Grand Junction will host two events to gather input from the community about interim housing. A virtual meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 10 at 6 p.m. and an open house is planned...

[Wednesday 7:14 PM] Ashley Chambers

And are welcome to attend the NEXT public meeting on the April 18th meeting.

[Wednesday 7:14 PM] Larry Craven

I agree with the If you build it, they will come. What are the stats from other cities? Anyone taking advantage of this should be required to go through mental, addiction and financial counseling. There should be NO drug or alcohol use on the property.

[Wednesday 7:14 PM] Leah Rice

Do the homeowners have a vote around those sites

[Wednesday 7:14 PM] Betsy Smith

Again, how in the world can this community afford to fund this? What will be taken over or defunded to make this happen? Especially when we don't have the money in the first place. Do not take money away from taxpayers who need programs to fund those who will drain the tax base.

[Wednesday 7:14 PM] Andrea Hamilton (Guest)

One question I have is there any procedure or process for proving mismanagement by any of the entities who are managing these sites? Not just for their neighbors, but by the people who are staying at these sites.

[Wednesday 7:14 PM] William Rice

What happen sanctuary city which we are not

like 3

[Wednesday 7:14 PM] Ashley Chambers

Yes, Andrea - there are some provisions in the drafted code.

[Wednesday 7:15 PM] Andrea Hamilton (Guest)

Excellent, glad to hear it. I look forward to more details Ashley

[Wednesday 7:15 PM] Leah Rice

What is the tax on EMS, mental facilities, er, etc? Will be hiring more ems to cover those areas and the influx of people coming

like 1

[Wednesday 7:15 PM] Ashley Chambers

I'm not able to answer all questions in the chat because they are coming so very fast. I apologize.



[Wednesday 7:15 PM] Ian

You said next meeting will be very similar to this one as far as content... can you guys have some supporting stats from some of the other successful AND failed sites that have already been through this?

[Wednesday 7:15 PM] Ashley Chambers

In sites we have explored, the strain on the system was reduced and call volume decreased.

[Wednesday 7:16 PM] Ashley Chambers

There are case study communities listed in Engage GJ with a lot of that information provided.

[Wednesday 7:36 PM] Ryan Goodman

Agreed, who's paying for the unaffordable housing that you are talking about...and the additional "next steps" with continued mental health services, job placement so they can keep their new housing...etc? who's paying for the infrastructure you propose? Security services at these sites? Healthcare? Transportation to and from medical facilities? So many unknowns! City cost for oversight and approval of applications? City costs for mitigation for noncompliance of policy at sights...

[Wednesday 7:36 PM] Leah Rice

What documentation will people need to stay? State issue ids

[Wednesday 7:37 PM] Gene

Thank you for hosting this meeting!

[Wednesday 7:37 PM] Ashley Chambers

Betsy, there are many sites that are working and working well. There are many that have not. This is a NEW form of housing that has been a learning process for all involved. As there have been unsuccessful attempts, we are learning from both to help make informed responsible recommendations.

[Wednesday 7:37 PM] Betsy Smith

There needs to be more information to the benchmarks that will determine the approval or disapproval of this proposal.

[Wednesday 7:37 PM] Ashley Chambers

The site management entity is responsible for all of those decisions and expenses.

[Wednesday 7:37 PM] Mary Thompson (External)

Thanks for hosting!

[Wednesday 7:38 PM] Betsy Smith

The city makes the decision to let those management entities in. That is what needs to be discussed in greater detail with the public.

[Wednesday 7:39 PM] Ashley Chambers

we agree betsy. That's part 2 of the continued process.



Hello,

Thank you for presenting the concept of Interim Housing to the public in an online forum on April 10, 2024. I appreciated the time, however the presenters took 50 minutes to present which left little time for questions and answers. In addition, the technology did not cooperate, but I appreciate the presenters staying on for 30 more minutes to allow for comments. Below are some of my comments since I will be out of town for tonight's open house.

1. After much discussion between my husband and I we are not sure all the questions have been addressed or will be addressed. I felt the presentation was very much limited to what the presenters wanted to present and appeared to be predetermined outcome to the zoning recoding.
2. I felt that the plan has not been thoroughly vetted. There was only 1 portion presented and it was limited in scope.
3. I am very concerned with the responsibilities of the private, NGO's or churches that choose to move forward on a special use permit if they are no support services to get people out of interim housing into permanent housing. That portion of the plan was not addressed until the question was asked. The answer was somewhat disappointing.
4. Delta's attempt at interim housing failed miserably. Denver and Aurora who are case studies for this project, are spending more money on the problem by moving the homeless around, (much like our shell game of moving them from Whitman to Emerson to interim). I don't think there are any positive case studies that really show the true picture of this problem. In addition, Denver just announced an \$8 million reduction in the police dept's budget to help the homeless with a total increase in funds from other depts totalling \$90 million. We don't have that kind of budget and the taxpayers of this City should not have to pay the price.
5. The fear of "if you build it, they will come" is very real. Very Real and I don't want this in my backyard.
6. When is the City going to document where and how our \$19 Million dollars spent, per the Housing Report 2023?
7. Finally, the presentation only addressed what the presenters and I am

8. Many folks in this county live paycheck to paycheck, it is not right for their dollars that are given to our City be spent on people that take and do not give. We need a more comprehensive plan that addresses the problem from all angles not just by destroying our landscape of our beautiful city.

Bottomline: I am not in favor of this proposal and would vote against it.

Thank you for your time,  
Regina Stout

---

This email was sent from a contact form on [gjspeaks.org](http://gjspeaks.org)

**From:** Cheryl Conrod <[bcconrod@gmail.com](mailto:bcconrod@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 20, 2024 10:39 AM  
**To:** Ashley Chambers <[ashleyc@gjcity.org](mailto:ashleyc@gjcity.org)>; Sherry Price <[sherryp@gjcity.org](mailto:sherryp@gjcity.org)>  
**Subject:** Grand Junction Regional Center as homeless shelter

Dear Ms Price and Chambers,

I write this in response to Mr. Neiderkruger's frustrated call for response after the recent meeting at Lincoln Park Barn. I've lived in the Grand Valley since 2007 and have heard all the hemming and watched the chin scratching over local homeless issues. I've read about homeless camps being trashed and vandalized by police and people freezing to death and being murdered on the streets. I've helped at overflow shelter programs through local churches. I've watched homeless people being harassed and moved along while the community nibbles around the hole and misses the doughnut altogether.

Catholic Outreach construction can never keep up with the need for housing. "Affordable housing" in this day and age is a cruel pipe dream. This is all window dressing. Much as you would like it, our homeless residents are not going to disappear.

I have circulated this proposal for several years now, and I think it has the most merit of any I've seen. Please give it a serious look.

Yours,

Cheryl Conrod

### ***What to Do With the Regional Center***

Here's an idea to put the Grand Junction Regional Center to use after current residents are resettled and the facility closes. Create a city/county/charitable consortium that would run it as an all-inclusive facility for the homeless.

Here are some services and amenities such a campus could provide:

- \* Indoor overnight housing for homeless men, women and families
- \* Air conditioned day room for shelter from hot/cold/inclement weather
- \* Campground and/or tiny houses with central restroom/shower facilities for those who prefer to sleep outdoors or who keep pets
- \* Farm to grow fresh food for on-campus food services and the food bank
- \* Classes for lifelong learning, GED, job training and apprenticeship for maintenance and repair of the facility (perhaps Habitat for Humanity could help with this)
- \* AA and al anon meetings
- \* Mail, Internet and phone service
- \* Laundry facilities and lending library
- \* Small commissary-like shop with snacks and toiletries
- \* Move *Catholic Outreach* soup kitchen and thrift store to this campus
- \* Move *Homeward Bound* into this residential facility
- \* Move food bank into existing warehouse on campus
- \* Move animal shelter here. Volunteers could care for, socialize and exercise shelter animals.



- \* Host “Stand Down” and other veterans services
- \* Volunteer maintenance of Veterans Cemetery

Create a bus route to take residents downtown and to social/medical service providers in the morning and return to the facility in the afternoon. This would be partially funded by reducing extra downtown police patrols and partly through purchase of bus tokens by charitable organizations. Residents could earn tokens by working at the facility.

Advantages:

- \* Increased efficiency of social services through consolidation.
- \* Homeless population would find meaningful work through volunteer facility maintenance, repair, gardening and upkeep of Veterans’ Cemetery in exchange for bus tokens, sundries.
- \* Job training and a safe environment.
- \* Residents would not be denied access due to sobriety or pet companions
- \* More remote location would encourage homeless people away from downtown and North Avenue.
- \* Reduced presence of homeless downtown would make shopping and entertainment more attractive and safe. This is an answer to the NIMBY (not in my backyard) effect.

I know I speak from ignorance of the enormous amount of work and coordination among city and county agencies, charitable organizations and the religious community. I’m sure others in the social welfare field can think of many more possible uses for this facility. But I think a converted Regional Center would offer a fantastic opportunity for our community to consolidate, coordinate and improve the care we provide for our homeless population.

I can hear the “yeah, buts” already. Many of the buildings are in deplorable condition. I know this would require imaginative, creative organization and added funds. It would upset many settled groups and systems. But I hate to see the Grand Junction Regional Center sold off to some developer and razed for yet another (un)affordable housing project or a big box store.

Our community can do better than that.

---

From: Jessica Meyer <[jessicameyergj@gmail.com](mailto:jessicameyergj@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2024 11:11 AM  
To: communications <[communications@gjcity.org](mailto:communications@gjcity.org)>  
Subject: [Grand Junction Speaks] Interim Housing Objection

<<https://gjspeaks.org>>

There are numerous reasons the idea of interim housing and tent camping will negatively impact our community. Decreased property values, overall general safety of our children and neighborhoods and communities, and overall general upkeep of our community to name just a few! Let's take a look at other communities this method has been adopted and you will find that it has not made one positive change/impact on those communities and cities. If this is seriously an idea that is danger of being passed I would ask our City Leaders to first open up the streets they live on, sidewalks they walk daily and parks they allow their children to play at and then have a discussion on the impact this will have on the rest of the community. We have people moving here everyday to get away from these kind of dangers in the bigger cities. There are numerous other ideas that should be explored before this even a thought.

---

From: Patricia Heartsill <[pheartsill@gmail.com](mailto:pheartsill@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2024 1:06 PM  
To: communications <[communications@gjcity.org](mailto:communications@gjcity.org)>  
Subject: [Grand Junction Speaks] Interm housing

<<https://gjspeaks.org>>

I have lived in my home downtown for almost 30 years. I live next door to the public library and the Unity Church. I own a business in Main Street downtown Grand Junction It has been more and more challenging to deal with homeless in my yard and in my business. Please, don't allow this program that will make it worse. My business has suffered terribly by the homeless bothering my customers and scaring paying customers away.

I fight everyday to keep homeless people out of my yard and from camping with huge piles of trash in front of my house and business.

My property value is declining everyday this problem is allowed in my neighborhood and now you propose to make it legal. You want to allow camping in front of my home and business... Will they be camping in front of your home and business too???

Just this morning lawn tools were stolen from my driveway. And we were outside when it happened. Allowing these people to legally "live" on the sidewalk by my home and driveway is invasive and scary. Please before you allow this proposal to go forward, consider how you would feel if you were in my place. I'm horrified and beg you not to move forward but instead look for alternative solutions.

Thank you

Patricia Heartsill  
[pheartsill@gmail.com](mailto:pheartsill@gmail.com)

From: Lana Malan <[lana.malanrealty@gmail.com](mailto:lana.malanrealty@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2024 10:47 PM  
To: communications <[communications@gjcity.org](mailto:communications@gjcity.org)>  
Subject: [Grand Junction Speaks] Interim housing

<<https://gjspeaks.org>>

Our family is against this program. Placing these tents in our community will have negative impact on property values. When you work all your life and invest in rental property as part of your retirement and then a program like this will definitely affect getting renters and reduce property values. We visited cities that tried this (to name one - Tacoma) and the result was disaster. The trash around the tents was horrible. Homes around the area were vacated, many went into foreclosure and many were drug houses. A beautiful historic area was destroyed.

This is a bad idea

---

From: Stephanie Jordan <[Stephjordangjre@gmail.com](mailto:Stephjordangjre@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2024 8:40 PM  
To: communications <[communications@gjcity.org](mailto:communications@gjcity.org)>  
Subject: [Grand Junction Speaks] Interim Housing

<<https://gjspeaks.org>>

I do not want our community implicate this way of living and as a realtor and property manager/landlord I am also concerned with rents and the negative impacts on property values based on this implementation. I also ask the city to consider conducting meetings where we can all be more involved and have a say in what happens and in what locations we would all be willing to consider allowing this process to occur. I do not feel like this will be successful within our local area/community and it will cause negative aesthetics and distress to our community and the balance of lifestyle we are trying to achieve and strive to make it a highly desirable place to live and people want to move here and live here due to the way things are currently. This could impact our ability to maintain a desirable community and its still affordable "as-is" and we continue to maintain a healthy balance of living in various lifestyles and we already offered plenty of housing options to people of all income levels, so why do we need to go to this extreme and risk an uproar of uncertainties?

From: Niki Yenter <[Nyenter@gmail.com](mailto:Nyenter@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2024 4:36 PM  
To: communications <[communications@gjcity.org](mailto:communications@gjcity.org)>  
Subject: [Grand Junction Speaks] Proposed interim housing

<<https://gjspeaks.org>>

Thank you for asking for input about the homeless issues in our city. I worry that we are creating an environment that encourages homelessness by handing over shelter and services. Many of the homeless are passing through GJ and other have no intention of returning to responsibilities. There will always be poor and mentally ill and we have services that help those that can not get out of that situation and for those that want to get out of the situation. We must stop trying to polish and corral and make comfortable those that are choosing this way of life. Look around at the people that are paying for these things...;they are people that when hungry, go to work. And when not able to work there is social security and services to help. When we give people free tents and continue to give give give we take away dignity that comes with contributing and we take away a desire and hope to make our lives better. People camping in the park are doing it, not because they have fallen on hard times, but due to addiction, illness and life choices. I have seen them craping in the downtown doorways and being higher than a kite and It will not benefit anyone to make a nice campsite unless you are looking to have woodstock in our neighborhoods.

---

From: TERI FEENEY-STYERS <[REJUVENATIONREALESTATE@gmail.com](mailto:REJUVENATIONREALESTATE@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2024 4:41 PM  
To: communications <[communications@gjcity.org](mailto:communications@gjcity.org)>  
Subject: [Grand Junction Speaks] CAMPING IN CITY LIMITS (INTERIM HOUSING)

<<https://gjspeaks.org>>

Currently the City of GJ ordinances do not allow a property owner to rent or otherwise house someone in a camper or RV on their property. I think you should change this ordinance. You could require the installation of a proper sewer dump and hook up to potable water (many homes already have this option for convenience). Then the burden of keeping a site clean would fall on the property owner. They would also benefit from potential rents. This type of living situation may involve an adult child, a senior family member, or an unknown tenant. The property owner could offer a camper/RV owned by them - or just a space rental for a person who has their own rig. The new ordinance should include restrictions for where the camper can be parked on the property. Perhaps you offer a "permit" similar to the STR permit. These self contained units (tiny house on wheels, motorhome, fifth wheels, trailers) are a cheap housing alternative. By dispersing the units onto individual lots the public impact is lessened.

From: Kaycee Keller <[kcelese87@gmail.com](mailto:kcelese87@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2024 4:44 PM  
To: communications <[communications@gjcity.org](mailto:communications@gjcity.org)>  
Subject: [Grand Junction Speaks] [kcelese87@gmail.com](mailto:kcelese87@gmail.com)

<<https://gjspeaks.org>>

In regard to Interim Housing, I strongly disagree with this proposal- the design hasn't worked in other cities, and it will not work in ours. We do not want our community to be modeled after Denver/ Aurora... we choose to live here on the western slope away from the negative effects this proposal has brought to Denver and surrounding areas. In Denver, this implementation has caused negative impacts on property values, negative community aesthetics/ unsanitary conditions, an increase in criminal activity and a decrease in safety. As a Real Estate Agent and Property Manager, I strongly believe that this would have a detrimental effect on our community. Alternatively, the city needs to review other methods that could help encourage/promote those to seek economic stability and growth while still protecting our local community that we've all grown to love.

---

**From:** Kaitlin Pettit <[kaitlin@toiletequity.org](mailto:kaitlin@toiletequity.org)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 10, 2024 7:09 PM  
**To:** Housing <[housing@gjcity.org](mailto:housing@gjcity.org)>  
**Subject:** Thank you for the open meeting

Hi all,

Thank you for hosting the open comment meeting tonight. Your presentation was very thorough and informative, and I learned a lot. You all had a lot of composure and handled the open comment period very graciously, and I know how hard that can be. You are very brave and wonderful for opening up the discussion like that.

Thank you for taking the time to address each concern that was presented to you, and thank you for looking into this opportunity for Grand Junction. I hope it will be successful.

Please let me know if there's anything I or [Toilet Equity](#) can do to help, we are happy to work with any interim site to provide toilet access.

Thank you all so much for your patience tonight,  
Kaitlin

--

Kaitlin Pettit, PhD  
CEO, Toilet Equity  
She/her  
[toiletequity.org](http://toiletequity.org)



First, the decisions about "unhoused" resources, closing of parks, etc being made even before discussion with the public is unacceptable! A housing city employee told me at the meeting that went so badly (held at the hospitality room at Stocker Stadium) that the decision had already been made to put up the resource tent. This was decided without public and business input and should have never been allowed to happen. Another lie to the public is the idea came from the Zoning and Development Code Review Committee.

We already have a problem with "unhoused" people living in the foothills around the valley. They leave their trash and never clean up. What do you think they do when their sewer tanks are full in their RVs? They just dump sewage where they sit. In addition, people with RVs are not allowed to "camp" overnight in the Walmart parking lot. I would much rather have tourists stay in the parking lot than have people living in tents around the valley.

I am a housing provider. I have seen what people do to properties they do not own and how they lack respect for other people's property. Having "unhoused" people live anywhere would cause human feces to be anywhere they are allowed to live. It was made clear to the governor that we are not a sanctuary city. This should also include having people "camp" wherever they want. There are RV, state and national parks with paid camping available. Those facilities have plumbing to accommodate camping. In addition, private citizens are required to pay for the privilege of camping in state and national parks. Why would the city council consider allowing people to set up residence in a city park and not pay for that privilege? There will be additional cost for cleaning up after people including picking up trash (drug needles) and cleaning public restrooms.

**PUBLIC RESTROOMS!** We can't even keep local public restrooms open because of the "unhoused" vandalizing the public restrooms.

**SPLASH PAD!** We can't have a nice splash pad for children to play in because "unhoused" people bathe in it!

Seriously, those two last sentences alone should remind the city council that opening up public areas for unhoused to "camp" in is not a smart idea! We had nice bathroom facilities on 5th St. We had a fun splash pad that is now fenced

off.

I do not want to be driving my grandchildren around town and have them see people relieving themselves on private or public land. I have already witnessed this myself. A walk in downtown Denver should be all it takes to remind the city council that this is a bad, horrible idea.

Dena Watson  
Owner/Broker  
Freedom Property Management  
970-245-6411

---

This email was sent from a contact form on [gjspeaks.org](http://gjspeaks.org)



For the love of God, do NOT pass this bill. It will turn our city in to the same mess Arvada and Denver are. I live in GJ to get rid of the problems associated with interim housing.

---

This email was sent from a contact form on [gjspeaks.org](http://gjspeaks.org)



To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to express my comments regarding the Interim Housing, as we were limited in the amount of public comments accepted during the Public Outreach meeting.

First, we were not given the ability to disagree with the proposal. We were told where we wanted to put this zoning type. I fundamentally disagree with this and was not able to state as much as I could only place dots on a map. The dots indicate my agreement, and that is NOT what I intended with my attendance at the meeting.

Second, we were told that the initial idea came from the Zoning and Development Code Review Committee. I have checked with several members of that committee and that is not true.

Third, Denver / Aurora is the community we're modeling our community after in this proposal. I do not wish our community to look like that area. There are negative impacts on property values based on this implementation, in addition to negative aesthetics of the community.

Fourth, I have a tenant in a fourplex in Clifton that pays \$650 per month in rent - utilities included. In the eight months she's lived there, she's been late four months. If this type of zoning exists, why would she continue paying me rent? She would have no motivation to do so and would likely leave and live for free in one of these communities. She is not currently in the "unhoused" population, but something like this could encourage her to do so.

Finally, there are many other options for addressing this need that would encourage people to make choices to ensure their economic stability. I would love to see the City brainstorm with landlords such as myself who house the population most at risk for being unhoused. Could we offer classes for these folks when they are late on their payments? Could free classes offered by the City be part of the application process for some landlords?

I would encourage the City to review options that would not diminish property values and the aesthetics of our community.

Thank you

**From:** Jamie Stehman <[jstehman@bresnan.net](mailto:jstehman@bresnan.net)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 17, 2024 7:35 PM  
**To:** Housing <[housing@gjcity.org](mailto:housing@gjcity.org)>  
**Subject:** Vote No on Interim Housing

I would encourage everyone of you to vote NO on the interim housing bill! This will not solve the problem but make it worse!

Have you discussed this with Chief of Police Matt Smith?

Have you discussed this with the local churches, business owners, golf courses, etc.?

All of the above are or service TAX PAYERS! I would bet that 90% of TAX PAYERS do NOT want this to happen!

It would simply spread out the homeless population and add crime to every different vacant land in this city!

And remember, if you vote this in, we will vote your butt out! Period....

Jamie Stehman

---

**From:** Ed Krey <[Ed@lhhs.net](mailto:Ed@lhhs.net)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 18, 2024 4:02 PM  
**To:** **council@gjcity.org**; Housing <[housing@gjcity.org](mailto:housing@gjcity.org)>  
**Subject:** Interim housing code update

I am a resident of the City of Grand Junction. I am writing to express my deep concern for the proposed city code update regarding the “interim Housing” locations on residential and commercial lots in town that will have implications that reach far beyond helping people. ie: decreasing surrounding property values, increased crime etc. Currently there is NOTHING in the city code that will allow for sanctioned camping, temporary structures, RV parking etc.

This will definitely be a detriment to our city and create unintended Or maybe intended consequences. Please do not move forward with this drastic change.

Ed Krey

**From:** Kelsay Heath <[kheath@cbcprimeproperties.com](mailto:kheath@cbcprimeproperties.com)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 11, 2024 11:37 AM  
**To:** Housing <[housing@gjcity.org](mailto:housing@gjcity.org)>  
**Subject:** Interim Housing

Thank you for the presentation last night. Can I get the slides from yesterday? Or the maps you showed, I would like to gather all my information. As well as if you have the surveys/assessments the city has gathered for the unhoused. I will be at the next meeting as well, I appreciate you allowing us to discuss this as a community.

Thank you,

**From:** Hrhufnpuf <[hrhufnpuf@aol.com](mailto:hrhufnpuf@aol.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 17, 2024 6:17 PM  
**To:** Council <[council@gjcity.org](mailto:council@gjcity.org)>  
**Cc:** Housing <[housing@gjcity.org](mailto:housing@gjcity.org)>  
**Subject:** Homeless housing plans

Your new proposal for housing homeless in Grand Junction is terrible for the people who actually pay taxes. These people do nothing for the community nor do they want to. Anything offered should have a moving forward target to achieve productive member of community that contributes and expulsion for those who don't.

Jackie Savage  
970-234-0340

Alli, 7 days ago

[Alert moderator](#)

I do not support these changes to the zoning code. This is not the only answer to our current situation and is costing the taxpayers an incredible amount of money to even look into this process. We do not need this zoning code update and I think it's clear that it is not a good fit for our community.

**REPLY**

Do you agree?  0  0



cg, 9 days ago

[Alert moderator](#)

As a representative government, it is imperative that you ensure you are acting per the will of the majority of the taxpayers you represent. This is too large of an issue not to be taken to the taxpayers to VOTE on.

**REPLY**

Do you agree?  2  0 [Hide reply \(1\)](#) 



Valanders, 3 days ago

Alert moderator

As a business owner that operates in the City of Grand Junction I certainly do not agree with "hot patches" that will not solve anything. It appears that the actual homeowners in the city will get the bill for the resources used to organize, permit and police this in the form of their taxes. Yes, I know there are "grants", but that is also taxpayers \$, just at the State or Federal level. As it is we have had equipment stolen from our yard, company vehicles and our back lot used as a bathroom. I absolutely do not think it is a good idea to implement policy's that we will pay for and encourage more of the same by rewarding the "nomad" lifestyle. The Catholic Outreach has been a huge support and they actually seem to do things that get those that need and WANT it back on their feet. They also have programs that hold the people needing help to some accountability. Perhaps the city should look at some of their programs before warehousing them (temporarily) around our city on vacant property or parking lots.

**REPLY**

Do you agree?  0  0 [Hide reply \(1\) ^](#)



DianeS, 6 days ago

Alert moderator

I attended the zoom meeting on April 10th and watched the Council Workshop on this issue. I am not unsympathetic to the plight of the homeless and actively support Catholic Outreach with regular donations. That said I have real questions about the need for a code amendment to address interim housing options. I think that City Council should develop a set of criteria to insure public safety, health and welfare. Then the Council should approve each submittal. Additionally, just like with marijuana retail outlets there should be an initial limit on locations (maybe 3?) until we see the viability and sustainability of this proposed solution which has had limited success, at best, in other cities. I am also really concerned that limited resources will be spent on temporary solutions rather than working toward affordable permanent housing.

**REPLY**

Do you agree?  1  0 [Hide replies \(2\) ^](#)





I am writing in opposition to the attempt to circumvent our existing Zoning Codes and process for seeking variances to them. Currently, almost anything sought regarding Interim Housing or extended Camping/Parking can be accomplished without creating a new code of "right by use". By applying for a Conditional Use Permit one can acknowledge the use is not allowed, provide the reasons why in the applied-for variance the exception should be allowed and have the proposed use reviewed by the departments (utilities, city services, fire/safety, traffic, et al) responsible for the health, safety and quality of life for all of our citizens to identify what the allowance would impact and how that impact must be mitigated before the out of code use can be allowed. Our Planning Dept staff and Planning Commission can respond with a knowledgeable review and a hearing for input from the neighboring properties and owners about the proposed use sought. That having been accomplished the City Council can then perform the role they were elected to fulfill on behalf of their constituencies and timely approve or deny the proposed use, or remand it back to Planning to address any concerns or issues needing rectified. There is no "up side" for anyone avoiding the zoning and codes we have in place, and the methodology for exceptions, not for the interim users nor our citizenry and business community.

---

This email was sent from a contact form on [gjspeaks.org](http://gjspeaks.org)

Interim housing initiative



Teri Thomas <info@angelsinthemaking.com>

To Housing; Council



Thu 4/18

Retention Policy Default 2 Year Then Permanently Delete Mess Expires 4/18/2026

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

Good Morning,

I am writing this note as I am unable to make the open house at Lincoln Park barn tonight.

I am against the proposal being discussed as it does nothing to help the homeless situation. In my eyes it only makes it legal to squat in areas where they can not legally do so now. My business and my home would be downwardly effected by this. For me its a safety and sanitary concern. Loose dogs, as is common in homeless encampment is also a concern.

I am not insensitive to the homeless crisis but this solution is just a whitewash to "look the other way" rather than coming up with real solutions.

Have we proposed to some CMU students studying in the social sciences, urban growth and mental health be part of the solution? Could students work with our city government to creatively device a plan as part if their curriculums for graduation? Our government officials don't need to have all the answers. Can we work collectively with these young, brilliant, think outside of the box minds to devise a sustainable plan?

When we know better we do better. Let's do better!

Sincerely,

Teri Thomas  
Owner, Angels in the making  
21 yr resident of Grand Jct, CO

Interim Housing



Dead Cowboyz <craigman1962@gmail.com>

To Council



Wed 4/17

Retention Policy Default 2 Year Then Permanently Delete Messag Expires 4/17/2026

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

If you think this interim Housing proposal is a good idea..

Please by all means add the sidewalks around your home and business to the list of spaces that camping is allowed. If you approve this, that's exactly what you're doing to me. I live by the library and own a business on main St.

Stop this madness! It's horrifying to me and others in the areas you are proposing to turn into 3rd world country neighborhoods. My property value is already dropping because of the homeless, now you want to completely run my home and business into the toilet.

Don't let this happen. Look for reasonable solutions to the issue. Turning my home into the homeless campground is not an option.

Thank you  
Craig Heartsill  
[Craigman1962@gmail.com](mailto:Craigman1962@gmail.com)

## Code Change for Interim Housing



Jessica Holt <jrholt1978@hotmail.com>

To  Council;  Housing



Wed 4/17

Retention Policy Default 2 Year Then Permanently Del Expires 4/17/2026

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

I think we can all agree that the rise in homelessness in our Valley is concerning. Many places I use to feel safe are not longer safe, ie the Riverfront trail, Main Street, and even my grocery store (Redlands Safeway) where I have been followed to my car, and asked for money.

Interim housing is an AWFUL idea, and must not be passed. Property values will decrease for homeowners, & crime will increase to name a few concerns. As a homeowner and a mother, I do not want to have an encampment next to my home or anywhere close to my home.

DO NOT PASS THIS CODE CHANGE.

## Proposed interim housing



Cindy Amann <camannrealestate@gmail.com>

To  Council



Thu 4/18

Retention Policy Default 2 Year Then Permanently Delete Mess Expires 4/18/2026

Click here to download pictures. To help protect your privacy, Outlook prevented automatic download of some pictures in this message.

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

This would be a huge mistake. It has not worked in other cities and I feel it is not a viable option for our community.

Cindy Amann

Right-click or tap and hold here to download pictures. To help protect your privacy, Outlook prevented automatic download of this picture from the Internet.

[Click to see what your home is worth](#)



Interim Housing



Connie Tremblay <connie@connietremt  
To Council



Thu 4/18

Retention Policy Default 2 Year Then Permanently Del Expires 4/18/2026

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

I would encourage the City to review options that would not diminish property values and the aesthetics of our community.

Please listen to true residents that care about the people and not ideology that doesn't work in real life applications.



**CONNIE**  
BROKER & INSTRUCTOR  
THE VAN GUNDY GROUP

---

970-589-9468  
CONNIE@CONNIETREMBLAY.COM  
WWW.CONNIETREMBLAY.COM

NO to Homeless tent and parking areas in the City of Grand Junction



Paula Rohr <lomahillfarmcreations@gmail.com>  
To Council



Thu 4/18/2024 8:52 AM

Retention Policy Default 2 Year Then Permanently Delete Message (2 years) Expires 4/18/2026

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

Dear City Council,

We implore you to NOT go through with the proposal of Tent camping or parking for the homeless. This has not worked in the cities that the homeless committee used as examples. They only used these cities because they had numbers recorded and not success. The areas will be inundated with crime, drugs, and there is no way to go back from there. From what Grand Junction businesses are saying, when they make a call to the police for the homeless damaging or stealing things on their properties the police can't help them. Why put these sites near residential neighborhoods or churches? The police will not be able to do anything to help our citizens in this community.

I believe that the regional center would be a great place to house the homeless and homeless vehicles. The money that was spent for the homeless last year in our city was unbelievable on the committee's charts. This money could be used in a better way to remodel the regional center to get the homeless population out of the elements. This property has extensive grounds to be able to accomplish this. The soft top on Ute could then be transferred to this site when the transportation hub is ready to be constructed.

Insurance is a big issue in Colorado. I do not believe the insurance will cover churches when they become homeless sights. Also, will insurance insure a home near one of these sites. A lot to consider when insurance costs are on the rise and they are cancelling everywhere in the state of Colorado.

Please do not turn Grand Junction into Denver or California. The citizens voted you in to protect them.

Please VOTE NO!

Russ and Paula Rohr  
Concerned Citizens

Re: Hello



cheyenne Tharp-Etter <gracecheyenne@gmail.com>

To  Council;  Housing



Wed 4/17

Retention Policy Default 2 Year Then Permanently Delete Mess; Expires 4/17/2026

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

On Wed, Apr 17, 2024 at 8:49 PM cheyenne Tharp-Etter <[gracecheyenne@gmail.com](mailto:gracecheyenne@gmail.com)> wrote:

My name is Cheyenne Etter. My husband and I have lived here in Grand Junction for quite some time. We understand the city is trying to change the code that allows sanctioned camping and such in areas that as a local I would not be comfortable or feel safe if one gets set up near my house. I understand that the homeless is a growing problem but this is not the solution. You all drive the locals who call this valley home. Not to mention crime could increase. I urge the city to listen to our concerns. Thank you.

Homeless housing plans



Hrhufnpuf <hrhufnpuf@aol.com>

To  Council

Cc  Housing



Wed 4/17

Retention Policy Default 2 Year Then Permanently Delete Mess; Expires 4/17/2026

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

Your new proposal for housing homeless in Grand Junction is terrible for the people who actually pay taxes. These people do nothing for the community nor do they want to.

Anything offered should have a moving forward target to achieve productive member of community that contributes and expulsion for those who don't.

Jackie Savage

970-234-0340

[Sent from AOL on Android](#)

You have received a new comment on the Forum Topic, Interim Housing Code Draft on project Interim Housing (Alternative Housing Options) on your site,

I applaud the City housing team for doing the research and finding what appears to be some tested and proven options for helping our homeless population. I absolutely support citywide zoning changes for interim housing and parking. It's a great first step and I appreciate that if we get to the point of providing interim housing, it's a measurable option that can be implemented sooner and at a lower cost than some other long-term options.

Added by pingerfam

**From:** Rich Parker <[parkerspool@gmail.com](mailto:parkerspool@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 2, 2024 11:04 AM  
**To:** Ashley Chambers <[ashleyc@gjcity.org](mailto:ashleyc@gjcity.org)>  
**Subject:** Temporary shelters

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

Hello,

As a Grand Junction resident I would like to recommend the use of temporary shelters for unhoused individuals.

Thank you,

Rich Parker

**From:** Constance Combs <[combsconstance@gmail.com](mailto:combsconstance@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 2, 2024 11:06 AM  
**To:** Ashley Chambers <[ashleyc@gjcity.org](mailto:ashleyc@gjcity.org)>  
**Subject:** Support for zoning intervention for temporary unhoused shelters

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

Hi, Ashley. Thank you for receiving my email regarding the City's zoning code change to allow community organizations and service providers that work with the unhoused to set up temporary pallet shelters with 24/7 on-site management and to provide relief to the downtown area. I support the shelters being proposed as temporary and managed by our excellent service providers. It is wise for GJ to gain from Denver's experience, to improve on their temporary shelter models to start transitioning unhoused families and individuals in our community into more stable living situations.

I don't want to be counted among the silent community that without speaking out risks our losing this kind of shelter intervention as a lawful and affordable option to ensure the human right of shelter for all who need it - forthwith! Thanks for what you do!

Cheers,

Constance Combs

602-832-2984

**From:** Roy Brown <[60landslide78g@gmail.com](mailto:60landslide78g@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 30, 2024 12:19 PM  
**To:** Council <[council@gjcity.org](mailto:council@gjcity.org)>  
**Subject:** Homeless Population

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

Homeward bound and the City of Grand Junction created their own homeless problem. Having lived in Pueblo and other cities without homeless services people on the street had the goal of coming to Grand Junction. Because they knew of homeless bound and other services. Also being homeless myself about 6 years ago for a couple of months until I got a place I noticed that there are several people on the streets that want to be there. They do not want to conform to rules and responsibility of having their own place. Also several homeless people have income which they prefer to spend on drugs and alcohol instead of helping themselves. They would love to have a place to live but only if it is free. There is more important things the city needs than financing the carefree lifestyle of the homeless population. Once again I reiterate that Grand Junction presented itself as a great place for the homeless to come to because of the city government and especially homeless bound.

Thank you for your consideration in reading this email and I wish you luck in solving this sad situation that is a huge blemish on our community.

Sincerely,

Roy L. Brown

-----Original Message-----

From: Alethea Moon <[nyaparry@gmail.com](mailto:nyaparry@gmail.com)>

Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2024 2:18 PM

To: Housing <[housing@gjcity.org](mailto:housing@gjcity.org)>

Cc: Council <[council@gjcity.org](mailto:council@gjcity.org)>

Subject: Zoning codes

\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\*

Hello,

I support updating zoning codes to allow interim shelter and parking sites. Please do not let our most vulnerable neighbors down.

Sincerely,

Alethea Moon 81520

-----Original Message-----

From: Arlo Miller <[industrybased@gmail.com](mailto:industrybased@gmail.com)>

Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2024 4:21 PM

To: Housing <[housing@gjcity.org](mailto:housing@gjcity.org)>

Subject: Interim housing

\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\*

I support interim housing in Grand junction. Tent encampments, parking sites, pallet houses, any of the above. Please honor the work that the interim housing working group did and pass the zoning changes they suggested!

Arlo Miller, 81501

**From:** Thomas McCloskey <[tmccloskey@bresnan.net](mailto:tmccloskey@bresnan.net)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 1, 2024 10:34 AM  
**To:** Belinda White <[belindaw@gjcity.org](mailto:belindaw@gjcity.org)>  
**Cc:** 'tmccloskey' <[tmccloskey@bresnan.net](mailto:tmccloskey@bresnan.net)>  
**Subject:** Providing temporary shelters for our unhoused.

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

To the Mayor, City Council, and agencies engaged in helping the houseless in our community-

The city of Grand Junction is currently working on a zoning code change to allow the service providers that work with the unhoused to set up temporary pallet shelters with 24/7 on site management. I'm taking a moment to write a few words to our City Council and housing department, to express my concerns about the lack of shelter for our growing population of unhoused locals.

The shelters being proposed are temporary (1 to 2 years) and will be managed by staff (no unmanaged sites, like Delta tried). Denver has seen some amazing benefits from their projects, and we want to use and improve on their models to start transitioning our unhoused into more stable living situations so they can connect with resources, service providers, and get the help they need. The changes in code can be sunset limited if there is concern with ongoing expansion of this alteration of code which could degrade the building environment in our City.

If we don't do enough during this short-term crisis in affordable housing, there's a real risk that our inaction will eliminate temporary shelters as an option to address our unhoused (and it IS the most affordable option). I'm sharing my thoughts in the hope the city will start taking meaningful action to address the unhoused population. We simply can't continue the current situation and by default, just leave them unhoused and on the streets.

Thanks for your consideration and dedication to just housing and health care for your citizens, whether they have addresses or not.

Tom McCloskey

Redlands

**From:** [mhmok1@bresnan.net](mailto:mhmok1@bresnan.net) <[mhmok1@bresnan.net](mailto:mhmok1@bresnan.net)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 1, 2024 7:15 PM

**To:** Ashley Chambers <[ashleyc@gjcity.org](mailto:ashleyc@gjcity.org)>

**Subject:** Temporary pallet shelters

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

Ashley,

Wanted to let you know our entire family support the temporary pallet shelters 100%.

Having just found out about the program Tuesday afternoon, we were not able to rally others that we know that would support such a program!!

We will look at different areas where they might go as we haven't had time to do that.

Good luck,

Monique Morisseau M.D.

Martin O'Keeffe

Isabelle O'Keeffe

Jeanne O'Keeffe

You have received a new comment on the Forum Topic, Interim Housing Code Draft on project Interim Housing (Alternative Housing Options) on your site,

I strongly support citywide zoning changes for interim housing and parking. What those who disagree are missing is a full understanding and education of the factors in our culture and society that lead to homelessness, exacerbate it, reduce it and prevent it. This is something the housing team at the City does have a thorough understanding of and we should let them do their job. I applaud the housing team for providing case studies for how this has ACTUALLY worked and improved the housing situation and even reduced crime in other cities. Many commenters are making incorrect assumptions and have uneducated opinions regarding what really works to solve these types of problems. The people who don't want taxpayer money being used to provide shelter to the homeless are the same people who complain about homeless in the parks, camping, on the street or leaving trash everywhere. You can't have it both ways. They need somewhere to go. Despite inaccurate perceptions and wishful thinking, there are NOT ENOUGH shelters and spaces for homeless folks here. If you work in the field, you will see that there is actually a major shortage of resources. These are human beings we are talking about! Being homeless does not make someone a criminal. They are not going to be able to get back on their feet as you so demand until they have a safe place to keep their belongings and sleep at night. You try it. It's near impossible to do. You want it solved, this is how we do it. You can't just complain them away. At this point we are at step one of making changes. We're JUST changing the code. There is no reason not to simply allow ourselves the OPPORTUNITY to have these types of sites here. The funding, the providers, the mechanisms, the places...those will all appear in due time and nothing will be implemented without public input. The housing team has made that clear. What I would really like to see in addition to interim housing and parking sites is sanctioned camping areas. Those who will not or cannot function in an interim housing tiny home site will still need somewhere to go that is not a park or city street where they will be harassed. I would also like to see more traditional overnight shelters. I think we are missing a major opportunity and misusing what we already have by not having the Resource Center open at night when nighttime shelter is most needed. It has been stated that the Resource Center was meant to replace the park.... well, the park was open until 9 or 10. People cannot truck all of their belongings back and forth from the Resource Center to their camping area twice a day. If we want to reduce the number of people camping in parks and by the river, we need to give them a low barrier shelter or place to stay over night like the Resource Center. It's already there, why not get more use out of it? Why not maximize its benefit to this community?

Added by AshleyR

[Click here](#) to view the comment

*This comment is subject to moderation.*



-----Original Message-----

**From:** Angel Goodrich <angel.goodrich1@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 1, 2024 6:46 AM  
**To:** Housing <housing@gjcity.org>; Council <council@gjcity.org>  
**Subject:** Zoning codes

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

I support updating the zoning codes to allow interim shelter and parking sites Angel Goodrich 81505

-----Original Message-----

**From:** JEANNE MARIE <pinkjeanne@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 30, 2024 9:48 PM  
**To:** Council <council@gjcity.org>  
**Subject:** Interim housing

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

I support zoning and development codes to allow city wide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Jeanne Marie  
[Pinkjeanne@msn.com](mailto:Pinkjeanne@msn.com)  
81520  
Sent from my iPad

**From:** Miranda Springer <my.aorta@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 30, 2024 12:09 PM  
**To:** Housing <housing@gjcity.org>; Council <council@gjcity.org>  
**Subject:** zoning codes

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

Hello, I support updating zoning codes to allow interim shelter and parking sites. Thank you!!

Miranda Springer, 81505

**From:** Alexis Bauer <[octopuscoffeeinc@gmail.com](mailto:octopuscoffeeinc@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 1, 2024 8:42 AM

**To:** Ashley Chambers <[ashleyc@gjcity.org](mailto:ashleyc@gjcity.org)>

**Subject:** Housing Concern

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

Hi Ashley,

I just wanted to write in and share how important it is to me that the interim shelter zoning code changes get adopted by the City. I believe it is terribly unfair to leave the unhoused on the streets for many reasons, not the worst of which is businesses struggle with coping with their impact.

Grand Junction has to make a meaningful, 24 hour, seven day a week response to the community's housing crisis. And they need to do it quickly to help impacted businesses who are struggling with their now overwhelmed neighborhoods - it goes without saying that the unhoused are not going to find a path back to a healthy living situation without help either. Pallet shelters are cheaper than brick and mortar, faster and would help so much.

The Resource Tent is a good start, but the lack of overnight capability leaves that area vulnerable to unsupervised unhoused populations and their belongings. Pallet shelters would greatly help that area and other areas by giving the unhoused somewhere for themselves and their belongings to be, safely. I think it's unreasonable to expect folks to find work and save up for first last and deposit without a stable base from which to operate - and I think that is why our unhoused population is growing, our few shelters are doing the best they can but they're not enough.

I am available for discussion with anyone who would like more help understanding how the unhoused impact businesses and how these shelters would help so much to lessen that impact.

Thank you for all you do,

Alexis Bauer

**From:** Carl Grey <[carlgrey521@gmail.com](mailto:carlgrey521@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 29, 2024 8:49 PM  
**To:** Housing <[housing@gjcity.org](mailto:housing@gjcity.org)>; Council <[council@gjcity.org](mailto:council@gjcity.org)>  
**Subject:** Zoning Codes

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

To whomever it may concern,

I support updating zoning codes to allow interim shelter and parking sites.

Carl Posthumus  
Clifton, CO 81520

**From:** Z Stanek <[zsfstanek@gmail.com](mailto:zsfstanek@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 29, 2024 4:44 PM  
**To:** Housing <[housing@gjcity.org](mailto:housing@gjcity.org)>; Council <[council@gjcity.org](mailto:council@gjcity.org)>  
**Subject:** Support for Updated Zoning Codes to Allow Interim Shelter and Parking Sites

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

Hello,

I am writing to show my support of updating zoning codes to allow interim shelter and parking sites. This is for the betterment of Mesa County residents, houseless or otherwise.

Thank you for your time,

Zoe Stanek

81504

**From:** Kerrigan Cooney <kerrigan4321@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 29, 2024 6:11 PM  
**To:** Council <council@gjcity.org>; Housing <housing@gjcity.org>  
**Subject:** Interim Shelter and Parking Zone Codes

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

I support updating zoning codes to allow interim shelter and parking sites.

-Kerrigan Cooney. Grand Junction, CO. 81506

**From:** Laura Houston <laurathebartendress@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 29, 2024 3:49 PM  
**To:** Housing <housing@gjcity.org>  
**Subject:** Interim housing

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

I fully support updating the codes to allow interim housing! This should have been thought about, voted on and implemented BEFORE the closure of whitman park.

Laura

Grand Junction Resident

**From:** Bryan Collings <collings.bryan@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 29, 2024 6:19 PM  
**To:** Ashley Chambers <ashleyc@gjcity.org>  
**Subject:** Please allow Temporary Shelters

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

Hello,

I wanted to reach out and express my thoughts on allowing temporary shelters to be allowed in the city to help get some of the local Unhoused off the streets.

I think we should make sure code allows temporary shelters, they seem to be a tool that works more often than not in getting people back into permanent housing. Other cities have done a lot of work on this, we can use and improve on their models to start transitioning our unhoused into more stable living situations so they can connect with resources, service providers, and get the help they need.

It won't be cheap, I'm sure, but showing up to ERs without the ability to pay, contact with police for things like trespass simply because they have nowhere to go, these are costs incurred by not providing shelter and also hugely expensive from what I understand.

Brick and mortar shelters can take 2-3 years to build but the temporary shelters are much faster to get up and running and should actually help address the problem, maybe shrink the Unhoused population instead of just move them around.

This is meaningful action.

Thank you for your time,

Bryan Collings

You have received a new comment on the Forum Topic, Interim Housing Public Feedback Session Recording April 10, 2024 on project Interim Housing (Alternative Housing Options) on your site,

The city should provide opportunity and not actual housing for those who are unhoused. No wasteful tiny homes or providing structures to occupy. The city should focus on a managed space that is approved for people to stay. Like a designated parking lot for those wanting to sleep in their cars. Provide overnight security patrol and Porta Potty's. Or the Tent opportunity if your without a car. I could see a managed space with

Porta Potty's of tent camping available in Red insulated Kodiak IceFishing tents. With the occupants required to purchase the tent. So they have some skin in the game. This way the camping area is clean and well organized. Not tarps, and walmart tents and garbage. This campsite should be a on a couple acres of land at the new Community Center development and Park. Showers can accessed at the community center or local gym membership like planet fitness.

Added by Fergman

[Click here](#) to view the comment

*This comment is subject to moderation.*

You have received a new comment on the Forum Topic, Interim Housing Draft Code - PowerPoint on project Interim Housing (Alternative Housing Options) on your site,

I agree, this should be voted on by the tax payers.

Added by GJcity2024

**From:** Karen Prather <[pkaren626@gmail.com](mailto:pkaren626@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 29, 2024 2:16 PM  
**To:** Housing <[housing@gjcity.org](mailto:housing@gjcity.org)>  
**Subject:** Interim Housing Feedback

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

Hi there,

I received an email from Mutual Aid Partners asking to deliver feedback on the interim housing project. I'm not sure if there is a form I'm meant to use and I'm happy to do so. Please let me know if there is a better way to submit feedback. Otherwise, please see my feedback below.

I attended the open house at the Lincoln Park Barn a few weeks ago concerning housing support for unhoused individuals in the Grand Junction area. I know many friends that live in Denver and I follow a few pages that showcase the havoc and chaos that is perpetuated at the St. Francis Center and the Quebec Group funded "housing first" hotels and I hope that we take the failures of those

systems into consideration to plan an ideal solution for GJ residents and the unhoused community. Specifically, I think we need to address the following to make these resources succeed.

- **SAFE outdoor spaces:** Any free housing communities need to have systems in place to uphold a **zero tolerance policy for weapons, prescription and recreational drugs**. We cannot ask an addict to simply stop being addicted however, we have seen that housing first initiatives that are not accompanied by addiction treatment have dire outcomes for residents and the surrounding community.
- For example, records show that out of 10,000 households served by the St. Francis Day Shelter annually, only 7 exited to permanent or stable housing in 2023 and none so far in 2024. More people involved with the SFC died than moved onto permanent housing last year. In Grand Junction, we consider death a negative outcome and that is a reality of these services that we need to consider proactively rather than reactively as we are seeing the centers in Denver attempt to do.
- **Overdoses at encampments and in facilities:** we need to mandate and enforce zero tolerance for all drugs at these facilities and accurately record and communicate when these situations may occur. Addiction treatment needs to be mandatory for all residents and no use or sale of drugs should occur between residents. Even prescription drugs need to be verified to discourage circulation.
- **Mobile drug manufacturing:** Regular vehicle searches need to be complete for vehicles allowed to park in these areas. We cannot have mobile meth labs like we see in Denver.
- Colorado was recently voted the 4th most dangerous state by Forbes according to property crime, violent crime and chances of becoming a victim. For this reason we must have a **zero tolerance for weapons** and/or violence at these centers if we are to succeed with interim housing programs and we must ensure sufficient staffing so that residents are checked for weapons. We also need to consider *effective* security enforcement on site 24/7 at these facilities. Recently, I saw a viral video of a St. Francis security guard fully asleep while on duty. There are also countless stabbings, shootings and domestic disturbances at these kinds of facilities in Denver, including Overland, Renaissance Lofts and House1000 facilities, as well as areas surrounded by encampments in Denver, including the Sante Fe, Navajo, Colfax & Broadway, Kalamath & Lipan encampment areas. These statistics are recorded by Denver Police, we see almost 1000% increases in crime rates in these areas vs. further away from unhoused facilities and encampments. This kind of negligence cannot be tolerated at the Grand Junction facilities.
- If families and single unhoused individuals are residents we need to implement proper securities to ensure children are safe in these facilities. That means we need to check if people are on the SO list and provide alternatives for those individuals. Perhaps we consider separating sex offenders into alternative buildings. It seems many centers in Denver do not have safety regulations in place to protect unhoused children from being around dangerous individuals. This cannot be tolerated in the Grand Valley.
- **Fraud:** I recently read that the Crossroads Salvation Army program manager in Denver was fired for fraud and embezzlement. We need to do everything in our power to keep corrupt deals with development companies from infecting public services with this kind of fraud in Grand Junction. We cannot simply replicate the housing facilities in Denver because the evidence of these failing their community is abundant. We do not want GJ to turn out like Denver in these respects!

Thanks!

**From:** [prayercandle00@protonmail.com](mailto:prayercandle00@protonmail.com) <[prayercandle00@protonmail.com](mailto:prayercandle00@protonmail.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, April 29, 2024 1:53 PM

**To:** Housing <[housing@gjcity.org](mailto:housing@gjcity.org)>

**Subject:** Interim housing zoning codes

**\*\* - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - \*\***

I support updating the zoning codes to allow interim shelter and parking sites. As housing costs across Colorado and the US get worse we need to find solutions for people in need of housing.

Dominic Arzapalo, resident of Clifton, CO.

While I appreciate the effort that is going into this process, I think that this is avoiding the real questions and challenges that this type of approach will need to address before anything like this would come to fruition: 1.) Location - I believe that it will be incredibly difficult to find a site for any significant amount of these uses, whether it is parking areas, tent villages, and/or pallet village. Finding sites that are a) available, b) suitable for such uses in terms of access to services, etc, and most significantly c) acceptable to and compatible with the surrounding area will be very challenging to say the least. 2) Cost - from what I have been able to determine through some research, building a pallet village with even a modest number of units (perhaps 40-50) will require a significant capital investment as well as a significant ongoing operational expense. Candidly, I believe that the zoning obstacles are the easy part to address. But finding suitable locations and earmarking funds for both one-time as well as ongoing expenses will be both significant and difficult to justify to the community at large, especially if public funding is proposed.

Added by bherman



To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Brianna Dixon - Zip code: 81501

Optional comment:

Schoening  
I need a safe space for me - my puppy - and my husband to be able to feel safe and not get fucked with b/c Doctor Amos singled me out and told me that I can't have my dog w/ me @ the Amos Hangout House!!

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: LeRoy Revelle Zip code: 81509

Optional comment:

Fix the problem correctly  
Please stop drinkin' Alcohol

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Teika M. Roach Zip code: 81501

Optional comment:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Shanna Locke Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: It ~~too~~ would be easier  
to find work IF I had a place  
to keep stuff

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Jeff Fraizer Zip code: 81501

Optional comment:

need a place because  
it's a better night to talk to  
real walls

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Jason Banks Zip code: 81502

Optional comment: It is a big concern  
and much needed for the homeless  
community



To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: LeelVon Baker Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: This County needs a camping space. I am almost 75yo old & having to pick up & move every other week. No campers are not leaving... Lets find a compromise.

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Amy Mascarenas Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: We would like to see the parking spaces for camps and RV's. LEGALLY! And the tiny houses

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Andreea Avramov Zip code: 81502

Optional comment: The Homelessness problem  
is an issue that we have to have  
somewhere to go. It's ridiculous. I've  
lost so much including everything  
bathrooms, housing, laundry

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Kelly Merry Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: Need parking for  
poor disabled vets

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

5-22-17  
Name: Maureen Jaramila Keder Zip code: Herli 81501 Sheller

Optional comment: I want people to be safe  
I got upset w/ saying I mean no harm  
I would vote 2 help in any way I can  
Come See About Me. God Love You  
So do I My

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Stacey Banks Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: Much needed to help  
the homeless



To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Gretchen Clark Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: Its important to allow the freedom to camp, park, feel safe and have access to clean & sanitary amenities. I am "all-in" for the these all-zoning ideas I would gladly volunteer some of my time to help progress this action.

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Misty Bunick Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: Don't feel safe due to police. Need more, as a large place place for laundry.

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Huber Sterns Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: yes, please we need a space

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Maisie Meryhew Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: I 100% back and love the idea of having zoning and development codes allowed. Regardless there is always going to be homeless people ~~wherever~~ so why not have them in a designated spot? It would make things better



To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Jeremy Gander Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: This land is ours it  
should be free to camp  
Anywhere

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Ben Krueger Zip code: 81501

Optional comment:

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: CHARLENE DALBO Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: Depending Housing and  
Parking for people with camping  
PLEASE.

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Dustin Lennep Zip code: 81503

Optional comment:

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Cory Harvey

Zip code: 81502

Optional comment:

---

---

---

---

---

---

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Roxanne Neal

Zip code: 81501

Optional comment:

---

---

---

---

---

---

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Jesse Smith Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: check into using gravel pit @  
valley down ...  
to White water heat range? ...

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Glenn Grouting Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: stop being the bull on Colo's Ass



To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name:

Zip code:

Optional comment:

Please, ☺ shade,  
restrooms & water - please

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: CHRIS MONTGOMERY Zip code: 81502

Optional comment: freedom means at exactly  
what it sounds like. But nowadays  
opposite seems to be true in a  
world of contradictions on half truths  
because if freedom not in you/had  
then...

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Jeff Prazier Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: Need a safe place  
w/ out GJPD Harassment

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Amber Sterns Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: hard w/ dog / having to  
fear my place of being kicked  
out

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Paul Parker

Zip code: 81501

Optional comment:

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Tanja Baker

Zip code: 81501

Optional comment:

Tired of getting told  
by GSPD that BLM is where we  
belong, those in camper & trailer  
was told by BLM is not saying  
that BLM is the licensee



To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Robert Surbangl Zip code: 81501

Optional comment:

There are roughly 3500 homeless in GJ.  
The buildings are another banded that doesn't  
work for everyone. You want something to help  
build something to house all the homeless in an  
interim bases. 2-3 months tops.

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: BEN OTTO Zip code:

Optional comment: 970-566-1882

OTTOMATIONS.UNLTD (A) GMAIL.COM



To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Schawn Funk Zip code: \_\_\_\_\_

Optional comment:

You stole dogs,  
got ride of homes dogs,

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Jennifer Sawlough Zip code: 81502

Optional comment: I am Homeless I need to

find some more resources and I  
don't know the future of GJ.

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Sean Jacobson Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: I, a U.S. Citizen and son of a  
Deceased Veteran of the U.S. Air Force have been  
harassed by the G.S. Police because of me being  
homeless. It would be nice and in line of the  
Declaration of Independence and U.S. Constitution of the  
G.S. Government which include's G.S. Police provide's  
Continues On Reverse

kind and respectful interaction, unto me, and  
my fellow homeless people; and, that they  
would provide a section of empty ground  
- in the city, for me and my fellow homeless  
people, to set up tents, and to sleep, and  
not be harassed, and/or, uprooted, by the  
City Police, and/or, Meigs County Sheriffs, and  
wasting ~~any~~ parking for people with RVs  
with full hook-ups, for ~~the~~ Interim Housing Status,  
with all the same, as homeless people, and vice-versa.

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Bill Mullins

Zip code: 81501

Optional comment:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Raven Cook

Zip code: \_\_\_\_\_

Optional comment:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Daniel. marvel Zip code: 81504

Optional comment:

under the Colorado constitution we have the right not to be Harrassed, we have the right to rest, and privacy aswell as the right to Live a Free + Happy Life guaranteed to us By The U.S. constitution "Law of the Land"

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Sheila Fletcher Zip code: 82511

Optional comment:

I want safe. No hassle

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Patricia Langstaff Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: Please allow people to  
camp at a safe place and sleep  
22....

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Michael Ritchie Zip code: 81503

Optional comment: Please allow sleep  
to happen!!

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Eugene Sebastian <sup>Schultz</sup> Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: I believe we have the human right to sleep safe from any vulnerable situation the right to rest law etc etc

God Bless

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Marc Nichols Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: It would be great to get more folks off the streets



To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Brandon James Miller Zip code: 81510

Optional comment:

WE NEED SOMETHIN' Y'ALL!

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Adam B. Grill Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: I agree with this tremendously.



To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: John Ira McLaughlin Zip code: 81503

Optional comment:

---

---

---

---

---

---

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Jeffrey MADOFF Zip code: 81501

Optional comment:

The paper tragedy vs #MADOFF

---

---

---

---

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: *John Thomas* (not for *surveys*) Zip code: *81501*

Optional comment: *Helping homeless people feel secure and loved with "Amnesty"*

*Corner of Anderson Ave. All forgot to add more credibility?*

*[Signature]*

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip code: \_\_\_\_\_

Optional comment: *A place safe either to park a vehicle or van or car overnight or day without being harassed by "law" way*

*"Legal" way*

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: JOHN CURLEY

Zip code: 81501

Optional comment:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: MUNA

Zip code: 81501

Optional comment:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Elizabeth Bailey Zip code: ALL

Optional comment: Homeless for 14 years, because  
couldn't find a job finally have one need a place to  
live for me this would give me the strength to keep  
climbing

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Brad Rouse Zip code: 81501

Optional comment: Storage would be beneficial as well.  
Always a worry of the few belongings I have without  
a place to keep them becomes a full time job that  
makes getting a job harder than needed to get out of the  
ruts we are in.

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Brianna Savage

Zip code: 81501

Optional comment:

---

---

---

---

---

---

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Cassandra Richs

Zip code: 81601

Optional comment:

I have residence in Provo, nicer than any ones here in Grand Junction. I came here to flee from Domestic Violence in Utah. Try as many kind people do for GRAND JUNCTION I VOUCH FOR HOMELESS

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name:

Zip code: 81502

Optional comment: We need homeless and fix costs  
quit digging bullshit holes in the street. Stop  
harassing the homeless. God is watching.

Aren



To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Victoria Grassnik Zip code: 81501

Email: victoria-grassnik@men.com

Optional comment:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Shaylene Wood Zip code: 81501

Email: WoodShaylene@gmail.com

Optional comment:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: MARGA KRASIEKI Zip code: Grand

Email: Hammer5@gmail.com Junction

Optional comment: Homeward Board  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Gwendolyn Kay McGowan Zip code: 99134

Email: irishlissie2@yahoo.com

Optional comment: PLEASE HELP PEOPLE

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: RUSSELL CAMPBELL Zip code: 81501

Email: CAMPBELL RUSSELL CAMPBELL

Optional comment: (YESS) I WANT TO BE ALL FOR THIS OR STOP BACK GROUND TAKES

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Lori Fitz Zip code:

Email:

Optional comment:

YES PARKING  
YES TINY HOMES



To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Shannon Palmer Zip code: 81501

Email: ASHAWN PALMER@GMAIL.COM

Optional comment:

BEING WITHOUT A HOME  
DOES NOT MEAN YOUR  
WITHOUT A HEART.

Optional comment:

Email: jordanjenings@gmail.com

Name: Jordan Jennings Zip code: 81501

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Susan Sargent Zip code: 81504

Email: sintegrity511@gmail.com

Optional comment:

"selective" - "citywide" is too open-ended.  
Obviously, in my opinion, appropriate housing  
couldn't be just anywhere.

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Michelle Funk Zip code: 81501

Email: Fuehmichele402@gmail.com

Optional comment: Need a safe place to keep your things, get ceases if needed and get your dignity back jobs good family dogs

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Elijan Lewis Zip code: 81520

Email: elijanklewis@icloud.com

Optional comment: I believe that the unhoused needs a couple places to be. anyone can end up unhoused

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Allie Moberly Zip code: 81501

Email: Allie@Foundations4Life.net

Optional comment:



To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Dannette Keener Zip code: 81520

Email: dannette@amoscounseling.com

Optional comment:  
I believe that we as a community should support (all) of those in our community,

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Lori Murray Zip code:

Email:

Optional comment:  
GET A property (Nest) market's pet, work skills helping each other. Stay on site, People CAN come in camp. Offer skills, mechanics, cooking gardening under. The people who live out on the streets to ruin it.

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Sharon Contreras Zip code: 81501

Email:

Optional comment:

Please help with R.V. Parking so I can get my life on track with a job/ home. It will give back stability.

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Cassandra Ricks "Miracle Whip" Pro US Zip code: 84601 Paro, UT

Email: casandraricks244@gmail.com bpolarisny@gmail.com

Optional comment: I'm seeking presidential nominal bid  
Starting in 2024 and going forward until I'm elected as  
President. My platform is End Homelessness for the world,  
Give everyone in the world a home, free education & volunteer  
minimum hours per week Pro Roe v. Wade, pro patriotism  
pro Pledge of Allegiance it want to recite or be thoughtful. I  
support homeless, poor, children, youth, vet, parents, military

To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Sean Glen Fisk Zip code: 81501

Email: seanxxk@protonmail.com

Optional comment: I am a Capitalist  
and I believe in free market to whatever  
degree possible. I support the Republican Party and  
the 2nd Amendment. I support the military and  
the police. I support the right to life. I support  
the right to work. I support the right to own property.



To: Grand Junction City Council and City of Grand Junction Housing Division

**YES!** I want zoning and development codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

No, I do not support adapting zoning codes to allow citywide interim housing and parking sites in Grand Junction.

Name: Angela Griecoman Zip code: 81501

Email: angelagriecoman@gmail.com

Optional comment:

This would be very helpful for the street homeless I have experienced thers in my hometown (Wilmington NC) we have a tiny village call Eden Village the requirements to be housed are ridiculous though  
970 3075056