

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
MESA COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
JOINT WORKSHOP SUMMARY**

January 16, 2014 – Noticed Agenda Attached

Meeting Convened: 2:10 p.m. in the Auditorium

Meeting Adjourned: 4:15 p.m.

Council Members present: All. County Commissioners present: All. School District 51 Board Member (President) present: Mikolai. City Staff present: Englehart, Shaver, Moore, Trainor, Tonello, Valentine, Schoeber, and Tuin. County Staff present: Dechant, Baier, Atencio, and Widden. School District 51 Staff present: Schultz.

Agenda Topic 1. Orchard Mesa Pool

City Manager Rich Englehart introduced this item. He stated that direction is being requested on an agreement for the pool. A draft agreement was handed out and he noted some of the changes: on previous agreements, there was no definite owner listed for the pool so the draft agreement lists the School District as the owner, the School District will pay all of the utilities, the School District will schedule through the City to utilize the pool, a “Pool Board” will be established with one representative from each entity, the costs for operations on the capital side will be split between the City and the County, the billing process will be changed to be more like the animal control arrangement that the City has with the County, the notice for termination has been changed to one year, and the term is a 20 year agreement.

School District 51 Superintendent Steve Shultz said that he feels that an important piece of the draft agreement is that the school will not have to pay fees for using the pool. He expressed appreciation for the updated agreement and didn’t understand why the School District was not paying for all of the utilities in the past. He advised that School District 51’s Attorney David Price would like clarification on how the pool board will function, perhaps by the board setting up bylaws.

School District 51 Board President Greg Mikolai asked if setting the priority for using the “maintenance fund” referred to in the agreement is the board or the City/County. City Attorney John Shaver stated that ideally, the board would make recommendations to the governing bodies for purposes of the budget.

Councilmember Chazen asked how long the recent renovations that occurred at the pool will last and also asked how long before the next major capital improvement will be needed. Parks and Recreation Director Rob Schoeber said that the life expectancy for the recent renovations, the pool deck and floor, is ten to fifteen years. The next major expense will be the doors to the glass walls behind the hot tub. They do not open or close properly anymore. The estimate is \$150,000 and scheduled to be done in 2015.

There was discussion regarding the term of the agreement. The County suggested a twenty year agreement may be unnecessarily long; a five year term for the agreement with three five

year renewable periods would give new City Councilmembers and new Commissioners a chance to engage in the agreement. The pool is an older asset and should be kept as a real viable asset by all entities. It was also mentioned that no matter what the term is, an annual appropriation and an annual budget still has to occur.

Council President Susuras asked City Attorney Shaver if a final agreement needs to be reached at this meeting. City Attorney Shaver advised that a final agreement would not be approved at this meeting, but if all parties could reach a consensus and give direction for a term so that a final agreement could be drafted that would be ideal so that final approval could be given by each governing body at a later date.

A poll was taken and the County Commissioners would like to see a five year term. City Councilmembers Chazen, Traylor Smith, Norris, and Council President Susuras were all in favor of a five year term. Councilmembers McArthur, Doody, and Boeschstein were not in favor of a five year term; they would rather see a two year term and then reevaluate the term. School District 51 Board Member Mikolai said it makes no difference to him, however, he liked Councilmember McArthur's suggestion of going with a two year term and then reevaluating the term after the two years.

Commissioner Pugliese noted that the draft agreement references the old agreements as exhibits but she feels that they are only confusing and should not be exhibits to the agreement. City Attorney Shaver said that the old agreements were referred to in the draft agreement for historical reference but could be left out. City Council, Commissioners, and the School District Board were in favor of leaving out the reference to the old agreements, however language about the new agreement supersedes the old agreements was requested.

There was discussion about the agreement stating that any major changes for the Pool need a unanimous vote by the pool board. City Council, Commissioners, and the School District Board were in favor of needing a unanimous vote for any major changes.

It was agreed to remove the word "minor" from the agreement and add specific language where it is stated to establish a minor capital maintenance fund for the pool so there would be a reserve to fall back on if needed.

Agenda Topic 2. City/County Partnerships

City Manager Englehart introduced this item and advised that the City really appreciates the relationships that it has, written or not written.

521 Drainage Authority

Commissioner Acquafresca stated that the 521 Drainage Authority has been a successful endeavor. They are close to renewing a permit from the State to perform inspections for drainage regulatory purposes. They have been successful in identifying drainage hazards across multiple jurisdictions and suggesting ways to mitigate those and reduce those hazards. The

County is eager to continue the partnership. He is concerned about the Grand Valley Drainage District bringing their woes to the 521 Drainage Authority looking for solutions. He sees confusion between the missions of the two organizations and it is important to keep them separate.

Councilmember McArthur stated that there is a problem with a development in Clifton and the 521 Drainage Authority is blocking them. Mesa County Public Works Director Pete Baier said that it is the Douglas Wash and the County Staff is meeting with the Drainage District in the next week and will discuss that issue.

Councilmember McArthur said that the 521 Drainage Authority is having a summit in the upcoming week and the new members, including him, will be studying the by-laws, the rate studies, etc., and put forward a direction for the next year. Public Works and Utilities (PW&U) Director Greg Trainor also added that part of that meeting is to move forward on a consensus for a long range financial business plan.

Commissioner Acquafresca said that both the County Staff and the City Staff are experts in the drainage regulations that the State and Federal Government enforce and is appreciative of the fact that they work closely together.

City Councilmember Doody feels that the 521 Drainage Authority is limping along and a lot of mitigation needs to be done. He said rates need to be implemented.

Councilmember Chazen asked what amount the City contributes to the 521 Drainage Authority. PW&U Director Trainor said that the five entities contribute \$200,000 to the 521 Drainage Authority and it is prorated for each entity. The City's share is \$64,000 and the County's share is \$60,000.

Councilmember Boeschstein said that there should be a study for each drainage basin that looks at historic flows in order to get the numbers to figure out what the flows would be for urbanization. PW&U Director Trainor said that Gerald Williams from Fruita studied all the basins in the valley and there have been a few of those basins where the next step has been taken to determine mitigation.

Mr. Baier said that the 521 Drainage Authority is working great as far as operational goes but the capital needs do need to be identified.

Commissioner Acquafresca recommended that public outreach include some of the facilities that have been invested in to reduce the threat of drainage hazards such as Lewis Wash, the 200 residential homes that were taken out of the floodplain, and Ranchman's Ditch.

Councilmember Chazen said that the public does need to be aware of this issue but advised that it should wait until it is known what the requirements and cost will be.

Riverfront Commission

City Manager Englehart introduced this item. He said there were some concerns during the budgeting process with the relationships and who paid for what.

Commission Pugliese advised that the Riverfront is housed at the County building which is a \$12,000 space but is an in-kind contribution from the County and \$4.5 million was just approved for the final four mile section of the Riverfront Trail, which a majority of that money was from grants and Conservation Trust Funds. The County spent \$650,000 of their capital funds for the project. The County has one staff member that dedicates most of his time to the Riverfront Trail. There is other Staff that is called to the Riverfront Trail such as maintenance, the sheriff, and animal control. The County is committed to the Riverfront Trail and because of all of their in-kind contributions and their capital spending; no one should complain about the \$5,000.

It was asked if there was an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) for the Riverfront Commission. City Attorney Shaver answered that it is a form of an IGA and it is subject to annual appropriation. There was some discussion on how the budget is set for the Riverfront Commission. City Attorney Shaver said it is set by each entity's appropriation. Councilmember Boeschstein explained that their administrative budget is very small and funds a half-time person who takes the minutes of the Riverfront Commission and the Urban Trails Committee and take care of all of the records. The capital part of their budget is the big trail between Fruita and Grand Junction and the County is administering that. The City, County, Fruita, and Palisade do their part to repair and maintain the trail sections within their jurisdictions. The City is still funding their portion for the administrative person. The Riverfront is looking for private sponsors to help with the shortfall in the budget. Parks and Recreation Director Schoeber advised that they did meet with John Gormley with the Colorado Riverfront Foundation, Inc., and the Foundation will be asked to cover the shortfall for the short term.

Councilmember Chazen pointed out that the City contributed \$96,000 on trail repairs which does not include the ongoing maintenance.

City Manager Englehart said that the discussions regarding where the Riverfront Commission and Urban Trails Committee will be ongoing.

Airport Update

County Commissioners advised the application deadline is January 17th to replace Denny Granum's position on the Board. There is a good roster of applicants. They hope to have someone in place for the first Airport Authority meeting in February. The Commissioners have talked about placing a Commissioner on the board.

Agenda Topic 3. Persigo Projects

City Manager Englehart advised that they want to bring the Commissioners up to date on the Interruptible Service Option Credit (ISOC) Project.

Wastewater Services Manager Dan Tonello explained that the ISOC is a program that Xcel Energy has put together to help them save money in expanding their infrastructure to supply power. The program identifies large electrical consumers and allows them to reach an agreement with them to reduce (drop off of the grid) their electrical usage for periods of time. It would require a generator at Persigo for the City to do that. The cost is a little more than \$735,000 and in exchange for enrolling into the program, Xcel Energy will give the City a credit of \$105,000/year. City Council approved signing a contract for a generator at the Council Meeting on January 15th. Mr. Tonello also advised that he received a call from Xcel Energy advising that there is possibly going to be changes to the rebate program in 2017. They will get more information during a meeting that will be held on January 17th and determine how the City should proceed with this. Signing of the contract will be held off until more information has been gathered.

Wastewater Biogas Used as Vehicle Fuel

Mr. Tonello explained that a beneficial use for the biogas has been looked at for close to 10 years and recently they have asked for permission to proceed with a study for the actual costs of installing equipment and constructing a dedicated pipeline to the Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) site. There are government credits in place for a subsidy for every gallon of gas used in vehicles. Internal Services Manager Jay Valentine said they are looking at consultants that could validate and add more structure to the existing assumptions of this project. They will provide more details on this project as they get them.

Other Business

Commissioner Pugliese asked about the trunk-line extension agreement and where that stands. City Attorney Shaver advised they are still working on the report to address concerns and will bring it back to the next Persigo Board Meeting.

City Manager Englehart advised that the Municipalities Dinner is February 6th and the Council wanted more information on the buffer zones so that brought about having Rob Blieberg show up to provide information on that topic.

That concluded the meeting and the meeting adjourned.



AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, CITY COUNCIL
MESA COUNTY, BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
JOINT WORKSHOP SESSION
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM
250 N. 5th STREET
GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO
THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 2014, 2:00 P.M.

1. **Orchard Mesa Pool**

2. **City/County Partnerships:** The City and the County have entered into a number of partnerships, both formal and informal, over the years. A list of those partnerships is being provided for review and discussion. **Attachment**
 - **521 Drainage Authority**
 - **Riverfront Commission**

3. **Airport Update**

4. **Persigo Projects** **Attachment**
 - **Interruptible Service Option Credit (ISOC) Project**
Xcel Energy offers its large electrical consuming customers an incentive to participate in their Interruptible Service Option Credit (ISOC) program.

 - **Wastewater Biogas Used as Vehicle Fuel**
Installation of specific equipment with an estimated cost of \$1,750,000 will allow gas produced at the Persigo Wastewater Treatment Facility to be used as vehicle fuel.

5. **Other Business**