

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
AND
THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR MESA COUNTY**

SPECIAL MEETING

March 13, 2000

The Grand Junction City Council and the Mesa County Commissioners convened into special session at Two Rivers Convention Center to solicit public comment for continued deliberation of the 201 Sewer Service Area boundary adjustments. President of the Council Gene Kinsey and Commission Chair Doralyn Genova convened the meeting at 7:02 p.m. Those present were Councilmembers Cindy Enos-Martinez, Earl Payne, Janet Terry, Jack Scott, Gene Kinsey and Jim Spehar, and County Commissioners Kathryn Hall, Doralyn Genova and Jim Baughman. Clerk for the Commissioners Bert Raley and City Clerk Stephanie Nye were also present.

**CONTINUATION OF DELIBERATION OF 201 SEWER SERVICE AREA
BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS**

Mayor Kinsey announced the status of the discussions. The two areas to be discussed are Orchard Mesa and Wildwood.

Utilities Manager Greg Trainor introduced the City and County officials as well as the staff present to address questions.

This is the third public hearing on these additions and deletions in the 201 Persigo Boundary. Since October 1999, the City Council and Board of County Commissioners have held three public hearings and have made several boundary adjustments to the 201 Sewer Service Area Boundary. Two areas remain awaiting a final determination: Wildwood area, bounded by S. Broadway, adjacent to Canyon View Subdivision, Country Meadows Subdivision on the east, and the Colorado National Monument on the west, and a portion of West Orchard Mesa, south of B Road, from 30 Road to 32 Road.

He reviewed briefly what has happened so far and referred to an updated map. Certified letters were sent to most of the property owners in the areas to be discussed and also surrounding properties immediately adjacent to these properties. A display ad was also published in The Daily Sentinel.

Mr. Trainor identified some specific problems that were brought up. For example Guy Stephens' property was split by the proposed adjusted 201 boundary and Mr. Stephens wanted to be either all in or all out.

Regarding the Wildwood Area: Although there was sentiment expressed by some land owners on December 13, 1999 to leave the Wildwood area in the 201 Sewer Service Area, the Growth Plan and the current zoning for the area are in conflict. The Growth Plan envisions densities of "rural" (5-35 units/acre) and "low density residential" (1/2 to 2 units/acre). The current County zoning is R-2, 4 units per acre.

If the area currently in the 201 boundary is deleted, no sewer would be available and the current R-2 zoning would not be implementable and the area would never be annexed. Thus, it would leave an enclave serviced by Mesa County and surrounding properties serviced by the City. Lower density to Growth Plan recommendations would be the only options available.

If allowed to remain within the 201 Area, new development would be annexable by the City. However, the land use decision would still remain to be made, either keeping the 4 units per acre densities or rezoning to the Growth Plan densities.

So there is sentiment on both sides. The issue is still open for discussion.

Councilmember Terry stated that at the last meeting it became clear that the decisions made on the 201 Boundary will affect the Master Plan. That decision will have to be ratified later.

Mayor Kinsey reiterated that areas left in the 201 Sewer Service Area will have sewer service and will be developed within the City boundaries.

Councilmember Terry added that the discussion of the development plan for the area will have to take place.

Commissioner Baughman restated that development will not trigger annexation, only a change in zoning. Councilmember Terry corrected him by stating that any public hearing development is what will trigger annexation. Commissioner Baughman clarified that sewer service to existing residences no longer triggers annexation. The others said that is correct.

Mayor Kinsey asked for public comments.

Michael Anton, 2111 Desert Hills Road, said he did not receive notification of this hearing. If the parcel comes out of the 201 and the owner wants to develop, he asked if they can still file an application for development. Mr. Trainor said yes, but if it comes out, sewer is not available. The developer could request the City and County to take them back in. It is not a right to come back in.

Councilmember Spehar said whether or not a parcel is in or out, a petition must be filed to get back into the 201. Commissioner Hall said there is an extra step to get it back in. Councilmember Scott said the application may or may not be turned down.

Mr. Anton said leaving it within the boundary will make it more dense, allowing the development of a large number of units. Commissioner Hall said it depends on the assigned zoning.

Mr. Anton said the Growth Plan states the area is rural and he agreed with the Growth Plan. He felt it should remain rural.

Councilmember Terry said it is one or the other. It would be difficult to split because the Persigo Agreement indicates that the 201 service area will be developed in urban densities. Rural and rural estate are not urban densities.

Mr. Anton would like to leave it in then and keep it at the estate designation. Councilmember Terry said it cannot be done without changing the Persigo Agreement.

Dawn Maiella, 2112 Desert Hills Road, said she had not received notice of the hearing or the December 13, 2000 hearing. She purchased her property knowing the Growth Plan designated the area as rural, and there was a reason for that designation. It is next to the Colorado Monument which does not need to be cluttered with homes. The wild creatures would be run out of the area with higher densities and extra traffic. She wanted to stay with the rural designation recommended by the Growth Plan.

Mayor Kinsey asked if she wanted it to be excluded from the 201. Ms. Maiella said yes.

Guy Stephens, 2157 S. Broadway, has lived there 30 years, and before the surrounding Monument Meadows Subdivision. The developer put a sewer plant in the middle of the road. It has spewed onto his property. He went to the County Commissioners to discuss the sewer plant. He was told a sewer district was planned for the area and would include his property, and asked him to wait. They finally got sewer out there and tore the treatment plant down but didn't do cleanup in the area. His house is not less than 400 feet from the sewer. Half of his 18-acre property is not included within the boundary. He would rather have half of his property within the boundary so he can hook up or sell it for a subdivision later. He is surrounded by subdivisions. He has been told his property would either be all in or all out of the boundary, but he would rather have the split than be deleted completely. The agricultural value of the area is nil. Mr. Stephens said he would prefer having his entire 18 acres stay within the 201 boundary.

Steve McCallum, 363 Granite Falls Lane, adjacent to the Stephens property, said he sold 70 acres and retained 50 acres. He asked if the 400-foot requirement is to the house or property line. He felt it would be advantageous to remain in the district for the availability of sewer. The property line is within 50 feet of the sewer line and the house is 1300 feet away. He could see no benefit to being removed. He would like to remain in the 201 district.

Commissioner Baughman said a benefit is to keep this area low density so it would not need sewer.

Councilmember Terry said the basis for that was that the Growth Plan which indicated low density. She answered Mr. McCallum's question that the 400 feet is from the property line.

Steve McCallum asked if he had a failure of his septic system and his property line is within 400 feet of the collected, would he be forced to hook up to the sewer system rather than be able to repair his system.

City Utilities Engineer Trent Prall said Mesa County and Grand Junction rules state 400 feet from the property line to the sewer. The Mesa County Health Department rule states 400 feet from the sewer to the residence through existing platted rights-of-way and easements. Since Mr. McCallum's property is currently in the County, he could repair his septic system. The City hasn't changed its rules because in most cases inside the City, the 400 feet apply to both the house and the property line.

Terry Dixon, 441 Wildwood Drive, appreciated those saying they want the Wildwood area to stay rural. Her family has owned the property for a long time. She felt the Growth Plan guidelines have ruined the Redlands area. The properties are no longer rural. It is urbanized with huge homes at the edge of the National Monument. She said property owners in the area are being told they need to keep the area rural in nature, although they are surrounded by huge homes. She echoed Mr. McCallum's statement in questioning what is the downside of leaving it within the 201 boundary. There is a problem with emergency services for little enclaves. By leaving this area in the 201, possibly going into the City later, would alleviate such emergency services problems. She said Mr. Ray Riley couldn't attend this hearing as he had a prior business engagement. Mr. Riley had asked either Ms. Dixon or Mr. McCallum to express his sentiment that he wished to remain within the 201.

Commissioner Baughman asked how much acreage is owned by Mr. Riley. Ms. Dixon said 70 acres.

Dick Ennis, 2108 Desert Hills Road, owns several properties in the area. He said the 201 is a catch 22 situation, a moot point. He felt he might as well keep it

consistent. He noted a consultant had been hired out of Denver to study open spaces and keeping certain areas rural. Suggestions were made on how to do that. Those recommendations are not being followed. The lift stations have blown sewage out into three homes, and more lift stations are being proposed. Some are proposed to raise sewage over 80 feet in height and run it approximately a mile across wetlands. He was also concerned with traffic. One particularly bad section is in front of Lynn Arnis's house, close to Wildwood where there is a 26-foot right-of-way. The golf course expansion and proposed new subdivisions in the Wildwood area will add traffic.

Mayor Kinsey asked Mr. Ennis to clarify his position. Mr. Ennis said he didn't want City sewer services and wanted to be excluded from the 201 area.

Councilmember Terry asked for some clarification on Mr. Ennis's comment of possibly converting some of his property into a conservation easement. Commissioner Genova said Mesa County has a track committee that is working on such easements.

Harley Jackson, 455 Wildwood, said he wants his cake and eat it too. He has five acres and five springs making it difficult to subdivide. He would like to be on the sewer so he wanted to stay within the 201 boundary.

Councilmember Spehar suggested resolving these areas one at a time.

Commissioner Baughman was in favor of leaving this area within the 201 boundary. Several large property owners want to be left in. The 201 boundary will eventually become the City of Grand Junction. It makes no sense to leave this area as a Mesa County island with the City surrounding on all sides. At some point this area will most likely become a part of the City of Grand Junction.

Commissioner Genova said most of the large property owners came forward tonight. She asked if staff knows how large Monument Meadows is. A member of the audience said there are 62 homes in the second filing, and probably 20 in the first filing.

Councilmember Spehar agreed with Commissioner Baughman. There are probably a few areas that will be in the city limits that will be at the 5 to 35 acre density. He suggested looking at the Persigo Agreement for these limited areas to make it economically feasible to provide sewer to the larger lots; thus allowing more rural densities where it's appropriate. He felt these properties should be left within the 201 boundary and look at other ways to deal with the economics of providing sewer service.

Mayor Kinsey said it is not entirely the economics of providing sewer service. It's the economics of providing all the other City services such as police, fire, trash, etc.

Councilmember Terry said the Master Plan shows this area as high density but it will be reviewed and revised. For that reason, she favored leaving this area out of the 201. As needs and land uses change and plans are revised and reviewed, she would consider adding it back in at a later time. She said not allowing less dense areas in the 201 area creates dilemmas. It has caused approval of things that might not have been approved if not constrained by the Persigo Agreement.

Councilmember Payne agreed with Councilmember Spehar and Commissioner Baughman. Open spaces will be provided by these large landowners. They will dictate the density. He favored leaving them in the 201.

Councilmember Scott said he had not heard of the recent sewer problems stated by Mr. Ennis and asked if there are plans to move one of the sewer lines to Desert Hills Road or one of the others in the area. Greg Trainor said a contractor is installing water lines in one of the new filings in The Seasons. He flushed his waterlines into the sewer and overwhelmed the lift station, flooding it out and a couple of homes. It was not the result of a faulty lift station. It was the fault of abnormal use.

Utilities Engineer Trent Prall said the Desert Hills lift station is part of Desert Hills Estates and was approved two months ago. A lift station is proposed in that subdivision that will eliminate The Seasons lift station. Trunk lines will be installed on Desert Hills Road going down to the lift station, and then lifting up to the new driving range on the Tiara Rado golf course. There is 80-feet of gain there, although that amount of gain is not uncommon for lift stations.

Councilmember Terry said she has been asked why the City is doing that. Is there another alternative, perhaps a closer connection. Trent Prall said a lift station would still be required. They could have come out through Monument Meadows Subdivision on S. Broadway on the south side of Riggs Hill. By doing so, the sewage flows back to the east and then northeast which is further from the sewer plant. Pumping to the west is a more direct route to the wastewater treatment plant. Mr. Trainor said it eliminates the Seasons lift station which is good because it minimizes the number of mechanical devices that are subject to failure. The goal is to maintain gravity service as much as possible.

Councilmember Scott asked if there is a capacity problem. Mr. Prall replied no. Upsizing that line has been approved to handle the flow from The Seasons and includes the potential from this area too, not at 4 units/acre but sufficient for the next 10 or 20 years.

Dick Ennis said a simple alternative would be still remove the failed lift station, but the new lift station would be moved to the golf course property and it would only rise 35 feet, the same rise as the existing lift station. The entire distance would be less than a quarter of the one-mile distance. There is no need to run

the line a longer distance. He felt it has to do with a financial commitment to a developer.

Upon motion by Commissioner Hall, seconded by Commissioner Baughman and carried unanimously, the Wildwood Area was left in the 201 Sewer System Area.

Upon motion by Councilmember Payne, seconded by Councilmember Spehar and carried with Councilmembers **KINSEY** and **TERRY** voting NO, the Wildwood Area was left in the 201 Sewer System Area.

RECESS

A five- minute recess was called at 8:10 p.m. Upon reconvening at 8:15, the same City Council and County Commission members were present.

Commission Chair Genova announced the topic of the next discussion. Orchard Mesa area (along B Road to Highway 6 & 50):

Mesa County Public Works Director Pete Baier referred to the map and clarified the topic for discussion. He recapped what has been previously done, the area left in Valle Vista and 400 feet north and south. He had information to respond to some of the questions regarding density and capacity, as well as high ground water and failed septics. There have been only four in this area since 1966. Some recent engineered septics have gone in. There was some question on who will actually serve the area, the City or the County. Regarding cost-effectiveness, the cost to run a mile of sewer line for the densities indicated would be \$70/ lineal foot (approximately \$350,000).

He reviewed the parameters of being left within the 201 boundary versus being deleted as with Wildwood discussed previously such as density and service. He said the Persigo Agreement would have to be modified if this area stays within the 201 boundary. He then introduced Mesa County Planning Director Linda Dannenberger.

Councilmember Terry asked if that development would then allow annexation. Mr. Baier said yes if new development occurred, it would trigger annexation.

Ms. Dannenberger reviewed the zoning in the area (County zoning AFT, 4 units/acre). The Land Use Plan designates this area as rural except for the Valle Vista Subdivision which is designated residential. The rural designation recommends 1 unit per 5 acres to 1 unit per 35 acres. The Orchard Mesa Plan takes precedence in this area under the County-wide Land Use Plan. The Orchard Mesa Plan has the same recommendation except for those subject to a density bonus which allows 1 unit per 2.5 acres. Otherwise, the zoning is agricultural.

Pete Baier pointed out this area has been 4 units per acre as of 1995, as a density, not zoned that way.

Linda Dannenberger said the Orchard Mesa Plan is being revisited and updated by both City and County staffs and open houses are scheduled in May, 2000, with plans for adoption by City Council and County Commissioners this summer.

Wayne Kennedy, 3154 XL Spur, Dilasha Acres Subdivision, asked what the diagonal line on the plat running through the Orchard Mesa green area signifies. Pete Baier said the white is the 400 feet on either side of the Valle Vista line. The Persigo Agreement included that area within the 201 boundary mainly because of the Health Department requirements and the fact that Valle Vista Subdivision is currently being served by sewer.

Wayne Kennedy said his property is in that area, although the others in his development are not. Mr. Baier said the larger lots are in an engineered subdivision excluding the Dilasha Acres Subdivision.

Steve Kline, Dilasha Acres, said he is building a house. The subdivision has an engineered septic system. He said most of the soil is clay and sticky, and impermeable to water. He wondered how long his septic system will last. He said, being long-sighted, there may be people with failing septics without other options. He would like to be able to get on sewer at a later time if necessary.

Lloyd Elliot, 3126 B Road, said there is a high water table in Dilasha Acres. His septic system is failing. There are 50 houses from 31 Road to 32 Road and more in proposed subdivisions. Mr. Elliot presented a letter from Mr. Hellman, 3105 B Road, owner of 40 acres in the area, saying he can't attend this meeting due to illness. The letter cited the high water table and asked for reconsideration of being deleted from the 201 area. Mr. Hellman is currently on the sewer system and wanted to remain within the 201 boundary. Pete Baier clarified that the few homes (four) that are hooked up to sewer won't be removed from the 201 area.

Mike Randbell, 3113 A ½ Road, said one of the adjoining property owners tried to install an engineered septic system instead of running to the sewer, and it was next to impossible. Mr. Randbell is on septic now but he wanted to go on sewer down the road. The entire area has a high water table and there is no advantage to taking it out of the 201. He felt it is possible to stifle development by not approving the proposals rather than taking away sewer. The density can still be controlled. He felt it hurts nothing to leave it in, and he wanted to stay within the 201 boundary.

Mayor Kinsey clarified that being inside the 201 boundary does not mean sewer service will be provided any time soon. The 201 is also the Urban Growth

boundary and it will establish the future city limits, which is important for future planning.

Councilmember Terry said it's not simple. The agreement is an intergovernmental agreement between the City and County that laid out the parameters of development which is urban density. The parameters are defined by the sewer boundary. The boundary line is very important because within that boundary will be urban level density. When those densities develop, they will then be annexed to the City, and the City must be able to serve those properties when they annex. The City cannot serve an area so far away from the city boundaries. It will cost the City taxpayers a sizeable amount to service those developments.

Mike Randbell said a lot of people have purchased land to possibly develop and that is their retirement, and they have rights to do that. Government entities have restricted many property owners and now their property is going to be a burden. There is easy traffic access to Highway 50 in the area, as well as 32 Road, which is important when considering development. It's not that far from the city line and growth is going that direction.

Gretchen Sigafoos, 3079 A ½ Road, has lived there for 23 years. When she originally moved there she was outside the 201 boundary and was happy. When the Valle Vista problem came up and needed to be solved, she was thrown into the 201. She would like to be back out of the 201. They are selling their property but will still be living in the area. If the area goes back into the 201, they will have 4 units/acre with no control over the density of development taking place south of A ½ Road. She definitely wanted to stay out of the 201 sewer service area.

Commissioner Genova said the area is not currently zoned that way. Ms. Sigafoos said it is proposed. The current zone is AFT.

Tim Bevan, 3112 A ½ Road, said the new line bisects his house. He is currently on the sewer, but not on the list for inclusion or deletion. He wants all of his property to stay in the 201 sewer district. Commissioner Genova said they need to adjust the boundary, and Mr. Bevan won't be removed.

Mayor Kinsey reiterated there is no intention of taking anyone currently on the Valle Vista line out of the 201.

Rich Senko, 3108 A ½ Road, said he is in the same situation as Tim Bevan. Half of his property is included, he's already connected to the sewer, although his house is not in. He connected to the Valle Vista sewer line in 1996 when he built his home. He has dedicated an easement across the north end of his property for the sewer line. He had no preference of being in over being out. His only concern was that all of his property be either in or out of the 201. Commissioner Genova said Mr. Senko's property is in.

Jim Rooks, 155 31 Road, said he is the largest property owner in the area with 220 acres. He wanted to be left in the 201 area. He said 400 feet has been taken off both the north side and the east side of his property. Part of his property is within the boundary and part is out. He would like to be left in the 201 sewer service area.

Councilmember Scott asked how many acres encompass the entire white area on the map. Mr. Rooks estimated 450 acres.

Brian Harris, spoke representing his parents who reside at 3026 A ½ Road. In 1980 they understood they were inside the 201 boundary and voted for the sewer plant. They are served by a four-lane road in the area. B Road is within one and one-quarter miles of a four-lane road so access for development and service is better than it is on the Redlands. The fire station is within four miles. They have better fire protection than the Redlands. They wanted their 5-acre property to stay in the 201 service area.

Tom Nielsen, 130 30 ¾ Road, said he appreciated receiving the notice regarding tonight's meeting. He was not interested in being in the 201 sewer area. There have been only four failed systems in the area and it doesn't seem to be a real problem. People that want to live in these areas don't consider it a burden or they would live elsewhere. The Valle Vista situation was an emergency. If no sewer service is provided, there will still be a demand for property in that area.

Anna Boyles, 2134 B Road, wanted to get on the sewer. The water table is high in the area. She is under 400 feet from the sewer but can't get sewer. She is in the 201 area and wants to stay in. Pete Baier said the physical improvements are not there, but the manhole is in the road and the sewer line turns the other direction.

Tom Matthews asked for clarification on whether this area is currently in the 201 area. The Commissioners and Councilmembers assured Mr. Matthews it is in the 201 service area. The discussion tonight is whether or not to delete the area.

Jim Elsberry, 229 Radan, a board member of Orchard Mesa Sanitation District, said nobody will be upset if the area is not annexed. He is on sewer and he is outside the City, and he personally likes it that way. He said it's not the sewer that dictates the density in this area. To be fair to Orchard Mesa residents they need to understand that being inside the 201 area doesn't mean their properties are about to be annexed or that a certain density will occur. The Planning and Development Department decides. The number of houses per acre is set by the Orchard Mesa Plan for the future of Orchard Mesa. He questioned why the area would have to be annexed.

Councilmember Terry said new development in the 201 area, according to the Persigo Agreement between Mesa County and the City of Grand Junction, will

annex to the City. New development is what determines the annexation. According to the joint agreement, any property that develops will annex to the City. It is not the Planning Department that decides.

Mr. Elsberry said if the City is bound to annexation, then that's the direction it must go.

Commissioner Hall said it doesn't impact existing subdivisions.

Mr. Elsberry said he is in favor of leaving the district as big as it needs to be, only to serve those that need the service.

Jim Rooks, 155 31 Road, said the accurate acreage of the area is 800 acres. Regarding comments on the high water table in the area, he said there is an irrigation system being installed for water use off the Orchard Mesa irrigation system. The floor of the canal was dry when they dug a 2 ½-foot hole for the irrigation system. To pour their structure they are having to use a sump pump to keep the water out in order to build the structure. There is definitely a high water table problem.

Cleo Rooks, 155 31 Road, said they have no immediate plans, but the people who are subdividing in the area, their water drains to the northwest on Orchard Mesa and under her land. They have already used a portion of their acreage to provide drainage for the underground water, and it will continue to get worse as new subdivisions go in.

Steve Kline, 3158 XL Spur, asked if anyone in this area is being assessed taxes for this service. Councilmember Terry said no, it is funded entirely by user fees.

Wayne Kennedy, 3154 XL Spur, asked for the average cost of sewer. Deborah Davis, Orchard Mesa Sanitation District, said they charge \$12.25/ month, a tap fee is \$1500, and installation is \$750. The installation fee brings their line to the property owner's line. Any lines on the owner's property are paid for by the property owner.

Discussion then took place between the Commissioners and Council.

Commissioner Hall said the Orchard Mesa Plan and Comprehensive Land Use Plan are in conflict. Since the Orchard Mesa Plan will be updated soon, she recommended it be left as it is until the new Orchard Mesa plan is complete. There is no consensus in that area which is the purpose of neighborhood plans. She recommended leaving it as it is until the plan is complete.

Mayor Kinsey asked Commissioner Hall if she was suggesting following the neighborhood plan and giving up the decision by this board. Commissioner Hall

said every decision made by the County Commissioners in that area follows the Orchard Mesa Plan.

Councilmember Spehar said Tom Nielsen is right. The B Road line was supposed to solve the Valle Vista problem only, not to increase density. The effort was to retain the area as agricultural, and the Valle Vista line was not to promote density. He felt it would be appropriate to delete that area. He felt the high water table in the area might discourage high density development in the area.

Mayor Kinsey agreed with Councilmember Spehar. As a city resident, he was somewhat offended that individuals want to live out in the country on a septic system, but want the security of a sewer system provided by the City. Those that want to reside on the edge of the boundary should not want to be rescued by the City/County sewer service.

Councilmember Terry said the City never recognized this area as being within the City's 201 boundary.

Commissioner Baughman said it is evident this area is a high water table area and sewer needs to be available and increased density is not desirable. He would like to come up with some way to let existing residents have the sewer availability and a density limit for this area.

Mayor Kinsey said it is too expensive to run a line out there to rescue the current ten houses. High density development is the only thing that would make it feasible. He didn't want to offer false hope to anyone.

Commission Chair Genova agreed with making no decision tonight, and rework the Orchard Mesa Plan first.

Commissioner Hall sympathized with the City's position on density, but thought they should let the neighborhood decide its own fate.

Councilmember Terry said normally she would agree with that approach. She felt there should be some self-determination in all land use decisions. She asked about the cost again.

Jim Elsberry said all of those lines are Orchard Mesa Sanitation's lines. They would also foot the bill with the help of their customers. He said there is no additional cost to anyone in Grand Junction if lines are connected to subdivisions within the 201 boundary.

Councilmember Terry asked if this area is in the Orchard Mesa Sanitation District. Mr. Elsberry said no.

Commissioner Hall said it would then be the City's responsibility.

Mesa County Administrator Bob Jasper said the Orchard Mesa Sanitary Sewer District has been going out on a contract basis.

Mayor Kinsey asked Pete Baier to repeat the estimated capital construction costs. Mr. Baier restated it will cost approximately \$350,000 to run a line one mile.

Commission Chair Genova asked Linda Dannenberger to again state when plans to revisit the Orchard Mesa Plan are to begin. Ms. Dannenberger said they plan to start open house in May, with a public meeting in June, then adoption in June or July, 2000.

Commission Chair Genova agreed with Commissioner Hall.

Commissioner Baughman said there has not been enough information provided to vote on a deletion tonight. He felt it was worth waiting until the Orchard Mesa Plan is revisited.

Commission Chair Genova said during the scheduled round table discussions, the citizens need to look at the real cost to them.

Commissioner Hall asked Jim Rooks if most of his acreage is agriculture. Mr. Rooks said he is currently farming 150 to 160 acres of the total 220 acres. He said the rest of the area is smaller parcels. He will continue to farm as long as he can get a decent price.

Commissioner Hall explained people have moved out there because they want to be away from people, and when sewer is put in, it will be a subdivision. Everywhere sewer goes in, higher density is allowed so it is bought up and developed into high density. Sewer creates high density.

Brian Harris said the big owners could subdivide their property, but the rest of the parcels would not be able to be subdivided as they are too small.

Commissioner Baughman said development could still take place on five-acre parcels with many more septic tanks in an area that already has major problems.

Gretchen Sigafoos, 3097 A ½ Road and 131 31 Road, said the people wanting to get out of the 201 area are those residing in the hash-marked area. She reminded those present that if it stays in the 201 service area, the hash-marked area will be developed first. It is also closest to 30 Road where the sewer currently exists. Those speaking to get in are not affected by the hash-marked area. They are all north or east of A ½ Road. She again stated she would like to get out of the 201 service area.

Mayor Kinsey felt some direction needs to be given to those that work on the neighborhood plan.

Councilmember Spehar said higher density will make the City's fire protection problem worse, as well as other services. He felt the City shouldn't be chasing the planning process with services. The City should be setting some direction.

Councilmember Scott agreed with the County Commissioners to wait until July when the Orchard Mesa Plan is updated.

Councilmember Payne agreed to wait until July. He could see no reason to rush into a decision.

Councilmember Enos-Martinez couldn't see how the City can serve those people properly if they are kept in.

Councilmember Terry agreed. She also agreed with Councilmember Spehar the density shouldn't be there. The City can't afford to install the lines or serve the residents. She would have to vote to take it out of the 201.

Commissioner Hall said those concerns can be an important part of the planning process.

Councilmember Enos-Martinez said it's not fair to take areas in and not be able to serve them.

Councilmember Spehar said it gives them an unrealistic expectation.

Commissioner Hall said the City needs to participate in the planning of that hash-marked area along the highway because it is a part of the entrance to the City and the City should have input on how it will look.

It was noted the Orchard Mesa Plan is five years old, and needs updating.

Mike Randbell said holding off on a decision will give people in the area an opportunity to attend the meetings for discussion. People need to look hard at the money issues.

County Administrator Bob Jasper said it is good if both Council and the Commission would give staff direction to put the resolution together, leaving this area out.

Upon motion by Councilmember Spehar, seconded by Councilmember Terry and carried with Councilmember **SCOTT** voting **NO**, the area under discussion was deleted from the 201 service area and it will not be developed at a high density.

Upon motion by Commissioner Hall, seconded by Commissioner Baughman and carried unanimously, this portion of the Orchard Mesa area, 201 amendment, the portion from B Road south to Highway 50 be held in abeyance until the planning process is complete in July, 2000.

Commissioner Baughman agreed there shouldn't be high density in that area.

Commission Chair Genova said staff is directed to draft a resolution to make those decisions final.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Stephanie Nye, CMC
City Clerk