

**CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
and
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR MESA COUNTY**

**ANNUAL JOINT PERSIGO MEETING
AUGUST 10, 2005**

Call to Order

The Grand Junction City Council and the Mesa County Commissioners met at 11:30 a.m. on August 10, 2005 at Holiday Inn, 755 Horizon Drive, for the Annual Joint Persigo meeting.

President of the Council Bruce Hill convened the meeting at 11:45 a.m. He asked the governing bodies to accept a change in the order of the agenda to do the public hearing first. They so approved. Councilmembers present were Council President Pro Tem Gregg Palmer and Councilmembers Bonnie Beckstein, Teresa Coons, Jim Doody, Jim Spehar and Doug Thomason.

From Mesa County, County Commissioner Chair Tilman Bishop and Commissioner Janet Rowland were present. Commissioner Craig Meis was absent.

Also present were City staffers City Manager Kelly Arnold, City Attorney John Shaver, Public Works and Utilities Director Mark Relph, Community Development Director Bob Blanchard, Utilities Manager Greg Trainor, Wastewater Treatment Superintendent Dan Tonello, Assistant to the City Manager Sheryl Trent, Planning Manager Kathy Portner, Utilities Engineer Bret Guillory and City Clerk Stephanie Tuin.

County staffers present were County Administrator Jon Peacock, County Attorney Lyle Dechant, Assistant County Attorney Valerie Robison, Planning and Development Director Kurt Larsen, Development Planner Linda Dannenberger, Public Works Director Pete Baier, Long Range Planning Director Keith Fife, Public Works Office Administrator Connie Hahn, Mesa County Attorney Office Administrator Brenda Foote and Clerk to the Board Bert Raley.

City Manager Kelly Arnold gave a short overview of what is to occur. As a joint board, the two bodies may act to add or delete properties from the Persigo 201 boundary. This joint board can take action and proper notice has occurred for such action.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

The Joint Persigo Board then opened the public hearings at 11:49 a.m.

Utilities Manager Greg Trainor explained the past actions taken as far as inclusions and deletions. He gave examples of the reasons for such actions.

He then pointed out the four properties that have requested inclusion and the one property which has an exclusion request. The exclusion request may result in other alternatives that have been discussed. He then read a paragraph from the report regarding the area north of the interstate:

“The North Central Valley Plan specifically limited the Urban Growth Boundary (201 Boundary) to an area anticipated, at that time, to be able to be served by the Persigo plant. It is staff’s recommendation that this request is also premature. Continued piecemeal amendments without consideration of the larger policy assumptions are inappropriate and erode efforts for more compact growth opportunities within the Urban Growth Area. If amendments continue north of I-70, a logical boundary such as the Highline Canal should be established. The area north of I-70 should remain in low-density residential development currently supported by the North Central Valley Plan.”

INCLUSION REQUEST: Address 901 26 ½ Rd.

Fox Amendment Request
Parcel #2701-233-00-562

This property is located at the northwest quadrant of I Road and 26 ½ Road and is designated Estate on the City’s Growth Plan and County’s Land Use Plan. This designation establishes a residential density of two to five acres per dwelling unit. The North Central Valley Plan map shows this property located within an area identified as Estate, 2 – 5. County zoning is AFT, Agriculture, Forestry, Transitional. The property is bordered by Del’s Country Estates on the south (a 5 acre subdivision), Autumn Brook Farms to the southwest (a 5 acre subdivision), and North Valley Subdivision (RSF-E) directly to the west. The subject property is partially constrained in the northeast corner by the Airport Critical Zone. Where possible no residential development is permitted within the Critical Zone and if property is wholly or substantially burdened with this designation, residential densities are limited to one unit per five acres. Staff’s recommendation is that the requested amendment to the 201 boundary is premature and should be denied at this time.

Mr. Trainor reviewed this first request and explained what would need to occur in order to allow sewer service to this property. It would be quite expensive for the owner due to the topography. The owner wants to have this property included in order to develop the property at two to five acres per dwelling unit. This piece of property is affected by the critical zone as laid out by the Airport Authority, which means it cannot be developed at a higher density.

Pam Fox, the applicant, spoke in favor of the inclusion. She said the areas around it have been built out and the area is needed for development. She is willing to install a pump station and pay the cost.

Councilmember Beckstein inquired about her plan for development.

Ms. Fox responded that she wants to build three units per acre and would like to model the development after some green projects in California, that is, low energy housing.

Council President Hill inquired as to the future land use designation on this property. Mr. Trainor responded it is designated Estate which is 2 to 5 acres per dwelling unit. Mr. Trainor noted that gravity sewer service is not available to this site right now so it would be cheaper to put in a lift station. The developer would have to pay for the installation and with a forced main, the cost would be around \$370,000.

Councilmember Beckstein asked if the site would be hooked up to the Paradise Hills sewer line. Mr. Trainor said yes, it would be that interceptor that would serve this site.

Councilmember Beckstein inquired about capacity in the future. Mr. Trainor responded that interceptor is able to carry the flows for properties now in the boundary.

Council President Hill asked about the surrounding areas Future Land Use designation. Mr. Trainor replied that it is all designated as Estate. He added that the maintenance of a lift station would be charged to the developer as part of the plant investment fee.

Council President Pro Tem Palmer asked if the alternative for this developer, if the property is not included, would be to develop with a septic system so then they would be adding septic systems. Mr. Trainor agreed and added that also in 25 years the property owners could have failing septics and then they would be coming to the City/Mesa County and needing assistance to solve the problem, at which time they would probably extend the sewer and include them.

City Council and County Commissioners discussed other issues relative to allowing septics to be installed. Ms. Fox noted that there is a lot of shale in that area and nearby properties currently have problems with existing septics. Commission Chair Bishop inquired about any state or federal grants to give assistance to sanitation districts and was advised that in the past such grants were available to existing low income properties but is not available for new developments.

Council President Hill asked for public comments.

Utilities Manager Trainor advised that a letter was received objecting to the inclusion from John Trotter, 886 26 ½ Road.

There were no public comments.

The public hearing was closed at 12:16 p.m.

Commission Chair Bishop suggested they not add parcels in around the interstate in a piecemeal fashion but rather create an ad hoc committee to look at what is happening in

the valley and look at the existing 201 boundary and come back to this joint board with recommendations.

Council President Pro Tem Palmer agreed noting that inclusions then affect surrounding land for development. He queried if that is how they want the area to be developed. Rather they should set the infrastructure for a certain area in order to encourage development, try to work with the Strategic Plan and use infill policies to prevent sprawl.

Commissioner Rowland countered that they are creating sprawl when only allowing five acres parcels. The community has a large demand and by continuing to keep the boundaries where they are will result in increasing the cost of housing. She agreed with Commission Chair Bishop regarding an ad hoc committee that can look at the long term need and the need to continue to look at expanding the boundary.

Councilmember Spehar agreed that they should not be making parcel specific decisions. Additionally there are reasons to say no; as stated in the staff report there are existing development opportunities they have not developed yet. These kinds of developments will put the Paradise Hills interceptor at capacity.

Commission Chair Bishop noted there are lots of property owners wanting a decision so the joint boards should put some time limits on recommendations. He agreed that not expanding the boundary will make the cost of housing higher within the boundary.

Councilmember Coons agreed, noting they do not want to encourage installation of septs. She encouraged the committee be created as soon as possible.

Councilmember Doody inquired how annexation will occur if the property is included in the 201. City Attorney Shaver advised that anything in the 201 will be developed within the City, so annexation will be the natural consequence. Service delivery then follows.

Council President Hill said he doesn't mind looking at properties on a case by case basis but future land use does concern him. Since, sewer extension then results in a need to maximize the use, he would not be in favor of inclusion.

Councilmember Spehar moved to deny the Fox Amendment Request, Parcel #2701-233-00-562 located at 901 26 ½ Rd. Council President Pro Tem Palmer seconded. Motion carried.

Commission Chair Bishop advised that Commissioner Meis is out of town due to accident involving a family member.

Commission Rowland moved to deny the request to include into the Persigo boundary, the Fox Amendment Request, Parcel #2701-233-00-562, located at 901 26 ½ Rd. Commission Chair Bishop seconded. Motion carried with one Commissioner (Meis) absent.

Commission Chair Bishop suggested one representative from each board, the attorneys and the appropriate staff serve on the ad hoc committee. Councilmember Spehar volunteered to be the City Council representative.

INCLUSION REQUEST: 24 Rd. to 24 ½ Rd., north of I-70

Merkel Amendment Request
Parcel #2701-332-00-133 & #2701-332-00-023

This property is located east of 24 Road and north of Interstate 70 in the northwest quadrant of I-70 and 24 ½ Road and is designated Estate on the City's Growth Plan and County's Land Use Plan. This designation establishes a residential density of two to five acres per dwelling unit. The North Central Valley Plan map shows this property located within an area identified as Estate, 2 – 5. County zoning is AFT, Agriculture, Forestry, and Transitional. Staff's recommendation is that this request is also premature and should be denied.

Utilities Manager Greg Trainor described the location and the request. He advised that a request last year in the same vicinity was denied.

The applicant's rationale for the request is that they have property right next to it that is already in the 201. The cost for sewer extension is estimated at \$108,000.

Larry Beckner, an attorney representing the Merkel family, the owners, suggested that perhaps this parcel will be discussed in the ad hoc committee. However, he said this property is different from the Fox request. This property has been the subject of many requests since there is pressure to develop there. There is already a significant amount of commercial development in that area and the subject property adjoins a commercial zone. There is no need for transition from the adjacent commercial zone. The owner has nothing in mind for development but the property needs to be something besides residential, 2 to 5 acres. It is close to the interstate and needs to be given some planning opportunities, as opposed to being restricted, perhaps mixed use. Canyon View Park has an eight inch sewer main which ends in the middle of a soccer field. Proper sewer flow would go to the south for the subject property. He said he understands the argument of premature requests and the need for a study but there is development pressure now. He asked how long the study will take, noting he would like to see it in short order.

Commission Chair Bishop agreed that they should put a time frame on the ad hoc committee. The two Planning Commissions and the governing boards know about the development pressure; they see it every day.

Mr. Beckner noted that this property is south of the canal so it may be outside the study area.

Councilmember Spehar said he appreciates the desire on the time frame but recalled that the North Valley Plan was one of the most contentious plan developments, so whatever the process, it needs to involve those in that area to avoid controversy and antagonism.

Council President Hill asked for public comments.

Sam Suplizio, a realtor with Bray, noted that the flip side to restrictions on development is the driving up of prices and with commercial property, the stakes are even higher. With the oil and gas industry, there is an inadequate supply for these industries which in turn affects jobs. The real estate market is really suffering in some areas; the affordable housing market is starting to suffer.

Doug Baute, Bookcliff Ranches, agreed with the joint board on the need for a study. He would like to see sewer in the area but is concerned about the zoning. He agreed the community needs high paying jobs but was concerned on how inclusion would affect his property.

Jenny Thrailkill, owner of the adjacent property (766 24 Road), inquired how it will affect her property and the surrounding properties.

Councilmember Spehar noted the advantage in looking at the broader area.

Dale Beede, a real estate broker, felt the governing bodies needed to understand where the market is right now for commercial properties. The property at G and 23 Road was sold out in a couple of months, the properties around the airport have sold, two parcels in Railhead have been purchased as well as the last piece on the Blue Heron Trail, in western Grand Junction. With all this demand, commercial needs to go somewhere; the market doesn't have one year or two years to wait. Mr. Beede said he was on the Growth Plan Steering Committee and the plan put forward worked at that time, but it needs to grow with the community.

There were no further comments.

Council President Hill closed the public hearing at 12:51 p.m.

Councilmember Beckstein agreed that they need to review the Growth Plan and that there are needs now in the community for commercial development. She would not like to see companies have to put their plans on hold.

Councilmember Coons noted that the land owners and others that commented indicated the City and the County need to take an immediate but a broader look. She felt that granting a request today probably wouldn't address the need for additional industrial property but that they need to look at the whole area immediately.

Commissioner Rowland agreed with the urgency and suggested such studies take place in three to six months.

Commission Chair Bishop noted that Mesa County is in the process of updating their Master Plan. He was concerned that moving forward without a study of the area will cause problems.

Councilmember Doody agreed with the time frame suggested by Commissioner Rowland and agreed with Councilmember Spehar that the affected property owners should be involved in the discussions.

Council President Hill stated he probably could support the change now, but he is open to getting feedback from citizens as they may have additional perspectives. He supported east-west corridor (I-70) utilization and favored a speedy review.

Councilmember Spehar moved to deny the request for inclusion into the 201 boundary of the Merkel property, Parcels #2701-332-00-133 & #2701-332-00-023. Councilmember Coons seconded. Motion carried with Councilmembers Beckstein and Palmer voting NO.

Commissioner Rowland moved, in order to maintain consistency, to deny the request for inclusion of Parcels #2701-332-00-133 & #2701-332-00-023, owned by William Merkel. Commission Chair Bishop seconded. Motion carried with one Commissioner (Meis) absent.

INCLUSION REQUEST: Vicinity of 789 23 Rd.

Alex Mirrow Amendment Request
Parcel # 2701-311-00-518

This property is located at the southwest quadrant of H Road and 23 Road directly north of the 23 Road Park Plaza subdivision and is designated Estate on the City's Growth Plan and County's Land Use Plan. This designation establishes a residential density of two to five acres per dwelling unit. The North Central Valley Plan map shows this property located within an area identified as Estate, 2 – 5. County zoning is AFT, Agriculture, Forestry, and Transitional. At the joint Persigo meeting in 2000, this property requested to be included in the 201 boundary and was denied. Staff does not support this amendment considering it premature. Staff recommends this item be continued for public input on a more comprehensive amendment to the 201 boundary.

Utilities Manager Trainor reviewed the request and described the location and what it would take to get sewer to the property. There are several options to get sewer to the property. The preferred route would be to extend the service to the west and allow for gravity flow. The future land use designation is 2 to 5 acres per dwelling units.

Utilities Manager Trainor explained the reason that is the preferred route is there are residential properties that are on septic to the west which then they could get sewer if needed at a later time; this installation would allow sewer availability to the entire basin, for both existing and new development. Councilmember Coons inquired if existing homes would then be required to hook up to sewer. Utilities Manager Trainor replied that they would have to be included in the 201 boundary first.

Doug Baute, Bookcliff Ranches, said no one has asked to be hooked up but they do have concerns about existing systems. Currently there are 7 to 8 septic systems which are having problems out of the thirty existing homes. He expressed concerns about the zoning adjacent to his development.

Alex Mirrow, the applicant, said he has a contract to purchase the property and to subsequently develop it. He introduced Doug Gilliland, a partner in Triwest Investments, which has done development all over the world.

Mr. Gilliland said he has an interest in the area and is excited about the growth. He noted that Grand Junction is a regional market and is in a cycle of growth. The City can take advantage of that cycle which will avoid sprawl by getting ahead of the growth. He said in his experience, growth comes in layers; first it starts with jobs and he sees a lack of supply. Mr. Gilliland stated clearly decisions need to be made and he agrees with a study being done in a short period of time. He has already purchased a shopping center in Clifton. The applicant's property was already zoned in the early 80's; zoned industrial and has sewer to the south side of the property. The same zoning is on the property to the north but that piece is not in the 201 boundary. Sewer extension does not force the residents to hook onto sewer.

Alex Mirrow, the applicant, advised there will be no growth without sewer and if cities don't grow, they stagnate. Boom and bust cycles are a real issue and Grand Junction is currently losing high paying jobs to areas like Rifle and further east because the companies cannot find land in Grand Junction to locate to anymore. Mr. Beede stated there is no industrial land available, yet the gas industry wants to locate here. He referred to a newspaper article and the Listening to Business Report recently procured by the City. In reality, he could develop the property with septic systems but the location of the sewer plant and its proximity to the property in discussion seems to make expansion logical. Mr. Mirrow then deferred to Dan Wilson, the attorney representing Karen Marquette, the property owner.

Mr. Wilson advised that the zoning has already been in place since 1983, right before the bust, and a portion has already been platted. Stub roads indicate the plan for a second phase. The North Valley Plan and the Growth Plan overlooked the fact that the property was rezoned. The zoning map is in error and it doesn't make sense not to have sewer. The ad hoc study makes sense but questioned when the committee is done who will it report back to - does it have to come back to these two bodies? If so, could these two bodies reconvene within a sooner time frame rather than waiting another year when they would regularly meet.

Commission Chair Bishop questioned why this error was not discovered before.

Diane Atchison, 2272 G ³/₄ Road, lives right next door to the property and does not want to be forced to connect to the sewer; her septic works properly. She had concerns over vandalism with the development so close.

There were no other public comments.

Council President Hill closed the hearing at 1:30 p.m.

Councilmember Spehar asked that Mesa County staff address the zoning error issue.

Linda Dannenberger, Mesa County Development Planner, said their researchers looked at the subject property and showed it was zoned Planned Industrial at the same time the southern piece was zoned. She believes there is a Zoning Map error, and there is a public process to amend the map.

Commission Chair Bishop felt there is a greater potential for this parcel but still felt a decision today would be premature. Again, he felt that the ad hoc study committee should be convened and be given a time frame to report back. He did not think the land value will change in six months, and the demand will still be there. He felt that this request, along with the others, should be denied until the study is complete.

Councilmember Spehar agreed, noting it would take a public process anyway to change the map.

Doug Baute encouraged the governing bodies to involve the residents and the property owners and do it in a timely fashion.

Council President Pro Tem Palmer noted that everyone seems supportive of the ad hoc committee approach but the study won't change the reality of this piece; this property is the exception and he supports including this one in the 201 boundary.

Councilmember Beckstein agreed as she felt the entire parcel should be all in or all out.

Council President Hill said he could approve of it if the Growth Plan showed it as Industrial, instead of Estate.

Councilmember Spehar moved to deny the Mirrow request, Parcel #2701-311-00-518, in the vicinity of 789 23 Rd. Councilmember Doody seconded. The motion carried with Councilmembers Beckstein and Palmer voting NO.

Commissioner Rowland moved to deny the inclusion request for Parcel #2701-311-00-518, by Alex Mirrow, for inclusion, to remain consistent and requested a quick study of

the area. Commission Chair Bishop seconded. Motion carried with one Commissioner (Meis) absent.

INCLUSION REQUEST: East side of 22 Rd., north of I-70

WT Hall Property Amendment Request
Parcel #2701-312-00-520

This property is located north and northeast of the interchange at Interstate 70 and Highway 6&50 and is designated Estate on the City's Growth Plan and County's Land Use Plan. This designation establishes a residential density of two to five acres per dwelling unit. The North Central Valley Plan map shows the portion of the property southeast of Persigo Wash located within an area identified as Estate, 2 – 5. Property northwest of Persigo Wash is outside the North Central Valley Plan area. County zoning is mostly AFT, Agriculture, Forestry, and Transitional with the area northwest of Persigo Wash zoned PI, Planned Industrial. Staff does not support this amendment, considering it premature.

Utilities Manager Trainor reviewed the request, the location and how the sewer could be extended to this property. Other property owners in this area have contacted Utilities Manager Trainor to ask for inclusion. Two parcels belong to the applicant Mr. Hall.

Tom Volkmann, attorney representing the applicant, advised that the applicant has two parcels under contract; one parcel is in the 201 boundary and not zoned the same. A sewer stub is in place across Highway 6&50. The northern boundary of the subject project is the canal, so it does not bring any other properties into play by extending the sewer; it is simply a line adjustment. This is the one property that could be outside the scope of the study. The applicant is amenable to the concept of the approval of extension conditional on getting the other parcel rezoned but would like to get this taken care of, conditional on future land use approvals.

City Attorney John Shaver advised that this conditional approval was discussed at the staff level and it was agreed that the inclusion could be made conditional.

City Manager Arnold advised that this body can meet more often; it must have at least an annual meeting. Commission Chair Bishop agreed that this body does have the ability to call additional meetings.

There were no public comments.

Council President Hill closed the hearing at 1:52 p.m.

Councilmember Spehar said he could support this inclusion conditionally, with the canal being the north boundary. Councilmembers Palmer and Beckstein agreed.

County Attorney Lyle Dechant inquired if the development review would be in the City or Mesa County; he didn't understand the conditional aspect.

City Attorney Shaver advised that the inclusion would allow the development review process to go through the City. Council President Hill was concerned that inclusion would be a conflict when the Growth Plan doesn't match the zoning.

City Attorney Shaver advised that the applicant would have to proceed at his own risk; everything is contingent.

Councilmember Coons said she could support the inclusion with that condition.

Commissioner Rowland asked for clarification why this parcel is different from the other requests. Councilmember Spehar explained that this is part of the same property already in the 201.

Councilmember Doody expressed that he would rather look at the whole big picture and make a well-informed decision, after the study.

Commission Chair Bishop said he would support the inclusion of this property but would rather be consistent and include it in the study. Commissioner Rowland agreed.

Councilmember Spehar moved to deny the Hall request, Parcel #2701-312-00-520, on the East side of 22 Rd., north of I-70, to stay consistent. Councilmember Doody seconded. Motion carried with Councilmembers Beckstein and Palmer voting NO.

Commissioner Rowland moved to deny the inclusion request from W.T. Hall, for Parcel #2701-312-00-520, on the east side of 22 Rd., north of I-70. Commission Chair Bishop seconded. Motion carried with one Commissioner (Meis) absent.

Council President Hill called a break at 2:02 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 2:17 pm

EXCLUSION REQUEST: Vicinity West side of Rosevale Rd., northwest of Little Park Rd.

Ken Scissors Amendment Request
Parcel #2945-223-00-227

This property is located west of Rosevale Road and northwest of Little Park Road and is designated Estate on the City's Growth Plan and County's Land Use Plan. This designation establishes a residential density of two to five acres per dwelling unit. County zoning is RSF-4, Single Family Residential, 4 units per acre.

Utilities Manager Trainor reviewed the request, the location and the reason for the request for exclusion. Mr. Trainor said that another alternative is being considered, that the property remain in the 201 boundary but have them sign a Power of Attorney for

inclusion into a sewer improvement district which would involve 84 lots, as part of the Septic System Elimination Program (SSEP). This will allow the development to develop with septic systems but it will not exclude it from the 201 Boundary.

Dr. Ken Scissors, the owner, stated that he and his wife Colleen own the property and they want to develop it. Since the property is in the 201 Boundary, a sewer extension of one-half mile, at a cost of several hundred thousand dollars, would be required. The other alternative is to develop on septic systems but put in the infrastructure of sewer lines, and agree to hook up later. Percolation tests show septic will be ok in the meantime. The plan is for a nice development, developed by working with Ed Chamberlain, which will blend in with environment.

City Manager Arnold inquired how the Power of Attorney would work. City Attorney Shaver advised a POA would be signed for the entire parcel and would run with the land even after development. Councilmember Spehar inquired if dry lines will be installed. Utilities Manager Trainor said yes and when individual failed septic occur, they will have to connect to the sewer plant. Dr. Scissors added the hookups will be engineered so it will install easily.

Connie Schmaltz, 324 Rosevale Road, lives in that neighborhood and does not want to be removed from the 201 boundary as eventually her property will need to have sewer.

Carl Miller, owner of a neighboring property, inquired if under the SSEP, a property owner can still use the septic if it is functioning.

Utilities Manager Trainor responded that if the district is created, the property owner has to pay the prorated cost of construction. They can continue to use their septic system and won't be required to pay the tap fee or the cost of running a service line until they need to hook into the sewer system due to failing septic.

Council President Hill closed the public hearing 2:31 p.m.

Planning Manager Kathy Portner advised that the request for waiver needs to be approved by both entities, and then goes through another City step for final approval.

County Attorney Dechant inquired who owns the dry sewer line and who repairs it. Utilities Manager Trainor advised that once inspected and accepted, the City takes over responsibility.

Councilmember Spehar moved in the matter of the Scissors request, Parcel #2945-223-00-227, in the vicinity west side of Rosevale Rd., northwest of Little Park Rd., to grant a waiver of the requirement that the development hook onto sewer immediately, with the dry lines installed and that a Power of Attorney be executed. Councilmember Doody seconded. Motion carried.

Commissioner Rowland moved that with the Scissors amendment, Parcel #2945-223-00-227, vicinity west side of Rosevale Rd., northwest of Little Park Rd., they waive the requirement to immediately hook up to sewer, that sewer be used when available and a POA be required. Commission Chair Bishop seconded. Motion carried, with one Commissioner (Meis) absent.

Other Requests

Utilities Manager Trainor advised that he received some late requests for inclusion; requests from the Job Site, John Usher, First Assembly of God, and the Junction West RV Park have been received.

Council President Hill recommended they pick a date for another meeting to review the results of the study and to look at these other areas at that time.

Commission Chair Bishop noted that all of these late requests should be included as part of the study.

Workload and possible time frames were discussed, with six months or less being the goal.

Commission Chair Bishop moved to form an ad hoc committee with representatives of the two bodies of elected officials including one County Commissioner, two members of City Council, legal staff, planning staff, the City Manager and County Administrator, in six months or less, return a report, incorporating and involving the property owners of the areas being looked at, for possible inclusion into the 201 boundary. Councilmember Thomason seconded. The vote was unanimous with both bodies. Motion carried by the Joint Persigo Board.

County Administrator Jon Peacock volunteered to set up the first meeting. Commission Chair Bishop asked Commissioner Rowland to represent the County at these meetings and she agreed.

Council President Hill suggested the two bodies come back together in February, 2006.

Council President Hill adjourned the meeting at 2:48 p.m.

Stephanie Tuin, MMC
City Clerk