

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

**JOINT PERSIGO MEETING MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 13, 2008**

**Call to Order**

The Grand Junction City Council and the Mesa County Commissioners Joint Persigo meeting was called to order by President of the Council Jim Doody at 6:13 p.m. on February 13, 2008 at Two Rivers Convention Center, 159 Main Street. Council President Doody led in the pledge of allegiance.

City Councilmembers present were Teresa Coons, Bruce Hill, Gregg Palmer, Linda Romer Todd, Doug Thomason, and City Council President Jim Doody. Absent was Councilmember Bonnie Beckstein.

From Mesa County, County Commissioner Chair Janet Rowland and Commissioners Craig Meis and Steve Acquafresca were present.

Also present were City Staffers City Manager Laurie Kadrach, City Attorney John Shaver, Interim Deputy City Manager Trent Prall, Public Works and Planning Director Tim Moore, Utilities and Street Systems Director Greg Trainor, Utilities Engineer Bret Guillory, Communications Coordinator Sam Rainguet, Principal Planner David Thornton and City Clerk Stephanie Tuin.

County Staffers present were County Administrator Jon Peacock, Assistant County Administrator Stephanie Conley, Planning and Development Director Kurt Larsen, County Attorney Lyle Dechant, Long Range Planner Keith Fife, Code Enforcement Director Donna Ross, Public Works Director Pete Baier, and Clerk to the Board Bert Raley.

Council President Doody introduced the Persigo Board. County Commission Chair Janet Rowland outlined the proceedings and how they will take public comment.

County Administrator Jon Peacock welcomed the audience and reviewed the history of the Persigo Agreement including the purpose. He explained how changes are made to the boundary or to the agreement. The reason for this public meeting is because the amount of developable land within the current boundary has been depleted as the community grows. City Manager Laurie Kadrach then continued by identifying new areas that have been brought into the boundary in recent years. Many have asked why these boundary changes are being considered. There are different points of view, one of which is the opinion that this is an energy boom and the result will be overbuilding. Ms. Kadrach pointed out however that even following Black Sunday (the last energy "bust" – May, 1982), the population continued to grow. The economy is in better

condition now than 25 years ago. Grand Junction is in a much better position than other communities in the nation and around the State. Unincorporated Mesa County is growing even faster. Grand Junction's housing market has gone up. Ms. Kadrich highlighted the community meetings that have occurred in the previous two weeks to gather input prior to this meeting. The economy has doubled to \$5.2 billion since 1995. The Growth Plan, adopted in 1996, is reaching the end of its life. The City is currently working on the Comprehensive Plan and it would be helpful for the City to know where the growth boundary will be in 10 or 20 years so those areas could be planned.

County Administrator Jon Peacock then reviewed the transportation corridors and the current capacities. Regarding the areas being considered, the City has been working on a Comprehensive Plan and the County has been a partner in that planning. One of the exercises in the Comprehensive Plan process has been a "chip" game where housing was placed by participants. That led to the two areas being identified as "study" areas, the northwest area and Orchard Mesa or southeast area. This same presentation was made at four different times and he explained how input was received. City Manager Kadrich concluded the initial presentation by advising how the information was compiled, including following up with any questions or clarifications.

### **Public Hearing - Concerning 201 Sewer Service Area Boundary Adjustments.**

The public hearing was opened at 6:30 p.m. The Persigo Board said they would take five in favor of including the study areas into the 201 Boundary and five in opposition to the inclusion.

### **Comments in favor:**

Steve Kesler, Redlands property owner, read a statement into the record as follows:

**"OUR COMMUNITY MUST PLAN FOR CHANGE**

Our community is changing rapidly. Here are the facts:

- 52,000 new homes to be built in the next 25 years or almost 2100 per year.
- We have been creating less than 1400 new homes per year and less last year.
- We have effectively zero unemployment while creating 14,000 new jobs in 3 years
- There are effectively zero rental properties available.
- We are an energy capital of the world. The whole world wants our energy.

OK, here is what those facts tell us. We are one of the most desirable places in the world to live with views, weather, medical care, retail, commercial and social activities attracting people from everywhere. Many are coming for our new and good jobs. We do not have enough homes that normal people can afford. Two people making approximately \$12/hr. can afford to buy a \$250,000 home, but we have less than 1/2 the market supply of those homes and are getting further behind the need every day. Lot prices of a 1/4 acre lot start at \$125,000 and two acre lots start at \$200,000. Multiply that times 2.5, minimum, to buy the house built on that lot. Our current growth plan was formulated by good people 12 years ago when no one could reasonably have guessed

the incredible acceleration of growth in jobs, population, and need for housing that we have now been experiencing for years. 100's of people attending the Comprehensive Plan and Persigo 201 meetings have come to a similar conclusion: the only way we can accommodate this growth is to expand our sewer service and establish higher densities in all areas of our valley. No other conclusion answers the facts". Mr. Kesler lauded the Persigo Board and their dedication. In order to have affordable housing the boards must grant densities to build. Without densities there will not be housing for the kids, the parents and the workers.

Clay Tipping, 2596 I 3/8 Court, said his family owns and lives on eight acres there and enjoy the space. But he is not opposed to development. He is in favor of the expansion noting it will be more expensive to wait. There is a lot of land that could be developed if there was access to the sewer. The governing bodies will not have the option of where development will go if they wait. He encouraged long range planning. He distributed a memo for the Persigo Board to review. He thought the sewer should be extended as far out as possible because septic systems are not good for the environment.

To address technical difficulties with the sound system, a recess was called 6:45 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 6:50 p.m.

John Trotter, 887 26 1/2 Road, is a property owner in the north area being considered, and lives in a subdivision of 35 acres with 7 houses. He has always been concerned and primarily against small pocket boundary extensions because the density is always thought about afterwards. He is not one to tell his neighbors what they should do with their property but on the other hand he built there with an expectation of how the area was going to develop and there should be some consideration there. He sees growth coming and does not necessarily want to be in the urban growth boundary, be in the City or be on septic but growth is coming and he can't change that. However, he wants to know what is coming and asks for transition between the larger properties and more dense development. He suggested they put a plan together indicating how the land will be used and then expand the 201 boundary.

Mark Bonella, 973 21 1/2 Road, currently vice chair of the Mesa County Planning Commission, said he would support the expansion with modifications. He was against tying the sewer system to annexation as it is a joint sewer system. He believes the area needs sewer. He suggested they have an interim plan until sewer is available and affordable. He felt the current system is not affordable enough to allow farmers who want to develop. He suggested the boundary be expanded but continue to allow development until the sewer gets closer.

Mark Harris, 840 23 Road, business address, and 863 23 Road is his residence. He spoke in support of a modified plan. He has been here since 1958 and farmed for over thirty years. Much of the area in the north area is still agricultural with commercial, residential and school use rapidly developing around them. He said they are ready to face the reality of urbanization of their neighborhood. He said their best plan is to plan

for the best use of the area (that is south of I Road) which he suggested was high density residential and commercial development. Therefore, they favor the expansion of the sewer district boundary to include their immediate area. This will allow for an orderly development of the Appleton area and he urged that the City and the County make the necessary infrastructure decisions.

Five against the expansion:

Greg Isaman, 2270 Homestead Drive, Highline Homestead Association, expressed that “if you build it they will come” and it is built in favor of the developer. A boundary expansion will lead to other infrastructure issues. He believes that they can control housing with land use regulation. Most owners in the Highline Homestead Association have working septic systems and there are only two lots left to develop. The cost to extend the sewer would be high and for those retired on limited income, it would be a significant expense. He agreed it would be to their benefit if septic fails to have sewer available.

Gary Bates, 1014 21 Road, north of J Road, said he built a new house and had to have an engineered septic system which was costly. He would not want to hook up to the sewer system. He agreed that it is necessary to extend the boundary to I Road and the growth up until now has been very good. However, he cannot see expanding the boundary beyond that without planning it first.

Maureen Ramstetter, 774 23 Road, said she has already been taken into the boundary and the City prevented her from being accepted into the boundary. She then went to the County and came up with a plan for an RV Park with septic systems. She applied for permits for RV Park and the County held them up knowing that this proposed boundary change was coming up. She then referred to a letter that said she will not see sewer on her property. It was her contention that the City cannot be trusted and they will not stand behind what they put in writing. She again approached the City and was told that it will cost \$300,000 to go on City sewer; she will need to pump the sewage, she will need 2,000 feet of line and she will have to buy a right-of-way through commercial property in order to get to the sewer.

Gretchen Sigafous, 131 31 Road, on Orchard Mesa, is against the expansion. Their area is a quiet area with lots of wildlife. The expansion will lead to increased traffic and density. She agrees with slowing down and getting community input to plan the area. She suggested the growth move out to desert where there isn't good farm land. Ms. Sigafous stated that it is hard to travel from Orchard Mesa into town now; the infrastructure is not in place.

Darrel Sartin, 989 Priscilla's Way, south of J Road and east of 22 Road, said having the public input on the night of the vote is not right; there is no way to have meaningful discourse. He opposes the expansion because he disagrees with the premise that they can't stop influx of people, an estimated 250,000 people. He believes that comprehensive plans can control the influx and growth. Allowing that influx in the valley

will destroy quality of life; the other issues: schools, shopping, roads, air quality, pollution have not addressed. He suggested that the air pollution generated here will stay here a long time. His development has 60 acres and 12 lots; the adjacent 60 acres may have 400 homes which will not look like his neighborhood. He felt the County is breaking promises. The current plan is to install the sewer system in order to plan roads. He suggested they do it the other way around – plan the roads and then decide where the sewer should go. Sewer service expansion is first step in transforming the valley so he proposed they discuss issue further and perhaps take the issue to the ballot and let the people decide.

Five in support of expansion or in support of the expansion with modifications:

Lorna May McInay, 438 Athens Way, a property owner at L and 22 ½ Road, said she is in favor of infrastructure being in place before the area is developed. The more planning and infrastructure that is in place the better things will flow.

Brook Bray, 880 26 ½ Road, is in support of the expansion because she believes in having direction for the Comprehensive Plan to go. She believes in urban core areas. She feels the best way to mitigate pollution and transportation issues is to have several urban core areas where people work and live. Not creating urban centers will create urban sprawl, which will have a negative impact on the area.

Joe Carter, 222 N. 7<sup>th</sup>, agreed with the previous speaker in regards to expanding urban and commercial core centers. He did not believe the current development pattern is sustainable. With the expansion, he suggested that the Zoning and Development Code also be amended to redefine how densities occur which are best adjacent to commercial centers. That would allow the area to provide housing for same number of people which is more affordable and is less water consumptive. The current Zoning and Development Code limits high density development. Core areas of development are satellite centers and he described rings of development that are very dense at the center and density decreases as one moves away from the core centers.

Ted Ciavonne, 222 N. 7<sup>th</sup>, said he is in favor of the expansion but has a number of concerns. He is concerned the Persigo Board will expand only a little but it would be his recommendation that they do all of it. He felt they need to have the 201 boundary embrace each of the commercial growth areas; if they don't they will just end up with more of the same. He was concerned that it will put Staff and developers in an awkward spot in the interim. He suggested that the sewer line should be immediately installed out to these areas. He thinks the expansion is wise and visionary if they simultaneously provide the tools to make it happen.

Don Pettygrove, 8 Moselle Court, said he had been pushing hard for a major expansion for some time. He felt the Persigo Board should have been working on this incrementally. He would support elimination of the growth boundary which is constraining growth and making prices higher. He suggested the Board let supply and demand guide the growth; people will continue to come. However, he has had a

change of heart on amount of expansion at this point. The County is trying to look out for the County residents and preserve their rights, and they need to maintain that. He suggested the Persigo Board should take moderate steps to expand the boundary. The rural road system has excess capacity. He agreed with Ted Ciavonne in that they can direct growth by building the infrastructure; that will direct growth and still have development pay its way.

Five against the expansion:

Robert Hamner, 1150 23 Road, was at first in favor as water quality is key. Then he found out that annexation is required for development. He felt that Grand Junction doesn't take the best care of its citizens. He ultimately has grown opposed to the expansion and doesn't want to be forced to join into the City of Grand Junction.

John Kelleher, 2506 Riata Ranch Road, thanked the Board for not expanding into the area between 24 1/2 and 26 Roads last time. He realizes that the extra density is needed to justify cost of sewer extension but would prefer the area be kept as estate size lots which will keep it looking better in the long run.

Rick Warren, 2622 H Road, is against the expansion. Recreation is high on his list of things to do such as running, biking and walking. There are currently unsafe conditions on the roads in the north side yet there are lots of people using the roads for walking and biking. He chose to move here for quality of life. He felt it is incumbent upon this board to come up with a good plan for where the density should go before expanding the boundaries noting he could support a really good plan.

Alan Gobbo, 1151 23 Road, between K and L, with his business being located at 1161 23 Road which is a grassroots sod farm. He said his family has been around for a while; his grandfather came in 1919. He understands expansion from the current boundary up to I Road but north of I Road, the landscape changes; the hills come into play which affects gravity flow of the sewer. The Adobe Creek Wash crosses the Highline Canal between 22 and 23 Roads, and then comes out at the golf course. He said close to Fruita, the sewer would only be able to go on the County road right-of-way. He would discourage considering expansion north of I Road. He recalled a meeting at the church a couple of weeks ago and there were no County employees around the table. To him that meant it becomes a City project once the boundary is expanded. He was told that if one's septic needs repair, then automatically one has to come into City. That would mean if he wanted to split off a few acres, he won't be able to do anything without the sewer. He felt the people need to have a vote in this proposal.

Mike Phillips, 1188 23 1/2 Road, north of K and 23 1/2 Road, said he went to the first neighborhood meeting and was surprised the cost to connect to the sewer was not made public. He opposed the expansion because once expansion takes place then the area is incorporated into the City which increases property tax and sales tax. He came here 17 years ago, from outside LA, where he saw rapid development. He enjoys the

northwest area and is afraid of what the future will bring with expansion. He rebuffed numbers represented by first speaker Steve Kesler.

Five in support of the expansion:

Bob Engelke, 2111 Yellowstone Road, agreed the boundary is an arbitrary boundary and that it serves no useful purpose. It was his opinion that any expansion of 201 boundary is good as it will reduce the restrictions that are making land prices go out of sight. The Persigo Agreement disenfranchises County residents and with no representation, handicaps this expansion. He did not advocate forcing annexation on people so any discussions of expansion into Clifton needs to include the Clifton and Orchard Mesa Sanitation Districts.

Jana Gerow, 1334 21 Road, said land value withstands time and she complimented the two entities working together. She has seen sprawl and appreciates the Persigo Agreement. Her suggestion was to commit to including a large area, start doing the planning, create incentives to direct growth, chose areas that make sense, and not force them to develop. This provides the opportunity. She objected to those that said take it to a public vote when they haven't taken the time to research and attend the meetings that have been held.

Ann Hayes, 624 30 Road, the chair of Grand Junction Area Realty Association, complimented the Board on their proactive approach. She noted that in the last five years the cost of housing has increased 65%; a residential lot cost \$25,000 ten years ago and is now \$90,000. She did question why annexation is forced. Although she believed that eventually septic systems will not be allowed, she thought property should be able to connect to sewer and stay in the County.

Dale Beede was born here and grew up on a farm. He is a commercial real estate broker and in talking to companies that want to come to town, there is not the available land for these commercial and industrial companies. He concurred that natural gas is driving the economy, noting that coal and uranium will be the next commercial economic drivers. He has over 20 companies that are looking for 1 to ten acre industrial sites. Limiting sewer extension creates the community's own pricing bubble. There is land north of the Job Site, 100 acres, which are adjacent to the 201 boundary and could serve many of the companies looking for a site. He requested the expansion be at least north to I Road and west to 20 Road.

Bill Elmblad, 307 31 ¼ Road in Orchard Mesa, is in the Orchard Mesa planning area. He is concerned about the impact on quality of life noting however that some sewer extensions are logical, particularly to the school site.

Five against the expansion:

Bruce Johnson, 2278 Homestead Drive, has 8 acres and has been here six years. In the last five years, 100 new homes have been built and they are all on septic systems.

He moved out there for a reason to be away from the City and have breathing room. He said Grand Junction has a lot to offer. He suggested that trying to put together a sewer plan without the layout and a plan is irresponsible.

Randy Stouder, 303 E. Dakota Drive in the Redlands, said he moved to Grand Junction for the exceptional quality of life. The density needed to make the sewer extension viable will destroy a lot of the quality of life. He believed this expansion is the cart before the horse and subverts the will of the community. It was his contention that this is sprawl noting that sewage flows toward money. He urged the Board to maintain the quality of life.

Council President Doody called a recess at 8:25 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 8:35 pm.

As there were no more speaking in support, the board took two more speakers in opposition.

Darrell Rule, 2331 J Road, said he appreciated the efforts of the Persigo Board but he felt the rural people were getting left out. He felt that if boundary is extended all the way north, it is a land grab. He said it won't take long, if growth is funneled into this area, that farmland will be gone. He stated that agricultural and irrigated land needs to be protected. Land not irrigated should be what is developed. He asked about sewer plant capacity – if it will need to be expanded. He suggested a complete study of the area (north), notifying every property owner. Mr. Rule questioned the amount of growth that was being estimated.

Kate Geer, 2264 L Road, lived there three years, has worked in real estate and property management for 8 years in the valley and she is in middle of the road. She lives on the north boundary, near Appleton, north of I Road. It is beautiful farm land and crops are being grown in the area therefore using more water in the area. She believes those in favor don't live in the areas. She agreed with expansion below I Road and can see more houses there as it is closer to services.

Commissioner Chair Rowland noted they have heard from both sides. She asked for those who still want to speak to show of their hands.

County Administrator Peacock clarified that regarding septic systems, if one fails and the property is within 400 feet of existing sewer then yes the sewer must hook up to the sewer plant but that will not trigger annexation. City Manager Kadrich advised this is not a land grab or an attempt to annex. This is about expanding the sewer system boundary. This is about planning first and then asking for public comment. Tonight is about gathering information and figuring out ways to work together, both City and County government. The County Commissioners and their Staff want to focus on rural service delivery and the City specializes in urban service delivery. The planning is to figure out where each should be.



County Administrator Peacock said as development occurs that development would occur under the City's land development process, but simply expanding the boundary does not mean immediate annexation or immediate sewer. The cost issue is difficult to address; there is a \$2,500 plant investment fee to pay shared costs of infrastructure at the plant. It will then vary for individual properties depending on the proximity to the sewer system. They can sit down and work with individuals to try to estimate costs but cannot provide that on the fly, in a public meeting. Expanding the boundaries will not have an immediate impact on property taxes. At the time of annexation, the City mill levy of 8 mills would be imposed but some in special districts that may be countered some with a decrease from the special district. On the assessed valuation side, with infrastructure one may have an increase in assessed value. There is significant plant capacity now (64,000 EQUs), as the plant is constructed today. Sales tax is 2% County wide and the City sales tax is 2.75% on retail activities in the City of Grand Junction.

Commissioner Meis asked, referring to the Persigo Agreement, about changes to the Master Plan. He asked if the City adopts a new Comprehensive Plan, and if the County does not act on the Plan within 30 days, is the plan deemed approved. Administrator Peacock responded that is his understanding.

City Attorney John Shaver said there are two planning areas, one being Joint Planning Area in the Growth Plan. The Agreement deals with the growth and development within the 201 boundary.

Commissioner Chair Rowland clarified that either party has 30 days to consider the changes, or if the other party does not consider the changes or does wish to amend and does not respond, then it is a done deal.

City Attorney Shaver stated that is correct.

Councilmember Coons said the provision is encouragement for the two entities to work together.

Councilmember Todd asked about the 400 foot distance from the sewer; is it from the septic system or edge of property line? Administrator Peacock said it is from the property line and that it is driven by State Statute. City Attorney Shaver added that there is also a hardship provision.

Tom Schaffer, Water Quality Control Division of the State Health Department, said there is an exception for the 400 foot rule if it is physically impossible to get to the sewer.

Councilmember Coons clarified that if a person has an existing working system, they are not required to tie into the line even when annexed. Administrator Peacock stated only if they subdivide or further develop in a way that would trigger annexation under the Persigo Agreement.

There was a question from the audience if the tap fees were “grandfathered” in at the time of annexation. Mr. Peacock responded no, the tap fee in effect at the time of connection is the fee that would be assessed. In response to another question from the audience, Mr. Peacock stated septic system failures do not trigger annexation.

City Manager Kadrach explained the purpose of the Plant Investment Fee; it is the user’s fair share of a portion of the plant for future replacement. In response to questions on densities within the 201, Ms. Kadrach stated there are different densities which are determined by the joint planning efforts of both boards.

Councilmember Coons asked what is possible for changes to the Persigo Agreement that would enhance the ability to do planning; how can the Persigo Agreement be amended?

City Attorney Shaver said the two bodies direct Staff as to how they want the Agreement to read. That does not mean the planning area has to look like urban landscape. Chapter 5 of the Growth Plan understands that there are different needs, and growth pressures. Once the amendments are made, then they will be implemented by changes to the City and County development regulations.

The public hearing was closed at 9:05 p.m.

Commissioner Acquafresca said this joint Persigo Board collects and makes decisions at least once a year, so whatever decisions made can be reconsidered at any given time. The City and County is not promoting drastic population increases as has been indicated. The growth occurs whether it’s liked or not. He has attended all four of the community meetings and spoke to a lot of folks. He has heard planning processes are critical and that many thought more planning is necessary before there is a substantial jump in development in the north or to the east area. He heard more incentives needed for infill development within existing boundaries, vertical growth and redevelopment might take some pressure off within the area. Some incentives are already in place. The overriding theme has been development regulatory authority shifts from the County to the City. Many landowners said they want to stay under the County. Commissioner Acquafresca said when the growth boundary expands; it reduces options because development shifts to City. There seems to be a far greater acceptance by those close to the existing boundary; further out, there is more against the resistance.

Commissioner Meis stated in the mid valley area, there is no question this area is going to grow. The governing boards were trying to build a house without a plan and there is a need to pull back and plan for this area jointly. The area from 21 Road to 24 Road up to I Road is the area that needs to be looked at first; the same thing in Orchard Mesa from the Colorado River to Highway 50 and over to 31 Road. This needs to be a joint planning effort and they need to make sure to have community input. Commissioner Meis stated it is necessary to understand the basins and plan for future infrastructure. He has questioned the agreement, questioned annexation being tied to sewer, and

urged continued discussion. Commissioner Meis is supportive of moving forward with joint planning effort in smaller bites along with engineering studies.

Councilmember Thomason echoed what he just heard from Commissioner Meis, that the Boards need to take a longer look. That means a joint planning effort or more participation from the County in the Comprehensive Plan. The Boards need to be smart about planning for growth. He heard several times about putting the cart before the horse. He is not supportive at this time, but realizes at some point in time the boundary will have to expand.

Councilmember Hill stated Mesa County is in the rural service business and City is in the urban service business. The Persigo Agreement seems to require annexation but annexation is tied to density and density is tied to sewer. This doesn't address those that want to split off lots for other reasons. Councilmember Hill appreciates the City and County bodies working together and looking at the Agreement. He believes the planning needs to be done first so the public will be able to speak to that and to see where the boundary needs to be.

Councilmember Todd said one must talk about marketplace whenever they talk about development. It won't matter where the line is, some will want to be in and some won't. Originally the 201 line seemed way out there, but just because there is no joint plan in place doesn't mean that the Persigo Board should not be setting a boundary. She doesn't buy the argument that sewer is causing annexation; it is density that needs sewer that is causing this. Councilmember Todd would like to see a vision of 30 to 50 years out and expand the vision with the Comprehensive Plan.

Councilmember Palmer thanked the community for coming out and sharing thoughts and concerns. Planning means looking into the future 30 to 40 years. He believed it is wiser to move the boundary incrementally in logical steps and put sewer in advance and infrastructure in place to help direct growth. Councilmember Palmer believes that with talking together as the City Council and County Commissioners, along with the community, they can jointly plan for areas outside the 201 that may eventually come into the 201.

Councilmember Coons thanked all for taking the time to be at the meeting and at the other opportunities to comment. It is a really difficult thing and she is a relatively new transplant and likes the quality of life here. It is hard to look at changes and is hard for her to understand everyone always wanting the growth in another area. Everyone is looking for stability and knowledge of what the community is going to look like in ten or twenty years. The developers are also looking for this and the planning piece very critical. There is a need to figure out how to do better planning together as a City and County. She does not agree with Commissioner Acquafresca that by being in the County that owners are enhanced and have better opportunity but by being within access of sewer does provide more opportunities. Some issues within the Agreement can be tweaked or changed to get rid of some of the problems which create issues for

people. The Persigo Agreement boundary doesn't end the ability to plan and there is a need to continue to look at the best ways to build sewer expansions.

Council President Doody stated the vision is what this is all about, but a vision with a well laid-plan. He agreed with Commissioner Meis and others that this needs to be a plan and a possible amendment to the Persigo Agreement. He asked for clarification on paragraph 9 of agreement.

City Attorney Shaver read the paragraph which refers to both Boards jointly developing incentives for annexation to the City including financing those incentives.

Council President Doody agreed about planning jointly and looks forward to working with the Commissioners.

Commission Chair Rowland stated she was glad it was cleared up on what triggers annexation, what triggers sewer hookup and that annexation only occurs upon development. Annexation in urban areas is appropriate. However, changes to the Agreement may be needed to allow for some land splits; perhaps using a density threshold. There is a shortage of housing, especially a shortage of affordable housing in the valley; not only for new residents but also young people. It is the role of government to provide infrastructure. She can empathize with those in rural areas. Chair Rowland is anxious to get sewer but agreed not to go forward without a plan as long as it does not take three years. Areas in proximity to the current boundary are important and need to be looked at quickly. She would say yes to expansion, but not now the way it is drawn.

County Administrator Peacock summarized that the common thread for these areas is to come back with a plan. He is also hearing some provisions in the Persigo Agreement are areas of concern and Staff should bring some recommendations back. He noted this is an opportunity to leverage the work that has been done, strengthen the link between the two bodies and they should move forward quickly.

Councilmember Hill wants to make sure the other common thread is that the community continues to be engaged and included in the planning opportunity of this area as a community.

Councilmember Todd said there were such a number of landowners that did not participate so the question is are they interested? The City and the County need to reach out to give the other landowners an opportunity to participate. She also expressed urgency.

County Administrator Peacock stated there is a lot to be optimistic about. A good public process has been set up and the joint Board has done a good job of generating interest. The next step is to lay out the process that will meet the timelines and meet the sense of urgency being expressed.

Commissioner Acquafresca agrees that Mr. Peacock's summary is accurate. There is an area in the northwest area that when this Board met last, a request was made to include it in the boundary and testimony tonight reiterated the need for it to be included. He asked if this modest area should be included. The area is the region adjacent to the existing boundary between 21 and 23 Road, north to I Road. This is the second time since he has been in office consideration of inclusion for this area has come before them.

Administrator Peacock said that area is part of the joint urban planning area and is outside the 201 boundary.

Commissioner Meis stated he is not ready to make a decision on the Persigo adjustment without a full assessment of what the plans are for both bodies. He agreed to make 21 Road to 24 Road up to I Road a high priority as well as the area in Orchard Mesa from 30 to 31 Road. Commissioner Meis would struggle with adding that area tonight without community participation.

Councilmember Hill agreed those areas should be a high priority. He is uncomfortable moving the line tonight as the joint planning is not in place.

Commissioner Rowland would like to see A ½ Road to C Road; 30 to 31 Road as priority areas but wait so that property owners know what will happen to their property.

City Manager Kadrich asked for clarification on the direction. Originally the study areas were very large and they fit into comprehensive planning efforts. There were transitional areas of zoning and uses within those large areas. She asked if the Board wants Staff to narrow that planning area as there would be very different results. Does this mean that the Persigo Board will not meet again until information is available or will the Board consider individual requests that have been put on hold?

Councilmember Todd is against narrowing the study areas but agreed to look at some areas more aggressively. If there is a plan in place, there is a need to be moving forward at a faster pace for those properties that have been on hold. She believes they need to meet again in the near future and make this decision.

Councilmember Palmer agreed that they don't want to narrow the scope, but in the planning processes is looking to the future. If the Board does not want to act tonight on these specific areas, they need to act soon as possible.

Councilmember Acquafresca clarified Councilmember Palmer is suggesting this Board meet again prior to the completion of the Comprehensive Plan. Councilmember Palmer said yes.

Commission Chair Rowland stated the Board needs to take a look at the big picture.

City Manager Kadrich understood the direction to do both, plan the big areas and plan the smaller areas, and bring them forward possibly before the finalization of the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Meis said the Comprehensive Plan is planning out to the future. So the two Boards need to be in agreement with the technical aspects and feasibility being addressed.

City Manager Kadrich understands that the Board wants to speed up this area with Staff bringing it to the Board with amendments to the Persigo Agreement because those areas would be immediately open to the Agreement.

Administrator Peacock noted there are areas that are less controversial, smaller areas, and Staff should have some sense of future land use for those areas with an eye on longer term. So in essence there would be two increments, and Staff can figure it out.

Councilmember Todd asked if, for the areas for the short term, would it be unreasonable for this Board meet back in 60 days?

Mr. Peacock said he understands the sense of urgency and further public process so they will build a project plan and bring it back to the Board.

Ms. Kadrich stated a City-County meeting is scheduled in a month and they can bring the information to the two boards so they can establish a time frame from there.

Council President Doody said it is his understanding the land use piece to the Comprehensive Plan is close to being done.

Ms. Kadrich confirmed they have a draft document, but the plan is slated to have more public input and alternatives looked at. This would typically take another six to nine months depending on the consensus of the people who participated in the process. She said her plan was to gear the dialog to individual neighborhoods which would slow the process. It looks now like a combination effort will be needed.

### **Adjournment**

Council President Doody thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting at 10:10 p.m.

Stephanie Tuin, MMC  
City Clerk