

**THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION  
WORKSHOP AGENDA**

**Monday, December 13, 1999, 7:00 p.m.  
Two Rivers Convention Center, 159 Main Street**

7:00 MAYOR'S INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

7:05 **201 PERSIGO BOUNDARY CHANGES WITH BOCC:** Continued discussion of proposed changes to the 201 boundary with the County Commissioners. [AttachW1](#)

8:25 COUNCILMEMBER REPORTS AND COMMENTS

8:35 REVIEW WEDNESDAY COUNCIL AGENDA

**PRESENTATIONS**

8:45 **TREES AROUND CITY HALL:** Joe Stevens and Mike Vendegna will discuss options for the aging trees around City Hall. [AttachW2](#)

9:05 **BREAK**

9:15 **PROPOSED INFRASTRUCTURE REIMBURSEMENT ORDINANCE:** Dan Wilson will discuss this option.

9:40 **VOLUNTEER BOARD VACANCIES:** Stephanie Nye will update Council on the status of various board appointments. [AttachW3](#)

9:50 **UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL RETREAT GOALS:** David Varley will present the latest progress on these goals. [AttachW4](#)

10:20 **TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING DESIGN STANDARDS:** Mark Relph will discuss the status and process of updating the City's TEDS Manual. [AttachW5](#)

10:50 ADJOURN

This agenda is intended as a guideline for the City Council. Items on the agenda are subject to change as is the order of the agenda.

**Attach W-1**

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

**SPECIAL MEETING**

**OCTOBER 26, 1999**

The Grand Junction City Council and the Mesa County Commissioners convened into special session at the Country Inn, 718 Horizon Drive, to solicit public comment on changes to the 201 Sewer Service Boundary. President of the Council Gene Kinsey and Commission Chair Kathryn Hall convened the meeting at 7:05 p.m. Those present were Councilmembers Cindy Enos-Martinez, Earl Payne, Reford Theobold, 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.

Commission Chair Hall invited those present to look at the big map on the wall. She then introduced the rest of the officials and staff present.

Mayor Kinsey welcomed those present.

Councilmember Janet Terry entered the meeting at 7:09 p.m.

City Utilities Manager Greg Trainor introduced the discussion. He referred to the maps and identified areas to be deleted and those areas to be added. He gave the history of the original Persigo Sewer Service area. Changes have occurred, growth has occurred and areas have been identified for future growth. It is necessary to amend the boundary to implement the Persigo Agreement. Tonight's discussion was mandated in the agreement to occur within one year.

Mr. Trainor then referred to specific areas to be deleted and noted the reasons why, i.e. in Clifton Sanitation Districts No. 1 and No. 2. The area is presently served by an existing wastewater treatment plant with no plans to eventually hook up to the Persigo system and be served by the Persigo Wastewater Treatment Plant. There is an area adjacent (northeast and southeast) to the airport which will not be developed because of its proximity to runways and airport development. An area along Little Park Road (southwest portion of the 201 sewer service area) is mostly BLM public lands and won't be developed. Monument Valley, an area with existing development with septic systems, and an area west of Canyon View Subdivision will stay rural, also the area west of 19 ½ Road.

Areas proposed to be added are Valle Vista Subdivision which has sewer and an area along the extension that goes to Valle Vista, an area with existing highway commercial in Orchard Mesa because they are presently on sewer, an area along Monument Road proposed for development, the Appleton area north of Interstate 70, an area that is outside the current 201 sewer service area boundary, but is partially served by sewer (Appleton School). Another area is west of the Airport inside city limits but outside the 201 sewer service area, and adjacent to Paradise Hills which is

currently on sewer. The area north of Independence Valley which currently has sewer extended to it and is an area that is presently part of Fruita's 201 sewer service area. The area on Orchard Mesa is proposed to be rural in nature and not be developed in densities less than two acre lots.

Chair Kathryn Hall introduced Councilmember Janet Terry. She then opened up the meeting for public comment.

Gary Plsek had sent a letter referring to property at 872 26 ½ Road. It is in the 201 service area and Mr. Plsek wanted it deleted. The property is vacant farmland and located north of Paradise Hills and west of some of the proposed extension of Paradise Hills. All of the houses in that area are on five acres or more. The city does not have the AFT zoning so taxes would be affected.

Officials advised that taxes depend on the use of the property, not the zoning. Councilmember Terry clarified that the property would not have to be annexed unless it is developed. Mr. Plsek said he might want to split off a lot, then it would trigger annexation.

Sean Norris, 778 23 Road, said the boundary splits his parcel up the middle. It doesn't make sense if developed, with sewer on one half and septic on the other half. He understood the topography, so he asked that it all be included or it all be excluded, three other parcels also. Commissioner Jim Baughman asked Mr. Norris if he had a preference. Mr. Norris said no, it won't affect development.

City Utilities Engineer Trent Prall confirmed that topography did affect the drawn lines.

Councilmember Terry asked if it is in line with the Appleton Road. Mr. Prall said yes.

Councilmember Theobald asked if the sewer will flow all the way to 23 Road if it is extended the other way, that is would it be better to include it all or bring the line back to the east. Mr. Prall recommended bringing it back to the east because lift stations would be required if the boundary were extended further to the west. He would prefer to exclude it because of the drainage.

Ron Drake, 1974 S. Broadway, said his area is large acreage that may or may not be developed. His lot is 1.08 acres. It is difficult to change lines once drawn and conditions are made. They lived previously in Country Club Park and it was costly there to go on sewer (\$12,000 to \$20,000). He doesn't want to be excluded. There are a number of others in his situation, approximately 40 to 60 homes. He felt the boundary should be redrawn to include the lower one-third of his area in the 201 service area.

Councilmember Payne asked Mr. Drake if he attended the buffer zone meetings. Mr. Drake said no. Councilmember Payne said there was a lot of support for a buffer there, 95% in favor versus 5% against.

Councilmember Theobald characterized the expectation of the buffer zone as a rural area, but that may not be the case.

City Manager Mark Achen said Fruita's buffer zone prohibits Fruita or Grand Junction from extending sanitary sewer unilaterally without the approval of all three entities. The purpose was to not allow development in the buffer area.

Marie Tipping, 1967 Broadway, has 8.7 acres in the area. She was concerned with the high water table. In the winter time, water is on the surface. They have above ground septic systems engineered in the area. Her system is functioning okay, but neighbors might have problems. She and the neighbors don't want to be deleted. They have an agricultural nature in the neighborhood where several ranchers bring cattle into the area. They need to stay agricultural and not be in the city, but for health reasons, she would like to be able to get onto the sewer. Councilmember Terry asked Ms. Tipping what the Health Department has said regarding the high water table. Ms. Tipping didn't know.

Councilmember Spehar asked if leaving this area within the boundary would require an agreement with Fruita. City Manager Mark Achen said it would require discussion with them on what the intent is.

Councilmember Payne felt this would be changing the decision from the buffer zone meeting.

Councilmember Terry said they don't need to change the buffer zone, but provide a way to address failed septic systems in existing developments. Taking them out of the 201 would preclude the City and County from helping them in the future. Councilmember Theobald noted sewer service can't be extended outside the 201 boundaries.

County Administrator Bob Jasper said the Persigo Agreement says they can now bring sewer to existing areas in the 201 area, but it is quite expensive. That must be considered. The City and County always have the ability to change the 201 boundary. If later there was a neighborhood that is desperate, the lines could be changed then. Whether doing the sewer now or later, it would still be a considerable amount of money.

James McCall, 2083 S. Broadway, has a failing septic system. He was denied a permit to fix the septic system if sewer was available in the area. His property line is adjacent to Tiara Rado. He would like to retain the option of going on sewer in the future if his septic should fail. His property is approximately 3.5 acres in size. His neighbor has sewer.

Steve Nieslanik, Board member of the Orchard Mesa Sanitation District, said the board is opposed to the deletion of the area east of 30 Road. He feels it goes against the City/County agreement with goals to pursue health and quality on behalf of all citizens, and to encourage connection of all properties within the 201 in the short term rather than waiting for septic tanks to fail. There are a lot of failing septic systems in that area and there is high ground water. It has the same problem as in Valle Vista. There is a health and water quality problem in the area with sewer on the ground. He felt the only effort by the City and County has been to write his board a check and try to buy them off. He did not feel that was appropriate.

Councilmember Terry said she and Chair Hall visited with the Orchard Mesa Sanitation District board last year and researched the problem to see what type of failed systems existed, the extent to which they were failing, and the high water table. They did not determine the problem to be as

bad as Mr. Nieslanik described it. The data from the Mesa County Health Department does not show the failed systems described by Mr. Nieslanik. She said that was one of the main reasons the decision was made. They are not ignoring the board's problem. Chair Hall said they received the Health Department data, and it wasn't to buy the District out. The City and County were trying to make the District whole for taking care of Valle Vista sewer.

Mr. Nieslanik said he thought they have a problem there with failing systems and extremely high water tables. He said being on that board is tough telling some residents they can have sewer while having to tell others they cannot. He felt this proposal is doomed to fail in this area. He quoted past Grand Junction Mayor Connor Shepherd in a letter stating "Installing the Valle Vista sewer line would result in a population of 24,000 people being added to the area." That was seven years ago, and there has been very little population increase in the area. The District feels those people should be hooked up to sewer.

Councilmember Terry suggested Staff share the data regarding failing systems. She said the 201 system is designed to handle so much volume which is why some of these areas are being deleted.

Mr. Nieslanik said all lines south of Highway 50 would gravity feed into Valle Vista or the District's existing lines.

Councilmember Terry said they had talked about it for months and they made the right decision.

Councilmember Spehar said there was a lot of discussion on how to run that line to minimize the possibility of more development. The Appleton area is an example of sewer extension begetting growth. Once a rural area is sewerred, the growth begins.

Larry Beckner, attorney on behalf of Dr. Merkel, owner of property north of the interstate between 24 ½ and 24 ¼ Road and south of the wash, said they want it to be included. It will require a new drill under the interstate at Dr. Merkel's cost. He also owns the two properties to the west between 24 Road and 24 ¼ Road. Commissioner Baughman said that request has been discussed before because of the North Central planning process. Mr. Beckner understood but requested they follow the wash and bring the area into the 201.

Councilmember Terry asked for the proposed zoning for that property. Mr. Beckner said there is no current proposal. It is currently zoned agricultural.

Chair Hall asked if it is one parcel. Mr. Beckner said there are three parcels.

Kathy Cron, 214 E. Fallen Rock, Monument Valley, owner of a two acre lot, said her property is proposed for deletion. She said there have been flash floods two summers in a row. She has one chance to move her septic system, her neighbor has none because of ravines. Her septic system is 26 years old. She was worried about resale of her home. Councilmember Theobald said, under the Persigo Agreement, sewer and annexation are no longer linked. If her septic failed and she needed sewer service, that would not be a factor in annexation. Ms. Cron asked if sewer were installed in the area, would there be the possibility of being annexed. Councilmember

Theobold said it's possible, but not because of the sewer. Chair Hall said the agreement says existing residences can be sewerered without being annexed.

Ms. Cron was concerned that the City will annex around them and they will be left as an enclave. She was assured her property would not be annexed by enclave since her backyard abuts the Colorado National Monument. She said the sewer line is in across the street. She is no longer rural. The urban growth around them leaves them no longer rural. It's being filled in even though they are rural.

Councilmember Terry asked about the rest of the area. Ms. Cron said all the homes on the outside area of Monument Valley have ravine problems. It's the center section that burned two summers ago. Councilmember Terry asked if the neighbors have the same concern as Ms. Cron. Ms. Cron said she had no idea. Councilmember Terry said in order to get sewer, a concerted effort by the neighbors would be required to form the district. Ms. Cron felt that when someone's sewer begins to fail, it will become an issue.

Councilmember Theobold said it is the perception that this area is built out and that it is all two acres or more; thus room for rebuilding septics. It is still very expensive to extend the sewer line to an existing subdivision. Ms. Cron was concerned with property value on residences with old septic systems.

Mary Huber, 580 ½ Melrose Court, said Clifton Sanitation Districts #1 and #2 are proposed to be deleted. She asked what was presented to the Joint Urban Planning Commissions. Their minutes say "as amended", and she wondered where she could find out what the amendment is, who did it and when. Chair Hall said discussions have taken place over the past two years, and Clifton Sanitation requested to be deleted from the 201 boundary. Ms. Huber asked if there was someone from Clifton Sanitation who could verify that. Councilmember Terry said it was very clear at that meeting. She said Larry Beckner was representing all the districts at that meeting and could verify that, although Mr. Beckner had left this meeting.

Ms. Huber asked if the ten year limit means Clifton Sanitation Districts #1 and #2 will be included. Commissioner Genova said one does not affect the other. Boundaries can be changed with action of both bodies.

Councilmember Terry referred to the term "as amended" because it can change from time to time, and probably will change.

Ms. Huber asked how long the urbanized growth boundary can contribute to Persigo 201. Trent Prall said they are looking at expanding the plant in 2011 but the population in the valley could double before the plant reaches capacity.

Ms. Huber said she would like to get something in writing form Clifton Sanitation District #1 and #2 saying they want to be deleted. Chair Hall suggested Ms. Huber talk to the District.

Richard Mason, 2373 H Road, lives in the Appleton area which is proposed to be included. He supported the plan to expand the 201 into that area. Expanding sewer is an expensive process and he encouraged the City and County to investigate ways to provide incentives or creative

financing to form improvement districts. Mr. Mason's property is 2.5 acres, but most of the properties are less than two acres.

Jim Rooks, 155 31 Road, expanded on Mr. Nieslanik's comments. The proposed sewer boundary goes around 220 acres his family owns. His current residence is outside the red area on the map but he has credit for 4.5 sewer taps granted by the Orchard Mesa Sanitation District. He intends to use one of the credits for his residence when his septic begins to fail. He wants to use another sewer tap on his land and give to his sons. He asked if new residences will be able to hook on in the red area. Chair Hall said yes.

Mr. Rooks didn't disagree with removing the area for the most part but part of the area needs to be left in. He worked on the Orchard Mesa Master Plan. The area west of 31 Road was designated as four units per acre. The area north of A ½ Road, east of 30 Road, was designated to be five acre tracts. Deleting the area would go against that plan. Under the current land use code, the green area was in the urban growth plan. Mr. Rooks felt the earlier statement about not wanting any growth in this area is taking his property rights. Chipeta Pines Subdivision is currently being annexed. The city limits is expanding. He urged reconsidering the area and deleting part of it and leaving part of it in. Another parcel outside of the red area is already on sewer.

Commissioner Baughman understood at the time of the Valle Vista extension, 400 feet was the distance that sewer service was available. Trent Prall confirmed the red area is 400 feet on either side.

Toby Tiftiller, 2391 H Road, an Appleton citizen, said he liked it there until the sewer line was run to Appleton School. He voted against extending the sewer, mostly because of the expense, \$10,000 to run the line to the house and \$15,000 to hook into the sewer. He has a brand new house and septic system, and feels it is unnecessary. He didn't move there to be urbanized. It is a rural community. He was concerned with more dense development going into his area. His property is just under two acres. Commissioner Baughman said Mr. Tiftiller would not need sewer until his septic system failed. Mr. Tiftiller said there is still the expense (\$10,000) of running the sewer line down the street. Commissioner Baughman said that won't happen if he does not hook onto the sewer. Pete Baier, County Public Works Director, said if a majority of the people in an area want to form the district, those in the minority would still be assessed.

County Administrator Bob Jasper said the neighborhood voted for it once. They voted again and defeated it by one vote. Staff and the Boards will be meeting next week looking at incentives or ways to bring the price of the sewer down. Mr. Tiftiller said there are as many with failing septics in the area as those with new septics.

Jody Seagull, 3126 B ½ Road, didn't want to be excluded. Their home was built in the 1920's on a little over one acre. She sees the area filling in with many septic systems on two to five acre lots. She felt a County sewer system would be much better than separate septic systems.

Mel Reddig, 265 32 Road, thought the plan looks pretty good, although he would like to be excluded. He didn't feel his property should have been included in the first place.

There were no more public comments. The hearing was closed at 8:40 p.m.

Staff comments were taken at this time.

Councilmember Terry asked, in reference to Monument Valley, if Staff had any reaction to some of the issues brought up by Ms. Cron. Trent Prall said the area could be easily served except for the very northeastern corner of the area which will need a sewer lift station, but it will be expensive (\$12,000 to \$15,000 per lot).

Councilmember Terry asked Mr. Prall if he recalled why this area was proposed for exclusion. Mr. Prall said it was built out on two acre densities and there were several residents that asked to be excluded.

Councilmember Theobald asked if they are on a time frame for making a decision?

Chair Kathy Hall asked what the majority wants to do.

Commissioner Genova said she would like to investigate some of these areas.

Informal discussion by the City and County Officials then took place.

Councilmember Enos-Martinez suggested checking on the Orchard Mesa Plan.

Commissioner Baughman suggested checking with the Heath Department.

Chair Hall said some questions need to be answered and suggested a joint meeting at the beginning of the next City Council meeting to be held on November 3, 1999.

Mayor Gene Kinsey suggested action could be taken at this meeting on those areas that are clearly non-controversial like the airport.

Councilmember Theobald said most of tonight's comments have been on future concerns. There will be enough people at some point with the same problem and need to have a neighborhood solution. At that point, the entire neighborhood is going to need sewer service which also means the entire neighborhood is going to need to be in the 201. He wasn't sure how many of those concerns need to be addressed tonight. He suggested they not overreact, but wait and see what happens. They don't need to solve all the future problems tonight. It makes sense to approve the ones they can tonight.

Councilmember Spehar suggested having Mr. Trainor review each area one by one and a motion can be made on each.

The following individual motions were made:

1. Airport Property

City



Upon motion by Councilmember Theobold, seconded by Councilmember Terry and carried, the airport property was deleted from the 201 Sewer System.

County

Upon motion by Commissioner Genova, seconded by Commissioner Baughman and carried, the deletion was approved.

Councilmember Theobold suggested they not deal with the Plsek property right now, nor the requests for additional additions (150 acres in the west half of the area).

2. Saccomanno Property

City

Upon motion by Councilmember Theobold, seconded by Councilmember Payne and carried, the Saccomanno property was added to the 201 Sewer System.

County

Upon motion by Commissioner Genova, seconded by Commissioner Baughman and carried, the addition was approved.

3. Appleton Addition

City

Upon motion by Councilmember Theobold, seconded by Councilmember Terry and carried, the Appleton Addition was added to the 201 Sewer System and move the western boundary to the eastern property line of those properties that it currently bisects.

County

Upon motion by Commissioner Baughman, seconded by Commissioner Genova and carried, the addition was approved.

4. Independence Valley North

City

Upon motion by Councilmember Theobold, seconded by Councilmember Enos-Martinez and carried, Independence Valley North was added to the 201 Sewer System. It was noted that Fruita must delete a portion of this area from its 201.

County

Upon motion by Commissioner Genova, seconded by Commissioner Baughman and carried, the addition was approved.

City Manager Mark Achen noted that Fruita formally advised the City it is okay to include Independence Valley North in the Persigo 201 Sewer System.

5. Wildwood Addition (19 1/2 Road buffer area) deletion - **NO ACTION ON THIS ITEM.** It was determined this item will be considered at a later time when more information can be obtained. Councilmember Theobold said this needs to be viewed in a larger context. Whatever changes made may also affect the previous perception of the 19 1/2 Road buffer area. He felt the deletion needs to be discussed with Fruita. Councilmember Terry said whatever decision is made (how the 201 amendments are dealt with) would be contained in the body of the buffer zone agreement. Councilmember Theobold said the buffer zone was created outside the context of the discussion of the 201 amendments. In linking the two, they may decide the buffer boundary may also need to change in some way.

6. Wildwood Deletion – It was moved by Councilmember Theobold and seconded by Councilmember Payne to delete the Wildwood Area from the 201 Sewer system. Councilmember Terry asked if the area is developed? Councilmember Theobold said the extent of the development would be a few homes that front on S. Broadway, and then Wildwood. This is in Terry Dixon’s neighborhood. Commissioner Baughman said Mr. McCall's house, 2083 S. Broadway, would be in this area. Councilmember Theobold said yes and his house fronts on S. Broadway. Because it’s located right across from the existing 201, they could deal with it on an individual basis if a problem comes up. Councilmember Theobold withdrew his motion.

7. Monument Valley

City

Upon motion by Councilmember Terry, seconded by Councilmember Spehar and carried, Monument Valley was not deleted from the 201 Sewer System.

County

Upon motion by Commissioner Baughman, seconded by Commissioner Genova and carried, the motion was approved.

8. Monument Road

City

Upon motion by Councilmember Terry, seconded by Councilmember Terry and carried, the Monument Road area was added to the 201 Sewer System.

County

Upon motion by Commissioner Genova, seconded by Commissioner Baughman and carried, the motion was approved.

9. Little Park Road

County

Upon motion by Commissioner Genova, seconded by Commissioner Baughman and carried, Little Park Road was deleted from the 201 Sewer System.

City

Upon motion by Councilmember Theobold, seconded by Councilmember Terry and carried, the motion was approved.

10. Existing Highway Commercial Area (Trailer Park on the south side of Highway 6 & 50, east of 30 Road)

County

Upon motion by Commissioner Baughman, seconded by Commissioner Genova and carried, the existing Highway Commercial area was added to the 201 Sewer System.

City

Upon motion by Councilmember Terry, seconded by Councilmember Theobold and carried, the motion was approved.

11. Valle Vista (red portion)

County

Upon motion by Commissioner Genova, seconded by Commissioner Baughman and carried, the Valle Vista Extension Addition was added to the 201 Sewer System.

City

Upon motion by Councilmember Terry, seconded by Councilmember Theobold and carried, the motion was approved.

12. Valle Vista (green portion) – **DEFERRED.**

13. Clifton Sanitation District #1 and #1

City

Upon motion by Councilmember Theobold, seconded by Councilmember Terry and carried, Clifton Sanitation District #1 and #2 were deleted from the 201 Sewer System.

County

Upon motion by Commissioner Genova, seconded by Commissioner Baughman and carried, the motion was approved.

Three areas plus the Plsek property were left to discuss.

Chair Hall thanked everyone for attending the meeting and their input, and adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

Stephanie Nye, CMC/AAE  
City Clerk

**Attach W-2**

TO: Mark Achen

FROM: Mike Vendegna

DATE: December 9, 1999

RE: City Hall Trees

The following is a summary of the events leading up to the recommendation that the trees at city hall be removed. Jim Shanks and I met immediately after the decision was made to build on the existing site and at that time it was decided to try and save as many trees as possible. We determined those along the perimeter of the building and two others were probably salvageable. Even at that time we knew it would be a difficult task. As construction progresses the compaction from the heavy equipment and the massive amount of materials placed around the trees has been far greater than anticipated.

The compaction alone can be a killer of roots but when you add the trenching and lack of adequate water to the equation the chance of survival is reduced to almost zero. As we all know the root system is the life structure of a tree and contrary to many beliefs the root system of a tree extends far beyond the drip line. The root systems of the trees at city hall have undergone such devastating damage during the construction process the life support system has been damaged beyond repair. When a young tree is first planted they adapt to their environment and can survive for a very long time; the trees in the planters on Main Street are an example of that adaptation. In old mature trees environmental changes such as cutting roots, heavy compaction, increasing the soil level over the roots or a drastic change in water application rates cause the trees to decline and inevitably die. The trees at city hall have had their living environment changed so drastically long-term survival is not possible.

Leaving these trees also creates a potential safety hazard. The lack of root support leads to the entire tree being weakened in the ground and subject to collapse. The same lack of a healthy root system also leads to branch die back and creates a real hazard for persons and property underneath.

Discussions at recent Forestry Board meetings have centered on the trees and members have expressed great concern with leaving the trees. I have had discussions with Vince Urbina, Forestry Board President and Colorado State Forest Service Assistant District Forester, Curtis Swift with Colorado State Cooperative Extension, and a local area forestry consultant. All were in agreement, in many cases trees and construction don't mix and this is one where they don't.

It should be noted that the trees in question were not of specimen condition. Many, especially on the White Avenue side, were in declining condition due to years of road salts, previous grounds construction projects and the overall life expectancy of the tree species. These trees were slated for removal in five to seven years. The Rood Avenue trees were in a little better condition but still had at most, only a seven to ten year life expectancy. Prolonging life for these trees will result in losing valuable growth time for new trees and postpone the inevitable removal.

The recommendation is:

1. Remove all existing trees now.

Note: Forestry division crews will remove the trees and stumps. All that would be required from the contractor would be to remove equipment and materials to allow access to the trees.

2. Plant new trees in conjunction with the proposed landscape plan and upgrade the trees to the largest available caliper tree of the recommended species.

I have attached the December 1, 1999 letter to Joe Stevens from Vince Urbina, Forestry Board Chair and long time forester. Vince's letter confirms what I have stated and refers to statistical data that supports the proposal to remove the trees. I have also attached a copy of Curtis Swift's Daily Sentinel Article for December 12, 1999, again confirming the need for removal.

As City Forester for the City of Grand Junction, a green industry professional for over 25 years and an all-around "tree hugger", it saddens me to see any tree removed but in this instance I feel it is the only logical thing to do.

If you have any questions or require and further information please contact me.

cc: Dave Varley, Assistant City Manager  
Joe Stevens, Parks and Recreation Director  
Don Hobbs, Assistant Parks and Recreation Director

**Attach W-3  
Memorandum**

To: Mayor Kinsey and City Councilmembers  
From: Stephanie Nye, City Clerk  
Date: December 16, 2011  
Subject: Volunteer Board Vacancies

We have been advertising for numerous vacancies on various boards and commissions. Following is a summary of the status and the applications received.

**Planning Commission**

Planning Commission has two vacancies. In accordance with the by-law changes you made in November, you have the option of 1) designating two current Board of Appeals members as alternates then immediately moving them into those vacancies and then appointing two new Board of Appeals/ Planning Commission alternates, or 2) Appoint two new Planning Commission members and designate two existing Board of Appeals members as alternates who will begin attending Planning Commission meetings. Two of your Board of Appeals members have expressed interest in the Planning Commission seats - Paul Dibble and Jim Nall. In addition, we have received 10 applications (see [Summary1](#) below, applications are attached).

Appointments to the Planning Commission need to occur in a fairly short time frame to ensure a quorum in the upcoming meetings.

**Visitor & Convention Bureau**

The VCB Board of Directors has five vacancies. Two members: Wade Haerle and Robin Kleinschnitz have requested reappointment. Wade is currently vice-chair and will ascend to chair in 2001 if reappointed. If you reappoint those two, then there is one full-term and two partial term vacancies remaining.

The City has received 16 applications (see [Summary2](#) below, applications are attached).

**Historic Preservation Board**

Although we sent letters to the two members whose terms were expiring about reappointment, neither responded until after we started advertising. We only received one additional letter of interest but both members are now asking to be reappointed - Philip Born and David Bailey. I have attached their letters and the additional letter of interest.

## **Grand Junction Housing Authority**

In September you increased the number of Housing Authority members so we are in search of two additional members. There are no other vacancies this year. We have received two letters of interest and they are attached.

**Summary of Planning Commission Applicants (all are city residents)**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Phone No.</b>	<b>Other</b>
Bruce Jordan	1015 Belford Ave.	255-8587	Applied previously
J Creighton Bricker	3615 Ridge Dr.	263-0159	Applied previously
Bryan Cross	2997 Bret Dr.	243-9422	
Harry Butler	1148 Grand Ave.	242-5154	Applied previously
Jerry Ainsworth	2041 Wrangler Court	256-9008	Applied previously
Stephen Love	779 S. Sedonna Court	242-2495	
Joseph Marie	535 1/2 29 Road	255-6575	Applied previously
David Berry	530 Hall Ave	242-9281	
Robert MacGruder	722 North Valley Dr	241-3089	
Vicki Boutilier	2840 Kennedy	245-9529	



## Summary of VCB Applicants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Home Address (*)</u>	<u>Phone NO.</u>	<u>Business</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Peggy Page	2320 S. Rim Dr*	242-3420	Page-Parsons Jewelers 444 Main St	Currently serves as an ex-officio member on the VCB,
Dale Reigel	208 Park Dr. #2*	243-8140	CEO at Rocky Mountain Orthopaedic Assoc.	Interested in other boards too
Gregory Soloman	507 Dove Court*	256-9058	Self-employed - hospitality consulting and investment venture counseling	
Robert Mayer	630 31 ½ Road	434-8604	Associate Professor at Mesa State Travel, Tourism & Commercial Recreation	
Douglas Briggs	2938 Beechwood*	242-9012	Attorney at Castor & Associates	Was attorney for Walker Field Airport Authority
Scott Howard	2095 S. Broadway	242-8861	Owner Dos Hombres & Rockslide Brew Pub	
Chris Blackburn	645 Grand View Dr*	255-0000	Owner Pantuso's & Gladstones	
Kevin Reimer	2009 S. Broadway	242-2525	Developer of Hawthorne Suites Hotel	Extended Stay facility across from Two Rivers
Stephanie Schmid	3573 E ½ Road Palisade	464-0529	Owner of Orchard House Bed & Breakfast	Worked for Riverfront Commission
Brad Krebill	2979 Bookcliff*	263-2102	Branch Manager at Bank of Colorado	
Linda Smith	340 34 Road	242-0008	General	On 24 Road

	Palisade		Manager at Mesa Mall	Steering Committee
Dianna Saya	523 28 1/4 Rd*	243-5150	General Manager at Ramada Inn	
John Dwyer	1160 White Ave*	256-7976	General Manager at La Quinta	
Charles Novinskie	326 S. 16.5 Road Glade Park	244-9100	Public Information Officer for Walker Field Airport Authority	
Leif Johnson	2920 Formay*	241-8888	Director of Sales at Adam's Mark	
Gary Nagy	4021 Ptarmigan Piazza*	241-9748	Investment Rep with Edward Jones	

\*denotes City resident

Attach W-4

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA  
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<b>City Council</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Workshop</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Formal Agenda</b>	<b>Date Prepared: December 8, 1999</b>
<b>Meeting Date:</b> December 13, 1999	<b>Author: David Varley</b>
	<b>Title: Assistant City Manager</b>
	<b>Presenter Name: David Varley</b>
	<b>Title: Assistant City Manager</b>

**Subject:** City Council 1999 Retreat Goals Update

**Summary:** This is a status report on the goals the City Council adopted at their retreat in June 1999.

**Background Information:** The City Council set some goals at their June, 1999 retreat. Council decided they would like to have regular updates on the progress being made on these goals. Shortly after this retreat a summary of the goals was produced and distributed. This attachment is the latest report to Council on the status of the goals. This report includes a summary of each goal area from the original retreat report followed by information that was compiled from the various departments working on the goals.

**Budget:** Each goal may have various budget impacts associated with the implementation of that goal.

**Action Requested/Recommendation:** Council discussion of their goals.

**Citizen Presentation:** Yes  No. **If yes,**  
**Name**  
**Purpose**

**Report results back to Council?**  **No**  **Yes, When** \_\_\_\_\_

**Placement on agenda:**  **Consent**  **Individual Consideration**  **Workshop**

# CITY COUNCIL 1999 RETREAT

## GOALS UPDATE

December 1999



The City Council held a retreat in Glenwood Springs in June, 1999. During this retreat the Council discussed several goals they would like to pursue. Shortly after the retreat a summary of these goals was prepared and distributed to Council. This report is an update on the progress that has been made toward the goals that were developed by Council during their retreat.

### 1. SHORT TERM GOALS & OBJECTIVES

*Two main goals were identified in this category. The first one deals with a recreation/senior center. This goal involves planning for the possible development of such a center. This is to include a survey to determine public priorities and support for funding a recreation/senior center. A communications strategy will be needed and a decision will be necessary by the summer of 2000 in order to place an initiative on the November, 2000 ballot. Parks Director Joe Stevens has started work on this project. The Parks Department and the Parks Board are in the process of working out the details of a survey with a consulting firm.*

*The second major short term goal is the code rewrite and zoning map. This includes finishing the rewrite of the City's development code and making appropriate changes to the zoning map. Different options to accomplish this in a timely manner need to be discussed. It was suggested that we try to accomplish this by the fall..*

### **CURRENT STATUS**

- RRC Associates has been retained to conduct a survey to gauge citizen support for parks and recreation capital improvements. This survey will help identify desired improvements as well as funding options and willingness to pay for improvements. The survey will be presented to the Parks Board in late November or early December.
- The final workshops for the new code and zoning map have been held. The final draft of the code should be available for review in late December. Public hearings for the new development code and zoning map will be held in February with adoption to follow.

## 2. 2-10 YEAR LIST - KEEP FOR FURTHER REFERENCE/WORK

*This group discussed goals that fall in the two to ten year range. The first goal in this area is the*

**F** *development of neighborhoods. This includes developing programs and services*  
**R** *oriented around neighborhoods and strengthening them and helping them to help*  
**O** *themselves. We should also examine the possibility of customizing services so that*  
**M** *neighborhoods can receive services geared more toward their needs and desires. The*  
*Community Development Department will be responsible for pulling this program*  
*together.*

**R** *A second goal in this area is to speak with a single voice in the valley for water.*  
**E** *This entails working with other water entities develop a unified position with respect to*  
**T** *water and water use in the area. We should recognize that we have similar interests and*  
**R** *threats here in the valley when it comes to our water. We should work together on this*  
**E** *issue as we can accomplish more by combining our efforts.*

**A** *A few other goals were mentioned that fall within this time frame. These include*  
**T** *the preservation of open space, developing philosophy statements and redefining our*  
*relationship with the Grand Junction Rural Fire Protection District.*

### **CURRENT STATUS**

- The goal of developing a neighborhood services program is in the range of two to ten years. It is anticipated that it will be one to two years before the Community Development Department begins developing and coordinating such a program.
- Over the past three years municipal and agricultural water users have jointly participated in and have spoken with one voice on the statewide development of the “programmatic biological opinion”. This deals with the recovery of endangered fish in the Colorado River between Palisade and Grand Junction.
- Staff has begun an effort to hold regular roundtable discussions with municipal and agricultural water providers. The purpose of these discussions will be to work together on water issues and challenges. The first meeting was held December 9.
- The City has adopted buffer zones with Mesa County, Fruita and Palisade. The City has discussed funding a first project to preserve these areas in 2000. Two joint meetings have been held to discuss this issue.
- The Public Works & Utilities Department has been an integral part of the Grand Mesa Slopes Plan. This plan and process brings together various interests to work toward common goals. One of these goals is the preservation of open space.
- The acquisition of the Purdy Mesa Livestock Water Company provides an opportunity for the City to influence land use and open space through the

implementation of the Mesa County Growth Management Plan in the Kannah Creek area.

- City Council has met with the Rural Fire District Board. A suggested goal was to reach a common solution by early summer 2000. The Fire Chief will schedule future meetings between Council and the Fire District Board.
- A consultant has just finished a study of the emergency medical services system. This report will be presented to Council in the near future.
- The Civic Forum has sponsored a Citizen Focus Group on fire and emergency medical services. A public meeting on this topic was recently held and the Forum will continue work on this project into 2000.

### 3. LONG RANGE VISION

*This goal entails the development of a long range vision for the entire community.*

**F  
R  
O  
M  
R  
E  
T  
R  
E  
A  
T**

*It was discussed that we need to know where our citizens want us to be in 25 years so we can use that information now to help guide our decisions.*

*We don't need to reinvent everything as we might be able to use some information that has already been developed by different groups in the community. Several different examples of how to accomplish this were suggested such as the Vail Tomorrow effort and the American Assemblies process. It was suggested that we put money in the budget for this and*

*begin the process after we complete the code rewrite and zoning map.*

### CURRENT STATUS

- The visioning process will begin in 2000 after the new code is adopted. The budget includes \$20,000 for this project. Council needs to provide direction on this issue and staff will develop various options for such a process.

### 4. SHORT TERM V. LONG TERM AND FEEDBACK

**F  
R  
O  
M  
R  
E  
T  
R  
E  
A  
T**

*This goal covers two different ideas. The first idea is to balance short term and long term consequences when making decisions. It was suggested that we remember the growth plan values and the relation to our vision when we are making decisions. It may be worthwhile to have a quarterly review of our goals and objectives. The City Manager's office will be responsible for providing quarterly updates to the Council.*

*Also, it was discussed that we should change the structure of the Monday workshops in order to make them more productive. Suggested changes include a social activity or time for Council to discuss general items at the beginning of the meeting, reviewing the Wednesday agenda first, limiting the number and extent of presentations, require written requests by presenters and better focussing on the goal or desired outcome of the meeting.*

*The second area under this goal deals with the desire to have feedback regarding decisions that have been made. Council is called upon to make some tough decisions and they don't get the chance to see the consequences of these decisions. It would be a good idea for the Council to see what happens after they make a decision on an item. One way to do this is to have a section on each agenda item where the Council can request that they be updated on the item in the future. For example, have a report back to Council on a project six to twelve months after it is completed so they can see the actual impacts and consequences of their decision.*

## **CURRENT STATUS**

- Council was provided with both a summary of the retreat and notes taken at the retreat. This report will be the first update since that information was provided. It is planned that Council will receive a regular update on the progress we are making on the goals.
- The structure of the Monday night workshop has been changed in accordance with this goal. The new format seems to be working well. Council can review this and make any additional changes as desired.
- The agenda form for City Council meetings has been changed. A new section has been added where Council can request to have a report back on the particular item in the future. This has not been used very often.
- There are several projects that staff is preparing to report back to Council on in the near future. Some of these projects are the 12<sup>th</sup> Street pedestrian issue at Mesa State College, other traffic safety improvements, the new graffiti removal program, parking enforcement in the downtown area, and the woodstove replacement program. Additional items are scheduled for presentation and discussion at Council workshops during the next three months.

**Attach W-5**

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA  
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<b>City Council</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Workshop</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Formal Agenda</b> <b>Meeting Date: December 13, 1999</b>	<b>Date Prepared: December 6, 1999</b> <b>Author: Jody Kliska</b> <b>Title: Transportation Engineer</b> <b>Presenter Name: Tim Moore</b> <b>Title: Public Works Manager</b>
---	---

**Subject:** Transportation Engineering Design Standards (TEDS).

**Summary:** The presentation is a staff update on the status of the re-write of the Transportation Engineering Design Standards. The City of Grand Junction and Mesa County have jointly retained a transportation consultant to revise the current Transportation Engineering Standards to meet the demands of development as well meeting the joint standards requirement of the Persigo Agreement. The consultant is approximately halfway through the process and will have a draft out to technical committee members before Christmas.

**Background Information:** The City's current standards have been in draft form since 1994, without formal adoption by either Planning Commission or City Council. Mesa County has similar Road and Bridge standards. Both the City and the County were struggling to update their respective standards when the Persigo Agreement called for the adoption of joint infrastructure standards.

The new Transportation Engineering Standards will provide the following benefits:

- ⇒ The standards will be updated to reflect local issues
- ⇒ The standards will be compatible with the new zoning and development code
- ⇒ The document will be more user-friendly and will be available in various formats – paper, CD ROM, web page.
- ⇒ The document will have buy-in from the local engineering and development community
- ⇒ A “Design Exception” process is being developed to provide a way to vary the standards if necessary

The current standards address such issues as street classification, access control, traffic impact studies, geometric design and site circulation. Several new chapters will be added as part of the re-write. These include bicycle and pedestrian facilities, traffic calming, alley standards and private streets and autocourts.

To assure that the new standards are understood and accepted by the users, staff and the consultants have asked members of the development community



to serve on a committee to guide the process. The fifteen-member committee is comprised of local engineering consultants, developers, and representatives of the homebuilders, contractors, emergency services and an attorney. At the first meeting, the committee was asked to share their areas of concern and a list of 23 items was the result. The second meeting was a presentation and discussion of each of the chapters. The committee had asked for an introductory statement for each chapter, complete with goals.

The third meeting is scheduled for mid-January. The consultant will provide a draft to all committee members before Christmas for review prior to the January meeting. Staff anticipates the final product will be brought to Planning Commission and City Council in the first quarter of 2000.

**Budget:** N/A

**Action Requested/Recommendation:** None

**Citizen Presentation:**           Yes            **No. If yes,**

**Name**

**Purpose**

**Report results back to Council?**  **No**  **Yes, When** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Placement on agenda:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Consent</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Individual Consideration</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Workshop</b>
--

