

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
WORKSHOP AGENDA**

**WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2000, 6:00 P.M.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE ROOM
CITY HALL, 250 N. 5TH STREET**

*****PLEASE NOTE TIME, DATE AND LOCATION*****

6:00 MAYOR'S INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

6:05 COUNCILMEMBER REPORTS AND COMMENTS

PRESENTATIONS

6:10 PERSIGO AGREEMENT UPDATE: Greg Trainor and Kathy Portner will update Council on how the Persigo Agreement has been working and will ask for policy direction on specific issues. [Attach W-1](#)

6:40 AMENDMENT 24 AND VALID DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS: Dan Wilson will present options for defining what constitutes a valid development application as referenced in the growth initiative, Amendment 24. [Attach W-2](#)

7:10 REVIEW WEDNESDAY COUNCIL AGENDA

7:20 ADJOURN TO FORMAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING IN CITY AUDITORIUM

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.

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

CITY COUNCIL		
Subject:	Discussion of policy issues as it relates to the 1998 Intergovernmental Agreement (“Persigo Agreement”).	
Meeting Date:	September 6, 2000	
Date Prepared:	August 28, 2000	
Author:	Greg Trainor	
Presenter Name:	Greg Trainor	
X	Workshop	Formal Agenda

Subject:

Discussion of policy issues as it relates to the 1998 Intergovernmental Agreement (“Persigo Agreement”) between the City of Grand Junction and Mesa County.

Summary:

Policy issues:

Community Development

Summary of development proposals reviewed under the terms of the Intergovernmental Agreement and outline of resulting policy and coordination issues that need discussion (See Attached Summary from Community Development Director)

Public Works and Utilities

1. Review of wastewater budget review calendar.
2. Discussion of procedures for amending the 201 Sewer Service Area Boundary; Example: 23 Road Park Plaza
3. Verbal update from Mesa County on unresolved amendments to the 201 Sewer Service Area Boundary: Valle Vista Area
4. Verbal report from City on status of sewer rate study Septic System
5. Elimination Program proposed policy regarding the subdivision of lands after creation of Local Sewer Improvement Districts; Re-apportionment of improvement district costs on such subdivided lands; Reimbursements to properties which were fully developed at the time assessments were made
6. Verbal report on status of joint infrastructure standards
7. MOU on joint City/County funding of long-term transportation capital development plans
8. Verbal report on status of Panorama Sewer District dissolution.

Background Information:

Policy Definition

The annual “policy “meeting of the City Council and Mesa County Board of County Commissioners will be held this year on September 19.

By definition in the 1998 Intergovernmental Agreement between the City and the County, “Policy” means:

1. Setting goals and objectives
2. Reviewing and adopting capital improvement plans and annual operating budgets
3. Reviewing and setting system rates and fees
4. Entering into bond issues...amending the Sewer Rules and Regulations
5. Adopting policies and philosophies which govern rate and capital reviews and studies

Agenda items and background:

Community Development

Summary of development proposals reviewed under the terms of the Intergovernmental Agreement and outline of resulting policy and coordination issues that need discussion (See Attached Summary from Community Development Director)

Public Works and Utilities

A. Review of wastewater budget review calendar.

Review budget review calendar and summary of items changed from approved 2000/2001 budget; policy discussion of issue of whether to fund backbone system improvements within special sanitation districts; an item addressed within the rate study.

B. Discussion of procedures for amending the 201 Sewer Service Area Boundary; Example: 23

Road Park Plaza

There will be ongoing requests by landowners for certain areas to be added or deleted from the 201-sewer service area boundary. Is it the will of the City Council and County Commission to consider these items on an annual basis, in public hearing, as was done last year on the first series of additions and deletions? Or is there only a need for this review at longer intervals?

C. Verbal updates from Mesa County on unresolved amendments to the 201 Sewer Service Area Boundary: Valle Vista Area

D. Verbal report from City on status of sewer rate study

Black and Veatch are doing the rate study. A draft of the study results is anticipated by September 27 with final recommendations by the middle of October. The scope of the study is to conduct a *review* of the existing 10-year financial plan for the sewer fund, suggest adaptations to the plan, rates and PIFs, if necessary, and recommend financial policies relative to sewer system expansion, such as to issues of funding backbone system work in the special districts (See Item A above)

E. Septic System Elimination Program proposed policy regarding the subdivision of lands after creation of Local Sewer Improvement Districts; Re-apportionment of

improvement district costs on such subdivided lands; Reimbursements to properties that were fully developed at the time assessments were made.

This item is on City Council's agenda for September 20 and is relative to the Marsh Lane sewer improvement district assessment hearing and to other future districts, either within or without the City limits

F. Verbal report on status of joint infrastructure standards

Paragraph 15 of the Intergovernmental Agreement outlines the need for development of jointly agreed upon infrastructure standards, which shall be followed throughout the 201. A verbal report will be provided.

G. MOU on joint City/County funding of long-term capital improvements

Paragraph 26 (e) of the Intergovernmental Agreement outlines the County agreement to fund capital improvements, which are identified within the County's adopted two-year budget. Discussion is suggested as to the implementation of a memorandum of understanding with the County to fund/jointly fund with the City long-term transportation capital improvements.

H. Verbal report on status of Panorama Sewer District dissolution.

RESOLUTION NO. -00

(REVISION NO. 1)

Recitals.

This community has addressed growth issues in the central Grand Valley with the adoption of the 1996 Growth Plan (City Council and Mesa County Planning Commission), and the 1998 Persigo Agreement (City and the Mesa County Commissioners). Other intergovernmental agreements, including the buffer agreements between the City, Mesa County, and the municipalities of Fruita and Palisade, serve to define the areas where urbanization should occur, and perhaps more importantly, where it should not occur.

The proposed amendment 24 to the Colorado Constitution, according to its initiators, is needed to address primarily issues arising out of the rapid growth in the Front Range areas. Given that this community has already decided to limit urban growth to the area to be served by the Persigo sewer system, and to promote growth which is consistent with the Growth Plan, the proposed amendment does not appear to assist in solving a problem which is damaging to the community.

Instead, if amendment 24 passes, it will primarily serve as an impediment to necessary additional development, at least as related to the Persigo Urban Growth boundary. The additional information which the amendment requires will serve to better educate the public, however, the price to obtain this information seems high, at least for this community.

The City Council concludes that as long as the existing regulations and requirements and adopted plans will continue to apply, development which would be consistent with such rules, requirements and plans should be accommodated without the delay and costs associated with voter approval for development.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION:

Option 1

1. Any application for development received by the Community Development Department by 5 p.m. on September 12, 2000 will be deemed to be a valid development application for the purposes of the proposed amendment 24, Initiative 256 if it is:
 - (a) a site plan, preliminary plan, final plan, or other phase of a planned development application, major, minor or other subdivision of land (including condominium), preliminary plat, final plat, or any other development review process;
 - (b) a change of a zone or zoning;
 - (c) a conditional use permit;
 - (d) any other review process or request for which a public hearing is required under the Zoning and Development Code which, if approved, would result in additional lots or parcels or in additional new structures or any additional or new development;

(e) a concept plan, as described herein.

Option 2

1. Any application received by the Community Development Department by 5 p.m. on September 12, 2000 will be deemed to be a valid development application for the purposes of the proposed amendment 24, Initiative 256, if it is consistent with the Growth Plan, the Persigo Agreement, and intergovernmental agreements dealing with buffer areas and if it is:
 - (a) a site plan, preliminary plan, final plan, or other phase of a planned development application, major, minor or other subdivision of land (including condominium), preliminary plat, final plat, or any other development review process;
 - (b) a change of a zone or zoning;
 - (c) a conditional use permit;
 - (d) any other review process or request for which a public hearing is required under the Zoning and Development Code which, if approved, would result in additional lots or parcels or in additional new structures or any additional or new development;
 - (e) a concept plan, as described herein.

Option 3

1. For the purpose of implementing Amendment 24, Initiative 256, the term "valid development application" means a written application properly filed with the Community Development Department at City Hall, in accordance with the terms and requirements of the Zoning and Development Code and this resolution, on or before 5:00 p.m., September 12th, 2000, seeking approval or permission to develop for any of the following:
 - (a) a site plan, preliminary plan, final plan, or other phase of a planned development application, major, minor or other subdivision of land (including condominium), preliminary plat, final plat;
 - (b) a change of a zone or zoning;
 - (c) a conditional use permit;
 - (d) any other review process or request for which a public hearing is required under the Zoning and Development Code which, if approved, would result in additional lots or parcels or in additional new structures or any additional or new development.

[A through J would be part of whichever Option is selected]

- A. Nothing in this resolution shall have the effect of reviving or recognizing plans, designs, applications or development plans that are not otherwise valid and enforceable under the Zoning and Development Code. Any such land use approval or request will be evaluated in accordance with existing provisions of the Zoning and Development Code.
- B. The term "valid development application" is more specific, and "later in the process" than, and thus does not include an, application or request in whatever form for text or map changes to any zone or growth plan or other master plan or neighborhood/area plan petitions. A petition to annex to the City is not a valid development application.

- C. This resolution does not create, nor attempt to create, any rights or privileges in addition to those, if any, created or regulated by the Zoning & Development Code.
- D. This resolution does not change any of the submittal, review, and other requirements, standards and rules which are in the Zoning & Development Code or are otherwise applicable to any land or proposal.
- E. A purported subdivision plat, townsite plat or any phase of any planned development that is not valid or recognized under the Zoning and Development Code is not revived or deemed to be valid by the adoption of this resolution.
- F. For any concept plan submitted to meet the definition of a valid development plan, a complete plan for the next review process shall be submitted on or before September 12, 2001.
- G. Any project or land for which the City has granted some development approval, under the Zoning and Development Code, and which is proceeding consistent with an approved development schedule is also deemed to be land for which a development application has been filed.
- H. It is accompanied by a review fee of \$150.
- I. A concept plan is a combination of text generally describing proposed uses, numbers of uses, density for residential uses, floor area ratios and gross square feet of all other uses (including industrial, retail, commercial, *etc*), the neighborhood/environs, and how the project will integrate/complement existing and future development and the neighborhood/area. A complete concept plan will also contain:
 - 1. A general description of the location/availability of required infrastructure such as sanitary sewer, water for domestic use and fire protection, streets or other public roads needed for access, drainage/storm drainage facilities, parks, *etc*. If the infrastructure is not available adjacent to the site, describe the approximate costs needed to make it available.
 - 2. A drawing or map showing the types and numbers and locations of the proposed uses, including residential units and/or gross square feet of all proposed structures and general layout/placement on the lands. Density of residential shall conform with the Growth Plan or current zoning. FAR of all other uses shall conform to the Growth Plan or current zoning;
 - 3. A legal description of the land and the gross acreage. Tax parcel numbers and addresses must be included. If the land is within or a part of a subdivision, list the subdivision name and the recordation information.
 - 4. A location map (8 ½ x 11) labeled or outlined to clearly identify the land. An assessors map may be used if it clearly shows the particular land and distinguishes the land from other parcels/lands. Identify all roads/streets adjacent and providing access.
 - 5. Orientation and north arrow.
- J. **NOTICE: The terms of this resolution are adopted in anticipation of, and to be consistent with, Initiative 256 to be voted on by Colorado's voters in November, 2000. No person is entitled to rely on the adoption hereof by the City. Any person who relies on this resolution, or who takes action or spends money must do so based on such person's own reading of Initiative 256.**

[End]

Passed and adopted this ____ day of September, 2000

Mayor of the City of Grand Junction

ATTEST:

City Clerk