

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
WORKSHOP/SPECIAL SESSION AGENDA**

**MONDAY, AUGUST 18, 2003, 7:00 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 250 N. 5TH STREET**

MAYOR'S INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

- 7:00 **COUNCILMEMBER REPORTS**
- 7:10 **REVIEW FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS** [Attach W-1](#)
- 7:15 **CITY MANAGER'S REPORT**
- 7:25 **REVIEW WEDNESDAY COUNCIL AGENDA**
- 7:30 **YOUTH COUNCIL:** The students who have been working on this Action Step of the Strategic Plan will update Council on their efforts.
- 7:50 **COLORADO HOUSING AND FINANCE AUTHORITY (CHFA):** Karen Harkin and Jaime Gomez will make a presentation regarding Private Activity Bond (PAB) transfers to CHFA. [Attach W-2](#)
- 8:15 **STRATEGIC PLAN REPORT:** The Neighborhood Programs Team will present recommendations to achieve the Strategic Plan Solution for Vital Neighborhoods. [Attach W-3](#)
- 8:50 **STRATEGIC PLAN REPORT:** The Code Enforcement Review Team will present findings of the review of enforcement methods as part of Strategic Plan Objective 9. [Attach W-4](#)
- 9:30 **CONVENE INTO SPECIAL SESSION
EXECUTIVE SESSION: FOR DISCUSSION OF PERSONNEL MATTERS
UNDER C.R.S. 24-6-402(4)(f)(I)**
- 9:35 **ADJOURN TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

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
Future Workshop Agenda

CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP AGENDAS

SEPTEMBER 1, MONDAY – LABOR DAY HOLIDAY

**** SEPTEMBER 15, MONDAY 11:30 AM (Mtg. at City shops/materials lab buildings)***

11:30 Options for undergrounding existing overhead utilities.

12:15 Facilities and construction in the rights-of-way ordinance.

SEPTEMBER 15, MONDAY 7:00PM

7:00 COUNCIL REPORTS, REVIEW WEDNESDAY AGENDA AND REVIEW
FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS

7:25 CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

7:30 STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE

7:45 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT – ROLE OF THE CITY

**** SEPTEMBER 29, MONDAY 11:30 AM (Pinon Grill Restaurant at Tiara Rado)***

11:30 City Council lunch meeting with Parks & Recreation Advisory Board

SEPTEMBER 29, MONDAY 5:30PM at Two Rivers Convention Center

5:30 DINNER

6:00 CIP BUDGET PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

OCTOBER 13, MONDAY 7:00PM

7:00 COUNCIL REPORTS, REVIEW WEDNESDAY AGENDA AND REVIEW
FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS

7:25 CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

7:30 PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION OF DDA BUDGET

8:30 STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE

**BIN LIST FROM CITY COUNCIL RETREAT (June 2003)
(and other reminders)**

1. Need to explain to residents how Council works, e.g. two readings of ordinances, public record issues, how issues are brought forward to Council, how zoning works in our community.
2. Re-visit “Friendly Native” type program
3. Discuss identifying specific uses for property tax, e.g. economic development or infrastructure.
4. City Council meeting with the Riverfront Commission (*Lunch meeting on 3 **November***)
5. City Council meeting with GJEP (*Fall lunch workshop?*)
6. Santa Clara traffic calming

Attach W-2
CHFA Presentation

Creating Homeownership Opportunities For You
Colorado Housing and Finance Authority

At the Colorado Housing and Finance Authority (CHFA), our goal is to help low- and middle-income Coloradoans become homeowners. We offer several important benefits.

- Below-market interest rates;
- Fixed-rate, 30-year mortgages;
- An optional second mortgage for up to 3% of the first mortgage amount at 0% interest, deferred until payoff or refinance;
- Free homebuyer education classes offered statewide;
- A network of qualified, experienced lending partners ready to help prospective homeowners.

The **MRB First Step** program offers a low, competitive interest rate for 30 years with an optional 0% interest rate second mortgage for down payment and closing costs. The MRB First Step program has income and purchase price limits, and is reserved for first-time homebuyers. The **optional second mortgage** is available for up to 3% of the first mortgage amount to help with down payment and closing costs associated with purchasing a home. No repayment of the second mortgage is necessary until the home is sold or the mortgage is refinanced. **Private Activity Bond transfers are used with this program.**

The **Taxable Home Opener** program also offers a below-market interest rate fixed for 30 years. Income limits are not as restrictive as those for the MRB First Step and there are no purchase price limits. This program is not restricted to first-time homebuyers. The optional 0% interest second mortgage for down payment and closing costs is available with the Taxable Home Opener program.

Homebuyer Education Classes, paid for by CHFA, are offered throughout the year by nonprofit organizations across Colorado. All first-time homebuyers are required to complete a Homebuyer Education Class to obtain a CHFA mortgage.

To get started on the road to homeownership, prospective borrowers contact a CHFA **participating lender** from our network of professionals across Colorado. Over 45,000 Colorado families have become homeowners with CHFA's help.



Colorado Housing and Finance Authority

1981 Blake Street – Denver, CO 80202

(303) 297-7376 / (800) 877-2432 x.376

CHFA Loans Purchased January 1, 2001 – August 8, 2003

Grand Junction

	<u>Setaside Funds</u>	<u>MRB First Step (Not in Setaside funds)</u>	Taxable Home Opener (Not in Setaside funds)
<u>Total Loans Purchased</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>385</u>	85
Total Volume	<u>\$2,149,984</u>	<u>\$35,605,632</u>	<u>\$9,482,366</u>
<u>Average Loan Amount</u>	<u>\$89,583</u>	\$92,482	\$111,557
<u>Race</u>			
<u>White</u>	<u>92%</u>	<u>89%</u>	<u>87%</u>
Hispanic	<u>8%</u>	10%	12%
Asian	<u>0%</u>	.25%	1%
Black	<u>0%</u>	.75%	0%
<u>Average Gross Annual Income</u>	<u>\$33,578</u>	\$33,970	\$44,542
<u>Household Size</u>			
One person	<u>50%</u>	38.4%	40%
Two people	<u>33%</u>	29.4%	35%
Three or more people	<u>17%</u>	32.2%	25%
<u>Average Size</u>	<u>2</u>	2	2
<u>Dwelling Type</u>			
Single Family Detached	<u>75%</u>	81%	91%
Condominium	<u>4%</u>	5.5%	2%
<u>Townhouse</u>	<u>8%</u>	7.5%	3.5%
<u>Manufactured</u>	<u>13%</u>	4.7%	3.5%
Modular	<u>0%</u>	1.3%	0%

Attach W-3
Neighborhood Programs Report
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA						
Subject		Proposed Neighborhood Programs				
Meeting Date		August 18, 2003				
Date Prepared		August 13, 2003			File #	
Author		Kathy Portner		Planning Manager		
Presenter Name		Kathy Portner		Planning Manager		
Report results back to Council		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	When
Citizen Presentation		<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	Name
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Workshop	<input type="checkbox"/>	Formal Agenda		<input type="checkbox"/>	Consent
						Individual Consideration

Summary: The Neighborhood Programs Committee will present recommendations to achieve the Strategic Plan Solution for Vital Neighborhoods.

Budget: Proposed: In 2003, \$84,000 from current CDBG budget to be matched with \$84,000 from General Fund; In 2004, \$200,000 from CDBG allocation to be matched with \$200,000 from City property tax revenues.

Action Requested/Recommendation: City Council direction on the committee recommendations.

Background Information: See attached Staff Report/Background Information

Attachments:

1. Neighborhood Program Report
2. Meeting Summaries
3. Survey Results

Strategic Plan Solution: Vital Neighborhoods

Goal: Create program(s) to strengthen neighborhoods/provide framework to work with the City on issues...(3-5 yrs)

Objective 36: Reserve funds in 2003 budget to develop guidelines for neighborhood program, identify potential funding sources and staff requirements. (2 years)

Action 36.A: Select a work team that will review and provide a report on different models for neighborhood organizations and programs.

Action 36.B: City Council will discuss and establish criteria or guidelines for using CDBG funds.

Action 36.C: Work team will review and decide preferred model for a neighborhood program.

Action 36.D: City Council makes a decision on model.

Work Team and Process

Work team members are as follows:

City Council—Jim Spehar, Harry Butler, Bill McCurry
Community Development—Kathy Portner, Bob Blanchard, Dave Thornton, Ivy Williams, Kristen Ashbeck
Public Works and Utilities—Tim Moore
Parks and Recreation—Mari Steinbach
Police—Amy Clymer

The committee met on the following dates:

- February 26, 2003
- March 13, 2003
- April 10, 2003
- May 8, 2003
- June 2, 2003

Summaries of those meetings are included with this report.

The committees work culminated with a series of four neighborhood events as follows:

- June 9th—Riverside/El Poso at Riverside Park
- June 11th—Orchard Mesa West at Duck Pond Park
- June 23rd—Sherwood at Sherwood Park
- June 25th—Redlands at Broadway School

Surveys were administered at all of the neighborhood events. The results of those surveys are attached.

Neighborhood Program Summary

Cities have developed neighborhood programs as a way to “empower” local residents to have a greater role in the delivery of city services. The main goal of most neighborhood programs is to make it easier for residents to communicate with city government about what is important to them and what services and projects they want in their neighborhoods. The philosophy behind these programs stems from three main beliefs: people relate to their own neighborhood first and then relate to the city as a whole; people feel frustrated and powerless in their attempts to communicate with government; and local residents know best what services they need and what visions they have for their neighborhood and city.

Neighborhood programs can be used to let residents differentiate their neighborhoods and use city services in a way that is most beneficial to them. These programs are structured so that residents are more involved in solving neighborhood problems.

Most neighborhood programs take a “bottom-up” approach to communication. The best ones make it easy and convenient for citizens to communicate with the city. Many are centered on neighborhood organizations and/or homeowner associations. The development of such a program may encourage more neighborhoods to organize themselves. The residents themselves decide what is important to them, what changes they want to see in their own neighborhoods and how the city can help them.

The cities that have been most successful with neighborhood programs are those that look at them as not just another new “program”, but as a whole new philosophy. These cities have embraced the idea of a community-oriented government approach or mindset. With this philosophy, citizens are encouraged to define and differentiate their own neighborhoods and let the city know what services they want. Citizens are encouraged to get involved with their government starting at the neighborhood level, by forming neighborhood associations. These groups of citizens then define for themselves what they need from their city government.

Neighborhood Program Alternatives

Creating Neighborhood Boundaries: Generally, neighborhoods should identify their own boundaries, or at least agree with the boundaries the City might create. Each neighborhood has its own identity and boundaries. Sometimes these boundaries form around neighborhood schools or parks; sometimes they are formed by natural or physical features; or, sometimes they are simply subdivisions. However, many cities with neighborhood programs still organize the city into some larger boundaries that might include a number of neighborhood organizations. We would recommend that we do create those larger boundaries for organizational purposes and to better delineate which neighborhoods would be eligible for CDBG funds. Those larger areas could be

Council Districts, school attendance areas, census tracts, area plan boundaries or other geographic boundaries, such as Redlands, Orchard Mesa, City Core, etc. Staffing could also be based on those larger areas, i.e. one City staff person assigned as the primary liaison to each area. Within those larger areas, neighborhoods could organize their smaller associations.

Outreach: A major first step in the creation of neighborhood programs will be the outreach to the community to let them know what's available. We found, with our pilot neighborhood events, that many people just appreciated the opportunity to meet with City staff and Council. Annual events in the neighborhood areas should be an integral part of the program.

Staffing: A neighborhood program can be labor intensive and will take some time to build. There should be one staff member assigned to coordinate the efforts and involvement of all the city departments.

The committee recommends a job description and audit be completed for a Neighborhood Program Coordinator.

Budget: In addition to the staffing, many cities budget a certain amount of money each year for neighborhood projects and the neighborhoods apply for the funds and may compete with each other for limited resources. Some cities require a certain amount of matching funds or some type of in-kind service and donation from the residents. Also, some cities only award grants if a neighborhood has an active association and an accepted neighborhood plan. Funding might also be in the form of neighborhood input on the prioritization of the City's budget. The other source of funding for some neighborhoods is CDBG. The City is committed to allocating some percentage of our annual CDBG funds to neighborhoods.

The committee recommends the following for the remainder of 2003 and 2004:

- **\$84,000 from current CDBG budget for Riverside/EI Poso and Orchard Mesa**
- **\$84,000 match from general fund for Sherwood and Redlands**
- **Allocate ½ the 2004 CDBG funding for neighborhoods, approximately \$200,000**
- **Use City property tax revenues to match the CDBG allocation (\$200,000)**

Existing City Programs that Could be Wrapped into a Neighborhood Program:

- Community Policing
- Neighborhood Watch
- Traffic Calming
- Land Use Notification
- Spring Clean-up
- Street Trees Program

- CDBG
- Historic Preservation
- Graffiti removal
- Leaf pick-up

Additional Programs:

- City Budget Review
- Citizen's College
- Neighborhood Clean-up
- Entry signage/landscaping
- Parks—upgrade or new
- Infrastructure upgrades—drainage, streets, sidewalks, street lights
- Traffic safety
- Solid waste hauling/household hazardous waste pick up
- Events/block parties/recreation events
- Newsletters
- Information and referral
- Perimeter fencing/landscaping upgrades
- Youth programs—summer, after school

Pilot Programs

The committee recommends that the City start creating the Neighborhood Program with the four pilot neighborhoods: Riverside/El Poso, Orchard Mesa West, Sherwood Park and Redlands/Broadway.

Riverside/El Poso: We had 18 surveys completed for this neighborhood with the following results:

- The lowest ranked items (received less than a 3) were street lighting, level of traffic in the neighborhood, motor vehicle speed through the neighborhood, and on-street parking in the neighborhood.
- Several people commented that the El Poso and Riverside Neighborhoods should be separate.
- There is interest in being a part of a neighborhood association.
- Several properties were identified as needing City attention.
- There's a strong tie to the history of the neighborhood.

The committee recommends the following:

- **Police patrols be increased in the neighborhood in 2003 and 2004 to address the traffic and other safety issues raised by the neighborhood.**
- **City staff assist in forming a neighborhood association.**

- **Work with Riverside Task Force to submit a request for a State Historic Grant for fixing the roof on Riverside School. Use CDBG funds as the local match.**
- **Work with neighborhood group on other exterior upgrades to the school site, i.e. landscaping, community garden...**
- **Coordinate with the efforts on the improvement district for the El Poso neighborhood. Offer incentives for detached walks with landscaped parkway strip using City Street Trees**
- **Assess interest in creating a community garden on a portion of the Buck Oda property.**
- **Provide assistance to the El Poso neighborhood for clean-up of the visible entry from Highway 340 overpass, i.e. identification sign, landscaping...**
- **Coordinate with Housing Resources for assistance in Riverside and El Poso for housing upgrades.**

Orchard Mesa West: We had 13 surveys completed for this neighborhood with the following results:

- The lowest ranked items (received less than a 3) were level of traffic, motor vehicle speed through the neighborhood, and level of noise in the neighborhood.
- There is an interest in being a part of a neighborhood association.
- Several properties were identified as needing City attention.

The committee recommends the following:

- **Police patrols be increased in the neighborhood in 2003 and 2004 to address the traffic and other safety issues raised by the neighborhood.**
- **Pro-active Code Enforcement to address general issues brought up by residents.**
- **Coordinate with Housing Resources for assistance with housing upgrades.**
- **Target some of the infill/redevelopment effort for the Highway 50 corridor.**
- **Assess the need for sidewalk, especially along Santa Clara, and assist with forming an improvement district.**

Sherwood Park: We had 18 surveys completed for this neighborhood with the following results:

- The lowest ranked items (received less than a 4) were level of traffic in the neighborhood, motor vehicle speed through the neighborhood, on-street parking in the neighborhood, and level of police patrol in the neighborhood.
- There was general agreement with the neighborhood boundaries.
- There is interest in being a part of a neighborhood association.
- Like the convenient location of everything.

The committee recommends the following:

- **City staff assist in forming a neighborhood association.**

- **Promote neighborhood identity and pride with neighborhood entry sign(s).**

Redlands/Broadway: We had 10 surveys completed for this neighborhood with the following results:

- The lowest ranked items (receiving less than a 4) were motor vehicle speed through the neighborhood, on-street parking in the neighborhood, and level of police patrol in the neighborhood.
- The absence of a park was noticeable.
- General interest in being a member of a neighborhood association.
- Concern with the abandoned sewage treatment plant in the Bluffs

The committee recommends the following:

- **Coordinate with efforts to improve Wingate Park.**
- **Explore options for reclaiming the Bluffs' abandoned sewer plant.**

Riverside / El Poso Neighborhoods

Survey Results

- 2 General opinion of neighborhood
- 3 Condition of sidewalks
- 4 Street pavement
- 5 Maintenance of neighborhood houses
- 6 Street lighting
- 7 Level of traffic in the neighborhood
- 8 Motor vehicle speed through the neighborhood
- 9 On-street parking in the neighborhood
- 10 Neighborhood cleanliness
- 11 Level of noise in the neighborhood
- 12 If you have a neighborhood park, the adequacy of equipment
- 13 If you have a neighborhood park, the maintenance of equipment
- 14 If you have a neighborhood park, the safety of equipment
- 15 Your level of personal safety in the neighborhood
- 16 The level of police patrol in the neighborhood
- 17 The level of landscaping on public land in the neighborhood

	Dissatisfied					Satisfied						
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Avg	N/O
1	1	1	5	5	6	3	7	8	8	9	3.78	0
2	3	2	2	4	5	2	3	4	4	5	3.38	2
3	2	0	2	6	5	2	3	4	6	5	3.80	3
4	1	4	6	6	6	1	3	4	6	1	3.11	0
5	6	2	5	5	0	2	5	5	5	0	2.50	0
6	3	5	5	5	0	3	5	5	5	0	2.67	0
7	8	3	3	4	0	2	4	4	4	0	2.17	0
8	4	2	6	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	2.88	1
9	0	2	5	8	3	0	8	8	8	3	3.67	0
10	1	2	7	5	2	1	5	5	5	2	3.29	1
11	0	1	5	4	6	0	4	4	7	5	4.06	2
12	0	0	4	6	6	0	6	6	7	5	4.06	2
13	0	0	3	3	6	0	6	6	6	6	4.20	3
14	0	4	3	3	3	0	3	3	3	6	3.69	2
15	1	5	5	5	1	1	5	5	5	1	3.00	1
16	1	1	7	4	2	1	4	4	4	2	3.33	3
17	1	1	7	4	2	1	4	4	4	2	3.33	3
Average =	1.94	2.13	4.56	4.94	3.19	3.35	1.25					

18 Do you agree with the boundaries drawn for this larger neighborhood?

- If not, how would you define it?
- > Have Riverside & El Poso as separate neighborhoods x 3
- > Would take SE side all the way to Williams House, Confluence RR crossing
- > The original Crawford Edition should remain as a neighborhood unto itself, and zoned historic.

Yes	No	No answer
7	10	1
> No, but no reason given x 4		
> Natural fit		

19 Would you be interested in being a member of a neighborhood association?

See end of survey for names & addresses

Yes	No	Maybe	No answer
9	6	2	1

20 Are there structures, vacant lots, or other areas on your block or in the neighborhood that need City attention?

- If yes, please specify address.
- > 635 W. Ute
- > All of Lawrence Ave
- > Fourth Ave & Riverside Dr: Tires & weeds
- > Old school / Community Center x 5
- > Lot with steps and no house on W. Colorado
- > General comment: Volunteer assistance
- > Tunnel

Yes	No	No answer
13	3	2

21 What attracted you to this neighborhood?

- | | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| People - 7 | Type of housing - 3 | Convenience to retail - 2 | Other - 10 |
| Schools - 3 | Convenience to work - 2 | Parks - 4 | |
| > Family | > The River, price of property | > Quiet, not many people (1981) | > Rent is reasonable |
| > Owned property | > Been here since 1954 | > Live with Mother-in-law | |
| > Born here | > Born & raised in Riverside | > Lived here all my life, it's a pretty close neighborhood, not too many problems | |

22 What do you like most about the neighborhood?

- | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| > Park x 2 | > Warmer in the summer | > Family oriented community | > Close to town |
| > People x 3 | > Know everyone x 2 | > Store on Rockaway - convenient x 2 | > Recent clean-up |
| > River x 2 | > Sense of community | > Everyone looks out for other (kids) | > Good neighbors |
| > Quiet | > First Community | > Convenience to city (heart of city) | > Been here since the '50's |
| > Pleasant | > Value of property | > The people there very friendly & helpful | > Less traffic than downtown |
| > Low crime | > Living Environment | > People are willing to work together & improve | |
| > Friendly x 3 | > By River - fishing | > Close & long standing relationships with neighbors | |
| > Close to everything - shopping, schools, medical, etc. | | > Location - can walk to downtown, Albertson's, new shopping opportunities | |
| > Existing structures, you get what you see, no surprises | | | |

23 What do you like least about the neighborhood?

- | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| > The traffic x 5 | > Need a GVT stop | > Bums that sleep in the park | > Need signage - "Children at Play" - Lots of kids |
| > Violence | > Not enough lighting | > Lack of a convenience store | > Enforcement of noise ordinance is very poor |
| > Drug dealers | > Access to Hwy 340 | > Need more Code Enforcement | > Issues with a specific house on W. Colorado |
| > Dirty yards | > Some of the graffiti | > Disagreement with neighbor x 2 | > Short cut from Redlands to Orchard Mesa |
| > Speeders x 4 | > Less desirable people | > Don't get much attention | > Road is too close to park |
| > Noise | > No police patrol | > Still a few seedy houses - people simply don't know better | |

24 What makes the neighborhood unique?

- | | | | |
|-------------|-----------------------|---|------------------------------|
| > Park | > Everyone gets along | > After being here all my life, hard to compare | > Everyone knows each other |
| > Houses | > The people x 2 | > Neighborhood bond, feel good about neighbors | > Hispanics/Whites get along |
| > River x 3 | > History x 5 | > Katey Linn - someone who's always willing to help | |

25 How long have you lived in the neighborhood?

< 1 Yr	1-2 Yrs	3-5 Yrs	6-10 Yrs	> 10 Yrs	No Answer
2	1	2	1	11	1

26 Do you rent or own your home?

Rent	Own	No Answer
4	13	1

27 Do you have any other comments?

- > No parks in El Poso
- > "Hobo" Island could be turned into a park
- > To much traffic in the neighborhood
- > Alleys need improvements
- > I.D. problem makers in the neighborhood
- > Trim trees along river near Fairview
- > Need lighting by the tunnel
- > Some streets need repair in Riverside
- > Sidewalks on Fairview in bad condition
- > Need more street lighting x 2
- > School bus stops not marked on Chuluota
- > Park needs more equipment for the kids
- > Park needs more lighting x 2
- > Need to fence the park from the busy street
- > Park is too close to road in Riverside
- > Need traffic calming in Riverside
- > Some new sidewalks in Riverside - good!!!
- > Adult gangs in the neighborhood
- > No sidewalks and missing pavement in El Poso
- > Sidewalks need handicap ramps
- > Would like electric outlets at the park shelter in Riverside
- > Police patrol in Riverside has not happened in the past, it is improving
- > Riverside Parkway - take it all the way out to 24 Road, do not do anything @ 25 Road!!!!
- > The sprinklers in Riverside Park need to be checked to see what/where they are watering
- > On street parking a problem when special events are held

Names, Addresses, and/or given:

J.D. Cunningham	255-0612
Sally Price	525 W. Ute Ave 81505
Nancy Renteriu	510 Rockaway Ave
Yara Chavira	433 Rockaway
Linda Cruz	525 W Ute

Orchard Mesa Duck Pond Park Neighborhood

Survey Results

	1	2	3	4	5	Avg	N/O
2 General opinion of neighborhood	0	0	6	6	1	3.62	0
3 Condition of sidewalks	6	1	1	1	1	2.00	3
4 Street pavement	1	0	2	6	4	3.92	0
5 Maintenance of neighborhood houses	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	0
6 Street lighting	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	0
7 Level of traffic in the neighborhood	6	1	0	4	2	2.62	0
8 Motor vehicle speed through the neighborhood	9	3	0	0	0	1.25	1
9 On-street parking in the neighborhood	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	2
10 Neighborhood cleanliness	0	1	3	5	3	3.54	0
11 Level of noise in the neighborhood	2	4	2	5	0	2.77	0
12 If you have a neighborhood park; the adequacy of equipment	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	1
13 If you have a neighborhood park; the maintenance of equipment	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	2
14 If you have a neighborhood park; the safety of equipment	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	3
15 Your level of personal safety in the neighborhood	0	3	1	6	3	3.69	0
16 The level of police patrol in the neighborhood	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	2
17 The level of landscaping on public land in the neighborhood	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	0
Average =	1.75	1.19	2.19	3.75	3.19	3.44	0.88

Dissatisfied

Satisfied

18 Do you agree with the boundaries drawn for this larger neighborhood?

- > Further east to 29 Rd. > From River confluence to 30 or 32 Rd. > Unaweep divides the neighborhood

Yes	No
9	4

19 Would you be interested in being a member of a neighborhood association?

See end of survey results for addresses

Yes	No
10	3

20 Are there structures, vacant lots, or other areas on your block or in the neighborhood that need City attention?

- > Rentals in residential area x 2 > Trees need to be trimmed - Santa Clara & Roubideu stop sign > Lot on Aspen, 1st in from Hwy 50 motel
- > Steps to pavillion at park > Palmer between Unaweep & Santa Clara is junky > Several rental properties (600 Blk of Laveta)
- > 810 Santa Clara > Tree trimming Hwy 50 btwn Unaweep & Santa Clara > N side of Santa Clara just E of 5th St, junk in front
- > Science park has many homeless > Santa Clara - weeds, vacant lots above Dist 51 Sci. Park > 1650 Laveta - dump truck, bunch of cars parked
- > Junk pile at 560 Grand Mesa Ave > Old motel on Hwy 50 btwn Aspen & James St on N side
- > Vacant lot at Palisde St & Hwy 50 > House on the NE corner of Santa Clara & Grand Mesa Ave

Yes	No	No answer
13	5	1

21 What attracted you to this neighborhood?

- | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------------|---|-------------------|
| People - 2 | Type of housing - 5 | Convenience to retail - 1 | Other - 8 |
| Schools - 2 | Convenience to work - 3 | Parks - 0 | |
| > View | > Been here since 1958 | > Outside city boundaries - Lower taxes | > Rental property |
| > Just like it | > Townhouse | > Needed services they have to offer | |

22 What do you like most about the neighborhood?

- | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|---|--|
| > Good neighbors x 4 | > River | > Water - view of the river | > Is moving, selling |
| > Park (Duck Pond) | > View x 3 | > Quiet & low traffic volumn | > Convenient location x 4 |
| > People are friendly x 5 | > Location x 2 | > Established neighborhood | > No covenants |
| > Feels settled, content | > Blue collar needs | > Beauty of trees/scenery | > Neighbors watching out for one another |
| > Like Grand Junction | > Mix of people | > Close proximity to - Rivertrail, Spanish trail (recreation) | |

23 What do you like least about the neighborhood?

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| > Drug problems | > Graffiti | > 25 mph speed limit sign too close to Hwy 50 on Santa Clara |
| > 810 Santa Clara Ave | > Traffic x 2 | > Weeds/no landscape on B 1/2 Rd overpass at Hwy 50 |
| > City trying to take it over | > Burglaries | > Some feeling of alienation from city planning process (eg - lots of building going on w/ no green space preservation) |
| > Hwy 50 traffic speed | > Lots of rentals that aren't cared for x 2 | > Low income housing don't care about care of lawn |
| > Rentals are poor in area | > Incorrect red-headed step-child image | > Want to close B ¾ Rd Nof their bldg (Linden project) |
| > Lack of recreational facilities | > Limited retail/restaurants in O.M. | > Very hard to access Hwy businesses from Hwy |
| > Traffic - need 29 Rd corridor | > Density - not enough open space | > Congestion of 5th St river bridge |
| > Dirt along side of Santa Clara | > Intersection of Santa Clara & Hwy 50 | |

24 What makes the neighborhood unique?

- | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|--|
| > Location x 2 | > Businesses located here | > History of the area | > The people |
| > Mix of housing | > Diversity of people x 4 | > River is a neighbor | > Close to town but still has good views |
| > Views | > Est neighborhoods | > Old houses x 2 | > More homes becoming home occupied |
| > Happy City Council wants to hear comments | | > The area is separated by the rivers which makes it very close-knit. | |
| > For the residents, knowing your neighbors | | > Separated from rest of area socially & economically | |

25 How long have you lived in the neighborhood?

< 1 Yr 1-2 Yrs 3-5 Yrs 6-10 Yrs > 10 Yrs
1 0 3 3 6

26 Do you rent or own your home?	Rent	Own	No Answer
	1	11	1

27 Do you have any other comments?

- > Litter
- > Dog care by pet owners
- > We need the bridge!
- > Entryway to the City
- > Do not want B 3/4 Rd closed @ Hwy 50 & Linden, slow traffic on Hwy 50, light at Linden & Hwy 50 x 2
- > Do not like City landscaping requirements for new businesses moving into existing buildings
- > New Emerson - no designation for school zone - make it the same as OMMMS. DANGEROUS x 3
- > Why did City tear down the Stream Plant?
- > Linden & Hwy 50 intesection is dangerous
- > Still worried about not catching animal poisoning
- > High density/low income developments will have negative impact on neighborhood
- > Would like us to get back to the neighborhood
- > Suggest direct path down to pedestrian bridge
- > Continue steps & sidewalk to picnic shelter

Names, Addresses, and/or given:

Marcy Espergren 757 1/2 Hwy 50 245-3203
 Keely Sutherland 555 Santa Clara Dr 256-9891
 Terrill's 705 Grand Mesa Ave
 Susan McGlothlin 625 Grand Mesa Ave 241-4026
 Linda Kazmierczak 1680 Laveta Ave 242-6246
 Wizz @ C & D Shipping 2678 Hwy 50

Orchard Mesa Duck Pond Park Neighborhood

Survey Results Outside defined neighborhood

	Dissatisfied					Satisfied					Avg	N/O
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
2 General opinion of neighborhood	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	3.20	1
3 Condition of sidewalks	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	3.00	3
4 Street pavement	2	1	0	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	0
5 Maintenance of neighborhood houses	2	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	2.17	0
6 Street lighting	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	4.20	1
7 Level of traffic in the neighborhood	2	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	1
8 Motor vehicle speed through the neighborhood	2	0	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.40	1
9 On-street parking in the neighborhood	0	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	4.50	0
10 Neighborhood cleanliness	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	0
11 Level of noise in the neighborhood	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	4.17	0
12 If you have a neighborhood park, the adequacy of equipment	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	2	2	0	3.67	3
13 If you have a neighborhood park, the maintenance of equipment	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	4.00	4
14 If you have a neighborhood park, the safety of equipment	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	4.00	4
15 Your level of personal safety in the neighborhood	1	0	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	3	3.83	0
16 The level of police patrol in the neighborhood	1	0	3	0	2	1	1	0	0	2	3.33	0
17 The level of landscaping on public land in the neighborhood	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	2
Average =	0.94	0.38	0.81	1.00	1.56	0.94	0.38	0.81	1.00	1.56	3.43	1.25

18 Do you agree with the boundaries drawn for this larger neighborhood?

- > On 28 1/2 Rd - Morning Glory
- > Need another neighborhood defined to the east
- > Some County Talbot across from Fire Dept.
- > Look at area S of Hwy 50 to include in this neighborhood?

Yes 5 No 1

19 Would you be interested in being a member of a neighborhood association?

See end of survey results for addresses

Yes 3 No 1 No answer 2

20 Are there structures, vacant lots, or other areas on your block or in the neighborhood that need City attention?

- > Old cars & other debris on streets an yards
- > Vacant lot on E. Parkview, ? Utility Easement?, Doesn't look good, cut thru traffic over vacant lot
- > Hill & Holmes vacant lot on Hwy 50

Yes 3 No 2 No answer 1

21 What attracted you to this neighborhood?

- People - 6
- Schools - 8
- Fence for dog
- Location x 2
- Type of housing - 9
- Convenience to work - 3
- Cheap rent
- 3rd house on the block in 1951
- Convenience to retail - 4
- Parks - 8
- Central location, clean, safe, quiet, affordable
- Neighborhood has changed somewhat - still good
- Other - 7
- No Answer - 1

22 What do you like most about the neighborhood?

- > Everything is convenient
- > Accessibility to everything
- > Size of residential lots
- > Established neighborhood
- > Car knows the way home
- > Great location x 3
- > Friendly
- > Neighborhood
- > Relaxing
- > Looks good
- > Openness
- > Neighbors x 2
- > Park x 4
- > No problems
- > General feel
- > Clean
- > Close to shopping
- > All ages live here
- > The people are community minded
- > No one can build across the street
- > Like everything - sunrise & sunsets
- > Convenient to most things x 4
- > Close to all three schools x 3
- > Close to hospital/doctors x 3
- > Best park in town
- > Kids are respectful
- > Upkeep
- > Safe x 2
- > People x 2

23 What do you like least about the neighborhood?

- > Speeding
- > Noise at night
- > Parking on street
- > Increase in noise
- > More/improved neighborhood watch programs
- > GVT changed route - go back to 1st St
- > Lack of streetlights on Texas and street due north of Mesa
- > 2 neighbors - messy, loud car, lack of landscaping (rental)
- > Manhole covers - they are rough & there are too many of them all over town
- > Phone tree, more information about what's going on related to crime. More active program.
- > Influence of High School - traffic
- > Speeding drivers around park
- > More traffic

24 What makes the neighborhood unique?

- > Community feeling
- > Small street, close neighbors
- > Good neighbors
- > The park x 3
- > Use of the park
- > Nice parks, no burns
- > A great place to live
- > People are friendly & we know them
- > Whole world goes by in the day, use of park
- > Location, people, the way it looks
- > Older neighborhood w/ community feel
- > Everything you need within walking & biking distance x 2
- > Predominance of senior citizens x 2

25 How long have you lived in the neighborhood?

< 1 Yr	1-2 Yrs	3-5 Yrs	6-10 Yrs	> 10 Yrs	No Answer
1	4	4	2	6	1

26 Do you rent or own your home?

Rent	Own	No Answer
2	15	1

Sherwood Park Neighborhood

Survey Results

	1	2	3	4	5	Avg	N/O
2 General opinion of neighborhood	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	0
3 Condition of sidewalks	0	0	0	9	6	4.71	3
4 Street pavement	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	0
5 Maintenance of neighborhood houses	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	0
6 Street lighting	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	0
7 Level of traffic in the neighborhood	5	1	4	2	5	3.06	0
8 Motor vehicle speed through the neighborhood	4	5	4	4	0	2.47	0
9 On-street parking in the neighborhood	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1
10 Neighborhood cleanliness	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	0
11 Level of noise in the neighborhood	1	0	3	6	8	4.35	0
12 If you have a neighborhood park, the adequacy of equipment	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	0
13 If you have a neighborhood park, the maintenance of equipment	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	0
14 If you have a neighborhood park, the safety of equipment	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	3
15 Your level of personal safety in the neighborhood	1	1	0	4	11	4.35	0
16 The level of police patrol in the neighborhood	0	2	6	5	3	3.56	1
17 The level of landscaping on public land in the neighborhood	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	0
Average =	0.75	0.75	1.94	4.50	8.69	4.22	0.50

Dissatisfied

Satisfied

18 Do you agree with the boundaries drawn for this larger neighborhood?

- > Would draw it larger to include W of 1st St.
- > 1st to 5th & North to Orchard
- > Smaller - 1st to 5th

Yes	No	No answer
13	3	2

19 Would you be interested in being a member of a neighborhood association?

See end of survey results for addresses given

Yes	No	No answer
12	4	2

20 Are there structures, vacant lots, or other areas on your block or in the neighborhood that need City attention?

- > Playground equipment that has been vandalized
- > Side yards along 1st St from Elm to Orchard - too weedy
- > North end of park - doesn't mow grass

- > Mary Jo Calvin - 1709 N 3rd St
- > 5th & Orchard - heading north, can't see past big pine tree
- > Carport full of furniture, Last name George, E Sherwood 2 houses north

Yes	No
5	13

21 What attracted you to this neighborhood?

- People - 6 Type of housing - 9 Convenience to retail - 4 Other - 7
- Schools - 8 Convenience to work - 3 Parks - 8 No Answer - 1
- > Fence for dog > Cheap rent > Central location, clean, safe, quiet, affordable
- > Location x 2 > 3rd house on the block in 1951 > Neighborhood has changed somewhat - still good

22 What do you like most about the neighborhood?

- > Everything is convenient > Friendly > Park x 4 > The people are community minded > Best park in town
- > Accessibility to everything > Neighborhood > No problems > No one can build across the street > Kids are respectful
- > Size of residential lots > Relaxing > General feel > Like everything - sunrise & sunsets > Upkeep
- > Established neighborhood > Looks good > Clean > Convenient to most things x 4 > Safe x 2
- > Car knows the way home > Openness > Close to shopping > Close to all three schools x 3 > People x 2
- > Great location x 3 > Neighbors x 2 > All ages live here > Close to hospital/doctors x 3

23 What do you like least about the neighborhood?

- > Speeding > GVT changed route - go back to 1st St > Influence of High School - traffic
- > Noise at night > Lack of streetlights on Texas and street due north of Mesa > Speeding drivers around park
- > Parking on street > 2 neighbors - messy, loud car, lack of landscaping (rental) > More traffic
- > Increase in noise > Manhole covers - they are rough & there are too many of them all over town
- > More/improved neighborhood watch programs - Phone tree, more information about what's going on related to crime. More active program.

24 What makes the neighborhood unique?

- > Community feeling > Nice parks, no burns > Location, people, the way it looks
- > Small street, close neighbors > A great place to live > Older neighborhood w/ community feel
- > Good neighbors > People are friendly & we know them > Everything you need within walking & biking distance x 2
- > The park x 3 > Whole world goes by in the day, use of park > Predominance of senior citizens x 2
- > Use of the park

25 How long have you lived in the neighborhood?

< 1 Yr	1-2 Yrs	3-5 Yrs	6-10 Yrs	> 10 Yrs	No Answer
1	4	4	2	6	1

26 Do you rent or own your home?

Rent	Own	No Answer
2	15	1

27 Do you have any other comments?

- > Speed on 1st St
- > Boom boxes and motorcycle noise issue
- > Need more police activity
- > Use bike cops
- > Need street lights on Texas Ave
- > On street parking - open doors
- > Speed bumps
- > Vandalism occuring to private homes
- > Speeders - regulars who do it over & over
- > Happy to be here
- > Swings need to be replace with new
- > Existing senior center at 6th & Ouray not adequate
- > Pleased with City services
- > More police at park special events
- > Park needs more monitoring since it is used so much
- > Graffiti at park needs attention - not just @ playground
- > Merge lane on 1st near Hall Ave may need to be changed to 2 straight thru lanes
- > Use Sherwood Park as a model - has all the conveniences
- > Pavement section at driveway - scrape bottom of car @ 100 Mesa Ave
- > Location of the restrooms - not convenient
- > Emergency service traffic @ 1st & Elm - Public not giving them the r-o-w

Names, Addresses, and/or given:

Joe & Del Charlesworth	101 Elm Ave	242-6176
Louanne McMartin	250 Hall Ave	lammac77@msn.com
Irwin Nutting	1539 W Sherwood Ave	
Dawn Fossett	1619 W Sherwood Ave	245-8105
Debra Dobbins	131 Texas Ave	248-9632

Sherwood Park Neighborhood

Outside defined neighborhood - Spring Valley

Survey Results

	1	2	3	4	5	Avg	N/O	
	Dissatisfied				Satisfied			
2 General opinion of neighborhood	1			1		4.00	1	
3 Condition of sidewalks				1		4.00		
4 Street pavement		1				2.00		
5 Maintenance of neighborhood houses					1	5.00		
6 Street lighting					1	5.00		
7 Level of traffic in the neighborhood	1					1.00	1	
8 Motor vehicle speed through the neighborhood	1					1.00	1	
9 On-street parking in the neighborhood				1		4.00		
10 Neighborhood cleanliness				1		4.00		
11 Level of noise in the neighborhood	1					1.00	1	
12 If you have a neighborhood park, the adequacy of equipment						0.00	1	
13 If you have a neighborhood park, the maintenance of equipment						0.00	1	
14 If you have a neighborhood park, the safety of equipment						0.00	1	
15 Your level of personal safety in the neighborhood				1		4.00		
16 The level of police patrol in the neighborhood						0.00	1	
17 The level of landscaping on public land in the neighborhood						0.00	1	
18 Do you agree with the boundaries drawn for this larger neighborhood?						2.19		
19 Would you be interested in being a member of a neighborhood association?						No Answer - 1		
20 Are there structures, vacant lots, or other areas on your block or in the neighborhood that need City attention?						No		
21 What attracted you to this neighborhood?						No Answer - 1		
22 What do you like most about the neighborhood?						No Answer - 1		
23 What do you like least about the neighborhood?						No Answer - 1		
24 What makes the neighborhood unique?						No Answer - 1		
25 How long have you lived in the neighborhood?						No Answer - 1		
26 Do you rent or own your home?						No Answer - 1		
27 Do you have any other comments?						> Too much growth, too much traffic. Housing is too expensive, wages too low		

Names, Addresses, and/or given: No Answer - 1

Redlands Neighborhood

Survey Results

	Dissatisfied					Satisfied					Avg	N/O
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
2 General opinion of neighborhood	0	0	1	2	7	0	0	0	0	7	4.60	0
3 Condition of sidewalks	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	3
4 Street pavement	0	0	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	4	4.10	0
5 Maintenance of neighborhood houses	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	6	4.60	0
6 Street lighting	0	1	1	1	7	0	0	0	0	7	4.40	0
7 Level of traffic in the neighborhood	0	0	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	4	4.00	0
8 Motor vehicle speed through the neighborhood	1	2	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3.40	0
9 On-street parking in the neighborhood	0	1	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	4	3.80	0
10 Neighborhood cleanliness	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	6	4.60	0
11 Level of noise in the neighborhood	0	1	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	6	4.40	0
12 If you have a neighborhood park, the adequacy of equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	10
13 If you have a neighborhood park, the maintenance of equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	10
14 If you have a neighborhood park, the safety of equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	10
15 Your level of personal safety in the neighborhood	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	8	4.80	0
16 The level of police patrol in the neighborhood	1	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	3.22	1
17 The level of landscaping on public land in the neighborhood	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	4.20	5
Average =	0.13	0.50	1.06	1.69	4.19	0.13	0.50	1.06	1.69	4.19	3.45	2.44

18 Do you agree with the boundaries drawn for this larger neighborhood?

- > Would make boundaries larger - to Broadway to include Arriba, Palace Verde, etc.
- > Would make 3 areas - one N of Redlands Pkwy, one S of Pkwy W of 23 Rd, and one S of river & E of 23 Rd.
- > Maybe expand south if annexed
- > Neighborhood should be defined by school attendance boundary
- > Just the Bluffs as one neighborhood

Yes	No	No answer
5	4	1

19 Would you be interested in being a member of a neighborhood association?

See end of survey results for addresses given

Yes	No	No answer
6	2	2

20 Are there structures, vacant lots, or other areas on your block or in the neighborhood that need City attention?
 > Dead tree at corner of 23 Rd & South Rim Dr
 > Sewer Treatment / seepage - is it coming from the city?

Yes 2 No 8

21 What attracted you to this neighborhood?

- People - 0
- Schools - 1
- View x 5
- Liked the area
- Type of housing - 7
- Convenience to work - 2
- Area
- Proximity
- Convenience to retail - 2
- Parks - 0
- Housing
- CC & R's
- Other - 8
- No Answer - 1
- House on cul-de-sac

22 What do you like most about the neighborhood?

- > Landscaping
- > Comfortable
- > Has sidewalks
- > Nice neighborhood
- > Safe x 2
- > Secluded
- > Clean
- > Just like the area so much
- > Good for kids
- > Quiet x 4
- > Open space
- > Has street lighting
- > Neighbors x 6
- > Views x 2
- > Convenience - access to places x 2
- > Appearance - Driving into it - views spectacular
- > Everyone takes care of properties

23 What do you like least about the neighborhood?

- > Traffic
- > Cars in driveways
- > We don't have a park
- > Irrigation pond is ugly
- > Raccoons in back yard
- > Code/Covenant Enforcement
- > Lack of speed enforcement
- > Parkway - level of traffic and noise
- > Traffic on Broadway - 1st & Grand
- > Vacant lots remaining to be built on
- > Weeds on subdivision entrance
- > Development nearby taking open space
- > Pond/mosquitos - stagnant water
- > Lots are a little small - too close to neighbors
- > Access to Redlands Pkwy from Rio Linda - difficult to access

24 What makes the neighborhood unique?

- > Tasteful houses
- > Access to river trail x 2
- > Access to town & services
- > Good neighbors x 2
- > Good access to the river
- > It's walkable in the Redlands
- > Newer housing that's close to mall & downtown
- > View of Bookcliff, Mesa, Connected Lakes, & City x 2
- > Close to mall yet far & quiet
- > Quiet

25 How long have you lived in the neighborhood?
 < 1 Yr 0 1-2 Yrs 0 3-5 Yrs 3 6-10 Yrs 1 > 10 Yrs 5 No Answer 1

26 Do you rent or own your home?
 Rent 0 Own 9 No Answer 1

27 Do you have any other comments?

- > Pre-car wash - bad on 23 Rd
 - > Parking lots, curbs
 - > Concerned about car wash - Kansas
 - > Siberian Elms have ruined the blacktop on trail (South of Broadway)
 - > Appreciate street sweeper, patrol, and street lights
 - > Would like goathheads controlled along river trail. Used to spray, not seeing anymore (Along Redlands Pkwy)
 - > Disappointed on rezone for carwash, no concern fro residents fellings about traffic impact. Process was discouraging.
- > HOA irrigation pond (South Rim) looks bad
 - > Want traffic light @ Rio Linda and Redlands Pkwy
 - > Need more neighborhood patrol
 - > Not enough street lighting on E Rd, 23 Rd and none on Columbine, Holland
 - > Only 1/2 of Windwood was resurfaced
 - > 23 Rd could use sidewalks

Names, Addresses, and/or given:

Tina Peterson	536 Rim Dr	243-8295
Emily Patricks	544 Pinnacle Ct	
Tony Miller	2324 Eagle Pt Ct	
L.V. (Bob) Hanson	542 Pinnacle Ct	242-7066

Redlands Neighborhood - Outside defined neighborhood

Survey Results

	Dissatisfied					Satisfied						
	1	2	3	4	5	Avg	N/O					
2 General opinion of neighborhood	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	0					
3 Condition of sidewalks	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1					
4 Street pavement	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	0					
5 Maintenance of neighborhood houses	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	0					
6 Street lighting	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	0					
7 Level of traffic in the neighborhood	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	0					
8 Motor vehicle speed through the neighborhood	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	0					
9 On-street parking in the neighborhood	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	2					
10 Neighborhood cleanliness	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	0					
11 Level of noise in the neighborhood	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	0					
12 If you have a neighborhood park, the adequacy of equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	5					
13 If you have a neighborhood park, the maintenance of equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	5					
14 If you have a neighborhood park, the safety of equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	5					
15 Your level of personal safety in the neighborhood	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	0					
16 The level of police patrol in the neighborhood	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	0					
17 The level of landscaping on public land in the neighborhood	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	3					
Average =	0.44	0.06	0.38	0.81	2.00	3.28	1.31					

18 Do you agree with the boundaries drawn for this larger neighborhood?

- > From Canyon View & Monument Valley
- > From Monument Valley

Yes	No	No answer
2	0	3

19 Would you be interested in being a member of a neighborhood association?

See end of survey results for addresses given

Yes	No	No answer
4	0	1

20 Are there structures, vacant lots, or other areas on your block or in the neighborhood that need City attention?

Yes	No
0	5

21 What attracted you to this neighborhood?

- | | | | |
|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| People - 1 | Type of housing - 2 | Convenience to retail - 1 | Other - 5 |
| Schools - 0 | Convenience to work - 0 | Parks - 0 | |
| > Trees | > Golf Course | > Rural atmosphere | > Views x 2 |
| > Quiet x 2 | > Privacy | > Open Space | > Large Lots |
| | | | > Monument |

22 What do you like most about the neighborhood?

- | | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------|
| > Neighbors x 5 | > Security | > Golf course | > Convenience | > Long time neighbors | > HOA |
| > Views x 3 | > Ambiance | > Monument | > Still rural | > Beauty of area x 3 | > Quiet |

23 What do you like least about the neighborhood?

- | | | |
|---------------------------|--|---------------------|
| > Rentals - upkeep | > Housing being built on ridge line | > Bike path |
| > Need more police patrol | > Increased traffic on Monument & South Camp | > Growing too fast |
| > Parking | > Inconsistency of South Camp street section | > Lack of community |

24 What makes the neighborhood unique?

- | | | |
|--------------|--|----------------|
| > Trees | > Style of homes - Looks like NE village | > Architecture |
| > Rural feel | > Relationship to Monument/Scenery x 2 | > People |

25 How long have you lived in the neighborhood?

< 1 Yr	1-2 Yrs	3-5 Yrs	6-10 Yrs	> 10 Yrs
0	0	1	3	1

26 Do you rent or own your home?

<u>Rent</u>	<u>Own</u>
0	5

27 Do you have any other comments?

- | | |
|--|--|
| > Need just one trash hauler | > Falling behind in keeping up with growth & providing needed infrastructure |
| > Impact fees aren't high enough | > Citywide - keeping up with growth - i.e. police, fire & traffic |
| > Speeders on Broadway | > Need to better inform the public on funding etc. |
| > Preserve hayfield on South Camp for a park | > Yield sign hidden by trees, is a stop sign better? |
| > Need to build Riverside Corridor now | > Fire station should be at Meadowlark Garden |

Names, Addresses, and/or given:

Aldan & Bruce Isaacson 429 South Camp Rd
 Bob Crone 310 Dakota Dr

bjcron@bresnan.net

**Attach W-4
Code Enforcement Practices**

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA						
Subject		Review of Final Report from Strategic Plan Objective 9 Team				
Meeting Date		August 18, 2003				
Date Prepared		August 12, 2003			File #	
Author		Ivy Williams		Code Enforcement Supervisor		
Presenter Name		Ivy Williams		Same		
Report results back to Council		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	When
Citizen Presentation		<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	Name
xx	Workshop	Formal Agenda			Consent	Individual Consideration

Summary: There are recommendations in the final report to City Council from the Code Enforcement Review team that need to be reviewed by all Council members. The final report is a result of Strategic Plan Objective 9 that assigned a review of enforcement methods for practicality.

Budget: City Council direction may have impacts on Code Enforcement personnel budget.

Action Requested/Recommendation: Review recommendations in the final report and authorize staff to take steps to implement necessary changes in procedure or code as warranted by the review.

Attachments:

1. Final Committee Report

Background Information: See attached final report.

FINAL REPORT

City Council Strategic Plan

Objective 9

June 12, 2003

INTRODUCTION

This is the final report from the Code Enforcement Review Team that was assigned as part of the City Council Strategic Plan, specifically addressing Objective 9 relating to code enforcement practices.

Within the solution of Balancing Character, Economy and Environment is the goal:

Put in place strategies that enhance the attractiveness and character of the community.

Under this goal, objective 9 states:

Review the current code requirements and enforcement methods for practicality and take appropriate action.” This objective was assigned a two year implementation timeframe. The two actions under this objective were to

A) Create a team of City Council and staff to review current codes and enforcement practices and

B) Complete review and report to City Council. The final report from the team is to be ready for City Council by July 2003.

THE COMMITTEE

The team members that served on the Code Review Team are: Cindy Enos-Martinez, Gregg Palmer, Reford Theobold, Bob Blanchard, Doug Cline, Amy Clymer, Dan Wilson and Ivy Williams.

The team met five times reviewing sections of the code and discussing recommendations for changes that can be made to the code and/or to enforcement procedures in order to support the balance of character, economy and environment as stated in the solution above.

SUMMARY OF TEAM MEETINGS

1. Code sections that support enforcement actions and related complaints were reviewed. Codes that are routinely enforced but do not affect the objective of “attractiveness and character of the community” were not reviewed.

2. Since the enforcement of weeds is conducted only six months out of the year and is enforced by separate staff from the zoning enforcement staff, the two enforcement procedures were reviewed separately.
3. The committee acknowledged that the final report on the Growth Plan Update included action items that relate to Code Enforcement. The two Zoning and Development Code sections that will be looked at are landscaping (scheduled for review in 2003) and a limited review of the sign code (scheduled for 2004).
4. Objective 9.A is directly related to the Vital Neighborhood Solution and goals to create programs to strengthen neighborhoods and provide a framework for them to work closely with the City on important issues. Ivy Williams, Bob Blanchard and Amy Clymer, who are also members of the Neighborhood Team, will work to ensure that the two team goals and actions are in concert with one another.
5. Meeting discussions included:
 - a. The weed program, how it operates currently and possible changes that could improve efficiency.
 - b. Neighborhood driven enforcement that would allow the neighborhood to prioritize violation concerns.
 - c. Whether or not pro-activity should be increased
 - d. Budget impacts related to any recommended changes
 - e. Pros and cons of weekend enforcement
 - f. Problems of enforcement
 - g. PD support of enforcement

RECOMMENDATIONS

While several sections of the Zoning and Development Code and Municipal Code were reviewed, only those sections where changes were recommended to code language and/or enforcement procedures are included in this report. The format will be:

- The violation type including the specific Zoning and Development Code citation.
- The most common complaint(s) received by the Code Enforcement Division.
- Any specific recommendation(s) provided for an enforcement change or code language change will be listed.

1. Signs: Violations of Zoning and Development Code Section 4.2

The code states that:

1. "No sign shall be placed on any curb, sidewalk, post, pole, hydrant, bridge, tree or other surface located on public property including the posting of handbills except as may otherwise expressly be authorized by this regulation."
2. "Prohibited signs are signs which: d. Contain or consist of portable signs, tent signs, or strings of light bulbs not permanently mounted on a rigid background;"
3. Under allowed temporary signs is found "A non-illuminated sign, not to exceed six (6) square feet in area.....pertaining to the sale or lease of the premises on which it is located.

Common complaints or well known violations of the codes above are:

1. Yard Sale, weight loss, sell your home, make money signs are commonly placed illegally on public poles including traffic signs, light poles, utility boxes, in the roundabouts, in medians and other public places.
2. Businesses place portable signs (including A-frame or sandwich boards and stick in the ground style) in front of the business and sometimes in rights-of-way to include medians, on corners and other off premise lots.
3. Real estate signs (including "open house") are commonly placed on city rights-of-way at sub-division entrances and intersections.
4. Main Street is treated differently than other commercial areas.

Recommendations:

A limited review of the sign code should include the following:

- Language that legalizes portable signs on Main Street
- Legalize portable signs in other shopping areas that have characteristics similar to Main Street (wide sidewalks, pedestrian orientation, no hazard created for examples).
- If portable signs are legalized, the justification would be based on
 - 1) extra wide sidewalks;
 - 2) pedestrian orientation and
 - 3) existing use of the exterior space (sidewalks)

- In no case should portable signs be allowed in medians
- Consider Car dealers' request for balloons or other antenna decorations on all weekends and more frequent opportunities to display banners (code allows 30 days per calendar quarter).
- The fee for temporary sign permits should be reviewed.
- Allow Realtor's request for open house signs for designated hours
- Temporary on site signs should be allowed for specific one time events such as auctions, gem and gun shows.
- Yard Sale signs—should be allowed on Fridays, weekends and extended holiday weekends. If signs are not removed by Monday, should the signs just be removed from the poles or should Code Enforcement be following up with an enforcement contact on any yard sale sign removed from a public pole?
- Campaign signs – Consider a timeframe after a campaign ends for requiring removal of these signs. Free speech signs would continue to be unregulated.

2. Dead Landscaping – Violation of Zoning and Development Code Section 6.5.B.15

The code states that required landscaping be maintained by watering, weeding and pruning and that any plant that dies must be replaced within ninety days of notification or, if during the winter, by the next April 1st.

The most common complaint (often generated internally) is that landscaping is dead or dying on a property.

Recommendation:

The landscape section of the Zoning and Development Code is being reviewed as part of the Community Development Department's Work Program for 2003.

The requirement for a revocable permit for any landscaping in the right-of-way is not uniformly required. There is a team effort by the Planners and Code Enforcement in enforcement of this code section to keep required landscaping alive and maintained. Other than approved development, it is recommended that in order for Code Enforcement to pro-actively determine all rights-of-way that have been landscaped without a revocable permit that adding enforcement staff be considered.

3. Overnight Camping – Violation of Zoning and Development Code Section 6.2.B.3

The code states that overnight camping is allowed for up to two weeks total during any twelve (12) month period as long as the camper is not in the public right of way or in a private parking lot made available to the public.

The most common complaint is that someone is living in a camper, trailer or vehicle in a yard, behind a commercial building or on a vacant lot that are not zoned for camping.

Recommendation:

The committee recommends adding a provision to the code for hospice or other medical care situations that may exceed the allowed two weeks per year. The provision should require written need for care from a licensed medical practitioner.

4. Smoking in Public Places – Violation of the Municipal Code Section 16-127.

The code states that public places will be non-smoking and that restaurants with more than 30 seats may provide a smoking section in the restaurant so long as patrons do not have to pass through smoke to get to the restrooms, to reach the non-smoking section seating or while waiting to be seated.

The most common complaint is that smoking is occurring in a public area or that a restaurant is not in compliance with some part of the ordinance.

Recommendation:

This issue is currently being addressed by the City Council. Depending on the resolution, the appropriate Codes will be amended accordingly.

5. Weeds – Violation of Municipal Code Chapter 16 Article II.

The code states that any property within city limits will be maintained to keep any weeds on the property cut to within three inches of the ground. The property owner is responsible from the edge of the curb or pavement to the center of any alley.

The most common complaint is that weeds are growing somewhere on a property.

Recommendation:

The 2001 customer service survey listed weeds as the number one citizen concern. In 2002, the responsibility for weeds was divided into two categories so that Public Works will maintain weeds on city owned properties and Code Enforcement enforces weeds

on private properties. The committee had the following recommendations for weed enforcement:

- The Public Works' maintenance of city owned properties has proven to be a 12 month job. The assigned crew leader and tractor operator kept busy all winter. One additional seasonal worker will be hired for the summer. It was suggested that the budget for maintaining city owned properties be gradually increased to provide additional operational staff so the City is keeping up with the results of anticipated growth.
- It was suggested that weeds growing outside perimeter fencing on older subdivisions may create an unfair situation for the homeowners living on properties adjacent to the fence. The code holds adjacent property owners responsible for maintaining the weeds to the edge of the pavement or curb. There are sometimes access barriers to get to the weeds and there is no HOA in older subdivisions to assign the maintenance of the area. The maintenance challenge is complicated more if the adjacent residents are elderly (Cottonwood Meadows Orchard Avenue fence line was the cited example).

It was suggested to pick a year when HOA establishment was required for sub-divisions (1990 was suggested). Subdivisions established prior to that year would be exempted from the code requirement for maintaining to edge of street if:

- 1) There is no HOA
- 2) There is perimeter fencing with weeds between the fence and the sidewalk or street and
- 3) Adjacent owners have access barriers to get to the weed area and have to access the weeds by going to the main sub-division entrance.

The Cottonwood Meadows Orchard Avenue fence line was the only example that could be identified with the qualifications above. Most subdivisions are maintaining the outside perimeter between a fence and sidewalk. The Cottonwood Meadows neighborhood is the only neighborhood that complained in 2002 about the requirement. This fence line is a high visibility weed problem in a highly visible area and was maintained by a city crew until 2002.

- Two surveyors are hired to cover every private property within city limits. The assigned areas are inspected about four times each season. If the level of complaints about private property inclined Council to recommend increasing the

frequency of inspections, additional personnel would be required. Additional personnel would require additional surveying vehicles and additional office space

- The cost of a seasonal surveyor is minimally \$10, 599 for wages and personnel costs.
- The cost of a used vehicle is minimally \$4,000
- The cost of additional space would need further study
- There was also a discussion about transients (who sometimes set up camp in a weedy area). When this problem is identified, PD will coordinate with Code Enforcement to clear the weeded area (even on properties over one acre) to discourage transients from camping.

6. General zoning enforcement procedures

The committee also reviewed the following general enforcement procedures:

1. Issue a voluntary compliance request allowing ten days to correct the violation. (The exception is that immediate compliance would be required to remedy any dangerous condition).
2. A Notice of Violation is issued if the violation remains after the ten day voluntary compliance request.
3. Issue a summons when compliance is not reached by time established by the Notice of Violation, compliance has not been reached as established in a management plan, if the Notice of Violation is ignored or refused or if the violation is a repeat by the same violator.

Recommendations:

- If a violation is repeated within a two year period, the provision of allowing ten days to voluntarily comply should not be allowed. This should apply when the owner of the property is the violator or to a property that is renter occupied (even in the renters are different) because the owner of a rental property is notified of violations that occur on a property and should take measures to educate renters of city codes regarding junk, outdoor storage and the like.
- Maintain the practice that was established after the presentation to City Council in April 2002 to write tickets and not negotiate a management plan for compliance if a violator is guilty of the same violation a second time within a two year period.

- Follow closely the outcome of the Neighborhood Group to make enforcement changes that may be outlined by the group to better meet the needs of the neighborhoods, especially in managing junk and inoperable vehicles.
- Continue to build relationships with other departments and coordinate enforcement efforts with the assigned Police Department beat officers and the neighborhoods.
- Staff should continue to be available for inspections outside normal working hours including evenings and weekends to meet customer demand.
- Due to the continued increase in demand for Code Enforcement, additional staff will be required if any increase in service is desired. The statistics represent the need for 1) increasing the summer administrative clerk position to full time and 2) at least one Code Enforcement Officer. The cost to add these positions are:
 - Administrative Clerk upgrade would increase recurring personnel costs by approximately \$30,619 (salary 29,355 + benefits \$8,513 – current seasonal pay \$7,249 = \$30,619). There would be minimal increase in operating costs since this work station is fully operational for full time.
 - One Full time Code Enforcement Officer would increase recurring personnel costs by \$58,927 (Salary \$41,064 + Benefits \$11,909 + operational expenses \$4,875 = \$58,927) and approximately \$23,500 in the first year for a vehicle and work station set-up.