

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

M I N U T E S

July 14, 1981

The first meeting of the month of July, 1981 was called to order at 7:15 p.m. by Chairperson JANE QUIMBY. The following members were present: SUSAN RINKER, RICHARD LITTLE, MILAND DUNIVENT, ROSS TRANSMEIER, JACK OTT and TOM PRICE.

BOB GOLDIN, Planning Staff, MARK ECKERT, Planning Staff, and LEILA E. MOSHER, Certified Shorthand Reporter, were also present. There were approximately twenty interested citizens in the audience.

#48-81 DEVELOPMENT IN H. O. - SUPER 8 MOTEL AND RIGHT OF WAY AND EASEMENT VACATION

Petitioner: James Carlisle.

Location: Southeast of I-70, East of Horizon Drive.

A request for a motel on 1.18 acres in a highway oriented zone; and a request to vacate a right of way, and easement vacation.

JANE QUIMBY opened the public hearing.

TOM LOGUE, of Paragon Engineering, appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the proposed Development in H. O., together with request of right of way and easement vacation.

RICHARD LITTLE: Tom, that foliage at the back, bordering on Niblic Drive, what is the height of that?

TOM LOGUE: There are some existing, I believe, cottonwood trees right at the corner. The rest of it is mostly upright junipers, and some Pine varieties. We selected evergreen species because they maintain a foliage all year round.

RICHARD LITTLE: Have you given consideration to lighting back there? Flood lights spilling over into the neighborhood, or are you going to use directional --

TOM LOGUE: Right. We will utilize a light -- I didn't bring the detail with me tonight -- it's a light standard that is made out of bronze, and then it's a square fixture, and the lights are directed downward. It's not a globe type.

JANE QUIMBY: If this proposal were approved, Tom, what would you estimate start of the construction, and the time frame of construction?

TOM LOGUE: -- we would anticipate construction almost immediately upon approval by the City Council.

JACK OTT: If there was a shortage of motel space, then you would probably be using all the parking areas of 130 spaces; that leaves three for the help.

TOM LOGUE: Normally the help arrives after the bulk of the patrons leave. -- It doesn't have a restaurant or a lounge, or any of the other things that are quite often associated with motels.

TOM PRICE: Tom, I have one: That's in the area of sewage?

TOM LOGUE: Yes.

TOM PRICE: Okay. At this particular time, as you well know, we are at maximum in terms of usage. Would you address yourself to that situation, and also tell us what you project the sewage coming from this location will be?

TOM LOGUE: First off, we will utilize an existing fifteen inch sewer main, the Horizon Drive interceptor, located in Horizon Drive. It does flow to the City Treatment Facility, which is operating pretty close to capacity, or at capacity. The City Utility Department did receive this plan and made no comment in their review sheet, to that problem.

It is our understanding that the interim sewage treatment facility will be ready late this year. At that time they should have sufficient capacity to provide sewer service to that particular motel, I will have to check my file on the amount generated.

JAMES CARLISLE: Tom, I don't have it with me, but I went out there and talked with the man at the sewage plant, and he gave me a letter.

TOM LOGUE: You talked to Jim Patterson, do you recall?

JAMES CARLISLE: I don't remember. It has been about two weeks ago.

TOM LOGUE: I really don't have that information. -- I would anticipate you are probably looking at something in the neighborhood of thirty gallons per day, per room. I can't guarantee that's what it will be, but normally that's what the water consumption is, or it would be somewhere in that neighborhood of thirty.

SUSAN RINKER: What about buffering between the parking lot and this house?

TOM LOGUE: We haven't shown any buffering in there at all. This house sits up quite a bit higher, and it does have a grassy area -- not a grassy area -- weeds, maybe -- down below. It sits quite a ways from the structure itself.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: I noticed out there along Nine Iron, that most of that is curb and gutter, and sidewalk, except when you get close to that corner. Is there any curb and sidewalk planned that you are going to be doing?

TOM LOGUE: We haven't planned any. We will be providing Power of Attorney for Horizon Drive improvements.

JANE QUIMBY: Staff?

BOB GOLDIN: All the technical issues have been resolved, including the grading issue, which we had some concern with prior to tonight. As of today everything is satisfactory as far as Staff is concerned.

NANCY DICKEY appeared and outlined the history of the area along Horizon Drive, and objected to the proposal, as well as objecting to the vacation of the right of way.

NANCY DICKEY: I don't think you should be vacating the right of way for an easement; it has an irrigation ditch in it now. It will still have an irrigation ditch, no matter how he does it, and I still feel it should be an easement, and as I said, I really don't think he should be rezoning back to the residential lots. This is up on the same level of our houses, and this is why we asked them not to even consider those as a highway oriented, and Tom, how are you going to run your pipe, that is the drainage?

TOM LOGUE: We will be putting it in to a pipe and it will be buried.

NANCY DICKEY: Are you cutting the hill down?

TOM LOGUE: Yes. We will be doing some grading right in here.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: If they weren't able to put a motel on this piece of property, for lack of that piece, obviously that property is too expensive to sit there and grow weeds. They are going to put something in there.

NANCY DICKEY: We will just come back and ask for the same amount of screening and everything else.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: But it appeared to me what they would be putting in there would be something like a McDonald's, or something that would create more traffic.

NANCY DICKEY: We knew this.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: Which would you prefer?

NANCY DICKEY: Which would we prefer? I will leave that to my neighbors that are closer to it.

SANDY PEESO appeared and inquired about the vacation of the easement, described the difficulty the school busses had in negotiating the corner near the proposed development, and stated the area of the easement was needed for street improvements in the future, on that particular corner.

SANDY PEESO: I don't understand how a commercial development can use the City Planning Commission to get what they want, so that they can make a profit.

JANE QUIMBY: Do you want to explain that last comment a little bit more?

SANDY PEESO: It seems to me that right now the residents in this area are taking a back seat to what these developers want to do.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: What specific parts don't you like? What else can they do?

SANDY PEESO: They are crowding me. They are coming too far up on that corner of Niblic and Nine Iron. It is a very narrow road as it is, and if they do the way they have planned, there is absolutely no room for improvement on that road. It's narrow enough as it is. They wanted to vacate some of the easement, and I agree with what Nancy said a few minutes ago, and tell Tom he can talk to us. They are trying to put too much on too little ground.

TOM PRICE: So what's your alternative? What would satisfy you?

SANDY PEESO: Back down the hill a ways. Don't bring their property right up to the road. They do have a drainage ditch that they are going to have to work around that's existing there.

TOM PRICE: You do agree, then, this property is going to be developed.

SANDY PEESO: Oh, yes. That's what I said. We are aware that something will be put on it. Whether this is the right plan for that particular land, that's -- I don't think so. I think they are trying to put too much on what they have. It's just coming too close to our property, and the roads that we have to live on every day.

SUSAN RINKER: Your main concern, though, is that turn around the corner there? Because I was up there, and I know what you are talking about.

SANDY PEESO: See, the school busses come down that hill; there's no way two cars can get by there. We have watched it.

MILAND DUNIVENT: You talk about vacating an easement. Why hasn't that corner been improved prior to now?

SANDY PEESO: I can't answer that.

NANCY DICKEY: Why don't you ask Al Partee? He has owned it for years.

MILAND DUNIVENT: This is not a problem of the proposed developer, is it?

NANCY DICKEY: Yes. It will be; he's buying that lot.

JANE QUIMBY: Tom, could you address that particular question?

TOM LOGUE: In regards to improvements on Niblic and Nine Iron?

JANE QUIMBY: Right.

TOM LOGUE: First, we are not utilizing in any way, shape or form a connection between the Motel to Nine Iron, as far as vehicular traffic. We are asking for a vacation of part of Nine Iron. Now, we don't really need it. We can leave it just as it is, but it comes off on a square corner -- We are willing to participate with Power of Attorney, or escrow fund deposit, for this portion of the road adjoining our site, at such time as the neighborhood feels it is appropriate to form an Improvement District. We have met our obligation. The same thing applies to Horizon Drive.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: What about truck noise?

TOM LOGUE: As you will notice on the site plan, there is no provisions made for truck parking within the site. Those parking spaces are all for passenger vehicles. I am not saying that there won't be any truck parking there, and maybe Tom can address that, or Jim, either one. As you look at the site, it's kind of a circuitous route getting around the site. It is geared primarily for passenger vehicles. We do have a canopy along the front, and that is of sufficient height to allow the trash truck to come in. There just aren't any provisions for semi-truck parking. Right now, they are parking on the site as it is, and walking down the street to the Holiday, or to the Sandman, or to some of the other motels in the area.

JANE QUIMBY: Tom, perhaps you might address Nancy's comments about the ownership of the property.

TOM LOGUE: The Petitioners have secured a title insurance commitment to the property that states the ownership of the land and any encumbrances, and as far as what I have seen -- maybe Dennis or Jim can address that further -- it does not indicate any other ownership.

Like I say, on the road vacation we are willing to leave it as is, and we are even willing to go ahead and landscape up towards the edge of the improvements in there, as long as everybody understands that at such time as the City goes in and builds it, they will probably remove those.

TOM NAYLOR spoke as the future owner and manager of the proposed Motel and described the proposed operation of the Motel, stating the business would be a very quiet business.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

*1 TRANSMEIER/RINKER PASSED 5-1 (PRICE AGAINST) A MOTION TO SUBMIT #48-81, SUPER 8 MOTEL, TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION; THAT APPROVAL OF THE REZONING OF A PORTION OF THE PROPERTY BE RECOMMENDED, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS, AS THE PROPOSED REZONING DOES COMPLY WITH THE ADOPTED POLICIES AND OTHER FINDINGS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION; THAT THE IMPROVEMENTS ON THE CORNER OF NIBLIC DRIVE AND NINE IRON SHOULD BE IN PLACE AT THE TIME OF DEVELOPMENT.

*2 TRANSMEIER/DUNIVENT PASSED 4-2 (PRICE AND LITTLE AGAINST) A MOTION TO SUBMIT TO CITY COUNCIL #48-81, VACATION OF ^{UTILITIES} EASEMENT, FOR CONSIDERATION AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE VACATION OF ^{UTILITIES} EASEMENT TO THE CITY COUNCIL.

TRANSMEIER/RINKER PASSED 5-1 (PRICE AGAINST) A MOTION TO SUBMIT TO CITY COUNCIL #48-81, SUPER 8 MOTEL, VACATION OF RIGHT OF WAY ON PROPERTY ON HORIZON DRIVE, AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF SAID VACATION OF RIGHT OF WAY.

*3 TRANSMEIER/DUNIVENT PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT TO CITY COUNCIL #48-81, DEVELOPMENT IN H. O., SUPER 8 MOTEL, SITE PLAN, AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE SITE PLAN FOR ^{LANDSCAPING} SUPER 8 MOTEL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS, AND SUBJECT TO HIGH DENSITY BUFFERING ON NIBLIC DRIVE AND THE BACK PORTION OF THE PROPERTY; THAT THE LIGHTING USED IN THE AREA SHOULD BE OF A TYPE SO AS NOT TO DISTURB THE RESIDENTIAL AREA IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

TOM LOGUE: If you want, we would be happy to give to the Staff our details on the lighting fixtures themselves. We will see if we can find another one similar, or the same thing, in the City and go out and look at it when it gets dark. -- And if you want, we will go ahead and intensify the landscaping and work with the Staff, and if they want to get with the neighborhood and have their input to make sure we meet the right -- we can plant whatever they want to be looking at.

JANE QUIMBY: I would like for you very much to plant whatever you consider in the interests of the buffering; that you run it by the neighbors, particularly those that are adjacent, or in that area.

- *1) Deleted Development In H. O.
- *2) Added Utilities - Twice
- *3) Added Landscaping

Admended on July 28, 1981, Grand Junction Planning Commission Meeting.

JANE QUIMBY: That's the only item on the Agenda for the public hearing. We now have some workshop items that will deal with Persigo Village and the First Street Policy.

BOB GOLDIN: For the workshop on Persigo, what we have are representatives from both the developer and from the City, to answer any questions concerning any aspects of the proposal. This is not a discussion for them to input in to you. It is merely for them to answer any questions you have of them.

You are considering the Persigo PR 17, and also the rezone, 756 units, 48 acres. The orange proposal right here, off of G Road and 25 Road.

There were some concerns from the Commission concerning the public facilities, as far as water, sewage, schools and roads. The people are here to ask those questions if you have concerns concerning that. You don't need to make any kind of decision tonight because this is a workshop. This will be heard the end of the month at the public hearing, to give you a little background.

JANE QUIMBY: Thank you, Bob. I think one of the biggest concerns that was developed at the last workshop was concern with all developments we are seeing, particularly in the outlying areas. We are beginning to approach capacity of the new sewer plant, which is not yet built, but looks better and better all the time, and the Planning Commission had some very serious concerns, because previously we have always typically looked at one development at a time, without looking at the cumulative effect, and because this was such a large development, I guess, and grabbed our attention a little bit more, and we thought that perhaps it would be well to have some explanation and some background, particularly since there are so many new Members on the Planning Commission.

So with that, I would like to ask Jim if he wouldn't mind answering questions the Planning Commission Members might have of him. This is Jim Patterson, Director of Public Works, and he is the main man as far as water quality control is concerned.

JIM PATTERSON: If you would like, I can make a few comments and that might generate a few questions in addition to the ones you already have.

Back in 1974, we started to put together what we call the 201 Plan, or Facilities Plan, or Area Plan. You are probably familiar with the 201 boundaries. We had to address all the area inside that boundary as to the current facilities at that time, to the projected growth and need in that area, and how -- what would be the most feasible way to accomodate the sewage generated in that entire area.

In doing our population projections we broke that area down into several different sub-areas -- nine and ten sub-areas -- and we looked at the current land use at that time, the projected land use, the best information we could get for projected land use, and current development as far as timing and type of development.

And we tried to make some projections for a ten year period. EPA will fund a facility for a ten year growth period. They will not put funds into an area to build for a twenty year growth period. They do limit their funds to a ten year period.

We tried to determine what the demands would be for a ten year period. Our projections at that time, for 1990, and at that time we hoped to have the plant on line in 1980 -- obviously, we missed that. What we were trying to project from 1980 to 1990 was a ten year growth period. -- need to accomodate a population of about 100,000 in 1990. We proceeded to design the plant on that basis.

Not too long ago, especially when these concerns began to arise, I asked the Planning Department to take a look at our projections that we made, back in 1974 and 1975, especially since we had a census in 1980, and see what actual census counts in 1980 were, as compared to what our projections were back in 1974 and 1975, and at this point go ahead and make a new projection as to when we might reach the 100,000 mark, or what our 1990 population count might be.

They did this, and the information that they gave us pretty much confirmed that our projections that we made in 1974 were fairly close -- a lot better than a lot of projections that you see that many times don't bear out, so my reaction was that I feel fairly comfortable with the projections we had made in 1974. If we are deviating, I think we are going a little faster than we projected in 1974, and I would not be surprised that maybe if we are not looking at a plant expansion in perhaps 1988 or maybe 1987, rather than 1990.

I don't -- at this point that does not raise a great concern to me, either. We are proceeding as well as we can to build this plant. We would probably need about a five year lead time for the plant expansion. so we may get into the position while we are under construction, or maybe upon dedication of the new plant, at that point we would proceed immediately to design the plant expansion, and be ready to have that, but we still have the lead time that we need for that.

Also, my concerns are not so great as to -- as far as the treatment plant capacity is concerned, as to how the development may come within the 201 area, as far as the sub-areas. I do not see a red flag if you have a very high density development, such as Persigo Village, in one area. We feel that -- I feel that there is a certain amount of growth coming to this area, for various reasons: energy development, or it's a nice place to live, or whatever, and I am not sure that just providing units is going to generate any more, or any less, growth than that, and as far as the treatment facility plant is concerned, it doesn't make any difference on that end whether the density generates from one sub-area to another -- and another sub-area ends up having six thousand instead of eight thousand.

I am not saying that is not a concern of the community. That very definitely is of concern to you as to whether you want development, and what type of community we have, but it is a concern

of mine on that basis, but strictly from the treatment plant, it does not matter as to the locations. It could have an impact on certain collector lines, or sewage collection lines.

I think that's pretty much where I stand right now. We are behind schedule. As mentioned, we wanted this new facility on line back in 1980. We projected back in 1972, 1973, that our plant would be reaching capacity in 1980, so it did not come as any surprise to us that it has reached capacity. Many of the delays were beyond our control, things that we could not control and speed up, and as a result, we are three or four years behind schedule.

One of the measures that we came up with to accomodate that was the thing that we call the interim plant, and we ran this past the State EPA, and they agreed we could go ahead and build one of the new units of the new plant, out of sequence, if you will, ahead of the construction of the main plant itself. This unit is the flow utilization, and it just so happens it's big; we can put aerators in it. It will operate like a lagoon. It will accomodate one million gallons of sewage per day. At the rate of growth we have been going, that would accomodate about a two year growth period, so with that, we were able to come up with a solution where we could accomodate a two year growth period.

Now, the two year growth period, until the new plant gets on line, has been changed to three -- maybe four years -- so we are still in a crunch period. We have still got to get through that period. At this point I am not ready to recommend to anybody that we start considering a moratorium or stop on building. We are on a cease and desist order right now, and that is because on occasions, at the peak flow situations, our affluent does exceed the standards set by the State. This generally happens during June, July and August, and even then, as of right now, it is not happening on a day to day continuing basis. Maybe three times out of the month the B O D will exceed the limits set by the State, and they have issued a cease and desist order on that basis.

They are allowing us to continue to operate. They have not requested, at this point, for us to slow down or impose any type of moratorium. State Law requires that at ninety-five percent capacity that you have your plans to build a new plant, which we do have.

It is our hope and plans that we will proceed to continue to allow growth and development in the area. That we realize it will continue to have occasional discharge violations. In my opinion it is not a detriment to the River, in that we are not consistently putting a high oxygen demand on the River. I don't think we are endangering any wildlife. I don't think we will deteriorate the River to any extent before this new plant can be built. We will have to get an extension of our cease and desist order. We gave them a compliance schedule, which we cannot meet now because of other delays, so we anticipate probably in 1983 we will have to ask for another extension of that cease and desist order. At that time they will either grant that, and continue to let us develop more growth with some relaxed

discharge standards, or at that time they could get tough with us and essentially require a building moratorium, and not allow any more connections to the sewer system until the new plant is finished. At that time we will be a year, or less, away from completion of the plant, and it is my hope that they will just allow us to exceed those discharge limitations on occasion, rather than having the disruptive effect of a building moratorium here.

TOM PRICE: Pardon me, Jim, and clarify this if I am wrong: This sounds to me like double talk, okay? You will totally agree that we have got a problem right now with sewage, and anybody that drives down North Avenue at the given time of day can well affirm to that. Okay? You are talking in terms of 1983, and we are talking in terms of right now, things that we are approving.

Now, I am asking you point blank: Are we not to be concerned with the sewage problem down the line, or are we to be concerned with that problem?

JIM PATTERSON: I think you should be concerned. Let me clarify a little bit at the end of this where we will add one million gallons per day treatment capacity to our system.

JANE QUIMBY: Through the interim plant?

JIM PATTERSON: Through the interim plant, and this will accomodate some of the growth we have had this year and next year, so I am saying I don't think the situation is going to get that much worse over the next year or eighteen months, as we continue to grow. There is about a year period where it could be touch and go from the year 1983, essentially, that the new plant should be ready to operate at the end of 1983, or early 1984, at the latest. That's the period I think we need to be concerned about, is whether or not the State is going to allow us to continue to exceed our discharge limitations under the cease and desist order. No. I am not saying we shouldn't be concerned. I am saying I think I can at this point, see our way through this, by adding this million gallons per day capacity, and with the understanding that we are under construction in 1983, and that we are nearing completion at that time, I am thinking the State will allow us at that point to continue with our building until our plant is on line.

JANE QUIMBY: Mark?

MARK ECKERT: The Planning Staff has met with Mr. Patterson and part of our concern was the mass -- I think right now between the City and County we have got 9,200 units proposed since January 1 to June 30th. That's County-wide; not just the City, but within the 201 area.

The key factor here, and one should bear in mind, this will come down to first come, first served situation. If Persigo gets on the tool, it may well be they will get a building permit. No-one wants to talk moratorium, and that isn't our purpose here, but it

could come down to a Russian Roulette game. If somebody would get this thing built, they won't be able to get a C.O., for example, or they might be able to get a building permit, period. So this is where it stands. I guess what I am saying, I am backing up what Jim is saying: There is going to be a crunch. How severe it's going to be, we can't predict that. No-one can. And that's how it may go down. If these things are built out -- I think some people have said we may be cutting the ribbon on this one plant when we are going to have to open bids on constructing another one of similar size, that being 12.5 million.

So I guess in a way I am not downplaying the point, but I am trying to say the key thing here is like on the map up there, where we have projects out on the County, plus Persigo in the City Limits, it's going to be a first come, first served basis, and someone may get caught odd man out. But that's their problem, pure and simple. That's why they call it a risky business, I guess.

JANE QUIMBY: The other point is, all developments are being talked about in some stages, but it is highly unlikely that all will come on board within the next year or so. You know, and if they did, why then we all have -- we would all have a concern.

RICHARD LITTLE: Persigo, I think, is projected over a five year build out.

MARK ECKERT: And again, remember, going back to the Commission and the meeting earlier, the point on the project wasn't the technical aspects of the project, but the concern that we still do, as City Planning Staff, still feels a bit of a red flag about this issue, although we are willing to accept Mr. Patterson's opinion on it, and his Staff. You know, we don't have any problem.

JANE QUIMBY: What about the interceptor and the collector lines for development, as you can look at that map for that particular area? Are they sufficient if that were suddenly to all be developed out?

JIM PATTERSON: We designed Paradise Hills extension line in F Road, sufficient to serve that area. The County, or City, do not have plans, as government bodies, to construct sewer lines in those areas. That will have to be done by the developers. We are commenting on those development plans, what size those lines should be. I remember one or two developments along 25 Road, where they propose to put in a sewer line, and I commented on it that the line should be twelve inch in diameter and those comments went to the Planning Commission.

I suppose there is a question if a development wants to go in, in that area, and their requirement is only -- warrants an eight inch line, but knowing that line is not enough to serve the entire area, we asked it to be twelve inch line, and the question comes up, who pays for the difference in price on that? That's an unanswered question at this point, whether the County would be willing to pick that up, or we just insist the developer put the twelve inch line in, or we allow him to recover part of his front end costs through collecting fees.

We do have an overall Master Plan in that area that pinpoints what size, 24 Road, 25 Road, and we do make those comments as the developments come through.

JANE QUIMBY: Any other questions of Mr. Patterson? Any other information that you would like to have?

ROSS TRANSMEIER: Is there anybody here from the Street Department?

JANE QUIMBY: Mr. Patterson?

ROSS TRANSMEIER: I am kind of concerned about the corner of F.5 Road, and First Street, if this project and some others go in. Are you familiar with that corner, and are there any plans for improvements of that corner?

JIM PATTERSON: F.5 and First?

ROSS TRANSMEIER: F.25 and First. The one that goes along the canal up, meets right up on First Street.

JIM PATTERSON: That's outside the City, so we are not looking at that right now.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: F.25 is the bottom -- right below their project, right?

TOM LOGUE: It's F.5.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: F.5 and First Street.

(Discussion of locations on map)

JIM PATTERSON: We are looking at F Road and First Street, the extension of Horizon Drive. We are very involved in that.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: F.5 and First is the one I was concerned about, because it comes straight across the bottom of this project, or below this project, and it would be a feeder, say, into City Market on First Street, is what it's going to amount to, and it goes straight up the hill, along the canal, and kind of meets on a blind corner, a very residential looking corner, up there, right at the canal and First Street, and I just think we are going to get a lot of increased traffic at that intersection, and it would be a dangerous intersection, because it's a blind hump as you come up First Street. Maybe it's in the County, but someday it will probably be in the City Limits.

JACK OTT: What about the entrance into this area, where there is only one entrance planned?

JIM PATTERSON: Our Transportation Engineer has expressed some concerns about the one entrance, and I think he has suggested a second entrance be considered, perhaps to the north, or at least have some type of second entrance.

JACK OTT: This area right here, there is an entrance -- can there be an entrance connected that goes through that?

JIM PATTERSON: I think they have shown a future possible connection to the south. The only problem to that is that will ever happen, or when it might happen, and if it happens right away, great, and if not, you effectively end up with one entrance.

JACK OTT: The density will be pretty difficult for people to get in and out of there at eight o'clock in the morning, if they had only one way, or two ways to get in and out of it.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: I am concerned, also, with the access to the piece of property above, I believe it's Leach Creek, is the name of that Creek, which is basically a little jungle in between there, and G Road, if that's supposed to be recreational, is there going to be some way to use that by the developer?

TOM LOGUE: That area along G Road, along Leach Creek, or Persigo Wash, we have discussed that with the City Parks and Recreation Department. The County, since we are kind of transitional -- we jump back and forth between the County and the City -- have encouraged other developers, and have received dedication of open areas along that Creek, thinking ultimately they will have land available to develop some type of pedestrian access.

Mr. Idleman indicated, as we proceed through the steps with the City, that he seriously would like to work with the Petitioners in obtaining that as a park site for the general public use of the City, as opposed to just the residents of Persigo Village, in conjunction with another large park area that is reserved on a site along 25 Road, and he felt it was of sufficient size that they can adequately maintain it. That it, over the long term, would get more use from the entire neighborhood, as opposed to just the residents of Persigo Village.

With that in mind, he felt that if other access was necessary to the area, it would be best to look at some other direction, two accesses on to 25.5 Road, as opposed to one on 25 Road, and possibly a second one through this park area.

There is a pretty good little area of land up there along G Road that can function as more than just a preserve type park situation. There is two acres, did we figure in there? Of good usable land, in conjunction with the wash itself. We didn't want that much traffic close to a park like situation, and it can be addressed as we proceed with the preliminary and development plans of the project.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: I wouldn't be too concerned with it to begin with, but as the project would fill out, I would think the usability of the area east of the irrigation canal and north of the Creek would be important to be developed, when you get to the final stage. In the meantime, you have got some open spaces to build on with some recreation over here.

TOM LOGUE: The development plan does make provisions to connect pedestrian access across the canal, as well as Persigo Village.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: You are looking at about ten percent of the land as a whole that is inaccessible.

TOM LOGUE: By figures, that is correct.

Discussion was heard in regard to staging of the development of the recreation areas, and discussion of the size of the proposed park and open areas.

SUSAN RINKER: Tom, are these condos, or townhouses?

TOM LOGUE: These are condos; there may be some leasing, rental involved in it, but generally they will be marketed as condos.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: Is there ever an odor escaping from that substation? Is there a release valve, or --?

TOM LOGUE: No. We talked to Western Slope Gas about it. There is, on occasion, some noise generated from escaping gas and so on. It is basically non-hazardous. They are inspected by the Public Utilities Division. There is a provision in that for safety, and other than being stuck on a prime corner there, it creates a non-adverse impact situation.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: I assume that can be screened somehow?

TOM LOGUE: Definitely. We would like to do that.

Discussion was heard regarding precautions to keep persons from trespassing on the substation property.

JACK OTT: What precautions will be taken for safety along the Grand Valley Canal?

SAM HAUPT: You can't take any. That's the Grand Valley Canal's right of way, Jack.

JACK OTT: You mean you will just leave it open?

SAM HAUPT: Everytime we have run into it, they won't let us fence it off. You have got to leave it open for their ditch rider.

BOB GOLDIN: The Commission should be reminded this is an ODP. We have addressed these issues and some of them have been resolved prior to this. These questions that haven't been will be resolved prior to preliminary with you. We are aware of the issue, including access, substation, canals, security, etcetera, so again, at preliminary, should this be approved, then these issues will be resolved hopefully by then, and at that time any concerns should be brought up then, rather than at ODP, because it is merely an outline development plan, rather than getting into the exact detail, and that's the whole idea behind an outline development plan.

JIM PATTERSON: The Canal Company may be willing to reconsider their position on fences, providing the fences could be constructed in such a way they could still get their maintenance equipment in there.

SUSAN RINKER: Bob, was the School District --

MARK ECKERT: On the School District, roads and sewers, I just lump all in one thing. They are all under the same situation as the sewers. The Schools, to our knowledge, aren't going to respond.

SUSAN RINKER: They don't care.

MARK ECKERT: You are not talking long range planning. You are talking about incremental reinforcements to meet the plan -- built in short falls, in other words. What is going to happen with the roads out there, no-one knows. If they come in to the City, they are in. If not, they will be out in the County. Again, these are the general questions that basically no-one is addressing. Okay. Is that on the record? Let me just make that clear.

SUSAN RINKER: That's why I wanted to address them.

Discussion of the projected number of children attending school in the area of the proposal.

SUSAN RINKER: Could you at least make them aware they are going to have some problems?

MARK ECKERT: Yes. We are going to try.

Discussion of the Power of Attorney for road improvements.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: Personally, I feel a project this dense and this large that we ought to put a lot of emphasis on the recreational open space use, the recreational area on the thing, when we get down to preliminary.

At this point in the meeting the discussion turned to regular workshop items, and the meeting in regard to Persigo Village was adjourned.

** ** *