

**GRAND JUNCTION
CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP**

December 16, 2002

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado met on Monday, December 16, 2002 at 7:05 p.m. in the City Hall Auditorium to discuss workshop items. Those present were Harry Butler, Dennis Kirtland, Bill McCurry Jim Spehar and Janet Terry and Reford Theobald President of the Council Cindy Enos-Martinez was absent. Council President Pro Tem Dennis Kirtland chaired the meeting

Summaries and action on the following topics:

1. **DISCUSSION OF VARIOUS TRANSPORTATION ISSUES:** Staff presented and updated the City Council on a variety of transportation issues.
 - MPO/RTPO Issues
 - (a) MPO Boundary changes – Ken Simms of the MPO explained the federal requirements for boundary adjustments following the census. He distributed an updated map with the proposed new boundary. The rules for determining the urban area have changed to take into account areas based on their nighttime population. The boundary change will not affect funding. The organization is encouraging the inclusion of Palisade and Fruita. City Attorney Dan Wilson explained some the proposed inclusions an dexclusions which did not appear to be consistent. The buffer areas between Palisade and Fruita are not taken into consideration when determining boundaries. The boundary north of the airport was not drawn precisely and Council asked that be adjusted to conform to the BLM MOU. Tom Fisher, RTPO Director, advised that our area is always away form getting direct federal funding, need to reach 200,000 in population.
 - (b) RTPO IGA – City Attorney Dan Wilson distributed a new IGA that had different voting methods included which has been endorsed by the representatives of the different organizations. The new option allows a vote for each and does not provide the “security council” veto. There is an appeal process which effectively vetoes the decision and can be implemented by any of the organizations. The GVRTC will adopt the UPWP and the TIP which will be implemented unless the governing body objects within 30 days. There were concerns that the designee would be responsible for making decisions. It was suggested that it be handled internally either by procedures or via a resolution. If there is a need for more oversight, then the designee should be advised of such. The City Manager suggested that any needed discussion take place prior to the matter being addressed by GVRTC. The City Clerk was directed to attach the resolution to the Council Assignments discussion in April of each year.

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.

2. Update on Regional Impact Fee Study - Public Works & Utilities
Director Mark Relph updated Council on the proposal for the adoption of a regional impact fee as well as a local impact fee. There are many issues to be addressed and staff will continue to try to address some of them. The City's TCP (Transportation Capacity Payment) is still at \$500 per single family home and has not been updated since implemented. Also there are the TABOR issues. Less issues if decision is made sooner. Councilmember Terry felt this is much lower priority than many of the other issues currently being addressed (stormwater, drainage, etc.) Councilmember Theobald expressed concern that staff changed Council's policy by not collecting the TCp but is instead implementing another policy. City Attorney countered that requiring the improvements is an option in the TCP ordinance and that is the option Staff has taken in many cases.
3. 29 Road Construction Update - PW &U Director Mark Relph updated Council on the project. Spring, 2004 is the last section of street construction. Construction is slightly ahead of schedule.
4. Update on CDOT's Access Management Plan for I-70 B - PW & U
Director Mark Relph said this is also part of the big transportation plan. Mr. Relph has been having discussions with CDOT regarding access management on I-70 B, there are lots of issues, lots of businesses are voicing concern. CDOT is ready to discuss with the City Council on how planning and funding will take place for that corridor. Councilmember Terry asked that be coordinated with the west downtown transportation study.
5. CDOT's Other Regional Priority Funds – Future Priorities - PW&U
Director Mark Relph said these funds might be used for I-70 B. He referred to an earlier discussion on how these funds are distributed. Using these funds at the Hwy 50 and Riverside Parkway interchange. Councilmember Terry voiced concerns that such funds would put that corridor on the same system as North Avenue, unacceptable level of maintenance. Mr. Relph advised that maintenance funds are different from capital funds. Control being the big issue.
6. Riverside Parkway – PW & U Director Relph introduced the next item
 - (a) Design Action Committee Recommendation - John Elmer, Chair of the Design Action Committee laid out the process, some of the issues that were addressed by the DAC and how they came to the current recommendation. Councilmember Theobald voiced concern that the issues that were solved are all well and good but the new alignment may have uncovered a whole new set of issues. Mr. Relph responded that the State's 1601 process will try to address these. The preliminary design process is integral to the State's 1601 process.
 - (b) Future Steps – CDOT's 1601 Process – The State will look at all alternatives and then will determine the "best" alternative. Staff is not asking for Council to pick an alternative but rather to let staff

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.

know if they would like to pursue any alignment other than the southern alternative. The southern alternative does not require the 1601 process because there are no new structures involved whereas the Noland Ave alternative will require the 1601 process. Another issue is taking a question of indebtedness to the voters. Council discussed the 1601 process and the costs involved. Council objected to the timing for a vote should not be driving the decision to get the State involved at this time. Mr. Relph still felt, absent of any thought for bonding and vote, that from an engineering perspective to involve the state at this point. Council did not object to proceeding with the 1601 process. They directed the City Manager and the PW & U Director to begin discussion with CDOT on entering the process.

- (c) Financial Alternatives – Bonding – The Council decided to postpone discussion of financing.
- (d) Project Schedule - The schedule discuss was postponed.

10:00 **ADJOURN** at 10:45 p.m.

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.

