

**GRAND JUNCTION
CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP**

May 5, 2003

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado met on Monday, May 5, 2003 at 7:05 p.m. in the City Hall Auditorium to discuss workshop items. Those present were Harry Butler, Bruce Hill, Dennis Kirtland, Bill McCurry, Gregg Palmer, Jim Spehar, and President of the Council Cindy Enos-Martinez.

Summaries and action on the following topics:

- 1. CDOT'S 1601 PROCESS AND THE/RIVERSIDE PARKWAY PROJECT:**
Mark Relph, Public Works and Utilities Director, introduced the item and had Public Works Manager Tim Moore give the Council an overview of the process that the City has undertaken so far on this project and the purpose of the loop. The Design Action Committee met numerous times over the last year and unanimously recommends the Noland Avenue connection. Councilmember Palmer inquired as to the time frames for the project. Mr. Moore outlined the time frames for each piece. Councilmember Palmer asked about the widening of I-70B. Mr. Moore said that may happen too; a study on that is just beginning. He commented that it will be difficult to accommodate the projected amount of traffic in 25 years via just the State Highway system.

Mr. Relph then invited Doug Aden, State Transportation Commissioner, and Owen Leonard, CDOT Region 3 Director, to address the Council. Doug Aden commended the City on its work on addressing transportation issues. He praised the upcoming Corridor Optimization Study in conjunction with the County and the City. Mr. Aden told the Council that the 1601 process must be applied consistently state-wide and listed several projects that had also been required to complete the 1601 process. The requirement for the process is not tied to funding.

Owen Leonard, Region 3 Director, reciprocated Mr. Relph's comments and spoke of the valley-wide transportation planning process. He explained the Corridor Optimization Study process briefly and how it will be funded. The time frame for the report is within a year.

The role of CDOT and the need for approval was discussed in detail with the Council. Mr. Leonard offered the assistance of his staff to provide resources to move the 1601 process along. He agreed to look at the data and see what time can be saved in the process using what the City has already done. Mr. Leonard emphasized the need for the public process and cautioned against any pre-determined recommendation. When asked about the time frame for the process, Mr. Leonard responded an Environmental Assessment Action would have to occur first which would take around 18 months. If a more in-depth environmental study is required (Environmental Impact Study – EIS), then it could take two to three years. Mr. Aden explained about other alternatives that

would not require a 1601. Mr. Leonard noted , however, there will probably be other portions of the parkway that will require a 1601 process, such as the 29 Road and I-70 connection and the connection to I-70 B. If an alternative that did not require a 1601 process is selected , an access permit is usually decided upon within 45 days once the application is submitted.

City Manager Arnold asked Council if they want to take the next step and see what the 1601 process brings. If Council wants to go forward, he recommends that the 1601 process be started.

Councilmember Hill asked how much the 1601 process will cost. Mr. Arnold estimated \$1.5 million. Councilmember Spehar voiced concerns over spending that kind of money to come to the same conclusion. He suggested that other alternatives be reviewed again to see if another alternative can work. Mr. Arnold noted the results of the CDOT correspondence has not been taken back to the Design Action Committee (DAC).

Action summary: Council wanted time to consider the alternatives. Councilmember Spehar suggested a discussion with the Design Action Committee. Mr. Arnold said he will organize a luncheon meeting.

Council took a recess at 9:24 p.m. Council reconvened at 9:30 p.m.

2. **REGIONAL IMPACT FEES:** Tom Fisher, Director of the Regional Transportation Planning Office, presented this issue. He explained who makes up the RTPO and who the City's representative is. He then reviewed how data was collected for this proposal and what considerations had been made. He then asked the Council to discuss the possibility and come to a consensus as to whether the RTPO should continue to pursue this impact fee. The fee will be based on trip generation (capacity consumption). Councilmember Spehar asked about the cost of the study. Mr. Fisher said all of the work will be accomplished in-house.

Action summary: Councilmembers did not object to the study going forward.

3. **CITY COUNCIL ASSIGNMENTS:** Annually City Council discusses and assigns Councilmembers to represent them on various boards and within different outside organizations. Formal action is to be taken by resolution at Wednesday's Regular City Council Meeting.

Councilmember Spehar asked if the Council wants representation on GJEP and Incubator. Councilmember Spehar explained that the reasons for not having representation on these boards in the past. Councilmember Spehar said any representative will be there as eyes and ears for the Council. City Attorney Wilson noted that there may be some land use review on the Incubator property in the short term and a Council representative will need to be aware of that. The two new

Councilmembers will need to think about being on Strategic Planning committees.

Action summary: Council assignments were made and the Clerk will complete the resolution for formal adoption on Wednesday.

ADJOURN at 10:24