

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
WORKSHOP SUMMARY
May 1, 2006**

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado met on Monday, May 1st, 2006 at 7:02 p.m. in the City Hall Auditorium to discuss workshop items. Those present were Councilmembers Bonnie Beckstein, Teresa Coons, Jim Doody, Gregg Palmer, Jim Spehar, Doug Thomason, and President of the Council Bruce Hill.

Summaries and action on the following topics:

1. **ART FOR THE ACTIVITY CENTERS:** Presentation of the recommendation from the Commission on Arts and Culture to the City Council for art work to be displayed at the new City Activity Center at Bookcliff Middle School and the new joint-use gymnasium at Pear Park Elementary School. Allison Sarmo, Cultural Arts Coordinator, reviewed this item. She said the Commission reviewed the proposals along with the Parks and Recreation Department and representatives from the two schools. She said the artists were interviewed and a single artist was selected for the art work at both schools. Ms. Sarmo said the piece located at Bookcliff Middle School will be next to the door of the Activity Center and at Pear Park Elementary School, the piece will be displayed on the west side of the school. City Council wanted assurance that the materials would be able to withstand the climate in Grand Junction. Ms. Sarmo said the Arts Commission members asked the same question and they have been assured the materials are durable and will withstand the heat of the sun. She said the pieces will be installed prior to the beginning of the next school year.

Action summary: The City Council was comfortable with the selections and thanked the Arts Commission members, noting that the formal action is scheduled for Wednesday, May 3, 2006 meeting.

2. **RIVERSIDE PARKWAY PROJECT REVIEW:** Mark Relph, Public Works and Utilities Director, updated the City Council on the Riverside Parkway Project and reviewed the bids received for Phase 2. Mr. Relph advised that last week there was a significant bid opening for Phase 2 of the Riverside Parkway. He said the award of that bid is on the City Council agenda for Wednesday, May 3, 2006. Mr. Relph noted that there is a \$5 million dollar shortfall and presented some options for addressing that shortfall. He said there was a \$5 million contingency in the budget so the total shortfall is \$10 million. Mr. Relph said Phase 2 is the largest portion of the Parkway and said the cost of materials is just one factor as is the labor shortage due to the oil and gas industry. He said petroleum, cement, and steel are the materials that have increased in cost and it is hoped that the prices will stabilize until the Phase 3 is bid out, but said there is no way to predict the cost. He said the price increase is a problem both statewide and nationwide. Mr. Relph said the current estimate is still lower than the proposal received through the design-bid process and said the time frames are still on schedule. He reviewed some of the options for meeting the shortfall that includes delaying projects in the capital improvement fund and using additional sales tax. Mr. Relph said they are not recommending deleting any aspects of the Parkway.

Administrative Services Director Ron Lappi explained some of the revenue figures that were presented, specifically the bond proceeds and the interest income.

Project Manager Jim Shanks then addressed Council on the preparation of the engineer's estimate and the difficulty in getting current prices with the volatility of the cost of asphalt. He said the bulk of the cost is the cost of bridges and all the related appurtenances. Next is the cost of paving and asphalt. He detailed the rest of the major costs and the landscaping and aesthetic pieces were left in because that was not a significant factor. Mr. Shanks said street lighting is not in the contract and that contract is with Xcel to install the street lights, but there is a budget for the installation of the conduit for that lighting.

City Engineer Trent Prall displayed the Sales Tax Capital Improvement Program and identified projects to be eliminated or delayed. Mr. Prall said first Staff is proposing to use the increased sales tax. He said Staff also proposes that the Ute/Pitkin/1st Street project be deleted as Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) has included the completion of that project in their budget. Regarding the 29 Road Viaduct, it is proposed to use Mesa County's contribution for the right-of-way acquisition, starting in 2007 and the City's contribution would come later. Mr. Prall said there are some intersection improvements that Staff plans to move out three years. He said Staff will continue to pursue grants for these improvements.

Mr. Relph noted that moving these projects will significantly affect some of the costs for the same reasons the cost for the Riverside Parkway has increased. He said there are two projects that are proposed to be shifted out which are the 29 Road and I-70 interchange and 29 Road, from F Road to I-70. He said there will still be some significant funding issues with the I-70 interchange even with Mesa County's contribution of \$15 million.

Council President Hill noted that the additional lanes for I-70 may not need to be added until the future and as long as there is a plan to add those lanes, having the funding later may be acceptable.

Councilmember Spehar asked Mr. Lappi about the additional sales tax and its relation to the TABOR limit. Mr. Lappi said their projection is that Staff will still be within the limitations and said if sales tax were to stay at 14%, then Staff will be back to discuss the TABOR implications.

Council President Hill asked if the budget for storm water needs will be allocated to the Parkway. Mr. Relph said there are no other resources for the storm water and said that will need to be included with the Parkway project.

Action summary: The City Council thanked Mr. Relph and asked when the decision needs to be made regarding the other projects that are projected to be delayed. City Manager Arnold said Staff would like Council to award the bid at the Wednesday, May 3, 2006 meeting and any budget adjustment will be

proposed in the fall. Councilmember Spehar said he would rather delay these projects rather than scaling back any part of the Parkway project. Councilmember Coons agreed. Mr. Lappi concurred that the fall is when the second and final supplemental budget appropriation is proposed and at that time, Phase 3 will have been bid and Staff will have a better handle on the shortfall.

Council President Hill called a recess at 8:58 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 9:10 p.m.

3. **24 ROAD SUBAREA PLAN:** Discussion of the request to amend the 24 Road Corridor Subarea Plan and the Mixed Use Zoning to implement the recommendations of the Planning Commission, based upon the recommendations from the 24 Road Steering Committee.

Council President Hill asked City Attorney John Shaver to review the history of these deliberations. City Attorney Shaver said the review committee was reconstituted and composed mostly of members that were on the original committee to create the 24 Road Subarea Plan. He said the committee reviewed the plan and made recommendations to the Planning Commission.

Council President Hill asked if the results were two recommendations and questioned if Council will determine if the item needs to be sent back to the Planning Commission. City Attorney Shaver said Council can always remand any matter back to the Planning Commission. He said there were three recommendations and Council could handle each one individually or as a whole.

Lori Bowers, Senior Planner, presented an overview of the process. She said the revitalized committee was asked to look at the minimum residential density from 12 units per acre to 4 units per acre; delete the requirement for residential development; and allow for large-scale retail development.

The committee's recommendations are to reduce the residential density to 8 units per acre; the 20% residential requirement be deleted; and the maximum retail square footage of 30,000 square foot be eliminated in the Mixed Use within a ¼ mile on either side of 24 Road and south of I-70, and that the retail square footage be increased to 50,000 square feet for the remainder of the area.

The Planning Commission considered the Steering Committee recommendations and made the following recommendations: 1) reduce the minimum required density from 12 du/ac to 8 du/ac and amend the Growth Plan to comply with that recommendation. 2a) delete the requirement for 20% of property to be residential in the ¼ mile from 24 Road to the west and east and ¼ mile south of the interstate and allow residential development to be an option and amend the Growth Plan to comply with this recommendation. 2b) retain the requirement for residential in the remainder of the Mixed Use land use designation (the part that is not within the ¼ mile strip, that the transfer of development rights be permitted, that the percentage of residential required be at the discretion of City Council and

amend the Growth Plan to comply with that recommendation. 3) delete the limit for retail development of a maximum of 30,000 sq. ft. (within a larger building or as stand-alone development) within the Mixed-Use designation within the ¼ mile corridor on either side of 24 Road and south of I-70 and that a maximum retail square footage of 50,000 sq. ft. be applied in the remainder of the Mixed Use district (within a larger building or as stand-alone development) and amend the Growth Plan to comply with that recommendation.

Public Works Manager Tim Moore then addressed the traffic impacts for these changes. He said Staff's traffic modeling showed that the changes as proposed would increase the vehicle trips in the study area by 21.5%. He said the Riverside Parkway, the 29 Road/I-70 interchange, G Road widening, and F ½ Road are assumed completed by the traffic modeling. Although the model shows a 21.5% increase, there are many projects that are planned that will take care of the increases with the exception of G Road but the increases will be manageable.

Council President Hill asked if a commercial project would generate more Transportation Capacity Payment (TCP) funds than a residential project, which might be able to fund additional improvements. Mr. Moore said yes, in fact TCP is some of the funding that is being planned on for the construction of F ½ Road and other improvements. The underlying zoning is taken into account for the traffic modeling.

The chair of the Steering Committee, Jeff Over, said the committee did a lot of good work and lauded Staff for their assistance. The Planning Commission's recommendation differed under one item, that is to keep the residential component in one area.

Councilmember Coons asked if the Committee felt these were the three issues that needed to be addressed. Mr. Over said yes, and they were the same items they were concerned about three years ago. He said the Committee believes there will be residential in that area, but felt the market should dictate that.

Council President Hill asked about the discussions of residential being adjacent to industrial zoning and between commercial zoning. Mr. Over said that specifically was not discussed.

Councilmember Spehar recalled the reasoning behind the 20% residential requirement. Kathy Portner, Assistant Community Development Director, responded that its purpose was to take the Growth Plan Designation regarding residential and spread it out over the larger area. Councilmember Spehar said he wanted to retain the high density housing opportunity, even if a new zoning designation must be created.

Council President Hill said neither recommendation eliminates the opportunity, it is just not mandated.

Councilmember Coons noted that zoning will encourage the higher density.

Council President Hill brought up the final piece of the recommendation, the big box size limitation. He said various philosophies were debated as to what should drive the development of this area.

Action summary: Staff was directed to bring forward the ordinance with the Planning Commission's recommendation along with verbiage for the one piece that the Steering Committee recommended differently.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 10:32 p.m.