

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
WORKSHOP SUMMARY
February 5, 2007**

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado met on Monday, February 5, 2007 at 7:02 p.m. in the City Hall Auditorium to discuss workshop items. Those present were Councilmembers Teresa Coons, Bruce Hill, Jim Spehar, and Acting Council President Doug Thomason. Absent were Councilmembers Bonnie Beckstein and Gregg Palmer and Council President Jim Doody.

Summaries and action on the following topics:

- 1. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:** City Manager David Varley presented the proposal and scope of work for the City's comprehensive plan which will begin in 2007. A comprehensive plan has not been done in Grand Junction in a long time. The comprehensive plan and the currently adopted plans will be pulled together. It will take a year and a half to complete. It covers a wide range of activities, services, policy guidelines, etc. There will be a variety of methods to gather input. It will be a time-consuming and costly process but it will be a document that can be used on a regular basis and include methods for implementation. The goal is to help the City organization in making decisions. Mr. Varley reviewed the time schedule. He asked for feedback on setting up a Steering Committee. He stated that 2007 is the year for the biannual telephone survey. He questioned if that should be done with this other process going on.

Councilmember Hill stated that the City needs to get the community involved in this plan early.

Councilmember Spehar said he supports the appointment of a Steering Committee but advised not to appoint the usual citizens. The Steering Committee should have a good cross section, the broadest possible outreach. He said the City should look at seeking out people that might not otherwise be considered.

Councilmember Coons stated that the City shouldn't rely too heavily on the Steering Committee. She would like to see the Plan done without a Steering Committee.

Mr. Varley advised that Vision 20/20 group obtained community input in unique ways.

Councilmember Spehar suggested looking at a program that is taken out to the community in their own settings. Staff shouldn't do too much groundwork beforehand.

Mr. Varley asked for Council's input on any ideas to get a diverse group together.

Councilmember Hill stated that a telephone survey is a Steering Committee function. The biannual community survey is designed to develop baseline data and that could be lost if the City skips a year.

Mr. Varley stated that maybe it would be best to use a different method for the Comprehensive Plan input.

Councilmember Spehar said that the City should not rely on those responding to mail outs as it is a shot gun approach.

Acting Council President Doug Thomason asked Mr. Varley for the timeline on this Plan.

Mr. Varley stated that proposals will be due back March 2nd; in the meantime they can brainstorm on ideas for the Steering Committee. It will probably take close to 18 months to finish the Plan.

Councilmember Hill asked is there are going to be suggestions to make changes to the Future Land Use Plan and if so, how will that process work?

Mr. Varley stated that ideally, the Comprehensive Plan supersedes all other plans.

Councilmember Hill said that he is concerned that this will be a short cut to undercut the Future Land Use Plan.

Councilmember Spehar stated that the Future Land Use Plan can be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. The City can't anticipate and make everything fit beforehand but conflicts could be brought forward and looked at.

Councilmember Hill said that the Future Land Use Map is revered; steps should be identified in the Master Plan to make modifications to the Future Land Use Plan.

Action Summary: The City Council was supportive of the process being proposed and expressed a variety of concerns regarding soliciting community input and incorporating the existing plans, especially the Future Land Use Plan, that garnered a tremendous amount of input in its development.

Acting Council President Thomason called a recess at 8:00 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 8:08 p.m.

2. **UPDATE ON GENESIS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN:** Deputy City Manager Laurie Kadrach reviewed the status of the work that is being done on this project. She briefly reviewed the history of this process so far. Many of the questions being asked by the community cannot be answered until the actual drill permit is issued. Much of the work so far has been to educate the "stakeholders" on what could happen. There is an open house scheduled on April 17th. On April 16th a meeting for the elected officials has been scheduled to explain what the draft document will be. There has been a request for one additional joint meeting. Baseline data is currently being gathered for both the Grand Junction and Palisade communities. The same contractor is being used and Genesis is paying for the gathering of the baseline data.

Ms. Kadrach advised that it is very common for communities to have their own regulations for lessees to drill on City-owned property. No applications for permits have been submitted. Genesis has indicated that they are a year or two out from filing for any permits on City property or in the watershed.

Councilmember Coons asked if there have been discussions regarding bonding. Ms. Kadrach stated that the language in the ordinance is more related to the company's responsibilities for repair. City Attorney John Shaver clarified that the City's ordinance does have bonding provisions as does the BLM. Ms. Kadrach stated that the amount will be determined on each basis depending on the risk.

Ms. Kadrach stated that the City would also have a say in Palisade's watershed as the City owns property there. Everyone is working cooperatively.

Councilmember Spehar said that the process is staff and stakeholder based, not community-based. There is no representation from the group that brought the watershed ordinance forward. This is not just a technical issue but also a political issue, and he has concerns on how the process has developed.

Councilmember Hill said that there have been a lot of technically oriented meetings but that doesn't mean the general public cannot be brought in. The public should be engaged at the April 17th open house.

Ms. Kadrach stated that from April until July, Grand Junction can take the draft plan to the public and get feedback.

Councilmember Spehar stated that it is the constituents who are the stakeholders. The City has set up a tenuous basis to expect consensus on what comes out of the working group.

Councilmember Coons asked what the realistic expectation is to have another public input process to include the constituency and include citizens to review the draft plan.

Ms. Kadrach clarified that the document is a communication, not an enforceable document. The information contained in the document can be used by the elected officials to develop stronger regulations and statements and have baseline data to react when the application for a permit comes forward.

Councilmember Spehar questioned the Community Plan as a communications tool because the BLM intends to incorporate the Plan into their permitting process.

Councilmember Hill stated that there are many sets of eyes on this process.

Councilmember Coons hopes that the Plan is a process for ongoing communications among the stakeholders similar to the energy advisory board in Garfield County that meets regularly to stay updated.

Councilmember Hill stated that the City has to be mindful of its resources and keep this in mind during the budget process.

Ms. Kadrach reminded Council that as elected officials they have the ability to form groups or committees to meet on a regular basis on this issue, and if so desired, put into a strategic planning document.

Action Summary: The City Council talked about ways to take the draft document to the citizens and make sure those stakeholders are heard and educated. The formation of a board to continue discussions as this industry continues to develop was also mentioned.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 8:43 p.m.