

GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP SUMMARY
June 15, 2015 – Noticed Agenda Attached

Meeting Convened: 5:00 p.m. in the City Auditorium

Meeting Adjourned: 8:02 p.m.

City Council Members present: All except Chazen and Kennedy

Staff present: Englehart, Shaver, Lanning, Kovalik, Watkins, Camper, Nordine, Quimby, Tice, Portner, Thornton, and Kemp

Agenda Topic 1. Chabin Concepts Competitive Analysis

Legislative and Management Liaison Elizabeth Tice provided background and described the project. The two action steps that were identified in the Economic Development (ED) Plan were to identify and understand the existing marketing efforts of the Economic Development Partners (ED Partners) and identify potential opportunities for new or coordinated marketing efforts. Staff reached out to ED Partners with a survey asking three questions which were: 1) what are their organization's current marketing activities and investments; 2) what did they see for areas needing improvement valley wide for marketing efforts; and 3) what role did they see the City playing in economic development marketing. There were many meetings held with the ED Partners. A partnership and joint venture was formed and goals and outcomes were to have cohesive branding, have a unified voice for Economic Development marketing, and define a strategy for implementation. Council's leadership helped analyze the status quo for the opportunity and investment in the request for proposals (RFP) for a strategic plan consultant for ED implementation. North Star Destination Strategies and Chabin Concepts were selected because they are experts in ED and branding for communities the size of Grand Junction, they have an outside viewpoint with national experience, their proposal was data, research, and outreach based, and advertising strategies would utilize a local firm's involvement. Ms. Tice referred to the competitive location assessment that was conducted by Chabin Concepts and DSG Advisors that was provided to Council prior to the workshop. The assessment provided the local community's ranking relative to competitors, insight into business and site selection perception, and identified opportunities to improve a business attraction program. She reviewed the objectives which included an outside perspective on the site selection process, insights on how not to get eliminated, an understanding of market drivers, a way to better identify targets and strategies to convert leads into successes, and ideas to better position the community for economic growth. The three primary drivers for the region are the traded sector (manufacturing companies that export goods or services), visitor potential (overnight visitors spend more than day visitors), and population driven businesses (businesses that are providing goods and services to the base population). From the location assessment, Ms. Tice briefly reviewed overall factor findings for the top ten factors. Five areas that were identified for improving competitiveness were product improvement (develop infrastructure, available

building and ready sites, physical connectivity between employment centers, and community beautification), packaging (a marketing suite that sells a value proposition to businesses), operational effectiveness (community leaders together develop a broader-term strategy for success), tactical targeting (work together on strategic targeting based on value proposition and business characteristics), and brand identity (create a consistent brand identity and messaging platform). Ms. Tice advised that the next steps to be taken are to further partner outreach and gather questions and concerns. The June 29, 2015 workshop with City Council and Mesa County Commissioners where Ed Barlow with North Star Destination Strategies will present research and insight information and hopefully have Audrey Taylor with Chabin Concepts there to present. Then the Chamber of Commerce has offered to host an implementation summit and get all of the ED Partners together to go through the report.

When asked who would facilitate the summit, City Manager Englehart advised that the ED Partners and the Chamber are considering asking Audrey Taylor to act as a facilitator and help prioritize what is really important. They are considering having the summit sometime in August.

There was discussion regarding some areas of the report that need to be addressed and clarified at the presentation on June 29th such as the lack of control standards, what communities were being used for the benchmark, additional information on the need for site ready land or buildings, specificity on the need to beautify the region, eliminating the team chart, providing examples of the suggested website, clarification on wage comparisons, and an explanation on what is "site ready".

City Manager Englehart advised that the report that was provided to Council for this meeting will be sent to the County Commissioners on June 16th.

The questions will be compiled to be addressed at the June 29th presentation.

Agenda Topic 2. Update on Drainage Summit

Public Works Director Greg Lanning reviewed that about a year ago the City received a bill from the Grand Valley Drainage District (GVDD) and as a result there has been three drainage summits. GVDD has to date created a financial plan on how they can continue to operate.

Meanwhile the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority is managing the stormwater quality permits with no problems or issues. County Commissioner Scott McInnis has replaced Commissioner Justman on the 5-2-1 Board. Commissioner McInnis asked for more study on the issue and as a result the "white paper", which was distributed, was developed. The "white paper" was then presented. Council President Norris asked if the County is supportive of the recommendations in the "white paper". Councilmember McArthur said he briefly saw a letter where all three Commissioners supported the recommendations but was unsure of their support for a fee.

Mr. Lanning reviewed the recommendation for a committee to be formed to develop a valley wide drainage and stormwater organization; a (Greater) Grand Valley Drainage District. There was discussion regarding a draft bill that has been prepared for the District which would go to the legislature to propose taking on the boundaries of the 5-2-1 and changing the District's mission. A letter that the Mayor sent to GVDD in March 2015 was referred to which supported a fee. Because of Council's support, GVDD will allow two ongoing projects to proceed. Councilmember McArthur explained the options proposed and the benefits or disadvantages. One of the main disagreements is the leadership structure of the new expanded entity. The "white paper" basically recommends the expansion of the boundaries of the GVDD, transferring the dues of the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority to the GVDD, imposing a fee or a mill levy on users, and dissolving the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority. The other option is to transfer all of the authority to the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority and impose a fee. The advantage to the expansion of the GVDD and the transfer of the authority is there is no option for an entity to withdraw under that scenario.

There was discussion on the timeline for the implementation of a Greater Grand Valley Drainage District or Authority and looking at taking it to the State Legislative Session in 2016 instead of waiting until 2017 as suggested by Commissioner McInnis. Mr. Lanning reviewed a letter that was sent to City Attorney Shaver by GVDD's attorney which acknowledged that City Council is in support of finding solutions to the valley's serious drainage issues. GVDD is asking for a letter of response. City Council directed Staff to draft a letter to GVDD that will state that Council conceptually supports continuing discussions.

Councilmember McArthur then updated Council on the status of discharge permits and water quality standards.

Agenda Topic 3. Body Worn Cameras Update

Police Chief Camper advised that Commander Paul Quimby and Deputy Chief Mike Nordine have done a lot of research and put a lot of work into the matter of body worn cameras (BWC's). He advised that many law enforcement agencies are adopting the use of BWC's. Some of the advantages are: they improve evidence collection; they strengthen officer performance and accountability; they enhance agency transparency; they document encounters between police and the public; and they assist in investigating and resolving complaints and officer-involved incidents. Some of the disadvantages are the cost (cameras run from \$800 to \$2000 each plus the storage and maintenance and probably a leased program would be best to look at); the retention, redaction, and production are very labor intensive (13 minutes of camera video would require about 45 minutes of labor); privacy (HIPAA); what information would be considered protected under Colorado Open Records Act; and overly high expectations and capabilities of the camera.

Commander Paul Quimby advised that for 18 months they tested out eight cameras to see what officers like or dislike about them. Technology advances so rapidly that now there are cameras that do so much more than 18 months ago. There is not one camera that has all the

features one may want. An in-house policy has been drafted, a Colorado JAG grant was applied for but was denied, and they are staying alert to any funding/grant opportunities that may be out there. There are federal grants available but they have a lot of strings attached and would only go to 16 small agencies (defined as 250 officers or less), and Grand Junction probably would not have a chance of being awarded one of those grants.

Chief Camper stated that it is expected that there will be Federal or State legislation mandating BWC's in the near future and that is why they are researching it now to be ahead of the curve and know what is available. There was discussion about costs, retention, security, outfitting a sub group of officers with BWC's and a half time evidence staff person to handle the videos to see how that works, getting 60 BWC's for the entire patrol force and a half time evidence staff person, having an outside company handle the storage (cloud storage) and management of the videos, and the benefits of having BWC's in Grand Junction.

Chief Camper asked Council for their thoughts on whether or not to continue to pursue the use of the BWC's. City Council requested Staff provide a cost for 60 BWC's and a half-time staff person to manage the videos. Then it could be decided whether or not to add it to the budget consideration for 2016.

Agenda Topic 4. Other Business

City Manager Englehart advised that he has prepared a letter to HomewardBound regarding their request for up to \$100,000 for their development costs.

City Manager Englehart said that the Parks and Recreation Department has been talking about selling alcohol during adult league softball games at Canyon View Park. The Parks and Recreation Advisory Board was in favor of it. As a test, they will be applying for a Special Events Permit for the Boston's Tournament which is scheduled on August 8th and 9th in order to see how it might work. City Council was in favor of obtaining a Special Events Permit on a trial basis prior to considering a full time liquor license.

City Attorney Shaver advised that he received an order regarding the Panhandling court case. The claim by Eric Neiderkruger was dismissed. However, the second motion in the case is pending a Supreme Court decision regarding a "Thayer" case out of Massachusetts with a very similar ordinance that is being challenged. It was agreed by the Administrative Law Judge that the second motion would wait on that outcome.

There was discussion regarding the presentation that was given on Las Colonias on June 1st. Some Councilmembers have received some negative citizen feedback on the phasing plan. City Council agreed that the phasing should be looked at before moving forward.

Agenda Topic 5. Board Reports

Councilmember Boeschstein said that Mesa Land Trust had a picnic at Fall Creek Ranch and it was a nice gathering in a gorgeous area. He attended a meeting at the Incubator Center and he feels they are right on top of economic development and the City should support them more. The Downtown Development Authority has a contract for the demolition of the remaining part of White Hall and is pending the permit from the Colorado Department of Health for Air Quality. Councilmember Boeschstein attended a meeting with Colorado Preservation, Inc. and there are two parties very interested in purchasing the historic depot. If that happens, Bonsai Zip Line, a company currently leasing part of the depot, will need support in finding a new location in Grand Junction.

Councilmember Taggart commented on the successful Ride the Rockies Event the previous weekend and felt it was great for the community as well as other local communities. The organizers are going to try to get Grand Junction on a two or three year cycle for Ride the Rockies.

Council President Norris advised that the trip to Canada was very successful. They had lists and rated the companies as A, B, and C, and called on people. There were 30 (A) companies on the list that are interested in relocating. Their focus was mainly on manufacturing companies. They brought back some names for Grand Junction Economic Partnership to follow up on. They also visited booths of local companies (Encana and Calfrac) and thanked them for being in Grand Junction.

Councilmember McArthur attended the West Star Aviation's new hanger barbeque and commented that it was very impressive.

With no other business, the meeting was adjourned.

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
MONDAY, JUNE 15, 2015**

**WORKSHOP, 5:00 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM
250 N. 5TH STREET**

To become the most livable community west of the Rockies by 2025

1. **Chabin Concepts Competitive Analysis**
2. **Update on Drainage Summit**
3. **Body Worn Cameras Update:** The Police Department will present considerations regarding Body Worn Cameras. **Attachment**
4. **Other Business**
5. **Board Reports**