

GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP SUMMARY
March 14, 2016 – Noticed Agenda Attached

Meeting Convened: 5:04 p.m. in the City Hall Auditorium

Meeting Adjourned: 7:53 p.m.

City Council Members present: All except Councilmember Traylor Smith

Staff present: Moore, Shaver, Camper, Hockins, Finlayson, Kovalik, Coleman, Valentine, Dackonish, Lanning, Schoeber, Watkins (arrived at 5:52 p.m.) and Tuin

Also: Kamie Long, Kirk Granum, Allison Blevins, Les Miller, Diane Kruse, Richard Swingle, Jason Farrington, Brian Watson, and Josh Hudnell

Council President Norris opened the meeting and noted Agenda Topic 2, Update on Chronic Homelessness, will be addressed at a later date when more information is available. Interim City Manager (ICM) Moore then introduced Rob Schoeber, Parks and Recreation Director.

Agenda Topic 1. Forestry Board Bylaws and Code Changes

Mr. Schoeber said the Forestry Board has been operating without adopted bylaws but have used bylaws drafted in 2006. He introduced Randy Coleman, Parks Maintenance Supervisor, and Kamie Long, Forestry Board Chair. Ms. Long explained since the bylaws had not been adopted, the Forestry Board decided to review and update them (included in handout) before requesting Council's consent to adopt them. It was noted the Board chose not to have a city residency requirement to allow a larger pool for the needed expertise.

Councilmember Taggart suggested requiring one Alternate be a professional in the industry so when a member seat became available, the Board would still have the required number of professionals.

Council President Norris asked how Board Alternates become members. City Attorney Shaver said typically Alternates are appointed to the next available seat which provides continuity to the Board and rewards their service.

Council President Norris asked for this item to be added to an agenda for adoption after the clarifications on the points mentioned are updated.

Agenda Topic 2. Update on Chronic Homelessness

To be addressed at a later date.

Agenda Topic 3. Broadband Master Plan Update

Diane Kruse, NEOfiber Consultant, updated Council on the RFP (request for proposal) responses regarding a public/private partnership, public survey responses and comments, and Community Outreach Meeting feedback. Additional material was made available.

Survey Update - Ms. Kruse said the surveys targeted the residential market, the business community (one specifically for the Downtown Development Authority (DDA)), and one was general for all

businesses and institutions within the City. The surveys were advertised through various media (not mailed) allowing respondents to find the online surveys and participate. Speed rates were defined. The key findings, listed in order of rated importance, were: service reliability (it is insufficient), price (a barrier to higher speeds), upload and download broadband speed (it is asymmetrical, although higher than many other areas in the state), telecommuting is in place and important (stressing the need for valley wide infrastructure), and local infrastructure is in place. Ms. Kruse encouraged Council to watch the Outreach Meetings highlight video.

Ms. Kruse explained consumers are trending toward symmetrical internet services (entertainment sites having the highest demand) and away from bundled services. Local companies have plans to implement fiber to the premise, but not increase upload speeds. She noted most respondents would like the City to build and administer these services; it is seen as a utility.

RFP Update - Ms. Kruse said good options are available for the DDA Broadband Pilot Project (but all wanted a larger service area than just downtown) that supports Council's goals: ubiquitous, symmetrical gigabit service, for both residential and business, pricing similar to Google, and fiber network for City and business use. Eleven companies responded to the RFP and will be given Council's feedback regarding how much ownership (does not have to mean operating) the City would like and how much capital they would like to contribute. She explained the terms of the RFP (initial coverage would be for the downtown area and then expansion to encompass the entire city for both residential and business), that other cities with similar projects were interviewed regarding their models, and that the RFP respondents were interviewed. The RFP response types were: a Google-like service and pricing, lease/payback models – two different structures (revenue neutral), incumbent providers with no real changes (Century Link and Charter), a joint capital project, and a city owned model. She outlined the findings for each type, pros and cons of increased City involvement (capital, ownership, and operation), highlighted various municipal models in use, reviewed financing options, and how "take rates" (percentage of those with interest) affect capital costs. Ms. Kruse noted locally there is a substantial amount of fiber in place which could be leased or purchased. She advised "take rates" have increased when municipalities become involved.

Ms. Kruse asked Council for input specifically regarding how much capital and ownership they would like so an RFP addendum can be issued with their refined goals, desires, and direction. Questions were raised regarding how large an area outside the City limits should be considered (up to the Persigo 201 Boundary), "take rates" (no guaranteed level), overtaking consumer choice (other cities, using various models, have had competing providers step up their service in response; a competitive atmosphere can be maintained with most of these models), why Google-like companies have not already come to the area (they prefer larger cities), why other providers have not approached the City (many US cities want public/private partnerships and providers are being approached by many cities), and how quickly a system/network would become obsolete.

Paul Jagim, Engineering Program Supervisor, said he is hesitant to endorse the City becoming a service provider, but would like to look at all the options.

Council agreed they do not want the City to become a service provider. Questions arose regarding funding for the Westminster, MD model since this would be an enterprise model. An enterprise model would be exempt from TABOR (taxpayer bill of rights) and would not require a vote of the people.

Council agreed they would like a committee to look into the Westminster, MD model (infrastructure built by municipality and operation run by a private company).

Agenda Topic 4. Other Business

Capital Project Priorities - ICM Moore followed up on the February 29th workshop discussion regarding capital project priorities and handed out a list of capital projects in order of cost. Various suggestions were put forward regarding what parameters and categories should be used to better organize the list. Staff will reorganize the list for the March 21st workshop.

Council President Norris noted a committee is looking into selling some of the undeveloped City properties designated for parks. Those proceeds could be used for projects like the ones listed.

Project and Committee Worksheet - ICM Moore asked Council to email him feedback.

Contributions to Homeless and Vagrancy Projects – There was discussion regarding setting submission deadlines for agencies requesting assistance, what budget line item should be used for these requests, if a nonprofit rate should be established to repay enterprise funds for such fees, if nonprofit agencies should be given discounts or deferrals for fees and how much. The Economic Development (ED) Fund has been used for these requests in the past.

It was suggested to better define ED and split the budget line item for direct and indirect expenses.

Performance Reviews by Council - Questions were raised on how best to evaluate positions that do not have a direct supervisor or reports. A peer evaluation process that would include surveys and relationship information was suggested. Council will review a drafted ordinance from 2009 regarding this process and will continue working toward establishing a review process.

Agenda Topic 5. Board Reports

There were none.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
MONDAY, MARCH 14, 2016

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. **Forestry Board Bylaws and Code Changes:** The Forestry Board is proposing adoption of bylaws that govern the actions of this volunteer board. The Forestry Board is a reviewing body for the purpose of determining professional qualifications and competence to engage in the business of cutting, trimming, pruning, spraying or removing trees. [Attachment](#)
2. **Update on Chronic Homelessness**
3. **Broadband Master Plan Update:** For the City's broadband master plan, Diane Kruse with NEOfiber will give a presentation to update City Council and the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) Board on the work to-date, and will discuss next steps for expanding and enhancing the broadband capacity in the City. [Attachment](#)
4. **Other Business**
5. **Board Reports**