

To access the Agenda and Backup Materials electronically, go to www.gjcity.org



**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
MONDAY, JUNE 4, 2018**

**PRE-MEETING (DINNER) 5:00 P.M. ADMINISTRATION CONFERENCE ROOM
WORKSHOP, 5:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM
250 N. 5TH STREET**

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

1. Discussion Topics

- a. Rules of Procedure for City Council Meetings
- b. City Council Regular Meeting Minutes
- c. Board and Commission Assignments for City Council

2. Next Workshop Topics - July 16, 2018

- a. Community Center Update

3. Other Business

What is the purpose of a Workshop?

The purpose of a Workshop is for the presenter to provide information to City Council about an item or topic that they may be discussing at a future meeting. The less formal setting of a Workshop is intended to facilitate an interactive discussion among Councilmembers.

How can I provide my input about a topic on tonight's Workshop agenda?

Individuals wishing to provide input about Workshop topics can:

- 1. Send an email (addresses found here www.gjcity.org/city-government/) or call one or more members of City Council (970-244-1504);
- 2. Provide information to the City Manager (citymanager@gjcity.org) for dissemination to the

City Council. If your information is submitted prior to 3 p.m. on the date of the Workshop, copies will be provided to Council that evening. Information provided after 3 p.m. will be disseminated the next business day.

3. Attend a Regular Council Meeting (generally held the 1st and 3rd Wednesdays of each month at 6 p.m. at City Hall) and provide comments during “Citizen Comments.”



Grand Junction City Council

Workshop Session

Item #1.a.

Meeting Date: June 4, 2018

Presented By: Greg Caton, City Manager, Wanda Winkelmann, City Clerk

Department: City Manager

Submitted By: Wanda Winkelmann

Information

SUBJECT:

Rules of Procedure for City Council Meetings

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this item is for a discussion on possible rules of procedures to govern City Council meetings.

BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:

In alignment with the City's Strategic Plan Directive, *Communication, Outreach & Engagement*, and in accordance with City Council's desire for increased citizen participation at meetings, staff presented a memo in November to clarify how increased citizen participation will occur. Subsequent changes were made to improve the process, such as including information on the agendas about how citizens can provide additional feedback to Council, amending the "Citizen Presentation Form" to remove the speaker's address, and standardizing the amount of time allotted to speakers by adding a timer. The memo also addressed meeting decorum, instructions to speakers, and not including the "Non-scheduled Citizens and Visitors" portion on the agenda as there are multiple ways for citizens to provide feedback to City Council.

As part of the next steps in the process ("Phase II"), staff presented a memo in April and "Rules of Procedure" that address:

1. The order of business for Council meetings;
2. The length of Regular meetings;
3. Citizen Comment;
4. Public Conduct;

5. Procedural Decisions;
6. Council Questions and Debate;
7. Basic Rules of Order.

After the April memo and "Rules of Procedure" were distributed to Council, Mayor Traylor Smith provided the following feedback:

1. Invocations should be added to any meeting where the Pledge of Allegiance is given.
2. Voting by acclamation would be acceptable for the consent agenda/amendments.

Staff has incorporated these suggestions in red font (on page 1 and page 10) into the attached "Rules of Procedure" for Council's consideration.

FISCAL IMPACT:

N/A

SUGGESTED ACTION:

Council discussion and direction to staff.

Attachments

1. City Council Meetings Rules of Procedure

Rules of Procedures Governing the Conduct of City Council Meetings and Workshops

**Adopted DATE
Resolution**

Section 1. Order of Business for Regular or Special Council Meetings.

- a. Council business at regular Council meetings shall be conducted in the following order:
 - (1) Call Meeting to Order
 - (2) Pledge of Allegiance
 - (3) Invocation or Moment of Silence
 - (4) Presentations, Proclamations, Appointments, Certificate of Appointments
 - (5) Citizen Comments
 - (6) Council Reports
 - (7) Consent Agenda
 - (8) Council Pulled Consent Agenda Items
 - (9) Regular Agenda Items Needing Individual Consideration
 - (10) Other Business
 - (11) Adjournment

- b. Council business at special Council meetings shall be conducted in the following order:
 - (1) Call Meeting to Order
 - (2) Pledge of Allegiance
 - (3) **Invocation or Moment of Silence (suggestion by Mayor Traylor Smith)**
 - (4) Individual Consideration of Items Identified in the Call of Special Meeting
 - (5) Adjournment

- c. Council business at ~~special Council meetings called for the purpose of~~ Executive Sessions/Special Meetings shall be conducted in the following order:
 - (1) Call Meeting to Order
 - (2) Individual Consideration of Items Identified in the ~~c~~Call of Executive Session/Special Meeting
 - (3) Adjournment

- d. Procedures for conduct of other types of special proceedings by the Council shall be established by the presiding ~~officer~~member and shall comply with ~~all~~any applicable legal requirements.

Section 2. Length of **Regular Meetings**

- a. Regular Council meetings will begin at 6:00 P.p.Mm.; Executive Session/Special Meetings will begin at the noticed time.
- b. ~~Appropriate b~~Breaks may will be taken during meetings at the presiding ~~officer~~member's discretion; ~~based on~~ meeting length and agenda will be consideration for when breaks are taken.
- c. ~~Every r~~Regular Council meetings will end no later than 10:30 P.p.Mm., except that:
 - (1) any item of business commenced before 10:30 P.p.Mm. may as determined by a majority vote of the members be concluded before the meeting is adjourned; and,
 - (2) the Council, may, at any time prior to adjournment, may as determined by a majority vote of the members, by majority vote, extend a meeting until no later than midnight to for the purpose of considering additional item(s) of business.
 - (3) Any matter which has been commenced and is still pending at the conclusion of the Council meeting, and all All matters scheduled for consideration at the meeting which have not yet been considered by the Council prior to 10:30 (or midnight if the meeting is extended), will be continued without separate motion to the next regular Council meeting and will be placed on the regular discussion agenda for such meeting, unless Council determines otherwise.

Section 3. **Citizen Comment During Regular and Special Council Meetings.**

- a. Comment during Citizen Participation. Prior to the start of the Council meeting, citizens ~~shall~~ expressing an -their interest in addressing City Council during the "Citizen Comments" portion segment of the meeting shall complete by completing a form provided by the City Clerk. Citizen comment will be allowed on matters of interest or concern to citizens except the following:
 - (1) items the Council will consider at that night's meeting that include time for citizen comment (such as items discussed during public hearings);
 - (2) matters that are the subject of a board or hearing ~~officer~~member decision that will be appealable to the Council, if a submittal has been made to initiate the decision-making process.

- b. Comment on Agenda Items. Citizen input will be received with regard to:
- (1) each item discussed during a public hearing on the regular agenda;
 - (2) each item pulled from the consent agenda; and
 - (3) any item that is addressed by formal Council action under the “Other Business” portion segment of the meeting that may directly affects the rights or obligations of any member of the general public.

Such citizen input will be permitted only once per item regardless of the number of motions made during Council’s consideration of the item.

- c. Time Limits for Speaking. Each speaker will generally be limited to three minutes; however, the amount of time to be allotted to each speaker will be set by the presiding officermember based upon the number of persons expected to speak, in order to allow as many as possible to address the Council within a reasonable time given the scheduled agenda. The presiding officermember may ask those intending to speak to indicate their intention by a show of hands or some other means, and to move to a line of speakers (or to a seat nearby for those not able to stand while waiting). If necessary in order to facilitate Council’s understanding of the item, or to allow the Council to consider and act upon the item in a timely fashion, the presiding officermember may increase or decrease the time that would otherwise be allowed for each speaker.
- d. Manner of Addressing the Council. Comment and testimony are to be directed to the Council. Unless otherwise directed by the presiding officermember, all comments must be made into the microphone.
- e. Yielding the Lectern. Each speaker shall promptly cease his/~~or~~her comments and yield the lectern immediately upon the expiration of the time allotted or at the conclusion of questions from the Council. by the presiding officer.
- f. Yielding of Time. No speaker may yield part or all of his/~~or~~her time to another speaker, and no speaker will be credited with time requested but not used by another.

Section 4. Public Conduct During Regular and Special Council Meetings and Work Sessions.

- a. General Comment, or Expressions of Support or Opposition. Members of the audience are not entitled to speak except as provided in these Rules of Procedure, or as expressly requested by the presiding officermember or

City Manager or City Attorney staff, and shall not engage in expressions of support or opposition, such as whistling, cheering, foot stomping, booing, hissing, speaking out, yelling, or other acts, that disturb, disrupt, or impede the meeting or any recognized speaker.

- b. Signs and Props. No signs or props are permitted in the Council ~~c~~Chambers.
- c. Distribution of Literature. Distribution of fliers or other literature is permitted in the public lobby areas of City Hall only when City Hall is open for a public event. Distribution of fliers and other literature is permitted on the sidewalks and grounds around City Hall. (See, 9.04.160 et. seq. GJMC) Persons wishing to engage in such activities may do so only in a manner that does not interfere with the movement of persons or obstruct the passage of pedestrians or vehicles.
- d. Video and Audio Recording. Video and audio recording by the press or other members of the public is permitted in the Council chambers Meeting Room only if the person making the recording is seated, standing in the back of the Council chambers Meeting Room behind all seated persons, or standing in any other area pursuant to the direction of the presiding ~~officer~~member in his or her reasonable discretion or designated for that purpose ~~in advance~~ by the City.
- e. Areas Permitted for Seating and Standing. Except for persons waiting in line to speak in accordance with the presiding ~~officer~~member's instructions, no persons shall sit in the Council chambers Meeting Room except in chairs or seats provided by the City or in wheelchairs or other assistive devices, and no persons shall stand in the aisles or other locations in the Council chambers Meeting Room except in the back of the Council chambers Meeting Room, and only in accordance with other applicable limits for fire and building safety.

Section 5. Procedural Decisions Subject to Modification by Council.

Decisions by the presiding ~~officer~~member regarding procedures and procedural issues, including but not limited to time limits for public comment, may be superseded overridden by a majority vote of the Council.

Section 6. Council Questions and Debate.

Council questions and debate regarding an agenda item during a regular or special Council meeting will occur immediately following citizen input and prior to entertaining any main motion related to the item. Except when raising a point of order at a regular or special Council meeting, Councilmembers seeking to ask questions or participate in debate or discussion will do so only when recognized by the presiding officermember. The presiding officermember may limit or curtail questions or debate as he/~~or~~ she deems necessary for the orderly conduct of business.

Section 7. **Basic Rules of Order for Regular and Special Council Meetings.**

These procedures are based on following commonly used rules of order and these procedures will control govern the conduct of City Council business at regular and special Council meetings. Except as specifically noted, all motions require a second. These procedures rules of order are based upon *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised* and have been modified as necessary to conform to existing practices of the Council and to the requirements of the City Charter. For example, all motions of the Council, except a motion to go into executive session or a motion to adopt an emergency ordinance, may be adopted upon approval of a majority vote (four members) of the members of City Council, pursuant to Art. VI, Sec. 50 of the City Charter.

If ~~there is~~ a question is not addressed by these of procedures then not addressed by these rules, reference may be made to Robert's Rules of Order for clarification or direction, however, adherence to *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised* shall not be mandatory, and, in the event of any conflict between these procedures rules of order and Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised, Robert's Rules of Order, these procedures rules of order shall prevail. In the event of any conflict between these procedures, Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised rules of order or Robert's Rules of Order and a City Charter and/or City Code provision(s), the City Charter or City Code provision shall prevail.

Any councilmember and the presiding officermember may make or second any motion, except as specifically limited by these procedures.rules.

MAIN MOTIONS

- Main motions are used to bring business before the Council for consideration and action.
- A main motion can be introduced only if no other business is pending.
- All main motions require a second and may be adopted by majority vote (4) of the members of City Council.
- A main motion may be made or seconded by any Councilmember, including the presiding officermember.
- A main motion is debatable and may be amended.

SUBSIDIARY MOTIONS

These are motions that may be applied to another motion for the purpose of modifying it, delaying action on it, or disposing of it.

1. Motion to Amend. The point of a motion to amend is to modify the wording - and, within certain limits, the meaning - of a pending motion before the pending motion itself is acted upon.

- A motion to amend, once seconded, is debatable and may itself be amended once.
- A "secondary amendment," which is a change to a pending "primary amendment," cannot be amended.
- Once a motion to amend has been seconded and debated, it is decided before the main motion is decided.
- Certain motions to amend are improper.
 - For example, an amendment must be "germane" to be an order. To be germane, an amendment must in some way involve the same question that is raised by the motion to which it is applied.
 - Also, some motions to amend are improper, for example, a motion that would merely make the adoption of the amended question equivalent to a rejection of the original motion, or one that would make the question as amended identical with, or contrary to, one previously decided by the Council during the same session.
- "Friendly" amendments acceptable to the maker and the seconder of the main motion do not require a second and are permissible at any time before a vote is taken on motions to amend the main motion.

2. Withdrawal of a Motion. After a motion has been seconded and stated by the presiding officer/member it belongs to the Council as a whole and the maker may withdraw his or her motion unless one or more members of the Council objects, in which case the majority of the Council must consent to withdrawal of the motion.

3. Motion to Postpone to a Certain Time (or Definitely). This is the motion by which action on an agenda item or a pending motion can be put off to a definite day, meeting or hour, or until after a certain event has occurred.

- A motion to postpone definitely can be debated only to the extent necessary to enable the Council to determine whether the main motion should be postponed and, if so, to what date or time.
- Similarly, it is amendable only as to the date or time to which the main motion should be postponed.

4. Motion to Lay on the Table. A motion to table is intended to enable the Council to lay the pending question aside temporarily, but only when something else of immediate

urgency has arisen.

- Adoption of a motion to lay on the table immediately halts the consideration of the affected motion, since a motion to table is neither debatable nor amendable.

5. Motion to Postpone Indefinitely. A motion to postpone indefinitely is, in effect, a motion that the Council decline to take a position on an agenda item or main motion.

- Adoption of a motion to postpone indefinitely kills the agenda item or main motion and avoids a direct vote on the item or motion. It is useful in disposing of an item or motion that cannot either be adopted or expressly rejected without undesirable consequences.
- A motion to postpone indefinitely is debatable but not amendable.

6. "Calling the Question". "Calling the question" may sometimes motivate unanimous consent to end debate. If it does not, however, then debate does not automatically end.

- If any member objects to ending the debate, the presiding officermember should ask if there is a second to the motion and, if so, he must immediately take a vote on whether to end debate.
- A motion to call the question is not debatable or amendable.

INCIDENTAL MOTIONS

These are motions which usually apply to the method of conducting business rather to the business itself.

1. Point of Order. If a Councilmember thinks that the rules of order are being violated, he or she can make a point of order, thereby calling upon the presiding officermember for a ruling and an enforcement of the regular rules.

- A "point of order" takes precedence over any pending question out of which it may arise *and does not require a second*.
- A "point of order" is not amendable.
- Technically, a "point of order" is not debatable; however:
 - With the presiding officermember's consent, the member raising the point of order may be permitted to explain his or her point.
 - In response to a point of order, the presiding officermember can either immediately rule, subject to appeal to the Council, or the presiding officermember can refer the point of order to the judgment of the Council, in which case the point becomes debatable.
 - In making his or her ruling, the presiding officermember may consult with

the City Attorney ~~and/or or request the advice of experienced~~ members of the Council.

- No member has the right to express an opinion unless requested to do so by the presiding ~~officer~~member.
- When the presiding ~~officer~~member has made a ruling, any two Councilmembers can appeal the ruling (one making the appeal and the other seconding it).
 - When an appeal is taken, the matter is decided by majority vote of the Council.
 - A tie vote sustains the decision of the presiding ~~officer~~member.
- If a point of order is to be raised, it must be raised promptly at the time the perceived violation of the rules occurs.

~~2. Point of Information. Robert's Rules of Order provides for a "point of information" or a "request for information" which is appropriate in the formal setting of a large legislative body. Because Council consideration of an item is generally an opportunity to request information and ask questions, the formal "point of information" procedure provided in Robert's Rules is not needed or appropriate for City Council meetings.~~

23. Motion to Divide a Question. If a motion relating to a single subject contains several parts, each of which is capable of standing as a complete proposition by itself, the parts of the motion can be separated for consideration and voted on as if they were distinct questions by the adoption of a motion for division of the question.

- A motion to divide a question, if seconded, takes precedence over the main motion and is not debatable.
- The motion to divide must clearly state the manner in which the question is to be divided, and while the motion to divide is pending, another member can propose a different division by moving an amendment to the motion to divide, in which case the amended form of the motion, if seconded, would be decided first.
- Often, little formality is involved in dividing a question, and it is arranged by unanimous consent.

34. Motion to Suspend the Rules. When the Council wishes to do something that it cannot do without violating one or more of its regular rules, it can adopt a motion to suspend the rules that interfere with the proposed action.

- A motion to suspend the rules can be made at any time that no question is pending and can be applied to any rule except those that are fundamental principles of the City Charter, City Code or other applicable laws.
- This motion is neither debatable nor amendable.

RESTORATIVE MOTIONS

These are motions that bring a question again before the Council for its consideration.

1. Motion to Take from the Table. The object of this motion is to take from the table and make pending again before the Council a motion or series of adhering motions that previously had been laid on the table.

- A motion to take an item from the table is neither debatable nor amendable.
- When a question is taken from the table, it is before the Council with everything adhering to it, exactly as it was when laid on the table.

2. Motion to Reconsider. This motion enables a majority of the Council to bring back for further consideration a motion which has already been voted on.

- A motion to reconsider is in order only if made on the same date that the vote to be reconsidered was taken, and can be made only by a member who voted with the prevailing side of the vote to be reconsidered.
- The purpose of reconsidering a vote is to permit the correction of hasty, ill-advised, or erroneous action, or to take into account added information or a changed situation that has developed since the taking of a vote.
- When a member who cannot make a motion for reconsideration believes that there are valid reasons for one, he or she can try, if there is time or opportunity, to persuade someone who voted with the prevailing side to make such a motion.
- A motion to reconsider is debatable whenever the motion proposed to be reconsidered was debatable. And, when debatable, opens to debate the merits of the question to be reconsidered.
- A motion to reconsider is not amendable.
- The effect of the adoption of a motion to reconsider is that the question on which the vote was reconsidered is immediately placed before the Council in the exact position it occupied the moment before it was voted on originally.

3. Motion to Rescind or Amend Something Previously Adopted. By means of the motions to rescind or to amend something previously adopted, the Council can change an action previously taken or ordered.

- A motion to rescind or amend something previously adopted is debatable and amendable.
- In contrast to a motion to reconsider, there is no time limit on making a motion to rescind or a motion to amend something previously adopted (provided that no action has been taken by anyone in the interim that cannot be undone), and these motions can be moved by any member of the Council, regardless of how he or she voted on the original question.

- The effect of passage of this motion is not to place the matter back before the assembly as it was just prior to a vote being taken.
 - Instead, it either entirely nullifies the previous action or modifies it, depending upon which motion is used.
 - For that reason, adoption of a motion to rescind or amend something previously adopted should be carefully considered if third parties may have relied to their detriment on the previous action.
- In order to modify an adopted ordinance, Council must adopt a new ordinance making the desired modification, in compliance with all formalities applicable to adoption of an ordinance.

PRIVILEGED MOTIONS

These motions are of such urgency or importance that they are entitled to immediate consideration, even when another motion is pending. This is because these motions do not relate to the pending business but have to do with special matters of immediate and overriding importance which, without debate, should be allowed to interrupt the consideration of anything else.

1. Motion to Adjourn. Generally, the presiding ~~officer~~member adjourns the meeting at his or her discretion at the completion of the agenda. However, any Councilmember may move to adjourn the meeting at any time.

- A motion to adjourn requires a second.
- A motion to adjourn is always a privileged motion except when the motion is conditioned in some way, as in the case of a motion to adjourn at, or to, a future time.
 - Such a conditional motion is not privileged and is treated just as any other main motion.
 - A conditional motion to adjourn at or to a future time is always out of order while business is pending.
- An unconditional, privileged motion to adjourn takes precedence over most other motions.
- The privileged motion to adjourn is neither debatable nor amendable, while a conditioned motion to adjourn is debatable and may be amended.

2. Motion to Recess. A motion to recess is essentially a motion to take a break during the course of a Council meeting.

- A motion to recess must be seconded.
 - A motion to recess that is made when no question is pending is a main motion and should be treated as any other main motion.
 - A motion to recess is said to be privileged if it is made when another

City Council Meeting Rules of Procedures
(DATE)

question is pending, in which case it takes precedence over all subsidiary and incidental motions and most other privileged motions. It is not debatable and is amendable only as to the length of the recess.

- After a recess, the meeting resumes when the presiding ~~officer~~member has called the meeting back to order.

Section 8. **Voting Procedure.** (suggestion by Mayor Traylor Smith)

1. Casting a vote.

- a. A roll call vote will be taken for items on the Discussion Agenda that require a Public Hearing. The City Clerk will call each Councilmember's name individually and the results shall be recorded in the official minutes.
- b. For non-roll call agenda items that are deemed routine or non-controversial in nature, the Presiding ~~Officer~~member ~~will~~ may call for a voice vote whereby the response will either be in the affirmative ("Aye" or "Yes") or negative ("Nay" or "No").

Comment [JS1]: In the past the City Clerk designated roll call with a @ next to those agenda items.



Grand Junction City Council

Workshop Session

Item #1.b.

Meeting Date: June 4, 2018

Presented By: Greg Caton, City Manager, Wanda Winkelmann, Tamra Allen,
Community Development Director

Department: City Manager

Submitted By: Wanda Winkelmann

Information

SUBJECT:

City Council Regular Meeting Minutes

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this item is to discuss the form of minutes for City Council regular meetings.

BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:

It is a statutory requirement that minutes be taken of any meeting of a local public body where formal action occurs. Municipalities can decide which type of minutes work best for their community:

Type of Minutes	Description
Verbatim	Every single word is recorded.
Detailed/Summary	A description of the item and staff's presentation are included, as well as specific comments and questions by Councilmembers and citizens.
Action-plus	A shortened description of the topic is included. A listing of the topics and comments discussed is provided. For some public hearings, citizen names and comments are provided.
Action	A narrowed explanation of the topic is given. A list of citizens who spoke on topics is included.

Presently the City of Grand Junction has detailed/summary minutes, where topical

detail is provided and deliberations and debate are included.

Instead of continuing the practice of providing summary minutes, staff is recommending moving toward "action-plus" minutes. There are two reasons for this recommendation:

1. The purpose of minutes is to capture the action that was taken, not the deliberations; and
2. The video recordings of meetings are kept as permanent records; if additional information is needed, viewing that portion of the meeting video is easy to do.

To aid in the discussion, staff has attached three sets of minutes:

1. The first set of minutes are the typical summary minutes;
2. The second set of minutes contain "track changes" that show the suggested strike-outs; and
3. The final set would be considered "action-plus" minutes. Certainly the names of citizens who spoke could have been added in list format without including the individual comments.

Last, a matrix summarizing the types of minutes used in other Colorado municipalities is attached for Council's review.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Should the switch be made to action-plus minutes, staff time composing the minutes would be reduced.

SUGGESTED ACTION:

City Council discussion and possible direction to staff.

Attachments

1. March 21 Summary Minutes
2. March 21 Track Changes Minutes
3. March 21 Action Plus Minutes
4. Matrix Types of Minutes Other Municipalities

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
MARCH 21, 2018**

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction convened into regular session on the 21st day of March 2018 at 6:00 p.m. Those present were Councilmembers Chris Kennedy, Duncan McArthur, Phyllis Norris, Barbara Traylor Smith (arrived at 6:13 p.m.), Duke Wortmann and Council President Pro Tem Bennett Boeschstein. Mayor Rick Taggart was absent. Also present were City Manager Greg Caton, City Attorney John Shaver, and City Clerk Wanda Winkelmann.

Council President Pro Tem Boeschstein called the meeting to order. Councilmember Kennedy led the Pledge of Allegiance which was followed by a moment of silence.

Presentation - Colorado Mesa University Funds Presentation

The City of Grand Junction has pledged to contribute financially to Colorado Mesa University (CMU). Council President Pro Tem Boeschstein presented President Tim Foster with two checks: the first in the amount of \$250,000 for the "Grand Junction Opportunity Scholarship Program," which will be used during the 2018-2019 academic year for 2018 graduates of District 51 schools; the second check for \$500,000 will help fund a classroom building located in the center of campus to be renamed Escalante Hall.

Advisors from three area high schools introduced students from their respective schools who are scholarship recipients. Students thanked Council for their support and gave a brief summary of their future plans.

Proclamations

Proclaiming April 16, 2018 as National Health Care Decisions Day in the City of Grand Junction

Councilmember McArthur read the proclamation. Erica Eng, Director, Patient Experience with Community Hospital, and Mary Watson, Safety Officer/Community Project Coordinator with HopeWest, were present to accept the proclamation. Ms. Eng thanked Council for the proclamation and gave a background of the organization. She spoke of the importance of advance directives and of the classes being offered. Ms. Watson echoed Ms. Eng's statements regarding the importance of advance directives.

Proclaiming April 8 - 14, 2018 as National Public Safety Telecommunicator Week in the City of Grand Junction

Councilmember Norris read the proclamation and thanked the first responders who were present. Paula Creasy, Regional Communication Center Manager, along with other first responders, were present to accept the proclamation. Ms. Creasy introduced the telecommunicators with her and thanked Council for the proclamation. She told of the challenges they face in their profession and thanked everyone for their support to help overcome those challenges.

Proclaiming March 31, 2018 as Cesar Chavez Day in the City of Grand Junction

Councilmember Kennedy read the proclamation. Susana Whitrock was present to accept the proclamation, along with Jose Chavez. Mr. Chavez thanked Council and told of Cesar Chavez's life and mission.

Citizens Comments

Bruce Lohmiller spoke of the Veteran's Art Center and asked for support for that organization. He displayed a sculpture that he made at the Center. He also spoke of tourism and presented a poster that he created to promote leaving the area as tourists found it.

Council Reports

Councilmember Norris attended a Planning Commission/City Council working lunch on March 8th where a discussion was held about short term rentals. She attended a Visit Grand Junction meeting on March 13th where they spoke of an increase to the lodging tax. On March 14th she went to Denver with City Manager Caton to conduct a presentation to the Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) for a \$1 million grant for infrastructure for Las Colonias Business Park. On March 15th Councilmember Norris attended coffee with the City Manager where she said 15 citizens participated; she urged citizens to attend as they are very informative.

Councilmember Traylor Smith stated she has been out of town and looks forward to hearing her fellow councilmembers' reports.

Councilmember Kennedy gave a Grand Junction Economic Partnership (GJEP) update. Jennifer Seal is leaving to take over as the Executive Director for the Fruita Chamber of Commerce. He shared that the Bureau for Land Management (BLM) Headquarters is having conversations of relocating to Grand Junction. Riverfront at Las Colonias covenants have been finalized and a ground breaking will take place on March 30th at 4:00 p.m., which means the Business Park can then be marketed. He spoke of the Opportunity Zones and Foreign Trade Zones that are well on their way which will be a great opportunity to leverage some projects that are underway.

Councilmember McArthur attended the National League of Cities Conference in Washington D.C. from March 11th – 14th where there were many interesting presentations. On March 15th he participated in the Associated Governments of Northwestern Colorado (AGNC) meeting where they reviewed upcoming State Legislation. On March 20th he attended the Grand Junction Area Chamber of Commerce meeting where they discussed upcoming legislation affecting businesses. He spoke of Federal Mineral Lease funds that will be paid back to counties of which Mesa County will receive \$1.8 million.

Councilmember Wortmann talked about the Federal Mineral Lease Board and that he and City Manager Caton attended to request funds to develop Las Colonias Business Park.

Council President Pro Tem Boeschenstein said a lot of exciting things are happening in Grand Junction.

Consent Agenda

Councilmember Kennedy moved to approve adoption of the Consent Agenda, items #1 through #5. Councilmember Wortmann seconded the motion. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

1. Approval of Minutes

- a. Summary of the March 5, 2018 Workshop
- b. Minutes of the March 7, 2018 Regular Meeting

2. Set Public Hearings

- a. Legislative
 - i. 2018 Supplemental Appropriation Ordinance for Expansion of School Resource Officer Program and Setting a Hearing for April 4, 2018
 - ii. An Ordinance Amending Chapter 2 of the Grand Junction Municipal Code regarding Ballot Title Protests and the Deadline for Write-in Candidate Affidavits and Setting a Public Hearing for April 4, 2018
 - iii. An Ordinance Amending Ordinance 4772 Concerning the Issuance of DDA Bonds and Setting a Public Hearing for April 4, 2018

- b. Quasi-judicial
 - i. Consider a Resolution Referring a Petition to the City Council for the Annexation of Lands to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Setting a Hearing on Such Annexation, Exercising Land Use Control, and Introducing Proposed Annexation Ordinance for the York Annexation of 5.943 Acres, Located at 2122 H Road

3. Contracts

- a. Authorize the City Manager to enter into a Community Solar Garden Subscription Agreement with Oak Leaf Solar XXXI LLC

4. Resolutions

- a. A Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Submit a Grant Request to the Department of Local Affairs for the Two Rivers Convention Center Improvements Project
- b. A Resolution Authorizing and Ratifying a Contract with Sunshine Polishing

5. Other Action Items

- a. I-70 / 29 Road Interchange Memorandum of Understanding Between the City of Grand Junction and Mesa County

Regular Agenda

Public Hearing to consider a request by Regeneration, LLC for Review of a Service Plan for the Proposed Lowell Village Metropolitan District

The Applicant, ReGeneration, LLC, is planning for the proposed Lowell Village project to be constructed on the easterly two-thirds (approximately 1.64 acres) of Block 84 of the Original City Plat also known as the R-5 High School Block located at 310 North 7th Street. Per conceptual plans reviewed by the City, the development will consist of 36 townhome units, each with the potential for an accessory dwelling unit above a garage on each lot. As a means of generating capital for the construction and on-going maintenance of the proposed public improvements within the development, the Applicant is proposing to form a Metropolitan District. Per Title 32 of the Colorado Revised Statutes (C.R.S.), the first step is to develop a Service Plan for the District, which is to be considered and, if found acceptable, approved by the City.

Kristen Ashbeck, Senior Planner with Community Development, presented the location, zoning, and plans for the development. Ms. Ashbeck spoke to the requirements of State Statute that must apply since the City does not have a policy/procedure for approval of Metropolitan Districts. She gave the criteria according to statutory compliance for approval or disapproval of Metropolitan Districts. Ms. Ashbeck outlined the Planning Commission Findings and Recommendations in which they found the Service Plan is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, but does not meet Title 32 C.R.S. for formation of the district in the following areas:

Approved Development Plan

The Need for Private and Intergovernmental Agreements

The Planning Commission recommended approval subject to the conditions listed above being met prior to the Service Plan becoming effective, since according to Ms. Ashbeck, the first condition that had previously been listed, has been met.

Jeremy Nelson with ReGeneration, LLC outlined the Lowell Village Townhomes project overview, economic impacts, and highlights of the site. Chris Bremner, Metro District Consultant, gave an overview, brief history, and legal basis for formation of Title 32 Special Districts. He listed six comparable Metro Districts in Colorado.

Pete Smith, attorney for the project, was present to request an adjustment of the wording of conditional approval for item #3 where he asked that "attached to the Service Plan" be changed to "allowed to the Service Plan".

Councilmember Kennedy asked for clarification of the "property owner," which City Attorney Shaver said was currently the Downtown Development Authority. Secondly, he asked about the mill and how that relates to TABOR laws. City Attorney Shaver said it would have to surpass the authorized mills originally presented which is typically in excess of the projected costs, then it would go to a vote of the property owners.

City Attorney Shaver said staff had no objections to the request of the word change, but recommended proper wording for fluency sake.

Councilmember Traylor Smith asked what happens if the approved mill levy is exceeded. City Attorney Shaver said material modifications to the Service Plan would go back to the property owners for a vote. If property owners don't approve the increase, then they would discuss how to bring costs down. City Attorney Shaver spoke of the Ridges Metropolitan District and how the City had to annex it because they failed to maintain their Metro District services. Councilmember Traylor Smith expressed concern that the City may be left to take on challenges if the Metro District fails.

Councilmember McArthur asked if the exterior of the buildings is covered like they are by Homeowners Associations and how the cost for the roads and public areas will be paid. Mr. Nelson said the exterior of the buildings are not covered by the District. Mr.

Smith said that in theory, the streets are built well and by the time they need to be replaced, the debt will be paid down and there will be money to replace streets.

Councilmember Norris asked if the Special District must be approved by District Court. City Attorney Shaver said it is a petition process which involves a hearing in front of the court. She asked about the size of the property and the roads that will be built into the development. Mr. Nelson said the roads are one-way streets that would be used to access driveways and garages. Councilmember Norris asked if the mill levy would go down if debt is paid and excess money is unused. Mr. Smith answered the mill levy could go down by a vote of the District property owners, but future needs would need to be kept in mind. City Attorney Shaver spoke to the mill levy certification and how it works the same way. Councilmember Norris asked about bringing in Lowell Valley School to the Metro District. Mr. Nelson said although that is not the primary goal, bringing in the school would increase the value of the property which may create additional bonding potential. It would help close the gap between the initial value of the District and the total cost of the infrastructure. Councilmember Norris asked about the process of the school inclusion and Mr. Nelson answered that the owners of Lowell School would vote on the inclusion, not the property owners of the district; the townhome owners would not have a vote for new debt, as long as the amount is under the original mill levy.

Councilmember McArthur said the district is not only a good idea, but necessary. His concern is oversight of the sale of the bonds and asked if the financial plan was part of the Service Plan. City Attorney Shaver said it is part of the recommended approval, but Council could not base their approval on future numbers, but rather the numbers that were presented to them for the meeting. Ongoing management of the board was also a concern to Councilmember McArthur. He asked about backup plans for board members. Mr. Nelson said there are no bylaws for the governing board and no organizational model. Mr. Smith said he would recommend starting the board with the developers and transition it to the homeowners.

Council President Pro Tem Boeschstein asked about the conditional steps to complete approval. Ms. Ashbeck said the development plan will be approved at staff level which would satisfy condition #2.

The public hearing opened at 8:07 p.m.

Trace Bolhaul, local builder, spoke in support of the Metro District because of job creation and affordable downtown housing.

Rich Garrigan, resident of downtown Grand Junction, spoke in support of the Metro District to bring more residents downtown and to increase the likelihood of businesses coming back to the area.

Irie Yates spoke in support of the District because of the potential of the project and the benefits for downtown Grand Junction.

Robert Strong spoke in support of the district and told of feedback he is getting from future homebuyers and how they are excited about the benefits of the development.

Christine Sere sees this District as a benefit because it would revitalize the downtown area.

Rob Greeden is a developer working on this project and feels this is an innovative project that will spark interest in the downtown area as well as interest for other districts.

Joanna Tipsky said Grand Junction is a wonderful place to live and that she has many people interested in buying homes such as the ones being proposed in this development. She believes this will be a great addition to the City.

Steve Amenterp believes this project has been very well vetted and that the time is right for such a development.

The public hearing was closed at 8:20 p.m.

Councilmember Norris asked what will happen if the district is not approved. Mr. Nelson said the project team would have to revisit the plans and rethink if they could move forward and how.

Councilmember Traylor Smith asked about providing services and water works in a Metro District. City Attorney Shaver said the City is responsible for how the water gets to the master meter, but the district is responsible for how the water gets to the homeowners and that is why the Intergovernmental Agreements in condition #3 is so important. She asked about emergency services and City Attorney Shaver explained, being a Metro District doesn't impact services, because regardless, they are in City limits.

Councilmember Kennedy moved to adopt Resolution No. 19-18, a resolution approving the Service Plan for the Lowell Village Metropolitan District with the following three conditions that shall be met prior to the District becoming effective. The effective date being the date which the election results are certified by the Colorado Department of Local Affairs.

- 1) Revise legal description and boundary map within the Service Plan that correlate to each other and accurately depict the location of the services to be provided and an accurate map of Areas of Operations and Maintenance that clearly show the areas within which the services will be provided by the District and whether the areas are within or outside the District Boundaries.

2) An Approved Development Plan

3) An Intergovernmental Agreement and such other agreements needed as acceptable to the City for the performance of any services (e.g. water acquisition, treatment and delivery; transportation systems; road and drainage systems and recreation facilities, parks and open space) between the proposed District and the City that is to be allowed by the Service Plan.

Councilmember McArthur seconded the motion. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

Council President Pro Tem Boeschstein called for a recess at 8:26 p.m.

The meeting resumed at 8:37 p.m.

Public Hearing for a Resolution Accepting a Petition for the Annexation and Ordinances Annexing and Zoning the Camp Annexation CSR and C-1 Located at 171 Lake Road

The Applicants, Mirror Pond, LLC, have requested annexation of their 8.626 acres located at 171 Lake Road. The proposed annexation includes all of the right-of-way of variable width of Power Road (approximately 750 linear feet), Dike Road (approximately 652 linear feet), and Lake Road (approximately 532 linear feet). The property is currently used as a primitive campground for special events under a Special Use Permit issued by Mesa County. The Applicant is requesting annexation for future development of the property, which is anticipated to constitute "annexable development" and as such is required to annex in accordance with the Persigo Agreement.

The request also includes zoning of 4.445 acres of the property to CSR (Community Services and Recreation) and zoning to C-1 (Light Commercial) for 4.181 acres of the property. The proposed split zoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and recognizes the constraints of the special flood hazard areas on the property.

Kathy Portner presented the property's location, future land use, and existing zones. Councilmember Norris asked about the cost of road improvements and if the County is going to share in that expense. Ms. Portner answered that those roadways may not have to be improved to the level quoted and a lot of the cost will fall on the developer. City Manager Caton said there was no indication that the County will share in the expenses. Councilmember Norris asked about the fire districts and change in mills. City Manager Caton clarified that the City would be losing revenue but still have to provide the services. She then asked about camp cleanups on that property and City

Manager Caton said that since this is private property it helps in enforcement of trespassing which limits the need for camp cleanups. Ms. Portner said the neighbors have written letters that this area has actually been cleaned up because of this business.

The public hearing was opened at 8:50 p.m.

There were no public comments.

The public hearing was closed at 8:50 p.m.

Councilmember Traylor Smith asked about transitioning this property to multifamily homes, and Ms. Portner said it is possible to develop this area, although it would cost more money to elevate the homes because of the flood plain. Councilmember Traylor Smith asked about the City's cost to repair the subpar roads since they have not been maintained. City Manager Caton spoke to that question and the high expense of fixing the roads. Councilmember Traylor Smith stated she would like to have a Joint Committee meeting with Mesa County to discuss this issue.

Councilmember Kennedy stated that the costs are a moot point because of the Persigo Agreement.

Council President Pro Tem Boeschstein concurred with Councilmember Traylor Smith.

Councilmember Wortmann said that these are issues that need to be discussed with the County and moved forward.

Councilmember Wortmann spoke of a community municipalities dinner where he asked Commissioner Scott McInnis how much money is needed to meet the needs of the County and he said \$1 billion. Councilmember Wortmann concurred with the other Councilmembers that discussions with the County are needed to move the issue forward.

Councilmember McArthur asked if the City is required to annex the property without requiring improvements. City Attorney Shaver said there are no stipulations in the Persigo Agreement that outline such requirements.

City Manager Caton spoke of more extensive staff analysis in other areas of the state in which properties would not be accepted if they were not financially feasible to the City.

City Attorney Shaver spoke about “bargain for exchange” and how the City does not have that.

Councilmember Norris reiterated her concern about the County stepping up and doing their part.

Council President Pro Tem Boeschstein suggested going in with Community Block Development Grant money to help these extremely poor neighborhoods.

Councilmember Kennedy moved to adopt Resolution No. 20-18, a resolution accepting a petition for the annexation of lands to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, making certain findings, and determining that property known as the Camp Annexation, located at 171 Lake Road is eligible for annexation, and Ordinance No. 4792 an ordinance annexing territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Camp Annexation, approximately 10.652 acres, located at 171 Lake Road, and Ordinance No. 4793, an ordinance zoning the Camp Annexation to CSR (Community Services and Recreation) and C-1 (Light Commercial) located at 171 Lake Road on final passage and ordered final publication in pamphlet form. Councilmember Wortmann seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote with Councilmember Norris voting NO.

Consider a Request by Two R&D, LLC to Accept the Dedication of 15.06 Acres of Open Space in the Pinnacle Ridge Subdivision Instead of Payment of the City's Open Space Dedication in Lieu of Fee

The Applicant, Two R & D, LLC, proposed that the City accept dedication of 15.06 acres of open space within Pinnacle Ridge Subdivision to satisfy its obligations arising out of its development being a “cluster” development under the Zoning and Development Code. To satisfy the open space requirement, the applicant may (1) dedicate the open space to the City or to another entity charged with maintaining and holding the land as open space, (2) deed the open space to a property owners’ association (HOA) with a public easement over it (which the Applicant does not want to do because of HOA and homeowner liability concerns), (3) dedicate discreet public trail easements within the open space area to be owned by the HOA (which the Applicant may be amenable to depending upon the scope and nature of the easements and the ability to limit liability), or (3) pay a fee-in-lieu (which the Applicant is willing to do). The Applicant’s preferred option is for the City to accept dedication of the 15.06 acres of open space. The proposed open space is adjacent to the City-owned open space along Mariposa and Monument Road and would provide connections to the open space in the Ridges and Redlands Mesa developments. The area is already used by the public for hiking and mountain biking, as indicated by a robust trail system on the property.

Scott Peterson, Senior Planner with the Community Development Department, presented the site location and the area proposed as dedication to the City of Grand Junction Parks Department. If the dedication of land is not approved, the applicant is willing to pay the open space fee, but not willing to dedicate a public easement over the fifteen acres. Parks & Recreation Advisory Board recommends acceptance of the payment of \$82,000 instead of accepting the dedication of the 15.06 acres of open space.

Robert Jones II, Vortex Engineering, presented more information on the item. The property is valued at \$272,240 and makes up 33% of the development's total acreage. The property is a natural continuation of the bike trails at the Lunch Loop Trails and the public currently uses this undeveloped property as trail connections.

Councilmember Traylor Smith clarified that if the open space dedication is denied, the access to the trails would be closed off. Mr. Jones said that was correct.

Councilmember Traylor Smith said a concern of accepting the properties was that it becomes an expense and a liability to the City, and that many times nearby property owners build structures on the areas. She asked if there was an option to leave this property open to other organizations maintaining it. Rob Shoeber, Parks & Recreation Director, said there were none he knew of that had volunteered.

Councilmember Wortmann asked why they want to dedicate 33%, an amount much larger than the required 10%, instead of developing it. Mr. Jones said because of the topography of the land, they have analyzed the areas that they can develop, and it makes sense to leave this as open space that could be dedicated. Councilmember Wortmann asked if the City has ever turned away property. Mr. Schoeber said they have entertained three other properties in the past few months, but this piece of property doesn't make sense to acquire.

Councilmember Kennedy stated he felt that this is piece of property is undevelopable and therefore is being dedicated.

Council President Pro Tem Boeschenstein spoke of the Ridges and Kingsview Desert subdivisions. He said it is a different landscape than one of a golf course and likes the proposal.

Tom Volkman, attorney for Two R & D, LLC, clarified why they had specifically asked to either pay the fee or dedicate the land - it was in response to an initial requirement of the City for a blanket easement over the entire property if the land wasn't dedicated and the fee was paid. That requirement later went away, but they wanted to ensure they were willing to do one or the other.

Councilmember Norris asked about how many trails would still be open or connected after the houses are built over them. Mr. Jones said there would be trailhead disruptions.

Councilmember Traylor Smith said the expense of maintaining the property is what makes the difference of approving or disapproving the dedication.

Richard VanGundy with Grand Valley Trails Alliance supported the adoption of the open space because of multi-level pathways, a concept that successful trail systems are connected trail systems, and these kinds of connections should be protected by public ownership. He believes accepting this dedication would reinforce the message that the City is strong on its trail systems. He also believes that the layout of the trail systems would be easy to map out.

Councilmember McArthur said that the City has to accept the consequences of requiring open space dedications. He likes the proposal and will support it.

Councilmember Kennedy moved to approve the request to accept the dedication of open space land in the Pinnacle Ridge Subdivision in-lieu of open space payment. Councilmember McArthur seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote with Councilmembers Wortmann and Norris voting NO.

Non-Scheduled Citizens & Visitors

There were none.

Other Business

There was none.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:03 p.m.

Wanda Winkelmann, MMC
City Clerk

Note: Video recordings of City Council meetings can be found on the City's website <http://grandjunctioncityco.iqm2.com/Citizens/Calendar.aspx>.

GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING MARCH 21, 2018

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction convened into regular session on the 21st day of March 2018 at 6:00 p.m. Those present were Councilmembers Chris Kennedy, Duncan McArthur, Phyllis Norris, Barbara Traylor Smith (arrived at 6:13 p.m.), Duke Wortmann and Council President Pro Tem Bennett Boeschstein. Mayor Rick Taggart was absent. Also present were City Manager Greg Caton, City Attorney John Shaver, and City Clerk Wanda Winkelmann.

Council President Pro Tem Boeschstein called the meeting to order. Councilmember Kennedy led the Pledge of Allegiance which was followed by a moment of silence.

Presentation - Colorado Mesa University Funds Presentation

~~The City of Grand Junction has pledged to contribute financially to Colorado Mesa University (CMU).~~ Council President Pro Tem Boeschstein presented Colorado Mesa University President Tim Foster with two checks: the first in the amount of \$250,000 for the "Grand Junction Opportunity Scholarship Program," which will be used during the 2018-2019 academic year for 2018 graduates of District 51 schools; the second check for \$500,000 will help fund a classroom building located in the center of campus to be renamed Escalante Hall.

~~Advisors from three area high schools introduced students from their respective schools who are scholarship recipients. Students thanked Council for their support and gave a brief summary of their future plans.~~

Proclamations

Proclaiming April 16, 2018 as National Health Care Decisions Day in the City of Grand Junction

Councilmember McArthur read the proclamation. Erica Eng, Director, Patient Experience with Community Hospital, and Mary Watson, Safety Officer/Community Project Coordinator with HopeWest, were present to accept the proclamation. ~~Ms. Eng thanked Council for the proclamation and gave a background of the organization. She spoke of the importance of advance directives and of the classes being offered. Ms. Watson echoed Ms. Eng's statements regarding the importance of advance directives.~~

Proclaiming April 8 - 14, 2018 as National Public Safety Telecommunicator Week in the City of Grand Junction

Councilmember Norris read the proclamation and thanked the first responders who were present. Paula Creasy, Regional Communication Center Manager, along with other first responders, were present to accept the proclamation. ~~Ms. Creasy introduced the telecommunicators with her and thanked Council for the proclamation. She told of the challenges they face in their profession and thanked everyone for their support to help overcome those challenges.~~

Proclaiming March 31, 2018 as Cesar Chavez Day in the City of Grand Junction

Councilmember Kennedy read the proclamation. Susana Whitrock was present to accept the proclamation, along with Jose Chavez. ~~Mr. Chavez thanked Council and told of Cesar Chavez's life and mission.~~

Citizens Comments

Bruce Lohmiller spoke of the Veteran's Art Center and ~~asked for support for that organization. He~~ displayed a sculpture that he made at the Center. ~~He also~~ spoke of tourism and presented a poster that he created. ~~to promote leaving the area as tourists found it.~~

Council Reports

Councilmember Norris attended a Planning Commission/City Council working lunch ~~on March 8th~~ where a discussion was held about short term rentals. ~~She~~ attended a Visit Grand Junction meeting ~~on March 13th~~ where they spoke of an increase to the lodging tax, ~~and~~. ~~On March 14th~~ she went to Denver with City Manager Caton to conduct a presentation to the Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) for a \$1 million grant for infrastructure for Las Colonias Business Park. ~~On March 15th~~ ~~CC~~ Councilmember Norris attended coffee with the City Manager where she said 15 citizens participated; ~~she urged citizens to attend as they are very informative.~~

Councilmember Traylor Smith stated she has been out of town and looks forward to hearing her fellow councilmembers' reports.

Councilmember Kennedy gave a Grand Junction Economic Partnership (GJEP) update, ~~stated that~~. Jennifer Seal is leaving to take over as the Executive Director for the Fruita

Chamber of Commerce, ~~and noted.~~ ~~He shared~~ that the Bureau for Land Management (BLM) Headquarters is having conversations of relocating to Grand Junction. Riverfront at Las Colonias ~~covenants have been finalized and a~~ ground breaking will take place on March 30th at 4:00 p.m., ~~which means the Business Park can then be marketed.~~ He spoke of the Opportunity Zones and Foreign Trade Zones that are well on their way, ~~which will be a great opportunity to leverage some projects that are underway.~~

Councilmember McArthur attended the National League of Cities Conference in Washington D.C. ~~from March 11th—14th where there were many interesting presentations.~~ ~~On March 15th he~~ participated in the Associated Governments of Northwestern Colorado (AGNC), ~~meeting where they reviewed upcoming State Legislation.~~ ~~On March 20th he and~~ attended the Grand Junction Area Chamber of Commerce meeting, ~~where they discussed upcoming legislation affecting businesses.~~ He spoke of Federal Mineral Lease funds that will be paid back to counties of which Mesa County will receive \$1.8 million.

Councilmember Wortmann talked about the Federal Mineral Lease Board and that he and City Manager Caton attended to request funds to develop Las Colonias Business Park.

Council President Pro Tem Boeschstein said a lot of exciting things are happening in Grand Junction.

Consent Agenda

Councilmember Kennedy moved to approve adoption of the Consent Agenda, items #1 through #5. Councilmember Wortmann seconded the motion. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

1. Approval of Minutes

- a. Summary of the March 5, 2018 Workshop
- b. Minutes of the March 7, 2018 Regular Meeting

2. Set Public Hearings

- a. Legislative
 - i. 2018 Supplemental Appropriation Ordinance for Expansion of School Resource Officer Program and Setting a Hearing for April 4, 2018

- ii. An Ordinance Amending Chapter 2 of the Grand Junction Municipal Code regarding Ballot Title Protests and the Deadline for Write-in Candidate Affidavits and Setting a Public Hearing for April 4, 2018
 - iii. An Ordinance Amending Ordinance 4772 Concerning the Issuance of DDA Bonds and Setting a Public Hearing for April 4, 2018
 - b. Quasi-judicial
 - i. Consider a Resolution Referring a Petition to the City Council for the Annexation of Lands to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Setting a Hearing on Such Annexation, Exercising Land Use Control, and Introducing Proposed Annexation Ordinance for the York Annexation of 5.943 Acres, Located at 2122 H Road
- 3. Contracts**
- a. Authorize the City Manager to enter into a Community Solar Garden Subscription Agreement with Oak Leaf Solar XXXI LLC
- 4. Resolutions**
- a. A Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Submit a Grant Request to the Department of Local Affairs for the Two Rivers Convention Center Improvements Project
 - b. A Resolution Authorizing and Ratifying a Contract with Sunshine Polishing
- 5. Other Action Items**
- a. I-70 / 29 Road Interchange Memorandum of Understanding Between the City of Grand Junction and Mesa County

Regular Agenda

Public Hearing to consider a request by Regeneration, LLC for Review of a Service Plan for the Proposed Lowell Village Metropolitan District

The Applicant, ReGeneration, LLC, is planning for the proposed Lowell Village project to be constructed on the easterly two-thirds (approximately 1.64 acres) of Block 84 of the Original City Plat also known as the R-5 High School Block located at 310 North 7th

Street. ~~Per conceptual plans reviewed by the City, t~~The development will consist of 36 townhome units, each with the potential for an accessory dwelling unit above a garage on each lot. As a means of generating capital for the construction and on-going maintenance of the proposed public improvements within the development, the Applicant is proposing to form a Metropolitan District. Per Title 32 of the Colorado Revised Statutes (C.R.S.), the first step is to develop a Service Plan for the District, which is to be considered and, if found acceptable, approved by the City.

Kristen Ashbeck, Senior Planner with Community Development, ~~presented the location, zoning, and plans for the development. Ms. Ashbeck~~ spoke to the requirements of State Statute that must apply since the City does not have a policy/procedure for approval of Metropolitan Districts. She gave the criteria according to statutory compliance for approval or disapproval of Metropolitan Districts. ~~Ms. Ashbeck outlined the Planning Commission Findings and Recommendations in which they found the Service Plan is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, but does not meet Title 32 C.R.S. for formation of the district in the following areas:~~

~~Approved Development Plan~~

~~The Need for Private and Intergovernmental Agreements~~

The Planning Commission recommended approval subject to the:

- ~~Approved Development Plan~~
- ~~The Need for Private and Intergovernmental Agreements~~

~~conditions listed above being met prior to the Service Plan becoming effective, since according to Ms. Ashbeck, the first condition that had previously been listed, has been met.~~

Jeremy Nelson with ReGeneration, LLC outlined the Lowell Village Townhomes project overview, economic impacts, and highlights of the site. Chris Bremner, Metro District Consultant, gave an overview, brief history, and legal basis for formation of Title 32 Special Districts. He listed six comparable Metro Districts in Colorado.

Pete Smith, attorney for the project, was present to request an adjustment of the wording of conditional approval for item #3 where he asked that "attached to the Service Plan" be changed to "allowed to the Service Plan".

~~Discussion ensued regarding the definition of property owner, mill levy and TABOR requirements, and the risk to the City if the Metro District fails. Councilmember Kennedy asked for clarification of the "property owner," which City Attorney Shaver said was currently the Downtown Development Authority. Secondly, he asked about the mill and how that relates to TABOR laws. City Attorney Shaver said it would have to surpass the~~

~~authorized mills originally presented which is typically in excess of the projected costs, then it would go to a vote of the property owners.~~

~~City Attorney Shaver said staff had no objections to the request of the word change, but recommended proper wording for fluency sake.~~

~~Councilmember Traylor Smith asked what happens if the approved mill levy is exceeded. City Attorney Shaver said material modifications to the Service Plan would go back to the property owners for a vote. If property owners don't approve the increase, then they would discuss how to bring costs down. City Attorney Shaver spoke of the Ridges Metropolitan District and how the City had to annex it because they failed to maintain their Metro District services. Councilmember Traylor Smith expressed concern that the City may be left to take on challenges if the Metro District fails.~~

~~Questions were asked about the Councilmember McArthur asked if the exterior of the buildings is covered like they are by Homeowners Associations and how the cost for the roads and public areas will be paid. Mr. Nelson said the exterior of the buildings are not covered by the District. Mr. Smith said that in theory, the streets are built well and by the time they need to be replaced, the debt will be paid down and there will be money to replace streets.~~

~~Councilmember Norris asked if the Special District must be approved by District Court. City Attorney Shaver said it is a petition process which involves a hearing in front of the court. She asked about the size of the property and the roads that will be built into the development, and. Mr. Nelson said the roads are one-way streets that would be used to access driveways and garages. Councilmember Norris asked if the mill levy would go down if debt is paid and excess money is unused. Mr. Smith answered the mill levy could go down by a vote of the District property owners, but future needs would need to be kept in mind. City Attorney Shaver spoke to the mill levy certification and how it works the same way. Councilmember Norris asked about bringing in Lowell Valley School to the Metro District. Mr. Nelson said although that is not the primary goal, bringing in the school would increase the value of the property which may create additional bonding potential. It would help close the gap between the initial value of the District and the total cost of the infrastructure. Councilmember Norris asked about the process of the school inclusion and Mr. Nelson answered that the owners of Lowell School would vote on the inclusion, not the property owners of the district; the townhome owners would not have a vote for new debt, as long as the amount is under the original mill levy.~~

~~Councilmember McArthur said the district is not only a good idea, but necessary. His concern was expressed overis the oversight of the sale of the bonds and asked if the financial plan was part of the Service Plan and board membership.~~

~~City Attorney Shaver said it is part of the recommended approval, but Council could not base their approval on future numbers, but rather the numbers that were presented to them for the meeting. Ongoing management of the board was also a concern to Councilmember McArthur. He asked about backup plans for board members. Mr. Nelson said there are no bylaws for the governing board and no organizational model. Mr. Smith said he would recommend starting the board with the developers and transition it to the homeowners.~~

~~Council President Pro Tem Boeschstein asked about the conditional steps to complete approval. Ms. Ashbeck said the development plan will be approved at staff level which would satisfy condition #2.~~

The public hearing opened at 8:07 p.m.

Trace Bolhaul, local builder, spoke in support of the Metro District because of job creation and affordable downtown housing.

Rich Garrigan, resident of downtown Grand Junction, spoke in support of the Metro District to bring more residents downtown and to increase the likelihood of businesses coming back to the area.

Irie Yates spoke in support of the District because of the potential of the project and the benefits for downtown Grand Junction.

Robert Strong spoke in support of the district and told of feedback he is getting from future homebuyers and how they are excited about the benefits of the development.

Christine Sere sees this District as a benefit because it would revitalize the downtown area.

Rob Greeden is a developer working on this project and feels this is an innovative project that will spark interest in the downtown area as well as interest for other districts.

Joanna Tipsky said Grand Junction is a wonderful place to live and that she has many people interested in buying homes such as the ones being proposed in this development. She believes this will be a great addition to the City.

Steve Amenterp believes this project has been very well vetted and that the time is right for such a development.

The public hearing was closed at 8:20 p.m.

~~Discussion ensued about Councilmember Norris asked what will happen if the district is not approved. Mr. Nelson said the project team would have to revisit the plans and rethink if they could move forward and how.~~

~~Councilmember Traylor Smith asked about providing services and water works in a Metro District. City Attorney Shaver said the City is responsible for how the water gets to the master meter, but the district is responsible for how the water gets to the homeowners and that is why the Intergovernmental Agreements in condition #3 is so important. She asked about and emergency services, and City Attorney Shaver explained, being a Metro District doesn't impact services, because regardless, they are in City limits.~~

Councilmember Kennedy moved to adopt Resolution No. 19-18, a resolution approving the Service Plan for the Lowell Village Metropolitan District with the following three conditions that shall be met prior to the District becoming effective. The effective date being the date which the election results are certified by the Colorado Department of Local Affairs.

- 1) Revise legal description and boundary map within the Service Plan that correlate to each other and accurately depict the location of the services to be provided and an accurate map of Areas of Operations and Maintenance that clearly show the areas within which the services will be provided by the District and whether the areas are within or outside the District Boundaries.
- 2) An Approved Development Plan
- 3) An Intergovernmental Agreement and such other agreements needed as acceptable to the City for the performance of any services (e.g. water acquisition, treatment and delivery; transportation systems; road and drainage systems and recreation facilities, parks and open space) between the proposed District and the City that is to be allowed by the Service Plan.

Councilmember McArthur seconded the motion. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

Council President Pro Tem Boeschstein called for a recess at 8:26 p.m.

The meeting resumed at 8:37 p.m.

Public Hearing for a Resolution Accepting a Petition for the Annexation and Ordinances Annexing and Zoning the Camp Annexation CSR and C-1 Located at 171 Lake Road

~~Kathy Portner explained that t~~The Applicants, Mirror Pond, LLC, have requested annexation of their 8.626 acres located at 171 Lake Road. The proposed annexation includes all of the right-of-way of variable width of Power Road ~~(approximately 750 linear feet)~~, Dike Road, ~~(approximately 652 linear feet)~~, and Lake Road ~~(approximately 532 linear feet)~~. The property is currently used as a primitive campground for special

events under a Special Use Permit issued by Mesa County. The Applicant is requesting annexation for future development of the property, which is anticipated to constitute "annexable development" and as such is required to annex in accordance with the Persigo Agreement.

The request also includes zoning of 4.445 acres of the property to CSR (Community Services and Recreation) and zoning to C-1 (Light Commercial) for 4.181 acres of the property. The proposed split zoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and recognizes the constraints of the special flood hazard areas on the property.

~~Kathy Portner presented the property's location, future land use, and existing zones. Questions were raised Councilmember Norris asked about the cost of road improvements, and if the County is going to share in that expense. Ms. Portner answered that those roadways may not have to be improved to the level quoted and a lot of the cost will fall on the developer. City Manager Caton said there was no indication that the County will share in the expenses. Councilmember Norris asked about the fire districts and change in mills. City Manager Caton clarified that the City would be losing revenue but still have to provide the services. She then asked about and camp cleanups on that property, and City Manager Caton said that since this is private property it helps in enforcement of trespassing which limits the need for camp cleanups. Ms. Portner said the neighbors have written letters that this area has actually been cleaned up because of this business.~~

The public hearing was opened at 8:50 p.m.

There were no public comments.

The public hearing was closed at 8:50 p.m.

~~Additional comments were made Councilmember Traylor Smith asked about transitioning this property to multifamily homes, and Ms. Portner said it is possible to develop this area, although it would cost more money to elevate the homes because of the flood plain. Councilmember Traylor Smith asked about the City's cost to repair the subpar roads since they have not been maintained. City Manager Caton spoke to that question and the high expense of fixing the roads. Councilmember Traylor Smith stated she would like to have, and the possibility a Joint Committee meeting with Mesa County to discuss this issue. It was stated that~~

~~Councilmember Kennedy stated that the costs are a moot point because of the Persigo Agreement.~~

~~Council President Pro Tem Boeschstein concurred with Councilmember Traylor Smith.~~

~~Councilmember Wortmann said that~~and these are issues that need to be discussed with the County and moved forward.

~~Councilmember Wortmann spoke of a community municipalities dinner where he asked Commissioner Scott McInnis how much money is needed to meet the needs of the County and he said \$1 billion. Councilmember Wortmann concurred with the other Councilmembers that discussions with the County are needed to move the issue forward.~~

~~A question was asked about Councilmember McArthur asked if the City is required to annexing the property without requiring improvements. City Attorney Shaver said there are no stipulations in the Persigo Agreement that outline such requirements.~~

~~City Manager Caton spoke of more extensive staff analysis in other areas of the state in which properties would not be accepted if they were not financially feasible to the City.~~

~~City Attorney Shaver spoke about "bargain for exchange" and how the City does not have that.~~

~~Councilmember Norris~~ and reiterated her concern was expressed about the County stepping up and doing their part.

~~Council President Pro Tem Boeschstein~~It was suggested that going in with Community Block Development Grant money could ~~to~~ help these extremely poor neighborhoods.

Councilmember Kennedy moved to adopt Resolution No. 20-18, a resolution accepting a petition for the annexation of lands to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, making certain findings, and determining that property known as the Camp Annexation, located at 171 Lake Road is eligible for annexation, and Ordinance No. 4792 an ordinance annexing territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Camp Annexation, approximately 10.652 acres, located at 171 Lake Road, and Ordinance No. 4793, an ordinance zoning the Camp Annexation to CSR (Community Services and Recreation) and C-1 (Light Commercial) located at 171 Lake Road on final passage and ordered final publication in pamphlet form. Councilmember Wortmann seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote with Councilmember Norris voting NO.

Consider a Request by Two R&D, LLC to Accept the Dedication of 15.06 Acres of Open Space in the Pinnacle Ridge Subdivision Instead of Payment of the City's Open Space Dedication in Lieu of Fee

The Applicant, Two R & D, LLC, proposed that the City accept dedication of 15.06 acres of open space within Pinnacle Ridge Subdivision to satisfy its obligations arising out of its development being a "cluster" development under the Zoning and Development Code. To satisfy the open space requirement, the applicant may (1) dedicate the open space to the City ~~or to another entity charged with maintaining and holding the land as open space~~, (2) deed the open space to a property owners' association (HOA) with a public easement over it, ~~(which the Applicant does not want to do because of HOA and homeowner liability concerns)~~, (3) dedicate discreet public trail easements within the open space area ~~to be owned by the HOA (which the Applicant may be amenable to depending upon the scope and nature of the easements and the ability to limit liability)~~, or (34) pay a fee-in-lieu ~~(which the Applicant is willing to do)~~. The Applicant's preferred option is for the City to accept dedication of the 15.06 acres of open space. ~~The proposed open space is adjacent to the City-owned open space along Mariposa and Monument Road and would provide connections to the open space in the Ridges and Redlands Mesa developments. The area is already used by the public for hiking and mountain biking, as indicated by a robust trail system on the property.~~

Scott Peterson, Senior Planner with the Community Development Department, presented ~~the site location and~~ the area proposed as dedication to the City of Grand Junction Parks Department. If the dedication of land is not approved, the applicant is willing to pay the open space fee, but not willing to dedicate a public easement over the fifteen acres. Parks & Recreation Advisory Board recommends acceptance of the payment of \$82,000 instead of accepting the dedication of the 15.06 acres of open space.

Robert Jones II, Vortex Engineering, ~~presented more information on the item. noted~~ ~~the~~ the property is valued at \$272,240 and makes up 33% of the development's total acreage. The property is a natural continuation of the bike trails at the Lunch Loop Trails and the public currently uses this undeveloped property as trail connections.

~~Discussion ensued about Councilmember Traylor Smith clarified that if the open space dedication is denied, the access to the trails would be being closed off. Mr. Jones said that was correct. Councilmember Traylor Smith said a concern of accepting the properties was that it becomes an expense and a liability to the City, and the possibility of, and that many times nearby property owners build structures on the areas. She asked if there was an option to leave this property open to other organizations maintaining it.~~

~~Rob Shoeber, Parks & Recreation Director, said there were none he knew of that had volunteered.~~

~~Questions were asked about the dedication of Councilmember Wortmann asked why they want to dedicate 33% of the land, an amount much larger than the required 10%, instead of developing it. Mr. Jones said because of the topography of the land, they have analyzed the areas that they can develop, and it makes sense to leave this as open space that could be dedicated. Councilmember Wortmann asked if the City has ever turned away property. Mr. Schoeber said they have entertained three other properties in the past few months, but this piece of property doesn't make sense to acquire.~~

~~Councilmember Kennedy stated he felt and that this is piece of property is undevelopable and therefore is being dedicated.~~

~~Council President Pro Tem Boeschstein spoke of Reference was made to the Ridges and Kingsview Desert subdivisions. He said it is a different landscape than one of a golf course and likes the proposal.~~

~~Tom Volkman, attorney for Two R & D, LLC, clarified why they had specifically asked to either pay the fee or dedicate the land – it was in response to an described the initial requirement of the City's requirement for a blanket easement over the entire property if the land wasn't dedicated and the fee was paid. That requirement later went away, but the applicants wanted to ensure clarify they were willing to do one or the other.~~

~~Councilmember Norris asked about how many trails would still be open or connected after the houses are built over them. Mr. Jones said there would be It was noted that trailhead disruptions would occur after houses were built over them.~~

~~Councilmember Traylor Smith said Discussion ensued about the expense of maintaining the property is what makes the difference of approving or disapproving the dedication.~~

~~Richard VanGundy with Grand Valley Trails Alliance supported the adoption of the open space because of multi-level pathways, a concept that successful trail systems are connected trail systems, and these kinds of connections should be protected by public ownership. He and believes accepting this dedication would reinforce the message that the City is strong on its trail systems. He also believes that the layout of the trail systems would be easy to map out.~~

~~Councilmember McArthur said that t~~he City has to accept the consequences of requiring open space dedications. ~~He likes the proposal and will support it.~~

Councilmember Kennedy moved to approve the request to accept the dedication of open space land in the Pinnacle Ridge Subdivision in-lieu of open space payment. Councilmember McArthur seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote with Councilmembers Wortmann and Norris voting NO.

Non-Scheduled Citizens & Visitors

There were none.

Other Business

There was none.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:03 p.m.

Wanda Winkelmann, MMC
City Clerk

Note: Video recordings of City Council meetings can be found on the City's website <http://grandjunctioncityco.iqm2.com/Citizens/Calendar.aspx>.

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
MARCH 21, 2018**

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction convened into regular session on the 21st day of March 2018 at 6:00 p.m. Those present were Councilmembers Chris Kennedy, Duncan McArthur, Phyllis Norris, Barbara Traylor Smith (arrived at 6:13 p.m.), Duke Wortmann and Council President Pro Tem Bennett Boeschstein. Mayor Rick Taggart was absent. Also present were City Manager Greg Caton, City Attorney John Shaver, and City Clerk Wanda Winkelmann.

Council President Pro Tem Boeschstein called the meeting to order. Councilmember Kennedy led the Pledge of Allegiance which was followed by a moment of silence.

Presentation - Colorado Mesa University Funds Presentation

Council President Pro Tem Boeschstein presented Colorado Mesa University President Tim Foster with two checks: the first in the amount of \$250,000 for the "Grand Junction Opportunity Scholarship Program," which will be used during the 2018-2019 academic year for 2018 graduates of District 51 schools; the second check for \$500,000 will help fund a classroom building located in the center of campus to be renamed Escalante Hall.

Proclamations

Proclaiming April 16, 2018 as National Health Care Decisions Day in the City of Grand Junction

Councilmember McArthur read the proclamation. Erica Eng, Director, Patient Experience with Community Hospital, and Mary Watson, Safety Officer/Community Project Coordinator with HopeWest, were present to accept the proclamation.

Proclaiming April 8 - 14, 2018 as National Public Safety Telecommunicator Week in the City of Grand Junction

Councilmember Norris read the proclamation and thanked the first responders who were present. Paula Creasy, Regional Communication Center Manager, along with other first responders, were present to accept the proclamation.

Proclaiming March 31, 2018 as Cesar Chavez Day in the City of Grand Junction

Councilmember Kennedy read the proclamation. Susana Whitrock was present to accept the proclamation, along with Jose Chavez.

Citizens Comments

Bruce Lohmiller spoke of the Veteran's Art Center and displayed a sculpture that he made at the Center, spoke of tourism and presented a poster that he created.

Council Reports

Councilmember Norris attended a Planning Commission/City Council working lunch where a discussion was held about short term rentals, attended a Visit Grand Junction meeting where they spoke of an increase to the lodging tax, and went to Denver with City Manager Caton to conduct a presentation to the Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) for a \$1 million grant for infrastructure for Las Colonias Business Park. Councilmember Norris attended coffee with the City Manager where she said 15 citizens participated

Councilmember Traylor Smith stated she has been out of town and looks forward to hearing her fellow councilmembers' reports.

Councilmember Kennedy gave a Grand Junction Economic Partnership (GJEP) update, stated that Jennifer Seal is leaving to take over as the Executive Director for the Fruita Chamber of Commerce, and noted that the Bureau for Land Management (BLM) Headquarters is having conversations of relocating to Grand Junction. Riverfront at Las Colonias ground breaking will take place on March 30th at 4:00 p.m. He spoke of the Opportunity Zones and Foreign Trade Zones that are well on their way.

Councilmember McArthur attended the National League of Cities Conference in Washington D.C., participated in the Associated Governments of Northwestern Colorado (AGNC), and attended the Grand Junction Area Chamber of Commerce meeting. He spoke of Federal Mineral Lease funds that will be paid back to counties of which Mesa County will receive \$1.8 million.

Councilmember Wortmann talked about the Federal Mineral Lease Board and that he and City Manager Caton attended to request funds to develop Las Colonias Business Park.

Council President Pro Tem Boeschenstein said a lot of exciting things are happening in Grand Junction.

Consent Agenda

Councilmember Kennedy moved to approve adoption of the Consent Agenda, items #1 through #5. Councilmember Wortmann seconded the motion. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

1. Approval of Minutes

- a. Summary of the March 5, 2018 Workshop
- b. Minutes of the March 7, 2018 Regular Meeting

2. Set Public Hearings

- a. Legislative
 - i. 2018 Supplemental Appropriation Ordinance for Expansion of School Resource Officer Program and Setting a Hearing for April 4, 2018
 - ii. An Ordinance Amending Chapter 2 of the Grand Junction Municipal Code regarding Ballot Title Protests and the Deadline for Write-in Candidate Affidavits and Setting a Public Hearing for April 4, 2018
 - iii. An Ordinance Amending Ordinance 4772 Concerning the Issuance of DDA Bonds and Setting a Public Hearing for April 4, 2018
- b. Quasi-judicial
 - i. Consider a Resolution Referring a Petition to the City Council for the Annexation of Lands to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Setting a Hearing on Such Annexation, Exercising Land Use Control, and Introducing Proposed Annexation Ordinance for the York Annexation of 5.943 Acres, Located at 2122 H Road

3. Contracts

- a. Authorize the City Manager to enter into a Community Solar Garden Subscription Agreement with Oak Leaf Solar XXXI LLC

4. Resolutions

- a. A Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Submit a Grant Request to the Department of Local Affairs for the Two Rivers Convention Center Improvements Project
- b. A Resolution Authorizing and Ratifying a Contract with Sunshine Polishing

5. Other Action Items

- a. I-70 / 29 Road Interchange Memorandum of Understanding Between the City of Grand Junction and Mesa County

Regular Agenda

Public Hearing to consider a request by Regeneration, LLC for Review of a Service Plan for the Proposed Lowell Village Metropolitan District

The Applicant, ReGeneration, LLC, is planning for the proposed Lowell Village project to be constructed on the easterly two-thirds (approximately 1.64 acres) of Block 84 of the Original City Plat also known as the R-5 High School Block located at 310 North 7th Street. The development will consist of 36 townhome units, each with the potential for an accessory dwelling unit above a garage on each lot. As a means of generating capital for the construction and on-going maintenance of the proposed public improvements within the development, the Applicant is proposing to form a Metropolitan District. Per Title 32 of the Colorado Revised Statutes (C.R.S.), the first step is to develop a Service Plan for the District, which is to be considered and, if found acceptable, approved by the City.

Kristen Ashbeck, Senior Planner with Community Development, spoke to the requirements of State Statute that must apply since the City does not have a policy/procedure for approval of Metropolitan Districts. She gave the criteria according to statutory compliance for approval or disapproval of Metropolitan Districts

The Planning Commission recommended approval subject to the:

- Approved Development Plan
- The Need for Private and Intergovernmental Agreements

Jeremy Nelson with ReGeneration, LLC outlined the Lowell Village Townhomes project overview, economic impacts, and highlights of the site. Chris Bremner, Metro District Consultant, gave an overview, brief history, and legal basis for formation of Title 32 Special Districts. He listed six comparable Metro Districts in Colorado. Pete Smith,

attorney for the project, was present to request an adjustment of the wording of conditional approval for item #3 where he asked that "attached to the Service Plan" be changed to "allowed to the Service Plan".

Discussion ensued regarding the definition of property owner, mill levy and TABOR requirements, and the risk to the City if the Metro District fails.

Questions were asked about the exterior of the buildings, if the Special District must be approved by District Court, the size of the property and the roads that will be built into the development, and bringing in Lowell Valley School to the Metro District.

Concern was expressed over the oversight of the sale of the bonds and the financial plan and board membership.

The public hearing opened at 8:07 p.m.

Trace Bolhaul, local builder, spoke in support of the Metro District because of job creation and affordable downtown housing.

Rich Garrigan, resident of downtown Grand Junction, spoke in support of the Metro District to bring more residents downtown and to increase the likelihood of businesses coming back to the area.

Irie Yates spoke in support of the District because of the potential of the project and the benefits for downtown Grand Junction.

Robert Strong spoke in support of the district and told of feedback he is getting from future homebuyers and how they are excited about the benefits of the development.

Christine Sere sees this District as a benefit because it would revitalize the downtown area.

Rob Greeden is a developer working on this project and feels this is an innovative project that will spark interest in the downtown area as well as interest for other districts.

Joanna Tipsky said Grand Junction is a wonderful place to live and that she has many people interested in buying homes such as the ones being proposed in this development. She believes this will be a great addition to the City.

Steve Amenterp believes this project has been very well vetted and that the time is right for such a development.

The public hearing was closed at 8:20 p.m.

Discussion ensued about what will happen if the district is not approved, providing services and water works in a Metro District, and emergency services.

Councilmember Kennedy moved to adopt Resolution No. 19-18, a resolution approving the Service Plan for the Lowell Village Metropolitan District with the following three conditions that shall be met prior to the District becoming effective. The effective date being the date which the election results are certified by the Colorado Department of Local Affairs.

1) Revise legal description and boundary map within the Service Plan that correlate to each other and accurately depict the location of the services to be provided and an accurate map of Areas of Operations and Maintenance that clearly show the areas within which the services will be provided by the District and whether the areas are within or outside the District Boundaries.

2) An Approved Development Plan

3) An Intergovernmental Agreement and such other agreements needed as acceptable to the City for the performance of any services (e.g. water acquisition, treatment and delivery; transportation systems; road and drainage systems and recreation facilities, parks and open space) between the proposed District and the City that is to be allowed by the Service Plan.

Councilmember McArthur seconded the motion. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

Council President Pro Tem Boeschstein called for a recess at 8:26 p.m.

The meeting resumed at 8:37 p.m.

Public Hearing for a Resolution Accepting a Petition for the Annexation and Ordinances Annexing and Zoning the Camp Annexation CSR and C-1 Located at 171 Lake Road

Kathy Portner explained that the Applicants, Mirror Pond, LLC, have requested annexation of their 8.626 acres located at 171 Lake Road. The proposed annexation includes all of the right-of-way of variable width of Power Road, Dike Road, and Lake Road. The property is currently used as a primitive campground for special events under a Special Use Permit issued by Mesa County. The Applicant is requesting annexation for future development of the property, which is anticipated to constitute "annexable development" and as such is required to annex in accordance with the Persigo Agreement.

The request also includes zoning of 4.445 acres of the property to CSR (Community Services and Recreation) and zoning to C-1 (Light Commercial) for 4.181 acres of the property. The proposed split zoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Future

Land Use Map and recognizes the constraints of the special flood hazard areas on the property.

Questions were raised about the cost of road improvements, fire districts and change in mills, and camp cleanups on that property.

The public hearing was opened at 8:50 p.m.

There were no public comments.

The public hearing was closed at 8:50 p.m.

Additional comments were made about transitioning this property to multifamily homes, the City's cost to repair the subpar roads, and the possibility a Joint Committee meeting with Mesa County to discuss this issue. It was stated that the costs are a moot point because of the Persigo Agreement and these are issues that need to be discussed with the County and moved forward.

A question was asked about annexing the property without requiring improvements and concern was expressed about the County stepping up and doing their part.

It was suggested that Community Block Development Grant money could help these extremely poor neighborhoods.

Councilmember Kennedy moved to adopt Resolution No. 20-18, a resolution accepting a petition for the annexation of lands to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, making certain findings, and determining that property known as the Camp Annexation, located at 171 Lake Road is eligible for annexation, and Ordinance No. 4792 an ordinance annexing territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Camp Annexation, approximately 10.652 acres, located at 171 Lake Road, and Ordinance No. 4793, an ordinance zoning the Camp Annexation to CSR (Community Services and Recreation) and C-1 (Light Commercial) located at 171 Lake Road on final passage and ordered final publication in pamphlet form. Councilmember Wortmann seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote with Councilmember Norris voting NO.

Consider a Request by Two R&D, LLC to Accept the Dedication of 15.06 Acres of Open Space in the Pinnacle Ridge Subdivision Instead of Payment of the City's Open Space Dedication in Lieu of Fee

The Applicant, Two R & D, LLC, proposed that the City accept dedication of 15.06 acres of open space within Pinnacle Ridge Subdivision to satisfy its obligations arising out of its development being a "cluster" development under the Zoning and Development

Code. To satisfy the open space requirement, the applicant may (1) dedicate the open space to the City, (2) deed the open space to a property owners' association (HOA) with a public easement over it, (3) dedicate discreet public trail easements within the open space area, or (4) pay a fee-in-lieu. The Applicant's preferred option is for the City to accept dedication of the 15.06 acres of open space.

Scott Peterson, Senior Planner with the Community Development Department, presented the area proposed as dedication to the City of Grand Junction Parks Department. If the dedication of land is not approved, the applicant is willing to pay the open space fee, but not willing to dedicate a public easement over the fifteen acres. Parks & Recreation Advisory Board recommends acceptance of the payment of \$82,000 instead of accepting the dedication of the 15.06 acres of open space.

Robert Jones II, Vortex Engineering, noted the property is valued at \$272,240 and makes up 33% of the development's total acreage. The property is a natural continuation of the bike trails at the Lunch Loop Trails and the public currently uses this undeveloped property as trail connections.

Discussion ensued about the access to the trails being closed off, the liability to the City, and the possibility of other organizations maintaining it.

Questions were asked about the dedication of 33% of the land, and that this piece of property is undevelopable and therefore is being dedicated.

Reference was made to the Ridges and Kingsview Desert subdivisions.

Tom Volkman, attorney for Two R & D, LLC, described the City's requirement for a blanket easement over the entire property if the land wasn't dedicated and the fee was paid. That requirement later went away, but the applicants wanted to clarify they were willing to do one or the other.

It was noted that trailhead disruptions would occur after houses were built over them

Discussion ensued about the expense of maintaining the property.

Richard VanGundy with Grand Valley Trails Alliance supported the adoption of the open space and believes accepting this dedication would reinforce the message that the City is strong on its trail systems.

The City has to accept the consequences of requiring open space dedications.

Councilmember Kennedy moved to approve the request to accept the dedication of open space land in the Pinnacle Ridge Subdivision in-lieu of open space payment. Councilmember McArthur seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote with Councilmembers Wortmann and Norris voting NO.

Non-Scheduled Citizens & Visitors

There were none.

Other Business

There was none.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:03 p.m.

Wanda Winkelmann, MMC
City Clerk

Summary of Types of Minutes

Municipality	Type of Minutes (Action, Detailed, Verbatim)
Cherry Hills Village	Detailed
Windsor	Detailed
Loveland	Action
Greeley	Action Plus ¹
Thornton	Action
Montrose	Detailed
Snowmass Village	Action
Aurora	Action Plus
Fort Collins	Detailed
Lakewood	Action Plus
Commerce City	Action Plus
Rifle	Action
Littleton	Action

1 = Land use items include more detail



Grand Junction City Council

Workshop Session

Item #1.c.

Meeting Date: June 4, 2018
Presented By: City Council
Department: City Manager
Submitted By: Wanda Winkelmann

Information

SUBJECT:

Board and Commission Assignments for City Council

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Each year, the City Council reviews and determines who on the City Council will represent the City Council on various boards, committees, commissions, authorities, and organizations.

BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:

The City Council assigns its members to represent the governing body on a variety of Council appointed boards, committees and commissions, as well as a number of outside organizations.

FISCAL IMPACT:

N/A

SUGGESTED ACTION:

Determine who will serve on each board, commission, or authority as the Council representative and direct staff to bring forward a resolution for formal action on June 6, 2018.

Attachments

1. 2018/2019 City Council Assignments to Boards and Commissions Worksheet

CITY COUNCIL FORMAL ASSIGNMENT WORKSHEET

Individual Members are assigned for each of the following:

Board/Organization	Meeting Day/Time/Place	2017/2018 Assignments/Number of Years Served	2018/2019 Assignments
Associated Governments of Northwest Colorado (AGNC)	3rd Wednesday of each month @ 9:00 am different municipalities	Duncan McArthur – 1 year	
Downtown Development Authority/Downtown BID	2 nd and 4 th Thursdays @ 7:30 am @ DDA Offices, 437 Colorado, BID board meets monthly 2 nd Thursday	Phyllis Norris – 1 year	
Grand Junction Housing Authority	4 th Monday @ 5:00 pm @ GJHA Offices at 8 Foresight Circle	Phyllis Norris- 1 year	
Grand Junction Regional Airport Authority	Usually 3 rd Tuesday @ 5:15 pm @ the Airport Terminal Building (workshops held the 1 st Tuesday when needed)	Rick Taggart – 3 years	
One Riverfront	3rd Tuesday of every other month @ 5:30 p.m. in Training Room A, Old Courthouse	Duke Wortmann – 1 year	
Parks Improvement Advisory Board (PIAB)	Quarterly, 1 st Tuesday @ noon @ various locations (usually Hospitality Suite)	Barbara Traylor Smith – 2 years as alternate, 3 years as primary Alternate – Duke Wortmann – 1 year	
Parks & Recreation Advisory Committee	1 st Thursday @ noon @ various locations (usually at Parks Administration Offices)	Duke Wortmann – 1 year	
Mesa County Separator Project Board (PDR)	Quarterly @ Mesa Land Trust, 1006 Main Street	Barbara Traylor Smith – 1 year	
Grand Valley Regional Transportation Committee (GVRTC)	4 th Monday every other month @ 3:00 pm @ GVT Offices, 525 S. 6 th St., 2 nd Floor	Bennett Boeschenstein – 1 year	
Grand Junction Economic Partnership	3rd Wednesday of every month @ 7:30 am @ GJEP offices, 122 N. 6 th Street	Chris Kennedy – 1 year	

Ad Hoc Committees	Meeting Day/Time/Place	2017/2018 Assignments/Number of Years Served	2018/2019 Assignments
Colorado Water Congress	Meets 3-4 times a year in Denver	Duncan McArthur - 3 years	
Colorado Municipal League Legislative Liaison		Duncan McArthur – 1 year	
5-2-1 Drainage Authority	Meets quarterly, generally the 4 th Wednesday of month at 3:00 p.m. in Old Courthouse in Training Rm B	Duncan McArthur – 5 years	
Club 20	The board of directors meets at least annually. The time and place for board meetings are determined by the Executive Committee.	Rick Taggart – 3 years	
Orchard Mesa Pool Board	Meets twice a year of each month at 8:00 A.M. at a designated location.	Duke Wortmann – 1 year	
Avalon Theatre Committee	Third Thursday at 8:00 a.m.	Bennett Boeschstein - 5 years Phyllis Norris – 1 year	
Property Committee	Meets as needed and scheduled	Barbara Traylor Smith - 1 year Bennett Boeschstein - 3 years	
Zoning and Development Code Review*	Meets as needed and scheduled	Duncan McArthur – 2 years Bennett Boeschstein - 2+ years	
Regional Communication Center Committee	Meets as needed and scheduled	Phyllis Norris – 1 year, Chris Kennedy - 2 years	
Las Colonias Development Corporation	Meets as needed and scheduled	Phyllis Norris – 4 months	

Other Boards

Board Name	Meeting Day/Time/Place	2017/2018 Assignments/Number of Years Served	2018/2019 Assignments
Associated Members for Growth and Development (AMGD)	1 st Wednesday, 7:30 a.m., Realtors Association Offices, 2743 Crossroads Blvd.	Duncan McArthur is facilitator – 2 years Open to all	
Building Code Board of Appeals *	As needed	NA	NA
Commission on Arts and Culture *	4 th Wednesday of each month at 4:00 p.m.	Bennett Boeschstein – 2 years	
Forestry Board *	First Thursday of each month at 8:00 a.m.	NA	NA
Historic Preservation Board *	1 st Tuesday of each month at 4:00 p.m.	Bennett Boeschstein – 2 years	NA
Homeless Coalition	Meets on the third Thursday of the month at 10:00 a.m. at St. Mary's Pavilion	Duncan McArthur – 2 years Bennett Boeschstein – 2 years	
Horizon Drive Association Business Improvement District *	3 rd Wednesday of each month at 10:30 a.m.	Duke Wortmann – 1 year	
Persigo Board (All City and County Elected)	Annually and as needed	All	
Planning Commission *	2 nd and 4 th Tuesday at 6:00 p.m.	NA	NA
Public Finance Corporation *	Annual meeting in January	NA	NA
Ridges Architectural Control Committee *	As needed	NA	NA
Riverview Technology Corporation *	Annual meeting in January	Bennett Boeschstein – 2 years	
Urban Trails Committee *	2 nd Tuesday of each month at 5:30 p.m.	Bennett Boeschstein – 2 years	
Visit Grand Junction *	2 nd Tuesday of each month at 3:00 p.m.	NA	NA
Zoning Code Board of Appeals *	As needed	NA	NA

*No Council representative required or assigned - City Council either makes or ratifies appointments - may or may not interview dependent on particular board