

**MAY 10, 2010**

**CALL TO ORDER**

At 6:00 p.m., Mayor Teresa Coons called to order the Annual Joint Persigo meeting between the Grand Junction City Council and the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners at the Grand Junction City Hall Auditorium, 250 North 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Grand Junction, Colorado.

Those in attendance from the County were Chair Craig J. Meis and Commissioners Steven Acquafresca and Janet Rowland; Jon Peacock, County Administrator; Lyle Dechant, County Attorney; Pete Baier, Public Works Director; Kurt Larson, Planning and Economic Development Director; Keith Fife, Long Range Planning; and Roberta Raley, Clerk to the Board. (Minutes transcribed by Roberta Raley, Clerk to the Board.)

In attendance from the City of Grand Junction were Mayor Teresa Coons; Council members: Gregg Palmer, Bruce Hill, Bonnie Beckstein; Bill Pitts, Sam Susuras, and Tom Kenyon; Laurie Kadrich, City Manager; Rich Englehart, Deputy City Manager; John Shaver, City Attorney; Tim Moore, Public Works and Planning Director; Terry Franklin, Deputy Director of Utilities, Streets, and Facilities; Dan Tonello, Wastewater Sewer System Division Manager; Bret Guillory, Utility Engineer; David Thorton, Principal Planner; Lisa Cox, Planning Manager; and Stephanie Tuin, City Clerk.

Jon Peacock suggested changing the order of the hearing by moving the Public Hearing portion for inclusion into the 201 prior to the Future 201 Sewer Service Area Boundary Adjustments discussion.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**135 31 Road**

Tim Moore, Public Works and Planning Director, stated this property is in the County area of influence and zoned AFT; the Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan designation is Residential Medium 2-4 dwelling units per acre.

Bill Pitts asked what the Orchard Mesa Overlay District was. Keith Fife stated it allows clustering in the AFT, up to 2.5 dwelling units per acre, leaving half the property in open space in perpetuity.

Bruce Hill asked where this property was in relationship to the 201 boundary. Tim Moore stated it is southeast of the 201 boundary.

Public Comments: Linda Roach, 138 30  $\frac{3}{4}$  Road, and Gretchen Sigafos, 131 31 Road. Linda stated she had circulated a petition in the area; receiving 22 signatures of those from the area that were not in favor going onto the sewer, 6 did not want to sign the petition, and 1 was unavailable. Gretchen displayed a map of the residences of those that signed not wanting to be included. Jeri Stinecipher, 3113 A  $\frac{1}{8}$  Road, stated she was near the parcel and just wanted information as to what being in the 201 would mean for her.

Laurie Kadrich stated the hearing this evening only concerned the two parcels listed on the agenda and not the surrounding area.

Don Pettygrove, DP Consulting, asked what would happen to the properties that were bypassed if this property was included in the 201. He believed state law requires properties to connect to the sewer in a specified period of time if the sewer was within a certain distance. He asked if the bypassed properties would be forced into annexation to the 201. Laurie Kadrich stated inclusion into the 201 is by application or by development of the parcel. Gregg Palmer asked what happens if there is a septic failure. Bruce Hill stated he does not remember any parcels being included within the 201 as a single parcel that was not adjacent to the 201 boundary. John Shaver stated if there is a septic failure and there is a sewer line within 400 feet, they have to connect to the sewer; the cost is borne by the property owner. Bonnie Beckstein also questioned what happens to those properties between the current 201 and this property; if any of the other properties had a failure would they automatically be included in the 201 boundary. John Shaver stated they would have to go through the process to be included.

Kerry Cook, 3097 A  $\frac{1}{2}$  Road; stated he bordered the parcel requesting inclusion; and asked where the sewer line would run. He stated he was not in favor of the inclusion.

Applicant, Tom Weigel, 135 31 Road, stated he had requested inclusion as he wanted to eventually go onto the sewer; that was until he found out the cost. Mayor Coons asked if the petitioner wanted to continue. He stated he would like to withdraw without prejudice.

Bruce Hill asked staff what the cost would be if a number of property owners asked for inclusion. Brent Guillory stated the cost would be lower; the estimate given was for the density called for in the Comp Plan, not just one home.

Chairman Meis asked where the existing infrastructure is. Brent Guillory stated this property could connect to the Valley Vista outfall on 31 Road, approximately 1500 feet.

Mayor Coons closed public testimony; no action was needed on this matter.

(Exhibit A)

### **30 and A ½ Road - Southeast corner**

Jon Peacock stated they received a letter from the second parcel owner stating the application was withdrawn.

There was no action taken.

### **POST COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION - Future 201 Sewer Service Area Boundary Adjustments.**

Chairman Meis stated he has concerns the area will develop at urban standards with the newly adopted Comp Plan; he would like to address that the 201 boundary does not match the Comp Plan boundary. He would also like to identify the areas where urban development is most likely to occur. He believes there are economies of scale by planning for areas rather than single parcels. He stated that the discussion had been tabled waiting for the Comp Plan to be completed.

Commissioner Rowland stated she was in agreement with Chairman Meis; that we need to take a look at the big picture.

Jon Peacock stated this discussion was tabled by both bodies until after the Comp Plan was adopted. He stated the County was seeking general guidance on the staffs' perspective as to whether the Persigo Board wants staff to get an analysis of different options for pursuing expansion/reduction of the boundary to match the Comp Plan boundary.

Bruce Hill stated this was attempted two to three years ago on how big and where Grand Junction would grow in 150 years. He thought the two properties that were being looked at for inclusion tonight, in area 7, were a bit premature; the interest it created was negative. He was comfortable with the two lines

not matching. He would rather see the property owners coming to the Persigo Board for inclusion.

Bill Pitts stated he was comfortable with where the lines are now; there was a lot of discussion when they reviewed the Comp Plan. Sam Susuras stated he agreed with Bruce Hill. Gregg Palmer stated he has not seen any pressing need to change or make a discussion item of this. Bonnie Beckstein stated she did not see any interest by the property owners.

Chairman Meis stated he was not pushing for inclusion of area 7. The Persigo Board was in the service provider business. He would like to see the Persigo Board review the lines to see if they could be tightened up to better correlate with the growth patterns; to try and minimize the checkerboard annexations into the City. There are disconnected service areas and growth patterns because of the checkerboard annexations; he wanted to ensure that services were not being duplicated in adjacent areas.

Tom Kenyon stated he agreed with Chairman Meis on the checkerboard annexations; it was a separate operational issue that service is available sporadically. He would like to improve on that in the future.

Mayor Coons stated that is a discussion that should be put on a future agenda for how to best provide service.

Jon Peacock stated the Comp Plan created significant urban density outside of the Persigo Growth Boundary; he believed the Urban Growth Boundary and the Persigo Growth Boundary needed to match up. The concern is that the County, in making the Land Use decision, could say this is planned for urban density and you have to wait for the infrastructure or allow some level of development that may not be of the same density of the vision of the Comp Plan. Many citizens have expressed concern with the checkerboard annexation and service delivery; there are many unresolved issues.

Bruce Hill stated he did not believe the community was ready for large inclusions into the 201. Teresa Coons asked if staff has any suggestions on how to proceed; is there another approach. Jon Peacock stated there could be alternatives developed with pros and cons for the Boards to consider, if given direction to do so. Laurie Kadrach stated inclusion requests are generated by the property owners, rather than the Persigo Board. Teresa Coons stated this would take staff time to come up with alternatives; and asked if both entities staffs had the capability and budget to do that. Jon Peacock stated given the

slowdown in development activity, there would be no better time to review this.

Laurie Kadrach disagreed and said they have lost 29 employees in Planning and Public Works in the past nine months; they were looking at a different model of operation for those departments. The City took a great deal of comment during the Comp Plan project and she did not believe the citizens would want to be involved in another round of discussions.

Gregg Palmer stated he respected Chairman Meis's concern regarding the checker boarding; he believed time would cure some of those issues. All the property inside the 201 is slated for urban development, most will develop with city density; and in time will be in the city limits. He agreed to look at service agreements with other agencies if the services could be provided at a lesser charge and a high level of service. Bill Pitts asked if there was a sewer line along the 201 boundary or if it was just an imaginary line. He also asked why the boundary could not be a block on the map. John Shaver stated the uneven boundary was created by collection basins, topography, and lot lines; also the plant is sized for the area of the 201 boundary. There is no sewer line along the boundary, it was merely a line.

Chairman Meis stated it was unfortunate to tie land use and the sewer service to the annexation. He would like to have a policy for staff on how annexation takes place. He stated you cannot deploy capital for two parcels when they were not adjacent to the existing infrastructure.

Commissioner Acquafresca stated staff recommended annexation of the two parcels into the 201 based on existing policy. He asked what the policy was. Jon Peacock stated there was policy laid out in the Persigo agreement; the petitioner has to request to be included into the Persigo 201 Boundary.

Commissioner Rowland stated the policy that is in place right now, none of the Board members were agreeing to it; tonight's hearing was a waste of time. She did not believe it was productive to the property owner or staff. The policies need to be on what the Persigo Board would approve. She would like to have a discussion on the guidelines for what will be considered for inclusion into the boundary.

Chairman Meis stated all the other special districts have annexation guidelines. He would like to look at how citizens petition into the boundary; he did not see any guidelines other than if it fits the Comp Plan. This Board is a service provider

not a land use policy maker; each entity individually is a land use policy maker.

Tom Kenyon asked if a cost analyst has been provided as part of the information for inclusion. He agreed with Chairman Meis that parcels should be contiguous from a business perspective. Laurie Kadrich stated, at this time, there is plant capacity that is calculated when requests are brought forward; Plant Investment Fees are charged to pay for plant expansion.

Chairman Meis stated it has as much to do with the backbone of the system (pipe capacity) as the capacity of the facility. When smaller areas are brought into the system the pipelines are sized appropriately than when larger areas are brought into the 201.

**ADJOURN**

With no further business to come before the Persigo Board, Mayor Coons adjourned the meeting at 7:25 p.m.

Janice Rich,  
Mesa County Clerk and Recorder

Roberta Raley,  
Clerk to the Board

Craig J. Meis,  
Chairman

(Verbatim digital files of the Commissioners' Proceedings of May 10, 2010, are on file in the Mesa County Clerk's Office.)

(Exhibit A)

