

1:00 PM  
**Stakeholder Meeting #1**

**Introduction**

Tim Moore announced that the City Council and County Commissioners were discussing the possibility of changing the 201 Boundary to the north and southeast. Tim presented the background information on growth in the greater Grand Junction area, economic trends and current conditions. He mentioned that the Comprehensive Plan process has been proceeding then announced that the study boundaries may change in the near future based on discussions between the County and City.

**Questions / Comments:**

Question: Do we know density of the City over time?

Staff: Not at this time; the consultants will attempt to research this.

Question: How does this impact Ute Water and other utilities?

Staff: There will be coordination with utility providers and planning will need to be done to reflect the change and address impacts.

Question: Why not trade land with BLM?

Staff: A land trade with the BLM is actually a possibility. The idea will be tested in one of the scenarios being developed for the Comprehensive Plan.

**How does this tie into the Comprehensive Plan process?**

Jeff Winston stated that he thought the boundary change was timely and ought to occur now rather than after the Comprehensive Plan was completed so that planning can be done in these areas along with the rest of the previously identified areas (although Orchard Mesa area was a piece of the original study area).

Jeff gave the background on the Comprehensive Plan process: stakeholder meetings, department meetings, a series of public meetings with the growth challenge chip game and the Open House held in December that revealed emerging concepts.

The emerging concepts include:

- Transportation connectivity
- Shopping closer to where people work
- Respect to sensitive land
- Affordable housing
- Green system
- More mixed use and housing variety
- Connected centers
- More compact
- Infill and redevelopment
- Efficient future growth.

Jeff noted that these ideas were new concepts for the Community and the ideas will need exploration and understanding.

### **Additional Questions:**

Question: The County stated recently that it was moving fast to bring water and sewer to White Water and would allow 1500 - 7500 roof tops. What does this do to this planning process?

Staff: White Water was identified as a place for growth. GJ would still plan around the area though White Water would remain under County jurisdiction and not City jurisdiction. It is possible that one GJ Comprehensive Plan scenario may show more than 7500 roof tops to test if more density can go to the area. Right now infrastructure and utilities for growth in White Water is being studied to see if growth in the area is possible and feasible.

Jeff added that these efforts need to be coordinated.

Question: In terms of BLM land, are the City and County looking at specific areas for land trades?

Staff: The idea is worth exploring though we don't know what might materialize. There may be BLM enclaves that provide better growth areas than others and lands that make sense to trade.

Question: Looking at the expansion of the Persigo Boundary - will there be a coordination of transportation planning with the expansion?

Staff: Interface with service providers is important and needs to be flushed out and if updates are needed; discussions with service providers will need to be done concurrently or shortly afterward.

Staff thanked participants for attending and invited anyone with further questions to contact the Department.

**3:00 PM**

### **Stakeholder Meeting #2:**

#### **Introduction**

Dave Thornton welcomed the group to the discussion. He explained to the group the 201 Boundary, the associated agreement between the County and City in regard to development within the boundary, and how the 201 Boundary and the City have expanded over the years.

Dave explained the recent population growth in the area and described economic trends and current City conditions that impact or are impacted by growth such as the transportation system.

Dave explained that the County and City were discussing the option of expanding the 201 Boundary to the northwest and southeast. This expansion of the 201 Boundary would also mean the expansion of the Comprehensive Plan study area to the northwest (the Orchard Mesa area was already included in the Comprehensive Plan study area).

#### **Comments / Questions:**

Question: Is there any talk that BLM land about land exchanges?

Staff: This is a concept being discussed and it is likely that this idea will be reflected in at least one of the scenarios being prepared for the Comprehensive Plan alternatives.

Comment: It appears that this should have been looked at in the 1980s; it appears that we are behind the curve. This is way past time.

Question: What is the capacity of the sewer plant?

Staff: There is room on site to expand and there is a study being conducted right now for capacity.

Question: Any talk on an agreement of City services and how to coordinate while we grow?

Staff: In general, the County and City are discussing service agreements and other ideas to better provide coverage of services.

**How does this tie into the Comprehensive Plan process?:**

Jeff Winston explained where the City was in the Comprehensive Plan process. He stated that now a good time to discuss changes rather than later. He stated that the stakeholders in these areas need to be contacted and the Community made aware of the added planning areas. Jeff listed the concepts emerging from the Comprehensive Plan process.

**Questions:**

Comment: Define sprawl.

Jeff: Sprawl – compared to historic land use pattern, sprawl consists of development that consumes more land per capita, creates increased travel time and is often hopscotch or leapfrog in nature.

Question: What's the timeline?

Staff: There will be a series of public information meetings during the week of January 21 – 24. On February 13, there will be a joint County – City meeting with hearing and a possible decision will be made about whether or not to move boundary and if so, where.

Question: Would we know by end of February?

Staff: Yes.

Question: What will the City do about the Growth Plan inadequacies and inconsistencies in regard to the boundary changes?

Staff: In March, the Comprehensive Plan scenarios will be reviewed at public meetings. Parameters and guidelines will be established after these meetings to help guide what can be done in these areas if proposals are submitted prior to the completion of the Plan. Time will be needed to review any proposed changes on particular parcels. Due to the time needed for review, it is doubtful that development would occur within 6 months from the submittal. Staff will need to wait to see what kind of requests will come in. However, staff will have a framework in place and will do best it can with what it has.

Question: We need some idea what densities will be allowed in the areas; will this be echoed in the Code and Comprehensive Plan - or will there be no parameters for developers before they go through the process?

Staff: We hope to have parameters for the future development. On February 13, there will be discussion on these parameters.

Question: What will staff tell people next week on why the 201 is being pushed before the Comprehensive Plan is complete?

Staff: The staff will explain that this is what the policy makers want to do and, therefore, these boundaries are to be studied; it's better to do such a study now rather than later.

Comment: The issue is having the boundary moved without any known densities. We will see more of the same low density here if guidance is not set.

Comment: In the north area, there is no long term direction on what should happen there. There may be half dozen proposals for land in that area before the Comprehensive Plan is complete so problems may not be too bad.

Question: I think people in these areas do want to see the change but how was decision made? How much and when? Phased or one single expansion? Will more areas be identified?

Staff: Staff does not know the extent of any potential boundary changes. The decisions were not entirely based on the chip game though the game results back up the idea. Other factors do play a role in the consideration.

Question: What are the areas of these lands?

Staff: The Orchard Mesa area is approximately 4 square miles; the northwest area is approximately 12 square miles; the City currently is approximately 33 square miles.

Comment: I would like to see the zoning code not allow low densities in these areas. I would not like to see the low densities continued.

Comment: But that is where the market is.

Comment: I disagree that this is where the market is.

Comment: Doesn't the system need to phase the expansion or will developers farther away be allowed to develop anywhere? We need to look at this in some kind of fashion before decision is made. I'm not opposed to this but need more information on table before decision made. We need to be more informed.

Staff: Policy makers want to know if sewer could be extended, and if expansion, how it would impact the City fiscally. This alone may impact their decision. Elected officials need to know your concerns. Please write these down and relay them to the Council persons.

Dave thanked the participants for attending and invited them to the meeting on the 13<sup>th</sup> of February.

**5:30 PM**

**Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee Meeting:**

**Introduction:**

Tim Moore presented the timeline for the potential boundary change:

- Focus group meetings on the January 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>,
- Week of January 21 - public meetings in Northwest and Southeast,
- Compilation of data and information for policy makers,
- February 13 - the City Council and County Commissioners will meet as the Persigo Board to discuss any adjustments to the existing 201 Boundary.

Tim provided the 10-year background on the 201 Boundary / IGA; displayed the vacant and undeveloped land within and around the boundary, and noted that the boundary had not changed much since the Persigo Agreement was established.

Tim then showed how growth was occurring in the area, relayed economic trends and discussed current conditions. He stated that today's growth policies may no longer be adequate due to the growth occurring and its potential impacts in infrastructure and services (transportation example made). He stated that the elected City and County officials were studying whether to expand the 201 Boundary to areas to the northwest and in the eastern Orchard Mesa Area. He stated that staff was meeting with residents of the areas to determine if the areas should have future urban development or continue with the rural development allowed currently. He noted that the elected officials may consider expanding in all, none or only a portion of the areas.

**Questions / Comments:**

Tom: How large is the area to the northwest? How large is the 201 / Persigo Boundary today?

Staff: The Persigo Boundary is approximately 44 square miles, the City today is approximately 33 square miles and the area to the northwest is approximately 12 square miles.

Bill: What about the Clifton area?

Staff: The County is looking at the area and discussing options for Clifton's future including incorporation and other tools for serving itself.

Tom: What about the other elephant in the room: the area north of I-70 and the Clifton area?

Staff: The area would be served by Clifton Sanitation so conversations with the organization would need to be held. Some of the area is privately held while other portions are BLM land.

Tom: Some of the area interferes with the airport.

Staff: The airport would be included in any conversations on growth in that area.

Tom: The southeast area makes sense to include in the 201 Boundary but looking at the northwest, it should be brought in incrementally to avoid losing control over the growth in that area. Staff is too taxed to deal with potential plan for the area. The entire area could be planned vaguely but the boundary should only be moved incrementally so that specific plans can be tailored to needs of that time. There is enough land already inside the existing 201 to accommodate much of the near term growth.

Ken: There are examples of similar growth plans (like the one that would occur to the northwest) in Colorado Springs and Highlands Ranch that can be looked at.

Jeff: Land assembly may be needed for larger developments in the northwest so longer range planning may be appropriate.

Paul: If we are going to plan it, we should plan it all right now but having phased development is preferred.

Rebekah: Incremental increases will drive housing costs up.

Tom: How will we know what will occur out there?

Staff: The consultants will look at areas and give recommendations on limitations to growth, cost of services, etc.

Paul: Leave a corridor for future transit.

Jeff: We want to establish predictability and allow for efficient growth and service provision.

John: What types of considerations are being made for those that live in the areas - especially to the northwest where there are large lots?

Staff: Sewer service would be provided.

John: There likely will be a backlash by the residents in the area.

Paul: It would not be fair not to tell the public the full extent of the intentions. Let them know the potential extent of the boundary and that logical growth is intended though political will is required to keep the reigns on growth.

Rebekah: Property values would rise if annexed.

Tom: Property values in the rest of the Persigo area will decrease due to the increased supply. Incremental moving of the boundary would allow adjustments to density overtime to best accommodate the needs of the community.

John: There were fights over past boundary adjustments. Is there a way to define how the boundary will move over time to hopefully avoid unnecessary fights?

Bill: Developers could assemble land to create larger developable areas.

Paul: Costs are so high that developers need large areas to meet costs and make profit.

John: Developers of large projects will not come to develop if they cannot develop large tracks on a year after year basis.

Tom: We are starting to see larger planned developments but still most are smaller in scale.

David Thornton asked the group to supply comments for the Council by January 28<sup>th</sup>.