

<b>MEMBERS</b>	<b>PRESENT</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>	<b>EXCUSED</b>
DIANE LOTHAMER, CHAIR	X		
JIM SEITZ	X		
BOB BEDA	X		
HARVEY HARRIMAN	X		
DELANEY KEATING	X		
MARTIN FROEHLICH		X	
COUNCILMEMBER ELLEN HARRIMAN	X		

**OTHERS PRESENT:** DIRECTOR STEVE WESTBAY, PLANNING TECHNICIAN PAM CUNNINGHAM, TIM SEIBERT, DICK BRATTON, RICHARD KARAS, RALPH (BUTCH) CLARK, JEFF WILKINSON, KYLE WALLER, CHRIS LEWARCHIK, MONICA SHUNK, MELISSA “ZOE” FRYER, CHRISTOPHER POTTER, ADAM ADAMO, ALYSSA CRUM, STEVE SCHECHTER, LARA RICHARDS, GINGER ROUSE, EDWARD M [sic], RACHEL MASON [SP?], LINSEY WARD, JACOB ANDERSON, MANDI LEIGH, DONALD MCLEOD, VIKKI ROACH ARCHULETA, JONATHAN HOUCK.

**I. CALL TO ORDER AT 7:03pm BY CHAIR DIANE LOTHAMER**

**II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG**

**III. CONSIDERATION OF THE APRIL 8, 2009 MEETING MINUTES.**

Commissioner Harriman moved to APPROVE the April 8, 2009 meeting minutes as corrected. Commissioner Seitz seconded the motion.

Roll Call Yes: Bob, Diane, Delaney, Ellen, Jim, Harvey

Roll Call No:

Motion Carried

**IV. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING AND POSSIBLE ACTION, ZA 09-1, BY GUNNISON VALLEY PARTNERS FOR THE REQUEST OF A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) ZONING IN THE PROPOSED GUNNISON RISING ANNEXATION.**

Chair Lothamer reopened the public meeting to 7:06pm.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Written comment received from the following individuals was entered into the public record. The text of their statements is included as Attachment A.

Michelle and John Campbell  
Kathryn Bernier  
Susan and Pete Rinaldi

Chair Lothamer asked for public comment. She stated that an overview of the annexation zoning amendment was provided at the last meeting but would be reviewed again if anyone wished. Also, the Commission will accept questions.

A summary of the public comments and responses is included as Attachment B.

Following the public comments, Chair Lothamer stated that the Commission is waiting for a response from the applicants. The Commission and staff have gone through their proposed PUD and asked for certain things to go along with City code. The applicant is now to respond with what they don't agree with, so that the Planning and Zoning Commission can make a recommendation to City Council regarding the zoning, which is the PUD Plan. There are a lot of other issues involved that the City Council will decide and there will be another opportunity for the public to respond. The Commission can't do its final findings until a response is received from the applicants. The public hearing will be continued one more time and written comments are invited.

Commissioner Beda asked if the Chair could clarify that once the public hearing is closed the Commission is under a time constraint. Chair Lothamer responded that the Commission wants to give a good recommendation and that it has 21 days to get a recommendation to City Council once the hearing is closed. The Commission is giving the applicant the benefit of giving a response.

Steve Schechter asked if the public can go on line to see what they have [staff's recommended *PUD Development Standards*] and the applicant's responses. Director Westbay said that the City's document will be put on line but that people will have to reference Gunnison Rising's website for maps and diagrams.

Commissioner Beda asked if the diagram and picture numbers will match. Director Westbay responded that they will not because chapters have been rearranged.

Director Westbay stated that another reason for keeping the public hearing open is that the final decision must be based on a public hearing and on the zoning application and that the final information from the applicant is necessary to do that.

Commissioner Harriman asked Director Westbay to provide the City and Gunnison Rising website addresses. They are:

[www.cityofguninson-co.gov](http://www.cityofguninson-co.gov)

[www.gunnisonrising.com](http://www.gunnisonrising.com)

Commissioner Harriman asked what would be available on the web at this point. Tim Seibert replied that Gunnison Rising is all on line, although the maps tonight are not posted yet, nor is the updated zoning map. Those will be provided to the City as well.

Commissioner Harriman reminded the audience that the documents are *proposed*, nothing is set in stone yet.

City Manager Ken Coleman asked when the hearing will be continued to. Chair Lothamer replied that it will be continued to May 13<sup>th</sup> and the hope is it that will be the last continuation.

Zoe Fryer stated that some of the links on the City's web site are broken. Staff will address that issue.

Councilor Harriman stated that City Council was supposed to have an eligibility vote last night, but it was removed from the agenda. She said that a number of people were in attendance and there was no explanation provided about why the agenda item was pulled. She asked what implications that has on subsequent votes [that the Council will have].

Tim Seibert replied that during the review of the annexation plat a survey error was identified. The survey is now being reworked and rechecked. That is why the eligibility vote was pulled from the agenda, at the applicant's request. He stated that Mr. Minchow is a surveyor and he noticed the error and notified the other partners. Dick Bratton explained that the error occurred when the condemnation was filed to condemn the airport and the County gave a different description to the surveyor.

Tim Seibert stated that it wasn't their intent to cause disruption. He said: "We apologize. It was not intentional. We want the eligibility hearing to occur. We would like to see that move forward. Once we get a new boundary every drawing will be amended."

Commissioner Harriman asked when that will be. Seibert replied that he is not sure. He further said: "The intent is to try to get the revised code back to you with all illustrations. Most are just trying to graphically illustrate the text. It is in written form in the book itself. We want the maps to match what we say."

City Manager Coleman said: "It is incumbent upon [the applicants] when they have it ready. They will notify us and we will set a special session for the eligibility hearing."

Councilor Beda stated that written comments from the public are still invited (and may be submitted by e-mail).

### **ACTION**

During the regular Planning and Zoning Commission meeting held on April 29, 2009 Commissioner Harriman moved to CONTINUE the public hearing for Zoning Amendment ZA 09-1 until May 13, 2009 at 7:00 p.m. Commissioner Beda seconded the motion.

Roll Call Yes: Jim, Diane, Delaney, Ellen, Bob, Harvey  
Roll Call No:  
Motion Carried

Chair Lothamer stated that the Commission will continue the discussion and that anyone who wants to leave can.

Director Westbay explained the draft staff report and asked the Commission for input.

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:** Chair Lothamer asked the Commission if there were any comments.

Chair Lothamer observed that the draft report doesn't contain the usual materials, such as comments from City staff. Director Westbay replied that the record goes back two years and that during that time he has received a volume of comments from staff, CDOT, the State Geologist, and many others. There is an immense volume of documentation. The draft staff report is an attempt to hone in on specific issues that must be addressed in more detail.

Chair Lothamer asked the Commissioners what else they would like to see in the staff report. Most had not had an opportunity to review it, so more time is needed before they can discuss it.

Chair Lothamer observed that at some point a list of outstanding issues is needed. Director Westbay responded that he plans to include a footnote at the end of each staff statement that will list the outstanding items that would be a cross reference to the "Status Report" spread sheet that has been previously distributed. Chair Lothamer stated that the Commission needs to be able to advise City Council if there is unfinished business in case there are issues they can't waive. Director Westbay will establish a finding that specifies those issues.

Director Westbay brought up the motion just passed to continue the hearing until May 13<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 p.m. He advised that two conditional use applications are already scheduled for 7:00 and 7:20 on that date. Chair Lothamer asked for a motion to amend the previous motion.

#### **ACTION**

During the regular Planning and Zoning Commission meeting held on April 29, 2009 Commissioner Harriman moved to CONTINUE the public hearing for Zoning Amendment ZA 09-1 until May 13, 2009 at 7:45 p.m. Commissioner Beda seconded the motion.

Roll Call Yes: Jim, Diane, Delaney, Ellen, Bob, Harvey

Roll Call No:

Motion Carried

**V. UNSCHEDULED CITIZENS:** There were no unscheduled citizens.

**VI. COUNCIL UPDATE.** Councilor Ellen Harriman updated the Commission on the April 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. The City Council:

- held a public hearing for a liquor license application for the Power Stop and voted to approve the liquor license;
- approved the City Electric Utility Energy Action Plan which will be presented to the Governor's Energy Office;
- approved the revised budget for 2009;

- approved an appraisal and survey for a proposed Thornton Way / 5<sup>th</sup> Street extension; and,
- approved a multiple day special events permit for Farmers Market.

The Council heard several reports:

- the pool will open on May 22<sup>nd</sup>, ahead of schedule and on budget;
- City ditch water is working its way through the ditch system; and,
- RTA has to make serious cuts in service. An open Advisory Board meeting will be held on May 13 at 8:30 am to hear from public. Jonathan Houck, who was in the audience advised that information is available at the RTA website.

## VII COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

- Commissioner Beda observed that the Power Stop sign is large and wondered if it meets code. Director Westbay will check with the Building Official.
- Commissioner Seitz observed that the sign is still up on the old Ford dealership. Director Westbay stated that the CB Brewery will be moving into that location.
- Someone observed that H&H towing has their sign up as well.
- Commissioner Keating asked if Director Westbay had checked with the Fire Marshal if the existing fire station will be adequate to serve the annexation area until Phase V. Director Westbay stated that the real issue is response time from the existing station to areas to the far east of the annexation area. The Fire Marshal said that the response time will be adequate through Phase V.

## VIII STAFF COMMENTS: Director Westbay stated that:

- staff is working on the VanTuyl Ranch Management Plan, and has shortlisted three planning consultants to be interviewed on May 6<sup>th</sup>; and,
- staff has written a nomination for an American Planning Association award for excellent planning for the *West Gunnison Neighborhood Plan*.

## V. ADJOURN

Chair Lothamer closed the meeting at approximately 8:50 p.m.

---

Diane Lothamer, Chair

Attest:

---

Pam Cunningham, Secretary

**ATTACHMENT  
PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED SINCE APRIL 8<sup>TH</sup>  
TO BE ENTERED INTO THE PUBLIC RECORD**

April 9, 2009

Dear Mr. Westbay,

I am writing this in regards to the proposed "Gunnison Rising" annexation project. I have attended a couple of the public hearing meetings in the last year, and feel that public opinion is a valuable tool in affairs that affect the entire community, such as "Gunnison Rising". Generally, I support growth and development in urban areas, but this proposition is not smart growth. In times of economic downturn, we should be aiming more at revitalization and developing lands that are already annexed in the city. The downtown area as well as the City Market/Wal-mart mall have been experiencing an increasing number of vacancies recently-- we should focus on maintaining occupancy in the buildings we have, rather than expanding the city with the likelihood of more empty buildings, only further from the town center. The model of "new urbanism" represents smart growth. By renovating and updating centralized buildings, such as in the downtown area, we, as a city, can attract a population to live centrally downtown, reduce commuting, promote the small businesses we have downtown, encourage foot and bicycle traffic, etc. This will achieve some of the energy goals currently being addressed by the "Energy Action Plan" committee. Elongating the city up to three miles to the east (Gunnison Rising) will only intensify the dependence on fossil fuels for transportation and discourage alternative transportation, i.e. walking and cycling. As far as increasing the residential capacity of the city, recently annexed plots should be built up before another annexation should even be considered. Van Tuyl Village is the most prominent example of annexation with high hopes that are yet to be realized. Annexations such as this need to be built up before we allow more customers on the city's utilities. Additionally, the city has plenty of vacant lots that are yet to be utilized--these should also be developed before more land is added to our city. From an ecological standpoint, the endangered Gunnison Sage Grouse represents a species whose habitat will be directly and negatively impacted by the infringement of development on its habitat. Please take into mind that the Endangered Species Act clearly protects those species which are endangered and extremely sensitive. In conclusion, I hope you take in to consideration the outcries of a concerned community who is not sold on Gunnison Rising. Last night's public meeting represented only a small portion of the population that is very worried about Gunnison Rising being passed. Please listen to the concerned citizens about Gunnison Rising: just say no to the proposal.

Thank you for your time,  
Sincerely,  
Kathryn Bernier

April 7, 2009

To: Mr. Steve Westbay, Director of Community Development  
From: Michelle and John Campbell  
Subj: Comments re: Land Annex Proposal

Please accept these comments for inclusion in the public record of the April 8, 2009 community hearing on the proposed annexation of the Gunnison Rising project by the City of Gunnison. Please also thank the City Counsel and staff for the diligence with which they are evaluating the proposal and the opportunity to provide comment.

Background:

My husband and I have been property owners in Gunnison for five and a half years. We own a single family home on North Pine Street. Since purchasing the original property we have made a significant investment in renovating the home, preserving the original foot print of the dwelling in order to maintain integrity with the neighborhood. The vast majority of our investments were made with local subcontractors and retail establishments in an effort to spend locally. While the home is currently used as getaway place we spend at least a week a month there and we plan to retire in Gunnison.

Summary of Comments:

We support planned growth for the City of Gunnison and the County. However we have been alarmed by the scope and potential negative impact of the Gunnison Rising development. We are strongly opposed to the annexation and the development for four primary reason: 1) upon full completion we understand that the project would nearly double the amount of developed land in the City, changing the character of the town and creating negative and potentially irreversible environmental impacts, 2) zoning and land use and home covenant details are unclear and can be changed post annexation, 3) the project does not make economic sense for the City, creating a net negative impact to the city budget of a \$1 million deficit per year upon completion, and 4) the project could reduce attractiveness of the area for tourists, creating further economic loss through decreased sales tax revenue.

Our conclusions are based on several hours research of related information on the City website, over five years of participation in the local economy, hundreds of hours enjoying the many recreational and community gifts Gunnison has to offer and 35 years experience as owners of a residential and commercial construction firm. Please allow us to highlight our specific concerns:

Environment and Aesthetics:

The project appears out of character with the beauty of Gunnison and current land use plans show a disproportionate amount of developed versus open space.

- The project appears at the entrance to the City, one which today creates excitement for the traveler and an extremely positive impression as one enters town through hay and horse fields, undeveloped hills and the beautiful Tomichi Creek.
- The plans to reduce irrigated land in favor of high density housing are contradictory to the principles of “greening our land” and do not represent wise land usage
- The plans for development in such an environmentally sensitive and beautiful area show less than 5 percent for the planned equestrian trails, open space and buffer area – including the acreage allotted for a park (which requires that the City fund and construct). This percentage is much less than the required amount for new developments in metropolitan cities.
- The large RV park (500 sites) represents the complete antithesis of the current view and is highly visible.
- The means to ensure the Tomichi Creek corridor remains open space and that public trailheads developed in conjunction with resource management plans have not been outlined.
- A plan for limiting the impact from doubling the amount of developed land in the night time environment does not appear – Gunnison already has significant night time light pollution – how will this be treated?
- The proposed build out of the total acreage will ,according to the traffic impact statement, create significant traffic and air quality impacts; “This will significantly change the character of Gunnison where there is little traffic congestion today. The Tomichi (US 50) corridor through town will become effectively full with the build out of this project, with associated traffic congestion that this community has never experienced.”
- Water quality and quantity issues appear unusually vague in the documentation we reviewed
- Since lot sales are assumed to commence one year after annexation (Year 2) and the first residential units are scheduled for completion and occupancy in Year 3 the community will experience considerable disruption through site preparation and infrastructure installation in the short term and the length of time for the total development build out would mean this disruption would continue for over a decade. How will this be managed?

It is concerning that when one reviews the issues / status list between the developer and City staff that many of the items remaining “in negotiation” relate to environmental issues including, sage and grouse habitat preservation, public trail head management, preservation of agricultural land use during construction, water quality and capacity assurances, funding for public transportation and more. These are all critical areas for resolution prior to voting on the annexation.

Zoning and land use:

- The time for complete build out is 15 years or more, is there a plan for site preparation to parallel the selling of sites instead of preparing the land all at once?

- Since final zoning will be determined with the Zoning request, after acceptance by the City of the Annexation Petition, will the required 90 days be of sufficient time to resolve the unresolved issues within the issues status report? Will this be adequate time to involve public comment?
- Will there be home owner and development covenants to assure design elements are compatible with the character of the area and create an aesthetically pleasing community?
- The planned density of the development indicates that a majority of the acreage dedicated to a “unit per acre ratio” that is much more dense than many subdivisions in metropolitan cities. Is there market demand for this density?

Economic Impacts: (Note: quotations are taken from the BBC January 2008 Fiscal impact report)

- “There is no indication of sufficient market demand to support the rate of growth” this project envisions. Indeed the lack of market demand for doubling the size of built out space, increasing retail and commercial space could only be exacerbated by the current economic recession.
- While there may be some positive financial impact from the commercial developments in the project, the large RV park has a negative financial impact and is of a scale out of balance to single family homes. Depending on site covenants (which we have not located) this area could create negative social impacts from transient residents.
- “The net impact of the overall Gunnison Rising project will be negative” and associated economic assessment that costs the citizens of Gunnison which would only be offset by increasing the level of current taxes.
- “Aside from a few positive years as construction related use taxes supplement other revenues sources and the total net value exceeds associated service costs.”
- “Overall the projects creates a \$1 million deficit per year upon completion ... over the full 20 years of development, the project will produce a net deficit of approximately \$3.2 million on a net present value.”
- “Gunnison derives 30 – 40 percent of revenue from county residents or tourists any new development will dilute the city’s “subsidy,” and present a financial burden to existing residents. Gunnison’s low property tax levy and heavy reliance on sales tax contributes to this problem. Gunnison residents enjoy a high level of municipal services without bearing the full cost. New residents, whether within the current city limits or at Gunnison Rising, can not replicate those additional incremental revenues and therefore virtually any new development will dilute the city’s “subsidy,” and present a financial burden to existing residents.” Therefore it appears the City budget losses cannot be offset unless the city raises taxes overall. Do the current citizens of Gunnison wish for this situation?

We ask that the City receive the following answers and agreements prior to voting on the Annexation :

- Proof of market demand for the project in the short term and long term
- Satisfactory agreements on all environmental issues currently pending
- Significant increase the amount of open space and requirement that the developer pay for city parks
- Decrease in the density of multi family areas and placement of open space within this acreage
- Traffic implications must be addressed – require the developer to add frontage roads to Highway 50 at their expense and fund mass transportation

Conclusion:

Colorado annexation law requires that “the City, during the Eligibility Review, determine if a “community interest” exists. This means that social, economic, environmental, and land use issues must be addressed to the satisfaction of the City.” Clearly these issues have not yet been adequately addressed.

Further, how does approval of an annexation of a project that requires increases in taxes to break even, has questionable market justification for success and creates irreversible and negative environmental and economic impacts serve the public good?

We ask that you do not approve the annexation proposal at this time and that you make an increased effort to inform the community about the magnitude of change and irreversible impacts this project will create for Gunnison. We ask you to consider a public referendum on the annexation decision.

Sincerely,  
Michelle and John Campbell

---

Michelle Campbell  
[mcampbellcpi@gmail.com](mailto:mcampbellcpi@gmail.com)  
(505) 269-1156

---

Received April 17, 2009

RE: Gunnison Rising

We live in Tomichi Heights and strongly object to the proposed truck stop to be located across the highway from Tomichi Heights. Truck stops do not belong near residential areas or waterways. The noise, air pollution and ground water pollution from runoff are unacceptable. The residents of Tomichi Heights are for the most part very active. We walk, run, bicycle, and ride and train horses on our properties and in our neighborhood. The college athletic programs train by running the cemetery ditch through Tomichi Heights and on to the contour trail. With no air conditioning, we keep our windows open all summer. The noise of trucks entering and leaving, the diesel exhaust from the continuously running trucks, and the pollution of Tomichi Creek by the run off of gas, oil and exhaust, make a truck stop incompatible with the current use of this area. In addition we question the advisability of placing a trailer park at the entrance of town. We have been to two of the meetings on the Gunnison Rising proposal. We agree with the comments and issues brought forward by its opponents who far outnumber its proponents. No one is in favor of putting a truck stop or for that matter, an RV park here. The reasons are sound and thoughtful. It seems reasonable to carry out the wishes of the current residents of Gunnison rather than the developers. To a person, we want a sustainable, environmentally friendly community that compliments rather than harms our life style. Though Tomichi Heights residents are not part of the City of Gunnison, Gunnison is our community. We go to schools, churches, doctors, dentists, stores, and activities in Gunnison. It is our hope that the council and planning commission will commit to maintaining the quality of life in Gunnison by rejecting the truck stop and trailer park. Thank you.

Susan & Pete Rinaldi  
287 Ute Lane  
Gunnison, CO

## **Text of Public Comments Received on April 29, 2009**

Butch Clark asked if current maps could be posted on the web site. Tim Seibert of NES stated that would be done.

Mr. Seibert addressed the Commission and explained that an illustrative map has been prepared as a result of the discussions on April 22<sup>nd</sup> related to road connectivity. He further stated that the applicant partners are still discussing how that document may get folded in as a subarea plan. The applicants are working diligently to get comments back to the City and are using the April 24<sup>th</sup> revision of the *Staff Recommendation on the Gunnison Rising PUD Development Standards*, which incorporates changes that have been discussed with the Commission.

Steve Schechter asked if there is a complete document with diagrams and photographs (referring to the April 6, 2009 *Gunnison Rising PUD Development Standards* prepared by staff that does not contain illustrations). Mr. Seibert replied that it is his intent to provide a complete document so that diagrams and maps are updated, but it takes time to get those things done. The intent is to have a document that has all diagrams current to the text. It also includes the additional sections that the Planning and Zoning Commission has discussed, including illumination standards. He said the applicants have written a signage section as well as a design review for architecture and landscape plans prior to submittal. Those are all in process.

Mr. Seibert explained the zoning map for the audience indicating the zone, acreage, usage and density of each proposed zone as well as the trail connections and internal trails. He presented a conceptual illustration of the potential at full buildout of the CM, R-2, R-2M, and IM districts that are proposed immediately adjacent to the campus and existing city limits to explain the connectivity of streets. He said that the illustration was developed according to the draft standards and taking into account the topography.

Steve Schechter asked about the size of the lots. Seibert replied that in the R-2M Residential Village they are 45 feet by 100 feet, rear loaded with alleys, and duplex lots. Schechter expressed concerned about solar access. Mr. Seibert explained that there will be additional setback requirements to ensure solar access. Schechter explained that the long axis of the buildings should run east and west to provide maximum solar gain and that the proponents should consider that in designing the layout of lots, as opposed to putting as many lots as possible in the development. Seibert replied that the conceptual density is not nearly as much as was originally proposed in the master plan. Discussion continued for a few minutes about the importance and methods of taking advantage of solar power.

Chris Potter, student at Western, stated that half of the single family zone seems to be in the 100 year flood plain. Director Westbay explained that the existing FEMA maps do indicate that. However, the applicants are in the process of requesting a Letter of Map Revision from FEMA. The City has proposed to establish additional floodplain standards that prohibit development within flood plains.

Chair Lothamer observed that the lower part of the project looks like it could be irrigated with ditch water but that the area above the Cemetery Ditch cannot be served by gravity feed. Director Westbay responded that there are two options: 1) the irrigation water could be pumped; or, 2) the alternative is xeriscaping. Irrigation to the south of the highway is from the Tomichi Creek. Dick Bratton explained the southern irrigation system. Tim Seibert stated that xeriscape is required in the area north of the irrigation ditch.

Melissa “Zoe” Fryer stated that in the plans it states that homes and businesses could have Kentucky blue grass. Tim Seibert explained that the proposal for the area north of ditch is that a minimum of 60% of the developable area must be xeriscaped. The applicants have provided a plant list and a “how to” for xeriscaping. The allowance for Kentucky blue grass is limited. There are also slope restrictions.

Mandy Leigh, a student, asked if there would be enough water to grow a garden. Director Westbay responded that in the area north of the Cemetery Ditch gardening would be limited. Tim Seibert suggested that raised garden beds would be one technique. Director Westbay pointed out that ditch water is a City utility that is provided, where possible, to citizens. One of the obligations the City has is to use its water rights in a beneficial manner. For those reasons the City plans to expand the City ditch system into the project. As a side note, Tim Seibert stated that although current water law makes it illegal, a new bill passed by house and senate allows for rainwater collection on lots less than an acre.

Butch Clark brought up the issue of the round-a-bout that is supposed to be a traffic calming device. He stated that his experience in England was that they didn’t slow down the traffic but rather, expediting movement through the intersection. He observed that what might be needed is a speed control limit (i.e., 15 mph) on Georgia because of bikes and pedestrians. He urged the City and applicant to figure out how to slow things down because that is a major route into the commercial activity center. Tim Seibert responded that with the nature of deflection and speed controls the round-a-bout being proposed will be different from those in England. Also, there will be pedestrian tables or other safety measures at street crossings to make the area slow and walkable.

Richard Karas stated that he and George Sibley met with the [Gunnison Rising] partners about the issue of energy. He and Mr. Sibley are on the City action planning advisory group and wanted to see how serious they [the partners] are about energy. He further stated, “They are avoiding being direct in their answers because of competition. If energy requirements are put in the PUD, but not in the soon-to-be-revised *Land Development Code*, they [the partners] would be at a disadvantage because of the initial cost to homebuyers. They [the partners] need to think of a way to guarantee that energy concerns last into perpetuity. If they don’t want it in the PUD they need to think of a way to do that. When the *Land Development Code* is revised, whatever we ask of them [Gunnison Rising] should also be in the *Land Development Code*. This is something the entire City has to grapple with, both in retrofit, building code, lot orientation, and infrastructure layout.”

Melissa Fryer asked if there is a number for total square footage for parking lots. Tim Seibert replied they haven't calculated it yet.

Commissioner Beda asked if the buildings on the conceptual plan are to scale and how large the large commercial building is. Tim Seibert replied that they are in proportion and the large commercial building is 55,000 square feet. Commissioner Beda stated that would trigger the "big box" standards and parking policies.

Steve Schechter asked: "Are you still seriously considering an RV park to anchor it?" Tim Seibert replied that they are. Schechter continued: "Have you discussed peak oil and what it will do to your development? You should reconsider having an RV park anchoring the project. It is a miscalculation you will regret and the City will regret. The sewer lines are south of the highway. We will have to pump into the city sewer. Most of the effluent will come from the north, which is higher. Why not run via gravity?" Tim Seibert replied, "The utility plan has two sections. Some will be gravity. Only those areas needing the lift station will use that. It is cheaper to utilize the gravity system." Schechter addressed the Commission and said, "Hold them to that, we don't want future costs to the City to fix the pump station. Part of the problem in Mt. CB was because the pump station was clogged and millions of gallons of sewage went into the Slate River. Make sure we don't have a problem like that."

Mandy Leigh stated she has concerns about the Prairie Dogs and paraphrased from the *Draft Colorado Division of Wildlife Colorado Gunnison's and White-tailed Prairie Dog Conservation Plan*. She stated, "The Prairie Dog warrants protection and the greatest threats are agriculture, urbanization, and road and gas development. Many groups have proposed relocation but it is not successful. Currently there is no protection for the Prairie Dog, however the US Fish and Wildlife Service says there are several options for conservation but the best solution would be to not disturb the present location. There is a road going through the Prairie Dog colony, which is the largest colony in Gunnison County. In the last 20 years 94 percent of the Prairie Dog's habitat has disappeared. I think it is appropriate to wait to zone until plans for protection [of the Prairie Dog] are complete."

Jacob Anderson, who lives on 12<sup>th</sup> Street, stated: "As everyone has shown, the plan perpetuates high energy consumption, which is questioned in our future. I encourage the City to promote this kind of growth within what is already here, rather than let this part of town stagnate. I have lived in houses that are not weatherproof and have high utility bills. We need to improve the current structures first. They [Gunnison Rising] said this could take 50 to 100 years to put in place, we could just as easily improve what is here."

Melissa Zoe Fryer read from her prepared statement: "My name is Zoe Fryer, and I am a resident of Gunnison. Aside from all the facts, statistics and valid arguments that I have submitted to the Council, I would like to share my feelings as a Western student. Two years ago, I decided to transfer from my community college in Florida, to a 4-year institution. I looked into many schools and did research on all the areas. The decision to relocate for college was a major decision. I was 28 with a daughter, and I was going to move my family across the country. The literature that I received on Western marketed that it was a

“destination college.” The Gunnison area and Western were so appealing, that we all made the trek out here, and we all are happy that we did.

Western truly is a destination college, and Gunnison is currently “authentically Colorado.” There is a reason why students choose Western over other Colorado colleges and universities. The uniqueness of the campus, and city, and the location combined; is what attracts students to Western. We have the ability to access trails leading into open space, right from Escalante Drive. Biology and Environmental Studies students have a living lab right next to campus. The anthropology students have a lab with Tenderfoot Mountain and the surrounding lands. The annexation, if approved, could be very harmful to the enrollment numbers of Western. If Gunnison is just like every other Colorado college town, why would students choose here? Student enrollment should not be jeopardized, especially with the higher ed budget cuts, tuition increases, and the potential tough times that Western could be seeing in the next 5 years. Along with these concerns, it may become more difficult to attract good professors to Western. The professors choose a lesser pay than one offered at many institutions, to teach at Western. It is worth the trade off in pay, for the quality of life that Gunnison and Western provide. However, with budget cuts, the lack of wage increases, and declining enrollment amounts; where is the incentive for professors to apply to Western? I wonder about this, because when I graduate, I plan to go elsewhere for grad school. I plan to obtain my PhD as quickly as possible, with the goal of returning to Western to teach. But if Gunnison becomes like every other college town upon approval and development of Gunnison Rising; why would or should I take a lesser wage to come here?

Finally, I would like to share something that happened last week. A Gunnison resident, whom I have never met, called my house. He was calling to commend me on the editorial on Gunnison Rising and the need for affordable housing, which was in last week’s Gunnison Times. He said that he and his wife moved to Gunnison in 1967. Next month, she is retiring from her long service at the Gunnison Valley Hospital. He expressed that if Gunnison Rising was approved, it was likely they would move out of the area. Overall, there may be a “community of interest” that lies somewhere east of town, but there is a large community of un-interest that lies within the city limits.”