

Grand Junction, Colorado

April 18, 1928

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, met in regular session at 7:30 o'clock P. M. Those present and answering at roll call were Councilmen Penberthy, Meders, Bear, Rogers, Hall, Ellison, and Moslander. City Manager Thompson, City Attorney Hinman, and City Clerk Niles were present.

The minutes of the regular session held April 4th were read and approved.

Sidewalk District No. 10:

The following resolution was presented and read:

A RESOLUTION DECLARING THE INTENTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, TO CREATE A LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT IN THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION TO BE KNOWN AS SIDEWALK DISTRICT NUMBER TEN.

WHEREAS, It appears to the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, and the Council so finds, that there exists an immediate necessity for the creation of a sidewalk district within said City to be known as Sidewalk District Number Ten, within the boundaries described, and of constructing sidewalks therein.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION:

Section 1. That the City Engineer for the City of Grand Junction be and he is hereby ordered and directed to prepare full details and specifications for the construction of sidewalks on the streets as hereinafter designated, which boundaries shall include the territory to be known as Sidewalk District Number Ten. Said Engineer shall make and furnish an estimate of the total cost of said improvements, exclusive of the percentage for the cost of collection and of other incidentals, and of interest to the date the first installments of the cost becomes due, and a map of the District from which map the approximate share of the total cost that will be assessed upon any lot or lands abutting upon the streets to be improved, as aforesaid, and upon each piece of real estate, may be readily ascertained.

The boundaries of said proposed Sidewalk District Number Ten shall be substantially as follows, to-wit:

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED SIDEWALK DISTRICT NO. 10

All of the real estate without regard to lot or land lines to a depth of fifty feet immediately in front of which the improvements are made.

First Street, on the East side thereof, from the North line of Teller Avenue to the alley between Teller Avenue and Belford Avenue.

Teller Avenue, on the North side thereof, from the East line of First Street to the East line of Lot 19, Block 12.

Hill Avenue, on the North side thereof, beginning on the West side of Second Street, thence West one hundred (100) feet.

Belford Avenue, on the South side thereof, from Eighth Street to Ninth Street.

Second Street, on the West side thereof from the alley between Gunnison Avenue and Hill Avenue, to Belford Avenue.

Second Street on the East side thereof, from Gunnison Avenue to Belford Avenue.

Belford Avenue, on the North side thereof from Second Street to Third Street.

Fourth Street, on the East side thereof from Belford Avenue to North Avenue.

Fifth Street, on the West side thereof, beginning at a point One hundred feet (100') South of the South line of North Avenue, thence North to the South line of North Avenue.

North Avenue, on the south side thereof from Fourth Street to Fifth Street.

North Avenue, on the South side thereof, beginning at Fifth Street, thence East one hundred feet(100).

North Avenue, on the South side thereof, beginning at a point one hundred (100) feet West of Sixth Street, thence East One hundred (100) feet to the West line of Sixth Street.

Sixth Street on the West side thereof, from Belford Avenue to North Avenue.

North Avenue, on the South side thereof from Sixth Street to Seventh Street.

North Avenue, on the South side thereof from Eighth Street to Eleventh Street.

Ninth Street, on the West side thereof from Belford Avenue to North Avenue.

Eighth Street, on the East side thereof from Teller Avenue to Belford Avenue.

White Avenue, on the North and South sides thereof from Fourteenth Street East to the City limit line.

Rood Avenue, on the North side thereof from Fourteenth Street East to the City limit line.

Fourteenth Street, on the East side thereof from Rood Avenue to Grand Avenue.

Fourteenth Street, on the East side thereof from Main Street to Ute Avenue.

Twelfth Street, on the East side thereof from Main Street to Ute Avenue.

Ninth Street, on the West side thereof from Ute Avenue to Pitkin Avenue.

Eleventh Street, on the West side thereof from Belford Avenue to North Avenue.

Councilman Meders moved, Councilman Bear seconded the motion that the resolution, as read, be passed and adopted. Upon which motion the following vote was cast: Councilmen voting YEA, Penberthy, Meders, Bear, Rogers, Hall, Ellison, Moslander. All the Councilmen voting YEA, the President declared the motion carried.

Councilman Rogers moved, Councilman Meders seconded the motion that the City do the construction work in Sidewalk District No. 10. Motion carried.

Resolution Concerning Gravel Paving:

The following resolution was presented and read:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, The City Council caused petitions to be circulated in various districts throughout the City where property owners had indicated a desire to obtain gravel paving for the purpose of determining the wishes of property owners therein and whether or not they desired the improvements to be made during this year; and

WHEREAS, Such action was taken by the Council to determine whether or not and to what extent this type of paving would be undertaken during this year, and in order to economize on expenses by forming all districts now desiring paving into one large district, and for the further purpose of allowing the performance of the work during the summer season and the

completion of all projects before freezing weather and thereby reduce costs and obtain better construction; and

WHEREAS, The said petitions have been in circulation for some time past and on many of the petitions a majority of the property owners in the proposed district have, as yet, failed to sign and the Council has thereby been unable to obtain the expression of the wish of a majority of the owners in such districts and can only conclude that they are opposed to such improvements;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION:

That in order to effectuate the original ideas of the Council in circulating said petitions, that no action of the Council be taken on any petitions so circulated unless and until a majority of the property owners shall have signed their names thereto in favor thereof or shall have signified in some appropriate manner in writing that they do not and will not object to the construction of said improvements.

Councilman Rogers moved, Councilman Penberthy seconded the motion that the resolution as read be passed and adopted. Upon which motion the following vote was cast. Councilman voting Yea, Penberthy, Meders, Bear, Rogers, Hall, Ellison, Moslander. All the Councilmen voting YEA, the President declared the motion carried.

Light Rates:

The following letter was presented and read:

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO

HENRY L. DOHERTY, PRESIDENT	HARRY T. HUGHES, TREASURER
CLARE N. STANNARD, VICE PREST. & GENL. MGR.	D. G. GUINEY, ASST. TREASURER
CHARLES A. SEMRAD, VICE PREST. & COML. MGR.	J. E. LOISEAU, SECRETARY
GUY W. FALLER, VICE PRESIDENT	. E.E. SHERMAN, ASST. SECRETARY

Grand Junction, Colo.,
April 17, 1928

Honorable City Council,
City of Grand Junction,

Gentlemen:

In 1927 the Public Service Company of Colorado submitted to you and put in effect electric rates applicable in Grand Junction. These schedules effected a yearly saving to the customers of over \$22,000. Certain power rates were thought to meet the general conditions. However, in line with our policy of

having rates as nearly uniform as possible in various districts of similar character and to even out certain inequalities, we, in 1928, proposed to replace these with one rate. This was similar to the rate in effect in Fort Collins, Greeley, Boulder, Lafayette, etc.

The schedule most generally applied after the change in 1927 was 7¢ per Kwh the first 100 Kwh used, 5¢ per Kwh for the next 40 Kwh per horsepower of connected load and 2¢ per Kwh for the excess, with a monthly minimum of \$1.00 per horsepower of connected load. The rate we proposed in 1928 was 7¢ per Kwh for the first 20 Kwh per horsepower of the contract load, 4¢ per Kwh for the next 40 Kwh per HP of contract load and 2¢ per Kwh for the balance, with a minimum of \$1.00 per contract horsepower. Inasmuch as the contract load was to be taken as either a percentage of the total connected load varying with the number of motors installed or as the measured demand our 1928 proposal should have been a material reduction in overall power charges and a benefit to most customers although some few might have been slightly increased.

When we applied this new set-up we found that some of the power customers had been billed in error since 1927 inasmuch as the hours use was based on the contract load rather than the connected load as specified in the schedule. We stated that no customers would be increased believing that the customers were properly billed and that the use of the contract load and 4¢ rate would more than offset the increases in energy blocks. The misapplication of the filed rate gave certain customers a greater decrease than warranted, hence the correct application of the proposed rate gave them an increase.

To correct this situation the Company is willing to do their part in filing an optional rate for use of customers whose contract load is not less than 15 HP. In this rate the top step is at 6¢ per Kwh. Furthermore, the contract load when 6 motors or more are connected can be taken as 45% of the total connected load instead of 50%; also the demand is to be not less than 75% of the rating of the largest motor instead of 100%. The minimum is to be \$1.00 per horsepower of contract load instead of \$1.00 per HP of connected load. So far as we can find this schedule will not materially change the present billing of these customers. In other words the Company is making good its claim in spite of the fact that the customers have had the benefit of the misapplication.

Let us take two specific cases, namely the Grand Junction Ice Cream Company and the Juanita Milling & Fuel Company.

The Grand Junction Ice Cream Company has 6 motors with a total connected load of 34.75 HP with a consumption for 1927 of 36,530 Kwh. With the schedule under which this customer was billed by the old Grand Junction Company the charge for the year would have been \$1,496.36. We actually charged them \$1,052.88 for

the year with ten months billed the 7,5,2 rate and two months at the 7,4,2 rate. We should have billed \$1,291.00 with the correct application of the 7,5,2 rate. Under our new proposal the charge would be \$1,030.12.

The Juanita Milling & Fuel Company has 2 motors with a total connected load of 28 HP with a consumption for 1927 of 37,180 Kwh. Under the old schedule the charge for the year would have been \$1,526.70. We actually billed \$1,183.60 for the year with ten months at the 7,5,2 rate and two months at the 7,4,2 rate. We should have billed \$1,206.80 with the correct application of the 7,5,2 rate. Under our proposal the charge would be \$1,173.68. On the monthly basis the comparison would be -

<u>Billed</u>	<u>Proposed Rate</u>
100 Kwh @ 7¢ = \$7.00	20x22.4 = 448 Kwh @ 6¢ = \$26.88
40x25 = 1,000 Kwh @ 5¢ = \$50.00	40x22.4 = 896 Kwh @ 4¢ = \$35.84
2,400 Kwh @ 2¢ = \$48.00	2,156 Kwh @ 2¢ = \$43.12

Hence the proposed rates come within 84¢ per month of equalling the rate as billed in error. It is, of course, impossible to devise rates that will be exactly equal at all steps.

We have attempted to simplify our power rates having the interests of all our customers in mind.

We trust that the situation is now cleared up to your satisfaction and that you have a full understanding of our problem.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Chas. Rump.
Chas. Rump, District Manager

Councilmen Ellison and Penberthy, members of the committee appointed by President Moslander to adjust the power rates, reported that they had met with Mr. Luscomb and Mr. Rump of the Public Service Company. They agreed to submit the proposed rates to the interested consumers, and if they were satisfied, they felt that the Council would adopt the new rates.

City Manager Thompson was requested to verify the schedules with those of Greeley, Fort Collins, Boulder, and Lafayette.

Interurban Track Paved:

The matter of the paving in the intersections on various streets where the interurban track is laid was brought up and discussed.

Councilman Penberthy moved and Councilman Bear seconded the motion that the City Manager be instructed to instruct the Public Service Company of Colorado to fix the streets between their tracks in the intersections, within thirty days, or the City would do the work at the expense of the Public Service Company. Motion carried.

Councilman Hall moved, Councilman Bear seconded the motion that the City Attorney be instructed to draw an ordinance penalizing trespassing on property where there is a vacant building. Motion carried.

DeBoer Zoning:

A statement from Mr. DeBoer showing a balance of \$1000.00 due him on his zoning contract with the City, and for \$115.30 due for Mr. Heinrich's trip from Denver to attend the Public meetings held in December, 1927, was presented.

Councilman Rogers moved, Councilman Hall seconded the motion that the City Clerk be instructed to pay Mr. DeBoer \$500.00 on account of his zoning contract, plus the \$115.30 for Mr. Heinrich's trip.

There being no further business to come before the meeting, on motion of Councilman Penberthy, duly carried, the meeting adjourned.

/s/ Helen C. Niles
City Clerk