

Grand Junction, Colorado

October 5, 1960

ROLL CALL

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction met in regular session in the Civic Auditorium at 7:30 o'clock p. m., October 5, 1960. Councilmen present and answering roll call were Meacham, Hadden, Surface, Colescott, Wright and President McCormick. Also present were City Manager Lacy, City Attorney Ashby and City Clerk Tomlinson.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given by Rev. Kenneth R. Schmidt of the First Assembly of God Church.

MINUTES

It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Hadden that the minutes of the regular meeting held September 21st and the special meeting held September 28th be approved as written. Motion carried.

TRAFFIC SIGNS 24th & Gunnison & 10th & Gunnison

President McCormick reported that several people had requested some sort of traffic control at 24th and Gunnison. There is a traffic hazard where these two streets intersect and a stop sign is needed on Gunnison Avenue. City Manager Lacy stated that Police Chief Karl Johnson had also mentioned this location at the same time, and that he had asked Mr. Johnson to check into the traffic count in considering Gunnison as a collector street; that it could either be a yield street or a stop street. Chief Johnson recommended that a stop sign be placed on the Gunnison side of 24th stopping traffic coming up 24th Street.

He also stated that there should be some changes made on Gunnison at Tenth Street between the Junior High School and the TAC building; possibly a stop sign. President McCormick also mentioned that the School Board was requesting different regulations on the traffic at this location when the traffic is heavy.

City Manager Lacy stated that there should be yield right of way signs on Gunnison between 5th and 12th. Authorization by the Council is required in order to place such signs. It was moved by Councilman Colescott and seconded by Councilman Hadden that the City Council recommend that the signs be erected as soon as they are available. Motion carried.

TRAFFIC Speed limit in new Fruitvale annex. 25 mph instead of 30 mph

City Manager Lacy also stated that Police Chief Johnson had recommended that the speed limit in the Fruitvale area be set at 25 miles per hour. The streets are unimproved, narrow and the present speed limit of 30 miles per hour is too fast for safety. There are no curbs, gutters or paving in this area and the dust presents a definite traffic hazard. It was moved by Councilman Surface and seconded by Councilman Colescott that the City Council recommend that 25 mile per hour signs be posted in the Fruitvale area. Motion carried.

3.2 BEER LICENSE Kenneth G. & Frances H. Mark, dba Southside Grocery 832 S 7th approved

Kenneth G. and Frances H. Mark dba Southside Grocery at 832 South 7th Street, presented an application for renewal of their 3.2 beer license. There was no criticism on the operation of

this business by the Police Department. It was moved by Councilman Meacham and seconded by Councilman Hadden that the application be approved and license issued when the state license has been received. Motion carried.

ORD. 1120 PASSED Vacating Blks 1/4 Garfield Park (Mesa College Activity Area)

The Proof of Publication to the following entitled proposed ordinance was presented and read: AN ORDINANCE VACATING STREETS AND ALLEYS IN BLOCKS 1, 2, 3 AND 4, GARFIELD PARK SUBDIVISION IN THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO. It was moved by Councilman Meacham and seconded by Councilman Surface that the Proof of Publication be accepted and filed. Motion carried.

It was then moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Hadden that the ordinance be called up for final passage. Motion carried. The ordinance was then read and upon motion of Councilman Colescott and seconded by Councilman Wright was passed, adopted, numbered 1120 and ordered published. Roll was called on the motion with all members of the Council voting "AYE." The President declared the motion carried.

AIRPORT CONTROL TOWER Special Meeting Oct. 10 to consider bids

City Manager Lacy explained that the bids for the construction of the Control Tower would be opened on October 10, 1960 at 2:00 p.m., and it would be necessary to hold a special meeting on that day to consider the bids and possibly award a contract.

Councilman Colescott brought up the matter as to whether the architect's fees would provide engineering and inspection, and Mr. Lacy stated that he would check the contract, with the architect, and be sure that everything was included in his fees.

It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Hadden that a special meeting of the City Council be held at 7:30 p. m. on Monday, October 10, 1960 to consider bids for the Airport Control Tower and to award a contract for construction of same, and that the City Council waive the formal twenty-four hour notice of meeting. Roll was called on the motion with all members of the Council voting "AYE." The President declared the motion carried.

ANNEXATION Petition & Resol (Bob Faith for 1st & Orchard Ave) - Instr #4023

The following petition for annexation was presented:

PETITION FOR ANNEXATION

WE THE UNDERSIGNED do hereby petition the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, State of Colorado, to annex the following described property to the said City:

Beginning at the SE corner of the NE¹/₄ Section 10, Township 1 South, Range 1 West, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, State of Colorado, N 89° 48' W 660', thence North 200', thence N 29° E 159.6' to the center line of the Mesa County ditch, thence S 78° 22' E along center line of said ditch to the E line of said Section 10, thence So. along said East line Section 10 to the place of beginning.

As grounds therefor, the petitioners respectfully show to the said Council that the said territory is eligible for annexation in that it is not embraced within any city or town, that it abuts upon or is contiguous to the City of Grand Junction in a manner which will afford reasonable ingress and egress thereto, that more than one-sixth of the aggregate exterior boundary of the territory proposed to be annexed coincides with the existing boundary of the said city, and that the non-contiguous boundary of the said territory coincides with the existing block lines, street lines, or governmental subdivision lines.

This petition is accompanied by four copies of a map or plat of the said territory, showing its boundary and its relation to established city limit lines, and said map is prepared upon a material suitable for filing.

Your petitioners further state that they are the owners of more than fifty per cent of the area of such territory to be annexed and also comprise a majority of the land owners residing in the said territory; that a description of the land owned by each signer, together with his residence address and other descriptive facts are set forth hereafter opposite the name of each signer.

WHEREFORE these petitioners pray that this petition be accepted and that the said annexation be approved and accepted by ordinance.

			Qual	LO	Property
Date	Signature	Address	Elect	Only	Description
			& LO		
9/24/60	Buford S. Garner (signed)	24 3/4 Rd No. 736 Route 3			Beg. 150' N of SE cor, NE¼ Sec 10, T1S, R1W, W 131' N to Canal SEly along SD Canal to a pt N of beg S to beg
9/24/60	Buford S. Garner (signed)	24 3/4 Rd No. 736 Route		x	Beg 150' N & 131' W of SE cor NE¼ Sec 10, T1S, R1W W 77' N to canal
	Ruby Garner (signed)	”		x	SEly along sd canal to a pt N of beg & 131' W of E line Sd Sec 10 S to beg.
	Goldie I. McCulley (signed)	411 Rockaway			Beg. 150' N & 208' W of SE cor. NE¼ Sec. 10, T1S, R1W W 92' N 181' to G.V. Canal Ely along sd canal to a pt N of beg S 162' to beg.
9-26-60	Roy H. Gearhart (signed)	6791 Quebec Derby, Colo.		x	Beg. 300' W of SE cor. NE¼ Sec. 10, T1S, R1W 360' N 200'
9-26-60	R. H. Gearhart (signed)				N 29° E 250' to GV canal Sely along Sd canal to a pt N of N of beg. S to Beg.
9-24-60	Leslie H. Lupton (signed)	2967 B Rd		x	
9-24-60	Chas. L. Brown (signed)	1913 N 1st St.	x		Beg at SE cor NE¼ Sec. 10, T1S, R1W, W 300' N 130' S 300' S to Beg
9-24-60	Arvilla A. Brown (signed)	”	x		
			Qual	LO	Property

WHEREAS a petition to annex the following-described property, to-wit:

Beginning at the Southeast corner of the Northeast quarter of Section 10, Township 1 South, Range 1 West, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, State of Colorado, North 89°48' West 660 feet, thence North 200 feet, thence North 29° East 159.6 feet to the center line of the Mesa County ditch, thence South 78° 22' East along center line of said ditch to the East line of said Section 10, thence South along said East line of Section 10 to the place of beginning

has been filed with the City Clerk and is now presented to the City Council; and,

WHEREAS, upon examination of the said petition and hearing the testimony presented, the City Council does hereby find: That the said territory is eligible for annexation to the City of Grand Junction; that the petition is signed by more than 50% of the owners of the area of such territory to be annexed and that the persons signing such petition also comprise a majority of the landowners residing in the territory at the time said petition was filed with the City Clerk; that there is attached to the said petition four copies of a map or plat of such territory which is suitable for filing; that the said petition and maps are sufficient and substantially meet the requirements of Section 2, of Chapter 314, Session Laws of Colorado, 1947;

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

That the said petition for annexation shall be, and the same is hereby, accepted and approved; and that notice of the filing of said petition shall be published once each week for four publications in The Daily Sentinel, the official newspaper of the said City of Grand Junction.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of October, 1960.

It was moved by Councilman Meacham and seconded by Councilman Surface that the resolution be passed and adopted as read. Roll was called on the motion with all members of the Council voting "AYE." The President declared the motion carried.

WATER Grant free use for Mesa College Activity Area - Instr #4025 Filed with Water College to pay \$1500 for water lines - to maintain water & sewer lines
City Manager Lacy stated that, in meeting with Mr. Wubben of Mesa College on this matter and from going out to the site and analyzing what is there and the reasons for the request, he found that they wish to use City water because the ditch water fills the sprinkler heads with silt, making it necessary to replace them twice a year. These cost \$25.00 each and there are at least 30 heads. They expect to continue to use water rights, taking point of outlet downstream, to irrigate Mesa College land for agriculture use. It has been necessary to screen water for sprinkling. The present piping system cost approximately \$8,000 and it will be used elsewhere, but they still wish to use City water for sprinkling the new practice fields, which will be about one-third of the area in question and which will be in lawn, even if they have to pay for the water used.

Councilman Meacham brought out the fact that when fully developed, they could be using a lot of water, and Mr. Lacy called attention to Mr. Burton's memo that eventually the water used, could amount to about \$3,000 a year and that eventually the City would start charging for water used by its facilities and all other water used in the City would have to be charged for too.

Councilman Wright stated that he would hate to see low priced water rights get away from the College.

Councilman Colescott called attention to the fact that the water used for sprinkling could be used for additional families, if necessary, in the future.

It was moved by Councilman Surface and seconded by Councilman Wright that permission for the service for developing of Mesa College Activity Area be granted and the City Manager inform them in writing that it is quite possible that they could be charged in the future for the water. Motion carried.

WATER Policy re granting taps West of 30 Rd fr Clifton Water Dist - Instr #3925 - Water CM's Memo

In discussing his memorandum and the problem of serving Mr. Cattles with water from the Clifton District, City Manager Lacy again called attention to the fact that anyone served west of 30 Road would have to pay three times City water rates for service. It has been the policy of the City not to grant service from the Clifton District line to users who are west of 30 Road. Clifton District has indicated their willingness to serve and administer the distribution of water west of 30 Road, metering and billing the rate as the City felt necessary. Mr. Burton and Mr. Lacy feel that if the City could adopt a policy on the existing line, as of this date, it might be satisfactory, but that if more lines were laid, it could become similar to the situation on Orchard Mesa, in serving unfiltered water. There will be a substantial charge by the Clifton people if they do the full administrative cost in serving water.

Councilman Hadden stated that he thought each case should be handled separately, and in that way there would be no trouble. Mr. Burton recommended that each water user sign the regular outside water user's contract, even though the water goes through the Clifton lines. Mr. Lacy stated that he and Mr. Burton both felt that it was very important to tie this down to the existing lines (as of this date) if the policy is made, and not allow any extensions to grow from that line.

President McCormick stated that even though the Clifton District has evidenced willingness to serve the people, there is still the matter of administration to be considered.

Everything would have to be cleared through the City Manager and Public Utilities Director. The City would have to know what the meter reading was and when it was taken and that the rate charged was three times the City rate. If the Clifton District charged administration costs, they would be entitled to that amount. A separate contract would probably have to be signed with Clifton, but at any time the water user was eligible to take City water, he would get off the Clifton line, and if the billing system breaks down, he could be cut off.

City Attorney Ashby stated that no doubt there would have to be a different contract written providing for all the contingencies and insuring the City that the water user was going to be able to fulfill the City's contract.

It was moved by Councilman Hadden and seconded by Councilman Meacham that the City establish a policy, wherein the Clifton Water District might serve water users west of 30 Road, contingent upon the user paying three times the City rate for the water, and the Clifton District taking care of all administration costs, such as reading the meter, billing, and furnishing the City with the proper data concerning the use of water. The City Attorney is instructed to draw up a form of contract for such user to sign; each application to be approved by the Public Utilities Director and City Manager. The contract would obligate the Clifton District to terminate the water user's contract at any time he became a part of the City of Grand Junction, and with the understanding that if at any time the billing system should be unsatisfactory, that the user could be cut off. Motion carried.

AUDIT FOR 1960 To appoint committee to select auditors

City Manager Lacy suggested that the President of the Council appoint a committee to recommend the auditors for auditing the accounts of the City for 1960. President McCormick said, at the present time, he was not prepared to mention the names of Councilmen to serve on this committee but would do so. The firm of Dalby & McNulty, having dissolved partnership, posed a problem in the appointment of the auditor for this year.

LAND FUND To put in 1961 Budget

City Manager Lacy stated that he wished to present to the Council the concept of a "Land Fund" to be placed in the 1961 budget. An offer has been made to the City to purchase a tract of land which is zoned for industrial use and which lies between the Sewage Disposal plant and the present City shops. This land would be for future industry, and could be used either by the city or for resale, after it is cleared. The City now owns a number of properties. If any of this land is sold, it is hard to know about at budget time. For instance this year, the City sold property for \$14,000 and purchased a tract of land for about \$4,000 which leaves a net gain of approximately \$9,000 to \$10,000, which will go into liquid assets and trickle into the general maintenance budget, as the City does not now have a capital budget set up as such. If this were transferred into a "Land Fund", the City could embark on a definite policy and hold the money for purchasing land for industrial use or right of way. In that way, it could be maintained in identity and would be available for use when the opportunity arose. It would also be available to Industrial Development, Inc. of the Chamber of Commerce to help attract industry and furnish land at a price that is attractive. He presented this for the Council's consideration and discussion, and as to the wisdom of actually tying up money. If the Council thought it a good policy, he would report back to the person offering the land for sale.

Several Councilmen expressed themselves as being in favor of the plan, if it conforms to the City Charter, with Councilman Colescott suggesting that the Council also purchase, at least special assessment taxes, on property which is sold at Sheriff's sale. Councilman Meacham suggested that the Council give a vote of confidence to the City Manager.

PROPOSED ZONING ORD. Hearing Nov. 9, 1960

City Manager Lacy stated that the new proposed zoning ordinance would again be ready for distribution within a week or two, and that the continuation of the hearing should be set for November 9, 1960. This date would give the proper amount of time for advertising for this hearing as it is necessary that it be re-advertised. It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Hadden that the zoning hearing be continued until November 9, 1960 and that the City Manager so advertise. Motion carried.

TRAFFIC To investigate school crossing Grand Ave. & Viaduct

Councilman Hadden brought up the matter of the school crossing at Grand Avenue and the viaduct. There is a thirty-five to forty mile speed limit on the viaduct. School children cross at this location which makes a traffic hazard. City Manager Lacy said that he would work with the State Highway Department but doubted if a stop sign could be located at this location.

PARK IMPRVMT ADV BD Hadden apptd to

President McCormick stated that owing to the additional work which he was doing in connection with being President of the Council, that he wished to resign as a member of the Park Improvement Advisory Board and appointed Councilman Arthur Hadden to take his place on this Board.

COMMUNITY CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON WATER STUDY

Councilman Colescott stated that he had attended a meeting of the Community Citizens Committee and that he thought the Committee deserved a vote of thanks from the people of the whole valley for the work they are doing; that they were doing a tremendous job.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Councilman Hadden and seconded by Councilman Wright that the meeting adjourn.

/s/ Helen C. Tomlinson
City Auditor & Ex-Officio
City Clerk