

Grand Junction, Colorado

November 2, 1960

ROLL CALL

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, met in regular session at 7:30 o'clock p.m., November 2, 1960. Councilmen present and answering roll call were Hadden, Meacham, Surface, Colescott, Wright, Lowe and President McCormick. Also present were City Manager Lacy, City Attorney Ashby and City Clerk Tomlinson.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given by Rev. Francis N. White, Pastor, First United Presbyterian Church.

MINUTES

It was moved by Councilman Colescott and seconded by Councilman Surface that the minutes of the regular meeting held October 19th and the special meeting held October 26th be approved as written. Motion carried.

WATER- BIDS Award Contract to H.C. Price Co. \$19,483.50 for Fruitvale mains

Bids for the installation of water lines in the Fruitvale area were opened at 10:00 a.m. November 2nd and the following were received:

B & S Construction Company	\$38,118.75
Geo. Tilton Construction Company	26,952.50
Corn Construction Company	22,767.50
F. H. Linneman, Inc.	21,920.25
H. C. Price Company	19,483.50

City Manager Lacy explained the bids stating that H. C. Price Company was the apparent low bidder; that his bid bond and specifications had been checked and were approved. It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Surface that the bid of H. C. Price Company in the amount of \$19,483.50 be accepted and that Mr. Lacy be authorized to enter into a contract for the installation of water lines in the Fruitvale area. Roll was called on the motion with all members of the Council voting "AYE." The President declared the motion carried.

PLANNING COMMISSION Accept Resignation Glen Hopper - Chairman No replacement apptd

A letter of resignation from Glen Hopper, Chairman of the Planning Commission, was read; the resignation to be effective immediately. President McCormick stated that in view of the fact that there will be a reduction in the number of Planning Commission members when the new zoning ordinance is passed, at the present time, he would not appoint a replacement.

Ltr of appreciation

It was suggested that a letter be written to Mr. Hopper extending the City Council's appreciation for the very diligent effort and the great deal of work he has done on the Planning Commission.

ANNEXATION 10 home area N of Pinyon W of 13th (Fairmount) Apprvd for Petition
The Planning Commission at its meeting of October 26th recommended to the City Council the eligibility of an area of ten homes north of Pinyon and West of 13th Street for annexation and issuance of a petition. City Manager Lacy explained that this area had been trying for some time to be annexed, but they had been asked to hold off waiting for more land to be included, but, because they were having very serious septic tank trouble now, it was being recommended for annexation.

ANNEXATION Pomona Subdiv - NW part of City apprvd for Petition
City Manager Lacy explained that the Pomona Subdivision area northwest of the City was being recommended for annexation and issuance of a petition also; that more than half of this area is built up with high value homes on relatively large sites. City Manager Lacy explained the annexation studies that had been done on these areas.

It was moved by Councilman Meacham and seconded by Councilman Hadden that the City Council ratify the recommendations of the Planning Commission and recommend the eligibility of the area North of Pinyon and West of 13th Street for the ten homes, and the Pomona View Subdivision. Motion carried.

ANNEXATION McCoy - 40 Acre tract S of North Ave bet 28¼ & 28½ Rds - Instr# 4030

The Planning Commission also recommended favorable consideration of a petition to annex a 40 acre tract south of North Avenue between 28¼ and 28½ Roads. City Manager Lacy explained that this consisted mostly of vacant land with a trailer court located on it. The following petition 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:

The NE¼ NW¼ Section 18, Township 1 South
Range 1 West Ute Meridian, County of Mesa,
State of Colorado

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.

			QE & LO	LO Only	Property Description
	Dorris Bernie G.			x	Lots 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14,
	Dorris, Maurine			x	Blk 1, Dorris Sub Sec 18, T1S R1E
	(not signed)				
	Taylor, Forrest G.				Lot 13, Blk 1, Dorris Sub
	Taylor, Arrah Wanna				Sec 18, T1S, R1E
	(not signed)				
10-7-60	Ralph C. Boswell	481 28½ Rd	x		Lot 10, Blk 1, Dorris Sub
	(signed)				Sec 18, T1S, R1E
10-1-60	William L. Shaw	483½ 28½ Rd	x		Lot 8, Blk 1, Dorris Sub
	(signed)				Sec 18, T1S, R1E
10-1-60	Maxine R. Shaw	483½ 28½ Rd	x		
	(signed)				
10-7-60	Fred R. Nelson (signed)	196 Glory View Dr		x	Lot 6 Blk 1 Dorris Sub Sec 18 T1S, R1E
10-7-60	Barbara M. Nelson (signed)	”		x	
	Raymond W. Turley (signed)	478 Glen Rd	x		Lot 2, Blk 1, Dorris Sub Sec 18, T1S, R1E
	Brownlee, Maurine (not signed)				Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, incl 7, 8, 9, 10, incl Blk 2, Dorris Sub. Sec 18, T1S, R1E
	Lankston, Dale M. (not signed)				Lots 11 & 12, Blk 2, Dorris Sub Sec 18 T1S, R1E
	Lankston, Nellie E. (not signed)				
	Dorris, Bernie G. (not signed)				Lots 5 & 6, Blk 2, Dorris Sub Sec 18, T1S, R1E
	Dorris, Maurine (not signed)				
9-24-60	Vernon P. Meek (signed)	475 Glen Rd	x		Lot 14, Blk 2, Dorris Sub Sec 18, T1S, R1E
9-24-60	Hallie E. Meek (signed)	475 Glen Rd	x		
9-24-60	Winston W. Williams (signed)	477 Glen Rd	x		Lot 13, Blk 2, Dorris Sub Sec 18, T1S, R1E

					Meets & Bounds
9-24-60	J.J. Schimpf	489½ 28½ Rd	x		Beg 362.5' S of N¼ cor
	(signed)				Sec 18, T1S, R1E W 169.59'
9-24-60	Laura I. Schimpf	”	x		S 153.43' E 165.59' N to
	(signed)				Beg exc N 80' thereof
10-5-60	Cecil Cross Jr.	491 28½ Rd	x		N 80' of foll: Beg 362.5'
	(signed)				S of N¼ cor Sec 18, T1S,
10-14-60	Ethelyn Cross	”	x		R1E, W 169.59' S 153.43'
	(signed)				E 165.59' N to beg
10-5-60	W. C. Brownlee	495 28½ Rd	x		Beg at N¼ cor Sec 18, T1S, R1E,
	(signed)				S 362.5' W 222.58' N 167.18'
10-5-60	Bertha E. Brownlee	”	x		E 44.95' N 193.22' E to beg
	(signed)				exc N 164' thereof
	Bender, E. A.				Beg 362.5' S & 169.59' W of
	(not signed)				N¼ cor Sec 18, T1S, R1E W 242.17'
					S167.63' W 82.5' S 207.41' E 324 75'
					N 374.12' to beg
	Meyer, Gunther H.				Beg 776.05' S of N¼ cor Sec 18,
	(not signed)				T1S, R1E N 60' W 147' S 60' E
	Meyer, Klara M.				to beg
	(not signed)				
	Lankston, Dale				Beg 515.93' S of N¼ cor Sec 18
	(not signed)				T1S, R1E S 200.12' W 147' S 20' W
	Lankston, Nellie E.				15.14' N 220' E 161.82' to beg
	(not signed)				
10-11-60	J. B. Funderburk	1420 Houston Ave.		x	Beg at N¼ cor Sec 18, T1S, R1E S
	(signed)				164' W 176.15' N 164' E to beg
10-11-60	Bertha Funderburk	1420 Houston Ave.		x	exc N 40' for H/W
	(signed)				
	Bender, E. A.				Beg. 176.15' W of N¼ cor Sec 18,
	(not signed)				T1S, R1E S 193.22' W 44.95' S
					167.18' W 179.18' N 360.37' E
					225' to beg exc N 40' for H/W
10-5-60	Joseph H. Beane	2841 North	x		Beg at NW cor of E 15 A NE¼
	(signed)				NW¼
					Sec 18, T1S, R1E S 528' E 82.5'
10-5-60	Helyn G. Beane	2841 North Ave.	x		N 197.63' E 10' N 330.37' W to
	(signed)				beg exc N 40' for H/W
9-28-60	Daniel M. McCoy	2837 North Ave.	x		Beg 30 Rd E & 270' S of NW cor
	(signed)				NE¼ NW¼ Sec 18, T1S, R1E, E
					165'
9-28-60	Nellie M. McCoy	2837 North Ave.	x		S 50' W 165' N to beg
	(signed)				
	Brown Hasty T.				Beg 30 Rd E & 220' S of NW cor
	(not signed)				NE¼ NW¼ Sec 18, T1S, R1E E
					165'

The following resolution was presented and read:

RESOLUTION

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

The Northeast quarter of the Northwest quarter of Section 18, Township 1 South, Range 1 West, Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado

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 the 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 2nd day of November, 1960.

It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Meacham 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.

APPROVE REQUEST for Filling Station at NW Cor 1st & Rood Phillips 66

The Planning Commission recommended approval of a request for a gasoline service station at the NW corner of Rood and First Street. The request was made by Mr. Schoonover for the Phillips 66 Petroleum Company. Councilman Wright stated that he felt a filling station would be an improvement at this location and moved that the permit be granted, if the plans comply with the building code. Councilman Hadden seconded the motion. Motion carried.

WATER BILL ADJUST. Jennie Bear, 328 Ute \$3.75

A request for an adjustment in a water bill was presented by Mrs. Jennie Bear, 328 Ute Avenue, due to an underground leak. Her letter stated that the line had been replaced. It was moved by Councilman Colescott and seconded by Councilman Meacham that an adjustment of \$3.75 be made in Mrs. Bear's water bill. Roll was called on the motion with all Councilmen voting "AYE." The President declared the motion carried.

ORD. 1121 PASSED Pinyon Street- Correcting spelling

The Proof of Publication to the proposed ordinance entitled AN ORDINANCE CORRECTING THE NAME OF PINYON STREET IN THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO was presented and read. It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Meacham that the Proof of Publication be accepted and filed. Motion carried.

It was then moved by Councilman Colescott and seconded by Councilman Surface that the ordinance be called up for final passage. Motion carried. The ordinance was then read. It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Hadden that the ordinance be passed and adopted numbered 1121, and ordered published. Roll was called on the motion with all members of the Council voting "AYE." The President declared the motion carried.

SIDEWALK DIST. #15 Statement of Engineer- - Final Estimate On

The Final Estimate and Statement of the Engineer on the completion of Sidewalk District No. 15 were presented.

FINAL ESTIMATE ON
SIDEWALK DISTRICT #15
Grand Junction, Colorado

Contract (United Sand & Gravel Co.)	\$ 7,207.50
Printing, Advertising & misc.	150.00
Bonds & Attorney	50.00
Engineering & Inspection	1,272.50
	<hr/>
	\$ 8,680.00

STATEMENT OF THE ENGINEER

Statement showing the whole cost of Sidewalk District #15 of Grand Junction, including six per centum additional for cost of collection and incidentals, and apportioning the same to lots to be assessed for same.

The sum of \$9,200.80 is to be apportioned against the real estate in the District and against the owners thereof respectively, as by law in the proportions and amounts, as follows, to-wit:

Total cost of construction	\$ 8,680.00
6% for cost of collections & incidentals	520.80
	<hr/>
Total	\$ 9,200.80

Carl A. Alstatt, City Engineer

It was moved by Councilman Surface and seconded by Councilman Hadden that the following 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.

Resolution on Completion SW#15

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, has reported the completion of Sidewalk District No. 15; and

WHEREAS the City Council has caused to be prepared a statement showing the whole cost of the improvements of Sidewalk District No. 15, including therein six (6) per cent additional for cost of collection and other incidentals and including interest to and including the 28th day of February, 1961, and apportioning the same upon each lot or tract of land or other real estate, to be assessed for the same.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the improvements connected therewith in said district be, and the same are hereby, accepted; that said statement be, and the same is hereby, approved and accepted as the statement of the whole cost of the entire improvements of said Sidewalk District No. 15, including six (6) per cent additional for cost of collection and other incidentals and including interest to and including the 28th day of February, 1961; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the same be apportioned on each lot or tract of land or other real estate to be assessed for the same, and that the same be certified by the President of the Council and filed in the office of the City Clerk; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the City Clerk shall immediately advertise for three (3) days in The Daily Sentinel, a newspaper of general circulation published in said City, notice to the owners of the real estate to be assessed, and to all persons interested generally without naming such owner or owners, that said improvements have been completed and accepted, specifying the whole cost of the improvements and the share so apportioned to each lot or tract of land; that any complaints or objections that may be made in writing by such owners or persons shall be made to the Council and filed with the Clerk within thirty (30) days from the first publication of said notice; that the same may be heard and determined by the Council at their first regular meeting after said thirty (30) days and before the passage of the ordinance assessing the cost of the improvements, all being in pursuance of the terms and provisions of Ordinance No. 178 of said City, as amended.

NOTICE

OF THE COMPLETION OF A LOCAL IMPROVEMENT IN
THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, AND
APPORTIONMENT OF THE COST THEREOF.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN To the owners of the real estate hereinafter described, said real estate comprising the district of lands known as Sidewalk District No. 15, and to all persons interested therein as follows:

That the improvements in and for said district, which are authorized by and are in accordance with the terms and provisions of a resolution passed and adopted on the first day of June, 1960, declaring the intention of the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, to create a local improvement district to be known as Sidewalk District No. 15; with the terms and provisions of a Resolution passed and adopted on the first day of June, 1960, adopting details and specifications for said District; and with the terms and provisions of a Resolution passed and adopted on the 6th day of July, 1960, creating and establishing said District, all being in accordance with the terms and provisions of Ordinance No. 178 of said City, as amended, have been completed and have been accepted by the City Council of the City of Grand Junction;

That the whole cost of the improvements has been definitely ascertained and is in the sum of \$9,200.80, said amount including six (6) per centum additional for cost of collection and incidentals and also including interest to and including February 28, 1961, at the rate of 4.25 per centum per annum on the bonds issued from time to time in payment of the cost of said improvements; that the part apportioned to and upon each lot and tract of land within said District and assessable for said improvements is hereinafter set forth; that payment may be made to the Treasurer of the City of Grand Junction at any time within thirty (30) days after the final publication of the assessing ordinance, assessing the real estate in said District for the cost of said improvements, and that the owner so paying would be entitled to an allowance of six (6) per centum for all payments made during said period, and of interest from date of payment to the date the first installment becomes due;

That any complaints or objections that may be made in writing by the said owner or owners of land within said District and assessable for said improvements, or any person interested, made to the City Council and filed in the Office of the City Clerk of said City within thirty (30) days from the first publication of this Notice, to-wit: On or before and up to 5:00 o'clock p.m. on the 7th day of December, 1960, will be heard and determined by the said City Council at its first regular meeting after said last-mentioned date and before the passage of any ordinance assessing the cost of said improvements against the real estate in said District, and against said owners respectively as by law provided;

That the said sum of \$9,200.80 for improvements is to be apportioned against real estate in said District and against the owners respectively as by law provided in the following proportions and amounts severally as follows, to-wit:

ASSESSMENT ROLL

<u>Description</u>	<u>Sq. Ft.</u>	<u>Total Amt.</u>
Blk 6 - Lots 17, 18, & 19	110	\$ 65.30
Blk 6 - Lots 20, 21 & 22	270	160.27
Blk 6 - Lots 31 & 32	150	89.04

Blk 7 - Lots 20 & 21	90	53.42
Blk 9 - Lots 31 & 32	111	65.89
Blk 13 - Lots 9 & 10	75	44.51
Blk 13 - Lots 15 & 16	5.5	3.26
Blk 14 - Lots 15 & 16	315	186.98
Blk 15 - Lots 1 & 2	395	234.47
Blk 15 - Lots 3 & 4	85	50.47
Blk 15 - Lots 5 & 6	180	106.85
Blk 15 - The E½ Lots 9, 10	185	109.82
Blk 15 - Lots 22 to 24	11	6.53
Blk 17 - Lots 3, 4 & 5	125	74.20
Blk 17- Lots 8 & W½ 9	180	106.85
Blk 17 - Lots 11 & 12	5.5	3.26
Blk 17 - The S½ lots 13, 14 & 15	85	50.47
Blk 17- Lots 23 & 24	80	47.49
Blk 17- Lots 25 & 26	250	148.40
Blk 18 - The N½ lots 8, 9, & 10	16.5	9.79
Blk 18 - The S½ lots 18 & 19	30.5	18.10
Blk 18 - The W½ lots 27, 28	185	109.82
Blk 19 - The N 42½" Lots 1 to 5	475.5	282.26
Blk 23 - Lots 21 & 22	16.5	9.79
Blk 23 - Lots 33 & 34	65	38.58
Blk 24 - Lots 17 & 18	11	6.53
Blk 24 - Lots 19 & 20	150	89.04
Blk 25 - Lots 17 & 18	50	29.68
Blk 26 - The E 19' lot 14	50	29.68
Blk 26 - Lots 29 & 30	76	45.11
Blk 26 - Lots 31 & 32	205.5	121.98
Blk 27 - Lots 24 & 25	11	6.53
Blk 28 - Lots 9 & 10	90	53.42
Blk 28 - Lots 27 & 28	45.5	27.01
Blk 29 - Lots 26, 27 & 28	340	201.82

Blk 30 - Lots 7 & 8	15	8.90
Blk 30 - The W½ lots 24 & 25	130	77.17
Blk 31 - Lots 19 & 20	100	59.36
Blk 32 - Lots 29 & 30	225	133.56
Blk 32 - Lots 31 & 32	490	290.68
Blk 33 - Lots 7 & 8	150	89.04
Blk 33 - Lots 9 & 10	11	6.53
Blk 34 - Lots 16, 17 & 18	140	83.10
Blk 38 - Lots 1 to 5	320.5	190.25
Blk 38 - The N 70' lots 14, 15 & 16	140	83.10
Blk 44 - Lots 5 & 6	30	17.81
Blk 44 - The N 40½' lots 33, 34	55	32.65
Blk 45 - Lot 18	265	157.30
Blk 46 - Lots 17 & 18	205	121.69
Blk 48 - Lots 15 & 16	195	115.75
Blk 48 - Lots 27 & 28	125	74.20
Blk 50 - The E½ lots 3, 4, 5 & 6	11	6.53
Blk 50 - Lots 30 & 31	185	109.82
Blk 51 - The S½ lots 1 to 4	105	62.33
Blk 51 - Lots 27 & 28	50	29.68
Blk 52 - The S 37½ lots 1 to 4	5.5	32.26
Blk 52 - Lots 15 & 16	290	172.14
Blk 52 - Lots 20 & 21	40	23.74
Blk 52 - Lots 31 & 32	11	6.53
Blk 53 - Lots 11, 12 & 13	85	50.47
Blk 53 - The S 85' lots 17, 18 & 19	155	92.01
Blk 54 - Lot 19	50	29.68
Blk 55 - Lots 21 & 22	72	42.74
Blk 57 - Lots 3 & 4	25	14.84

Blk 58 - Lots 4 & 5	75	44.52
Blk 59 - Lots 3 & 4	20	11.87
Blk 60 - N 75' lots 1, 2 & 3	480	284.93
Blk 60 - Lots 5, 6 & W 19' of 7	205	121.69
Blk 60 - Lots 17 & 18	600	356.16
Blk 62 - Lots 21 & 22	112	66.48
Blk 63 - The N 88' of lot 1	85	50.47
Blk 63 - Lots 17 & 18	100	59.36
Blk 63 - Lots 19 & 20	11	6.53
Blk 63 - Lots 21 & 22	250	148.40
Blk 63 - Lots 25 & 26	105.5	62.62
Blk 64 - Lots 15 & 16	11	6.53
Blk 65 - Lots 15 & 16	520	308.67
Blk 65 - Lots 17 & 18	122	72.42
Blk 65 - Lots 27 & 28	130.5	77.47
Blk 66 - Lots 22 & 24	175	103.88
Blk 67 - Lots 7 & 8	175	103.88
Blk 69 - The N 79' lots 1 & 2	105	62.33
Blk 70 - Lots 21 & 22	115	68.26
Blk 70 - Lots 23 & 24	200	118.72
Blk 71 - The N½ lots 17, 18, 19 & 20	235.5	139.79
Blk 72 - Lots 19, 20 & 21	85	50.47
Blk 74 - Lots 15, 16 & E 5' of lot 14	61	36.21
Blk 75 - Lots 15 & 16	185	109.82
Blk 75 - Lots 17 to 21	16.5	9.79
Blk 78 - The N 40' lots 13 & 14	110	65.30
Blk 79 - Lots 21 & 22	25	14.84
Blk 82 - Lots 22 & 23	300	178.08
Blk 82 - Lots 24 & 25	42	24.93

Blk 82 - The E½ lot 27, 26	161.5	95.87
Blk 85 - Lots 1 to 5	55.5	32.94
Blk 86 - Lots 11 & 12	100	59.36
Blk 86 - Lots 29 to 32	590	350.22
Blk 87 - Lots 6, 7 & E 21' of 5	5.5	3.26
Blk 88 - Lots 7 & 8	80	47.49
Blk 88 - Lots 16 & 17	386.5	229.43
Blk 89 - The N 90' of Lots 1 & 2	120	71.23
Blk 90 - Lots 15 & 16	475	281.96
Blk 91 - Lots 1 & 2	5.5	3.26
Blk 92 - Lots 1 & 2	16.5	9.79
Blk 96 - Lots 6 & 7	230	136.53
Blk 97 - Lots 13 to 16	155	92.01
Blk 98 - Lots 10 & 11	195	115.75
Blk 99 - The S 40' lots 10, 11& 12	60	35.62

STATE OF COLORADO)

COUNTY OF MESA) ss

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION)

I, Charles E. McCormick, President of the Council and Ex-Officio Mayor of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is the statement showing the whole cost of the improvements in Grand Junction Sidewalk District No. 15, and includes interest to and including the 28th day of February, 1961, and apportioning the same upon each lot or tract of land or other real estate to be assessed for the same, all in accordance with the terms and provisions of Ordinance No. 178, as amended.

President of the City Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk

NORTH AVENUE LIGHTING PROJECT

City Manager Lacy reported that the State Highway was going to proceed very shortly with the construction of the highway from Indian Wash to Fruitvale corner, and that every effort was being made to try to get the light bases put in during the construction of the highway. This does not seem to be possible beyond 28½ Road as there is no legal body capable of paying for the lighting; the County does not pay for street lighting; the City does not pay for street lighting outside of the City limits.

A committee of representatives from Public Service Company, the State Highway Department, the City and the County have been meeting trying to work out some solution. He stated that if these bases could be installed all the way out to Fruitvale corner now, it would eliminate or prevent the need for cutting the new highway in the future when new annexations are made and lights are needed. An attempt to jointly finance the bases and street lighting, at least the bases all the way, and the street lighting from Indian Wash to 28½ Road, was made but ran into a stumbling block when the County saw fit to not participate in the amount of \$2,200 which would have been for the bases all the way from Indian Wash to Fruitvale Corner. These bases cost \$40 apiece.

The Public Service Company had agreed to put in the underground conduit as a part of the project if the bases were to be put in; the lighting standards could be put in now or later as it was worked out.

This would mean that the City would have to vary its policy of not paying for lighting outside of the City limits in this distance from Indian Wash to 28½ Road because one-fourth of the sideage or the frontage along this new stretch of highway is outside the City limits; three-fourths is inside or will be when the petition just passed tonight is in. The annual light bill for this area would amount to approximately \$2,000.

It is the City's policy to provide street lights of standard specifications for inside the City limits which would have to be done by virtue of these annexations. There is \$500 worth which is one-fourth of the \$2,000 which is in the County and is a variance of policy. The State Highway for safety reasons will not allow the lights to go in unless they are lighted all the way. When the County decided not to participate at all, and if the City wishes to pursue its normal policy of street lighting, it must pick up the bill to the tune of \$600 for bases in addition to the lighting bill of \$2,000 per year; \$500 of which is for service outside the City area. If the City does decide to put in the bases, the State Highway Dept. will put into its contract \$6,000 worth of lighting standards. These are the big poles with the two lights. If they don't put them in with the project, it will be the City's responsibility to install them in the near future at its own expense; whenever the time comes that the area is annexed and it is ready for lights.

Councilman Meacham stated he felt that the City should spend the money to get the lights put in properly and asked if at a later date it would be the City's expense to dig up the pavement to put in these lights. City Manager Lacy stated it would indirectly be the City's expense; that the Public Service would do the cutting and installation but they would charge it against the City's credit for street lighting, and that it would be far greater after the street is paved than it would be during the construction stage and that a patching job of paving is never satisfactory.

City Manager Lacy stated that the North Ave. Merchants Association had been meeting with the Committee and had tried in numerous ways to get cooperation from the merchants in any way they could so that the balance of the light bill could be taken care of but they were not successful in finding a way to do this.

Councilman Wright felt that every effort should be made to get the bases put in during the construction of the paving and felt that it would not be long until the rest of the Fruitvale area would be annexed as he said he had had calls from people on 29 Road who were interested in annexation, and if there was anyway of getting the \$1,600 to put the bases in, he felt it should be done.

City Manager Lacy stated that it was the natural thing to do to put in the bases all the way out and that the City does have some credits in its street lighting bill but there are other annexations coming up which means street lighting for these people too.

Councilman Colescott was opposed to the City going any further if the merchants along North Avenue would not pay for lighting.

The Council discussed the idea of putting the bases in to Fruitvale on a delayed payment plan, providing the money to pay for them in the 1962 budget.

It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Hadden that the City Council authorize City Manager Lacy to include in the budget the bases, necessary standards and cost of lighting to 28½ Road. Motion carried.

It was moved by Councilman Wright that if Mr. Lacy is able to install the bases and pay for them at a future date, that he be authorized to enter into a contract with the Public Service Company and the State Highway Department. Councilman Meacham seconded the motion. Motion carried.

PAST DUE ACCOUNTS Policy re collection of

City Manager Lacy brought up the matter of overdue accounts owing the City for sales on major installations of water and sewer taps, etc. to some of the plumbing and heating contractors. He stated that normally they are billed at the time the work is done and given ninety days in which to pay. He stated there is approximately \$658 owing in such accounts. He felt it might be well to go back to a previous policy of the City, or to establish a policy that if the accounts were not paid after receiving a billing the first month, and the second, with a personal call, that by the end of the ninety day period any license the firm might hold should be suspended until the account was paid.

A policy recommended by the Council was as follows:

That after statements are issued, a sixty-day limit be given in which accounts are to be paid. Purchasers should be contacted by telephone and statements sent every thirty days, and at the end of another thirty-day period, any license which is held, would be suspended. License would be reinstated when the account is settled.

It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Hadden that the Council go on record as approving the policy set forth above in collecting this type of account. Motion carried.

BUDGET - 1961

City Manager Lacy stated that the Budget will not be out on the 9th of November as expected but will be out the following week in the form which he would like to have it.

PARK IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY BOARD

Councilman Hadden reported that he had attended meetings of the Park Improvement Advisory Board and was very surprised to learn what had been going on; that there had been many favorable comments on the tennis courts and he thinks the committee is doing a good job for the community.

SALES TAX Amendment No. 5 Election 11-8-60

Councilman Wright stated that he felt it was appropriate to bring up the matter of amendment No. 5 to be voted on at the Nov. 8th election. This amendment would enable the County to pass a 2% sales tax on a state-wide basis. The Mesa County Commissioners have agreed, in an official meeting, that they will use the sales tax strictly for the reduction of ad valorem taxes and that they will not approve the tax for Mesa County without a vote of the people. This law may have some faults, but it is not set up to hurt low-income groups, but would make a broader base, and if property taxes could be cut, it would go a long way to entice business and industry to the area.

Councilman Meacham stated that he agreed with Councilman Wright. The opponents to the amendment are contending that this would just be another tax.

City Manager Lacy explained that groceries and drugs would not be taxed and that it is estimated the tourist trade would pay approximately 45% of the sales tax. He told the Council that schools would not participate so that each property owner could figure that his over-all property tax would be reduced approximately one-fifth.

Councilman Lowe called attention to the fact that if Amendment No. 5 passes, it does not establish the tax but makes it possible for people in Mesa County to vote whether they want it or not.

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

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