

Grand Junction, Colorado

December 7, 1960

ROLL CALL

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, met in regular session at 7:30 o'clock p. m. Councilmen present and answering roll call were: Ray Meacham, Arthur Hadden, Ed Surface, Harry O. Colescott, Warren Lowe, Herbert M. Wright and President C. E. McCormick. Also present were City Manager Joe Lacy, City Attorney Gerald Ashby and City Clerk Helen C. Tomlinson.

INVOCATION

Invocation was given by Rev. Paul J. Habliston, Pastor, St. Matthew's Episcopal Church.

MINUTES

It was moved by Councilman Lowe and seconded by Councilman Wright that the minutes of the regular meeting held November 16th be approved as written. Motion carried.

PUBLIC HOUSING Hearing on formation of

This was the date advertised for a hearing on the formation of a "Public Housing Authority." President McCormick called on Mr. George Parker of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to present their program.

Mr. Parker stated that his agency was not recommending that the Council take any action one way or other. The Public Housing Administration is a federal agency, a part of the Home Financing Agency. It has as its function financial assistance to cities in eliminating slums and providing decent housing for the lowest income group of the City. He said, "As you probably know, we have as a maximum policy the statement that 'All American Citizens should be able to obtain a decent, safe and sanitary place to live!'" The Government has as one of its major programs the Federal Housing Administration which provides financial assistance to the ordinary citizen; they guarantee home loans through which a person may obtain the ownership of his own home and the program of the Public Housing Administration is intended to help that group who are at the bottom of the economic scale- those who cannot qualify for help in the F.H.A. program. It is a limited program. There is a current allocation for the country of approximately 35,000 units of public housing as compared to the customary construction in this nation of about one million or more housing units. It is intended for a limited help for the very lowest segment of population.

It essentially helps those who are in the welfare category of the City. In checking the Pueblo project, it was found that over half of their tenants are on the county welfare rolls. The purpose of the program is to demonstrate that in a democracy there is concern for all of the people.

The program works this way. A state that wants to participate in the program passes enabling legislation. The Colorado legislature did that some time ago. Colorado has going programs in Denver and Pueblo and recently started programs in Walsenburg, Lamar, Alamosa and Trinidad. The state legislature creates in every city above 5,000 in the state a housing authority.

It is a dormant public corporation that does not function until there happens in that City a petition signed by at least twenty five citizens. The petition is filed with the City Council calling for a public hearing. This happened here. The City Council then considers whether there is a need for the housing authority to function in this city as evidenced by views of the citizenry. If the Council determines the housing authority should function, they pass a resolution declaring the need for such housing authority to function. The Mayor is then appointed by the legislature to appoint the five commissioners of this housing authority. These are five local citizens who are willing to serve without pay. They are authorized to employ the administrator, legal help and hire an architect to carry out their program.

They are authorized, with the approval of the City Council, to file an application for financial assistance with the Public Housing Authority. The procedure is to consider the application which sets forth certain information as to need and to make a preliminary loan for the purpose of making a housing survey. These preliminary plans take form of a development program. The Housing Authority with the professional assistance of help they employ, will determine the areas in the City where there is bad housing and will determine how they will proceed with their projects. They sometimes pick out substandard areas and put in a few units here and a few units there, or they may place them all in one large substandard area. That is a decision of this local authority.

They file this development program with the Public Housing Authority. On that basis the P.H.A. enters into a permanent financial assistance contract to loan money to develop the housing project. When the project is well underway, they customarily sell bonds for 100% of the project cost. These bonds are guaranteed in effect by the Public Housing Authority, much the same as the F.H.A. guarantees the individual loans of individual citizens. These bonds are issued by the housing authority. They are not a debt of the City or the state; only of the housing authority which is an independent public corporation. They pay back from the proceeds of the bonds, the money advanced by the P.H.A. for the development of the project. After the units are completed, the housing authority selects tenants from the various lowest income groups who apply for tenancy, and they charge these tenants a rent which is approximately one-fifth of their incomes. In other words, the Act contemplates that the tenant will pay to the best of his ability for the accommodations that are furnished to him. The rent is based on ability to pay.

The Housing Authority will furnish them with accommodations commensurate with their needs. The Housing Authority takes the rental revenues and pays their operating expenses and to the extent funds are available, pay towards the amortization of the bonds. These bonds are customarily issued for a forty-year period. The P.H.A. pays them an annual contribution which makes up the deficit from the operation, as it is necessary to amortize the bonds.

The Housing Authority is a public corporation of the state and as such it is tax exempt. Its property is tax exempt and the bonds which it will issue are tax exempt. However, it enters into a corporation agreement with the City to furnish the customary municipal services such as fire and police protection. It agrees to pay to the City 10% of the shelter rent which it collects from the tenants.

Shelter rent is the net rent for the dwelling itself excluding water or any utility services that might be furnished within the rental payment. The return that the City gets is not equivalent to full taxes but it is substantially more than the City has been getting from the substandard

quarters that the people who are selected for this project have been living in. A recent report from the Pueblo Authority, showed the City received on its project approximately \$30 a year from each housing unit in the new project whereas the City received approximately only \$20 from the substandard units.

The City treats the housing project from a construction standpoint on the same basis as it would any private developer. The Housing Authority will pave interior streets on the project as part of the project cost; it will pay its normal assessments for the paving of boundary streets where they are assessed against the property owner; will pay the usual charges for running the utilities into the dwelling unit so the City is not assuming any unusual investment in that respect.

It is the intent of the federal act and the state act and generally of the local housing authority to avoid any competition with legitimate private property owners. There is a requirement in the federal act, with certain exceptions, that tenants must be selected from people who are living in substandard housing at the time. They cannot take a tenant from a decent standard house and take him into the housing project even if he meets the low income eligibility requirements. There is also a provision in the federal law that the rent in the housing project must be 20% below what rents for standard decent housing in the community is available for.

In other words, if a person makes \$200 a month then 20% of his income would be \$40 a month. In the federal and state laws the Cost of utility services is included in the \$40 so taking \$10 off of the \$40, then his actual shelter rent is \$30, and the Housing Authority cannot go within 20% of what decent housing is available for in the community.

There is a preference in the federal act for elderly families on the basis of need and there is a preference for disabled veterans. In Alamosa and La Mar, they were particularly interested in obtaining more housing for the young married couples at their colleges. If they have low income, they are eligible for this program. The idea is to give these people a decent place to live so that eventually they can raise their standards and move out of the project and into private housing. The idea back of it is to give these people a helping hand while they are down and hope that they will soon go up to something better.

It is not recommended that a city start off with any more than one-seventh of the substandard renter-occupied units in the community. In other words, not consider at all the owner-occupied units but start off with nearly one-seventh of the renter-occupied units.

Mr. Brown, the Architect, who had contacted the City about this program showed slides of projects in other cities and of substandard areas in Grand Junction, Colo. After viewing the slides, President McCormick threw the meeting open for discussion.

Mr. Don Cherp asked about prospective tenants living outside the City. Mr. Parker stated that this would be a question for the Housing Authority. They may set such regulations as they desire. Some of the housing authorities have requirements that the tenant must have been a resident of the city for one year before they are eligible and some have no such regulation. That depends on the local situation and what seems to be appropriate in the local city. Under the Colorado housing authorities law the Housing Authority is authorized to operate five miles beyond the City limits, but it would be necessary for any units located outside the City that a cooperative agreement with the county government be executed.

Mr. Dick Wells asked Mr. Parker should the Council decide on a Housing Authority, what the next step and expense to the City would be.

Mr. Parker stated it was up to the Housing Authority. After they are organized, they would prepare an application for financial assistance to be submitted to the City Council for approval and then this would be forwarded to the P.H.A. The project is financed from a preliminary loan and then from a permanent loan. The preliminary plan stems from the survey and there is no expense to the City other than the partial tax exemption for the program.

Councilman Wright asked if this preliminary loan on the survey, if the results of the survey would indicate that the project was not wanted or justified, would be forgiven or waived or what would happen to it.

Mr. Parker answered that if the survey showed there was no need, the P.H.A. would not make a permanent loan and enter into an annual contributions contract even if the City wanted to. If the P.H.A. turned down the development program on that grounds, there would be no obligation to it. There is a provision in the federal law that if the City should reject the program for reasons other than the need, then it would be expected to repay the preliminary loan.

Mr. Dale Luke stated that the pictures of the substandard housing shown covered quite a general area and asked what assurance would be had if the new housing is built that the old would be done away with.

Mr. Parker stated there was a requirement in the federal law that for each new unit, a substandard unit must be eliminated within five years. In some places, certain sites are cleared off to begin with. This may be done if it is desired. In some communities, due to lack of housing, it is preferred to develop some of the units and then the City through its building code would condemn substandard housing. The owner of the substandard housing could bring it up to standard or he could stop using it for housing but the elimination problem can be handled in any way the Housing Authority and the City agree upon within the five years.

Mr. Keith Mumby asked who foots the bill for condemnation as in the event of condemnation even substandard housing may become very valuable to the owner.

Mr. Parker replied that if the substandard housing is purchased by the local Housing Authority, they pay the appraised value of the unit. If the City should condemn that unit independently of this housing project, the owner has two alternative - one to stop using; the other, to bring it up to standard. He gets no compensation.

Mr. O. K. Clifton asked about the sub-standard housing and how to get rid of it.

Mr. Parker replied they can be gotten rid of by tearing them down for the site of the new unit; that's one way; second, any unit could be counted in the five-year period that is demolished by any other public activity such as construction of new municipal buildings, schools or for public highways. Third, it could be brought up to standard by the owner. Fourth, condemnation by the City under its code as being unfit for human habitation or stopped from being used for housing purposes.

Mr. Hockensmith asked Mr. Ashby if there is any code provisions at the present time to take care of this.

Mr. Ashby stated that he seriously doubted it at the moment. That the City has the usual provisions in regard to substandard dwellings and certificates of occupancy. He said he presumed that in the event the Council determined that the housing authority was a valuable thing to have, it could be strengthened. Mr. Hockensmith asked if it would be possible to have these torn down regardless of whether the City has public housing or not and Mr. Ashby replied that under the proper regulations, they could be.

Rev. Gebhart asked about the western section of the City and whether it was in the city limits. This area is very undesirable; has no sewage and no water; if in the City, could not something be done; if not, shouldn't it be taken in so something could be done.

President McCormick explained that a petition would have to be presented for annexation.

Rev. Gebhart stated he thought this was one location that could qualify and something should be done. He stated he could speak for the people as he works with them.

Mr. Don Stacey asked for some cost figures on either Denver or Pueblo.

Mr. Parker stated that the units cost approximately \$8,000 construction cost plus the land cost. The land cost would vary depending upon the city in which it is located and whether it is a slum site or a vacant site.

Mr. B. K. Harrison asked about the houses in the slides and stated that they looked like they cost \$10,000 or more.

Mr. Parker stated that Pueblo has a 150 unit project under development and they are inviting the owners of substandard housing to sell it. They make them an offer to buy up their particular area and they hope to pick and choose from these people who are willing and interested in selling. If there is a bad unit in an otherwise good block, they will give it a preference in their purchase. They hope to upgrade the city by this spot type of development.

Mr. Willis Best stated that he thought that what Mr. Harrison was referring to was the property being held by owners at impossible prices with the expectation that it will be worth more money some of these days. They won't tear them down; won't fix them up and won't sell them for what they are actually worth. If the government goes into the rental business and does not pay local taxes it is unfair competition to people who own apartments and rental property.

Mr. Clifton said he would like to have a definition of substandard which had been coming up in nearly every statement. What is a substandard house?

Mr. Parker stated they considered a substandard house one that does not have adequate plumbing inside; one that is dilapidated and in need of serious structural repairs. Mr. Clifton then asked what he meant by adequate plumbing, and Mr. Parker stated that it must have an inside toilet and decent heating. Mr. Clifton then asked what was considered decent heating, and Mr. Parker replied that it was heating that would keep the unit warm without danger of

burning it down. Mr. Clifton then stated that without definitions, they were talking in different tones.

Mr. Parker said that it was not a precise matter. The Housing Authority makes the determination themselves. They send in a report that they have accomplished a survey of substandard units and described what takes place, and it is the P.H.A. practice to accept the local decision.

Mr. Keith Mumby asked Mr. Parker who was behind the Agency.

Mr. Parker replied that the P.H.A. is a federal agency created under the U.S. Housing Act and a part of the housing and home financing agency related to the federal housing agency. The Housing Authority of G.J. would be a public corporation of the State. They would issue the bonds. Their project title would be in the name of the City of Grand Junction, and they would develop it just like an individual would his own house. The Agency is something like a bank in that they give financial help. They guarantee the bonds about the same way the P.H.A. does the typical home loan of the individual who buys his own home. The Project was intended to help those who must be subsidized in some way to get a decent place to live.

Mr. Wells stated he thought Grand Junction was no different from any other City and did have substandard housing. He asked if during the course of the time after this authority might be set up, if through the City and its planners and the real estate men, etc., they could work together with the Government and decide if in some areas there was a need, how much time would be allowed. Does it have to be done within one year, two years, or is there a limitation? Today, we might not feel such a thing is necessary but may be in two years it might be necessary. Could there be studies made so this thing could be worked out in this time?

Mr. Parker replied that as far as their Agency was concerned, they do not try to hurry any local organization. They preferred that this be a matter of local concern, and the more help you get from all segments of the community the better. The only urgency in the matter is that under their present authorization from Congress, it is anticipated no new applications can be taken after about next February, and that they have a present ceiling of 35,000 units for the term of the contract. If Congress makes additional allocation, the time urgency would not be so important.

Rev. Gebhart asked about the program cutting down juvenile delinquency and how the survey was to be taken.

Mr. Parker replied the housing survey is conducted by the local Housing Authority much like the census is taken. There are people on the P.H.A. staff who will be glad to advise and help set it up. Customarily, college students, housewives, etc. are used and go into the substandard areas with questionnaires for the people to fill out about the condition of the house; how much they are paying how many children they have, etc. The purpose of the survey is not only to find out the extent of the substandard areas, but whether these people are renters or owners; whether they would be interested in moving into a project of this type. What they are paying in rent and what their ability might be so they can plan.

In addition to knowing what the need is, they will want to plan on how many units to have with the number of bedrooms for families; how many for elderly people or couples.

There is a fundamental premise of the national act and the state act that there is a link between bad housing, bad health, crime and juvenile delinquency. Statistics available do show that substandard areas have more bad health, crime and juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Hockensmith asked if it was true after the local housing authority is established, it becomes a body corporate and can deal effectively with the problem without further authority.

Mr. Parker replied it was partially true. The Housing Authority is appointed by the Mayor and they serve for terms of five years. A new commissioner is appointed each year. First appointments are for staggered terms. They are subject to removal by the Mayor for malfeasance in office or non-functioning in office. They are an independent public body otherwise. They are subject to city control in the respect that all of their applications must be approved by the City Council and all of their projects are subject to the city zoning laws and city building codes and they must make an annual report each year to the City Council of their activities. The bonds are not an obligation of the City and will not affect the City's debt limit.

Councilman Wright asked if this body would determine what the specifications would be, what the needs are, call for bids and award contracts and hire architects.

Mr. Parker replied this body does hire the architect and he follows their instructions for the type of units they want and where they want them. They advertise for bids, award contracts on a competitive basis, and usually some local contractor builds the houses. The Housing Authority has the right of eminent domain and may exercise it. Customarily, they try to avoid it. They are local citizens, serving without pay, and are subject to the same pressures of public opinion as City Councilmen or anyone else would be.

Mr. Merton Heller asked about the 20% of the income, and how high this could go.

Mr. Parker stated that this is a decision for the local housing authority, and depends on the community. In Pueblo, the average income of the tenants in their project was \$2,099. They had a ceiling income of \$2,600 where it was a family of two; \$3,000 if there were three children; each additional child had a ceiling of \$100 more. That was the maximum income, the average was about \$2,000. Some of the people were welfare families with only their welfare payments. They have a maximum income so when they progress to this point they must move out.

Mr. Chas. Shaw stated that if there was enough applications to fill these apartments, fine, if there wasn't what happens to the apartments that are left. Are they available to others?

Mr. Parker replied that if such event were to take place, they would have to be held vacant until a low-income family came along. That rarely happens. They urge the local authorities not to apply for more than one-seventh of the substandard renter-occupied units of the community. If they want to apply for additional units, they are perfectly free to do so with the approval of the City Council.

Councilman Wright stated he thought they were all interested in all of the ramifications of this. He asked Mr. Parker, since he had stated that a good many were welfare cases, if he had any information on whether or not this would attract this type of people and that it might increase the welfare requirements of an area.

Mr. Parker replied that they had not found this to be so. If such a situation should develop, the local Housing Authority is in a position to cope with it. It may have been for that reason that some of them establish a length of residence requirement to make them eligible to avoid attracting the low-income families.

Mr. Wm. Foster asked about deficit financing and guaranteeing loans. He asked what the Agency gets as an interest rate or guarantee rate and what happens if there is a default in the bonds and the government actually has to come in and pay off the bonds.

Mr. Parker stated that the Agency charges no interest rate; the situation is about like it is on a G.I. loan, the guarantee is furnished without additional cost to the Housing Authority. Bonds are sold by the local housing authority to the bond purchasing syndicates. So far, no default by a local housing authority has happened in the twenty years this program has been in existence. They have always met their interest and principal payments. The contract provides that if the housing authority defaults on its bonds, the P.H.A. must pay for them and take over the project which is much like any mortgagee does if an owner defaults.

Mr. Foster then asked if there have been no defaults, why should the City of Grand Junction if it wants a housing authority, turn to the federal government?

Mr. Parker replied that if the City desires to issue bonds for financing such a project themselves they can do so. The problem is that most cities have so many demands on their financial bond retirement programs that they are unable to do so. This is a program that has been enacted by Congress to help the cities eliminate slums and no city is obligated to seek this financial assistance unless they feel it is the only way they can eliminate the slums. It is assistance available that taxpayers are helping to pay for. Of course, if they don't choose to do it, that's their decision. He stated that they were not in Grand Junction to ask the City to apply, but to explain that it is available if the City wants to apply.

Mr. Foster stated that the Federal Government is paying as much interest on its bonds as the City is and asked what the financial assistance of the Federal Government was other than guaranteeing the bonds.

Mr. Parker stated that the Government agrees to make up the deficits from the operation of this program. In other words, the Housing Authority charges the low-income families what they can afford to pay and what will bring in enough revenue that will exceed the cost of operating the units, but in most cases will not be enough to meet the full payment on the bonds. Each year, the Government agrees to make that additional contribution.

Mr. Foster then asked if there is a financial contribution other than the bond guarantee? Mr. Parker replied that there was.

Mr. Clifton then asked if it wasn't true that the City is supplying a considerable amount of this deficit in the form of lost taxes and for services they must supply.

Mr. Parker replied that this is partially true. The City receives 10% of the shelter rent but not the amount of the full taxes they would receive if supplied by private owners; however, it is substantially more revenue to the City than the substandard units would bring so actually is a gain.

Mr. Ben Carnes stated that he didn't believe the approach that had been offered was something that the City was in any position to accept at this time. No definite survey has been made by anyone. There is a problem, but as yet it isn't known to what extent it will be necessary to correct this problem. On the 25th of November, a meeting with the Chamber of Commerce Board and the Grand Junction Board of Realtors was held and the Realtors offered to go in and work with them jointly to make a survey of the community and determine exactly what the problems are. He thought that maybe the gentlemen of the Chamber and the members of the Board of Realtors were in a little better position to know what was needed than the housewives and the school boys. He thought that interest in the community should be great enough so that they could go out and find out where the community is weak and then the necessary steps could be taken to correct it. He stated that they had already found that on checking on the situations that have come up in several large cities that they had the same situation that we have here - no building code which requires the people either in the city or outside of the city to maintain their property to a certain standard. So a certain percentage of the homes that are now substandard can be corrected by establishing a building code.

The second situation that came out was that actually a high percentage of the substandard homes were owned by business people who had the ability to improve them and make them a reasonable house to live in as soon as they were forced to do so.

If after we have done everything we can possibly do locally through private enterprise, we find we still have a problem, then is the time to consider government assistance, or state assistance. There are urban renewal projects where the government participates only to the extent of acquisition of the property. There are other cases where communities have been able to go ahead and correct their problem entirely by private enterprise.

There is one type of financing through urban renewal which might give the terms that we need to put some of our people in the homes that have been taken over as a result of a G.I. walking off and leaving his house and the Government was forced to come in and take possession of the property. Understand there are ways we might move some of these people into these homes. There are 18 to 30 of them in Grand Junction standing idle practically all the time.

He asked for everyone to bear in mind in making any approach to solve the problem that any time the Government is involved, the expense goes up proportionately. The problem can be solved locally with a lot less expense.

Mr. Don Stacey stated that he would like to go on record as opposing this. He thought it should be investigated to see if it could be taken care of locally before seeking government assistance.

Mr. Carnes stated he had one other comment to make. He said that, representing the Board of Realtors, he hoped the Council would accept them as not always opposing everything. That they were opposed to the new zoning ordinance, but there have been a lot of changes made in it and that they have worked with the Council and City officials and now think we have something that is good for all of us. They certainly don't want to be placed in a position of always being an "Againer."

Mr. Sjolander, member of the P.H.A., gave figures concerning the amount of tax money which goes into this program in comparison to the entire Governmental budget.

Rev. Gebhart told how much he was in favor of the project and how it had helped him in New Orleans when he was attending school, and stated he thought we should be more interested in people than in taxes.

Mr. Hockensmith stated that he was very interested in this and thought it was an important subject. If this petition was turned down at this time, a similar one can be presented in about three months. There has been a proposal by the Board of Realtors to assist the City in order to keep it on a local basis. Mr. Allen, Planning Director, City Planning Commission are all doing a good job and possibly could assist with this survey. Possibly it should be referred to the people by referendum. He thought the Council might be a little premature in accepting the petition at this time.

President McCormick then closed the hearing and asked the Council if they had any questions to direct to Mr. Parker. Councilman Meacham asked if the Council voted to adopt the housing authority's plan to investigate the substandard housing in the City of Grand Junction, if upon completion of the investigation it is decided by the Council that there was no need for this service to be set up in the City, could the Council then recommend to dissolve the authority.

Mr. Parker stated that he was not sure this could be done. Any Housing Authority could not apply for a project until it was approved by the Council. He did not believe there was any law in the State of Colorado for dissolving the Committee, but it would dissolve itself if there was no application meeting the Council's approval.

Councilman Meacham stated that he did not believe it would be a good idea to get tied up to a housing authority until an investigation could be made to see if there was a need for it. The petition for the housing project was read at the request of Councilman Surface.

City Attorney Ashby told the Council that as a result of the hearing, they should determine whether unsatisfactory or unsafe inhabited dwelling conditions exist in the City and whether there is a lack of safe and sanitary dwelling accommodations in said City available for all the inhabitants thereof.

Councilman Wright suggested that the Council recognize Mr. Hockensmith's suggestion and hold the matter in abeyance to see if it can be determined whether there is need for it.

President McCormick stated that the advertisement merely stated that a hearing would be held, not that a decision would be made.

Councilman Lowe stated that a lot of information had been brought out that he had not thought of before, and moved that the matter be tabled to some future time when the Council has had time to evaluate all of the information. Councilman Colescott seconded the motion. He also stated he did not wish to see it just tabled, but that the real estate men had a good suggestion and should take some action. There was discussion on the motion by several of the Councilmen with the suggestion that each Councilman should do some study before he makes up his mind. The President called for a vote on the motion and it was unanimously approved.

President McCormick expressed the Council's appreciation to Messrs. Parker, Sjolander and Brown for coming to the meeting to explain the proposition to the Council. He also thanked the approximately 80 citizens who attended the meeting.

3.2 BEER VIOLATION Hearing postponed Bimbo's Cafe

The hearing on the violation of selling beer to minors at Bimbo's Cafe, 727 Third Avenue was postponed until the next regular meeting of the Council, December 21st.

ANNEXATION Hearing - McCoy S of North Ave bet 28¼ to 28½ Roads

This was the date set for the hearing on the annexation of the following described property: The northeast quarter of the northwest quarter of Section 18, Township 1 South, Range 1 West, Ute Meridian, County of Mesa and State of Colorado. Mr. Dale Lankston, 489½ 28½ Road, appeared before the Council and protested the annexation of this area. He stated that he had not been contacted to sign the petition. Councilman Meacham stated that the Council was aware that this area had been appraised as to the financial feasibility for annexation, and that the Planning Commission had approved of it. There were no further comments, and President McCormick declared the hearing closed.

SIDEWALK DIST # 15 Hearing

This was the date set for hearing protests on assessments in Sidewalk District No. 15. There were no protests filed, so the President declared the hearing closed.

PROPOSED ZONING ORD. Hearing

This date was set for hearing on the proposed Zoning Ordinance, and the following matters had been advertised for hearing:

1. Lot 7, Block 1, Mesa Gardens Subdivision (northwest corner of 23rd and Grand Ave.) to R 1 C. There was no one in the audience who protested or commented on this classification, so President McCormick declared the hearing closed.

Jaros property (Overhill) 12th & Orchard

2. Lot 16, Grandview Subdivision, except the East 125 feet and south 130 feet thereof, being the southeast corner of 12th and Orchard Avenues, to B 3. A subdivision plat of Overhill Annex was presented and a letter from the Overhill Corporation read in which the Corporation agreed that when commercial development is made on Block No. 2, the residential lots will be physically separated from the shopping area and service area in Block No. 2 by the construction of fencing along that line constituting the boundary of Block 2 and the rear lines of the platted residential sites. They stated that it was mutually understood that it is desired to effect a reasonable separation of the completed commercial facility from the area to be residentially used, and the letter was submitted as assurance that such arrangement will be made, essentially by fencing, and will be attractive in appearance.

A petition protesting zoning of this tract to B 3 was filed by residents of the area on the south side of Mesa Avenue and they were represented by Wm. E. Foster, Attorney. Mr. Foster commented as follows:

His clients protested the zoning on the basis of two contingencies. Subdividing in this area, as presented to the Planning Commission, and as City Attorney agreed was necessary; also a screen type fence to protect the surrounding land owners. They still object to the letter as

presented as it has no binding effect and no protection given as there are no protective covenants provided and it is still a question of whether it is “good zoning” or “bad zoning.” He quoted Gene Allen, Regional Planning Director as having been opposed to business zoning at this location.

He thought the Council should not read the ordinance at this time, as it is premature until such time as protections are nailed down. He brought up the matter of the width of the right of way for Mesa Avenue and 13th Street, stating that it was his understanding that there was to be a 20' dedication of street on Mesa Ave. and that he understood this had been changed to 10' after the Planning Commission had approved the 20'. Also that the dedication of land on the 13th Street side had been changed. He also stated that the petitioners do not like the size of the lots as shown on the subdivision map. He stated that this is not a situation where you will go from one residential area to another but from residential to business property. The lots across the street are deeper and wider than the lots proposed in the Overhill Annex. It takes a very attractive lot to make up to the fact that it is backing into a business area. The homes in this neighborhood are nice homes, and this would create a clash which is not desirable to have in zoning. It would appear that the lots should be made larger so that they would more closely conform to the area, so that the area would not be depreciated.

The fence has also been quite a question. Originally there was to be a fence and screen plantings, in the plan as submitted. The City Manager now suggests that it would be a chain link fence, and a chain link fence would not be desirable. It will catch papers and be an eyesore.

Lack of confidence in the City Manager and City Council has caused the people in this neighborhood to not rely on suggested plans.

A couple of the men who live on Mesa Avenue asked questions concerning the width of the street and the necessity for more business zoning in Grand Junction.

City Manager Lacy was then called upon by the President of the Council. He brought up the matter of whether the proposed zoning is good zoning, and stated that Mr. Foster had said that Gene Allen, Planning Director, had been opposed to the business zoning. This was over a year ago, and, since that time, it has become very clear what the impact of the Interstate Highway will be; also the location of a diagonal road and its interchange on either 7th or 12th Streets, either of which will bring substantial connector traffic down 12th Street and into this community.

It is a clear planning fact that the area growth center and direction of growth is to the northeast. Mr. Lacy stated that all of these things have become more clear as Mesa College decided to locate and develop its facilities in this particular area by having activity projects and parking across the street from this area on 12th Street. The problem does remain as to how to protect the houses and investment in homes if the shopping center is to be allowed.

He also explained how good planning and zoning is developed, stating that it would be a dream if you could start all over with a new town. When you can't start from the beginning you have to consider traffic patterns, existing population and population growth, and the nature of the population of a community by determining whether property is residential or

industrial. Then you consider land use, community, the character and needs of the people, their wishes and feelings in all property issues.

The Planning officials, City Council and others have tried to consider all of these things throughout the whole zoning ordinance procedure, and have left this Jaros matter until the last, and are now trying to approach this on a sensible basis. This is what has resulted in the plan which is now proposed, and whether it is a compromise, good planning or what, has to be determined by each individual. No matter whether this is decided now, or in court, or who wins, something is going to be there five or ten years from now, regardless of who the City Manager was or the Planner or the Council. This is an obligation the City of today owes to the City of tomorrow.

He explained the matter of the size of streets, stating that it is only necessary to have a 50 foot right of way on Mesa and 13th St., but very necessary that Orchard Avenue have 60 feet and 12th Street 80 feet, so the amount of right of way on Mesa and 13th was decreased in order to provide the proper right of way for the other two streets.

Mr. Lacy stated that he was speaking in minimums when he mentioned a chain link fence. The main thing is to guarantee that these lots are not used for parking. Homes should be of very similar quality to face the homes on the other side of Mesa Avenue.

Mr. Foster then quoted from the new zoning ordinance concerning fences in a B-3 District (This provision had not been considered by the Council at all up to this point.)

Mr. Foster protested the fact that there has been any change in planning because of the Interstate Highway or the use of Mesa College land on the west side of 12th Street. He felt that there was no guarantee that the Council would not change the zoning again and no protection to the residents by the letter from the Overhill Corp. He still stated that bad zoning a year ago is not good zoning today.

Mr. Lacy explained that zoning and planning is a constantly changing thing, and that is why it is so controversial and misunderstood.

Mr. Foster then criticized the business zoning on North Avenue, and stated that he felt this was still "strip" or "spot" zoning. He stated there was a good area out by 12th and Patterson or 12th and G Roads for a shopping center and couldn't understand that this was long range planning.

It was explained that a portion of this tract has been zoned for Business by the City since 1952.

The question was asked as to whether the Jaros interests would have to comply with the fence requirement, and the City Attorney assured the gentleman that they would. Also, whether or not the letter from the Overhill Corp. was a legal document. City Attorney Ashby stated that he thought it was submitted with the idea that it was to show their intentions, but that it would have to be something else to make it binding, possibly deed protections.

Mr. Lacy again stated that he and City officials have worked very hard since last April trying to get a zoning ordinance that would fit the needs of the community, and this Jaros matter has waited until the last because of the legal entanglements.

City Clerk to adv Plat Overhill Annex for 12-21-60

The City Clerk was directed to advertise the Overhill Annex plat for hearing on December 21, 1960.

City Attorney Ashby stated that every effort had been made to work out the knotty problems of the various controversial areas in zoning, but that the reading of the ordinance could be postponed until December 21, 1960, so that all of the existing problems could be ironed out.

To read ord. 12-21-60

There being no further comment, President McCormick closed the hearing.

S½ Lot 1 Blk 1 Fairmount Sub

3. The South half of Lot 1, Block 1, Fairmount Subdivision to B 3. Mr. Foster asked that this matter be delayed until the zoning on the south side of Orchard Avenue is resolved. President McCormick declared the hearing closed.

Lots 15/19 include Blk 1 Parkland Sub

4. Lots 15 through 19 inclusive, Block 1, Parkland Subdivision to R 2. There were no comments from anyone so the hearing on this zoning was declared closed.

Brach 1st & Orchard

5. Hearing on the Brach property at 1st and Orchard. Councilman Meacham reported that he had again met with the residents on Orchard and that they had agreed to the change of the shape of the B 2 zone. A letter from Mr. and Mrs. Brach was read in which they agreed to put up a fence screening the parking area and the loading area. This would be a masonry fence, and probably some shrubbery would be planted. Councilman Meacham asked City Attorney Ashby if the letter would be sufficient protection. Mr. Ashby stated that he would discuss this matter with Mr. Coit, Attorney for Mr. and Mrs. Brach, and try to work out some way in which the letter could be contractual. The hearing was then closed by President McCormick.

Text changes

6. Hearings on changes in the text of the Zoning Ordinance.

A change was made in Section b of Section 4. SIGNS - adding a paragraph "4" as follows:

"In B-2 zone districts, no sign shall have an area in excess of 150 square feet."

In Zone Districts (9) B-2 Retail Business under LIMITATIONS, the following was added:

"Service yards must be screened from adjacent single-family zoned property by the installation and maintenance of a solid wall or fence having a height of not less than four feet nor more than six feet."

Page 59 of the Zoning Ordinance under Home Occupation Section 4 remains the same as was originally in the ordinance Section 6 is changed as follows:

“No additions to or alterations of the exterior of the dwelling unit including outside entrances for the purpose of the home occupation shall be permitted.”

Section 7 will read as follows:

“The office or business does not utilize more than 25% of the gross floor area of the dwelling unit, and in any case not more than 400 sq. ft., provided however, that this does not apply to nursery schools.”

There being no comments on the above changes in the text of the zoning ordinance, President McCormick declared the hearing closed.

Walluck 7th & Walnut

Rev. Dwight Wallack presented a petition asking that his property on 7th and Walnut Avenue be zoned so as to permit a use similar to that now allowed in a Business “a” district. The proposed new zoning will be B 1, which does not allow the building to be extended to the property line. The zoning was changed in 1958 so that the building on the corner could be extended to the property line. Several Councilmen spoke in favor of changing the zoning to protect Rev. Wallack’s building program.

Mr. Abbott Tessman who lives at 2045 N 7th Street protested the changing of this zoning. He stated that there was a terrific traffic hazard created by the extension of the building to the property line, and that considering the type of residences in this area, it would not be good planning to allow further business there. City Manager Lacy stated that the Planning Commission had determined the zoning should be B 1. There being no further comments, the President declared the hearing closed.

1961 BUDGET Adopted Resolution

The matter of the 1961 budget was brought up and discussed. Several matters which had been questioned by the Council were explained by Mr. Lacy.

The following resolution was presented and read:

RESOLUTION

Be it Resolved by the City Council of Grand Junction, Colorado, that all regular full-time positions are classified as to pay range in Section I of this resolution, and that the following salaries as indicated in Section II be paid for the year 1961, effective January 1, 1961, and thereafter until such time as the City Council shall make changes therein. Such salaries shall be paid twice each and every month at regular intervals, or other established pay period:

Section I: POSITION CLASSIFICATION

<u>SALARY RANGE No. 1:</u>			
None			
<u>SALARY RANGE No. 2:</u>			
Clerk #2	Cashier	Secretary #3	
<u>SALARY RANGE No. 3:</u>			
Deputy City Clerk	Secretary #2	Street Crewman #3	
Deputy Treasurer	Clerk #1	Trash Crewman #2	
Machine Accountant	Recre'tn Utility Man	Communtns Operator	
<u>SALARY RANGE No. 4:</u>			
Secretary #1	Street Crewman #2	Park Crewman	
Librarian #2	Maintenance Man #2	Stadium Keeper	
Librarian #3	Utilities Crewman #2	Greens Keeper	
Librarian #5	Custodian #2	Forestry Crewman	
Trash Crewman #1	Zoo Keeper	Cemetery Crewman	
		Lube Man	
<u>SALARY RANGE No. 5:</u>			
Street Crewman #1	Purchasing Clerk	Golf Pro	
Utilities Crewman #1	Stock Clerk	Land Fill Operator	
Filter Plant Operator	Maintenance Man #1	Custodian #1	
Disposal PI Operator	Meter Reader	Park Machinist	
Tree Trimmer	Meter Man		

SALARY RANGE No. 6:

	Chief Meter Reader	Mechanic	Dog Warden
	Ass't Court Clerk	Pool Operator	Gen'l Inspector

SALARY RANGE No. 7:

	Field Engineer	Forestry Foreman	Intake Tender
	Draftsman	Court Clerk	

SALARY RANGE No. 8:

	Utilities Foreman	Cemetery Foreman	Fireman
	Park Foreman	Patrolman	Jail Warden

SALARY RANGE No. 9:

	Disposal P1 Chief	Ass't Bldg Inspector	Police Sergeant
--	-------------------	----------------------	-----------------

SALARY RANGE No. 10:

	Purchasing Agent	Police Lieutenant	Filter P1 Chief
	Fire Lieutenant	Police Detective	Maint. Supervisor

SALARY RANGE No. 11:

	Police Captain	Utilities Admin.	Equip Supervisor
	Fire Captain	Bldg. Inspector	

SALARY RANGE No. 12:

	Chief Librarian	Utilities Supervisor	Ass't Fire Chief
	Pub Wks Supervisor	Sanitation Supervisor	

SALARY RANGE No. 13:

	City Clerk	Developm't Director	Recreat'n Director
	City Treasurer	Project Engineer	

SALARY RANGE No. 14:

	Parks Director	Police Chief	Fire Chief
--	----------------	--------------	------------

SALARY RANGE No. 16:

	Public Works Director		
--	-----------------------	--	--

	Utilities Director
--	--------------------

Section II: SALARY SCHEDULE FOR PERMANENT POSITIONS

Job	A			D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
Range	1st	2nd	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th	13th	14th	15th
No.	6 mo.	6 mo.	yr.	yr.	yr.	yr.	yr.	yr.	yr.	yr.	yr.	yr.	yr.	yr.	yr.	yr.
1.	264	268	274	280	286	292	296	300	304	308	312	314	316	318	320	322
2.	272	276	282	288	294	300	304	308	312	316	320	322	324	326	328	331
3.	280	284	290	296	302	308	312	316	320	324	328	331	332	334	336	338
4.	288	292	298	304	310	316	320	324	328	333	336	338	340	342	344	346
5.	300	306	316	324	333	342	348	354	362	366	372	375	378	381	384	387
6.	312	318	327	336	345	354	362	366	372	378	384	387	390	393	396	399
7.	324	330	339	348	357	366	372	378	383	391	396	399	402	405	408	411
8.	336	342	351	361	369	378	385	391	396	402	408	411	415	417	420	425
9.	352	360	372	385	396	408	416	425	431	440	448	452	456	460	464	468
10.	368	376	388	400	412	424	431	440	450	456	464	468	472	476	480	484
11.	384	392	404	416	431	440	448	456	465	472	480	484	488	492	496	500
12.	400	408	420	431	444	456	464	472	480	488	496	500	504	508	512	516
13.	424	436	454	472	490	508	520	532	544	556	568	574	580	586	592	598
14.	448	460	478	496	514	532	544	556	568	580	592	598	604	610	616	622
15.	472	484	502	520	538	550	562	574	586	598	610	616	622	628	634	640
16.	496	508	526	544	562	580	592	604	616	628	640	646	652	658	664	670

- NOTES: 1. To find hourly rate, divide monthly rate by 176.
2. After 15 years service, annual increments cease (unless position is reclassified) and employee receives 3 weeks annual vacation.

BE IT ALSO RESOLVED: That the normal work week for all City Employees of the City of Grand Junction shall be based on forty (40) hours of five (5) eight (8) hours days.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 7th day of December, 1960.

APPROVED:

Ed McCormick
President of the City Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk

It was moved by Councilman Lowe and seconded by Councilman Hadden 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.

The following resolution was presented and read:

RESOLUTION

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING A BUDGET FOR DEFRAYING THE EXPENSES AND
LIABILITIES FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1961

WHEREAS, in accordance with the provisions of Article VI, Section 59, of the Charter of the City of Grand Junction, the City Manager of said City has submitted to the City Council, a budget estimate of the revenues of said City and the expenses of conducting the affairs thereof for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1961; and

WHEREAS, after full and final consideration of the budget estimate the City Council is of the opinion that the budget should be approved and adopted;

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

That the budget estimate of the revenues and expenses of conducting the affairs of said City for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1961, as submitted by the City Manager, be and the same is hereby adopted and approved as the budget estimate for defraying the expenses and liabilities against said City for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1961.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 7th day of December, 1960.

APPROVED:

President of the Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk

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

TAC BLDG. BLK 42 (Washington Park) School Dist. #51 req to build on lunch room - To put on ballot April 1961

A letter from Eugene H. Mast, Attorney at Law, was read calling attention to the fact that the Board of Education of Mesa County Valley School District No. 51 would like to build a kitchen and lunch room in Block 42 (Washington Park) where the TAC building is now located. This area between 9th and 10th and Gunnison and Hill, commonly known as Washington Park, formerly belonged to the City of Grand Junction, but by People's Ordinance No. 16, passed in 1925 was given to the School District with the stipulation that it only be used for recreation purposes. The Board of Education requests that this matter be placed on the ballot in April, 1961 for a referendum, giving the School District complete right and title to Block 42.

It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Colescott that the City Council instruct the City Clerk to include on the April, 1961, ballot the matter of granting permission to School District No. 51 to use a portion of Washington Park for a lunch room

and kitchen for the use of the students of Grand Junction Junior High School. Motion carried, seven members of the Council voting “AYE.”

BONDS APPROVED

The following bonds having been approved as to form by the City Attorney’s office were presented for approval:

<u>Cement Contractor</u>	<u>Gas Installer</u>
Ben H. Adams	Blue Flame Gas Co., Inc.
Eldon L. Kelly	M. J. Wesley, Jr.
<u>Contractor, General</u>	<u>House Mover</u>
Claud W. Garner, Jr. dba C. Garner	Bill Edward Farley
General Contractor	
Oliver L. Hermanns	<u>Junk Dealer</u>
John C. Pippenger	V. L. Ethington dba
	Ethington Iron & Metal
<u>Contractor, Special</u>	
Charles W. Bottoms	<u>Plumber</u>
Walto Fisher dba Sta-Brite Decorator	William M. Heaton
Samuel F. Gibson & Leon Norton dba	
Gibson & Norton	
Chester K. Klumb	
H. C. Price Co., Denver, Colo.	

It was moved by Councilman Colescott and seconded by Councilman Wright that the bonds be accepted and filed. Motion carried.

3.2 BEER APPL Dan Williams, dba Williams Groc 215 Colorado Hearing 1-4-61

Application was made for a 3.2 beer license by Dan Williams dba Williams Grocery, 215 Colorado Ave. This license was formerly held by T. B. Williams. It was moved by Councilman Colescott and seconded by Councilman Lowe that the application for beer license be advertised for hearing on January 4th, 1961. Motion carried. (7 members voted AYE.)

PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held on November 30th were presented to the Council.

ANNEXATION 10 homes - 13th & Pinyon - Petition & Resol - Fairmount Lot 3 (Cooper) - Instr #4031

A petition for annexation of the following described property was presented and read: Beginning at a point 30' North of the Northwest corner of Lot 3, Block 1 Fairmount Subdivision, Mesa County, Colorado, thence East 330' thence south 330' thence West 330' thence North 330' to point of beginning.

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:

Beg. at a point 30' North of the Northwest corner Lot 3, Block 1, Fairmount Subdivision, Mesa County, Colorado, thence East 330', thence South 330', thence West 330', thence North 330' to point 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.

Date	Address	Qual E. & L.O.	L. O. only	Property Description
11-29	(Signed) Lawrence W. Mooney	1270 Pinyon		Beg 30' N & 123.6' W of SE Cor Lot 3 Blk 1 Fairmount Sub Sec 12
11-29	(Signed) Talitha I. Mooney	"		T1S R1W N 125' W 58' S 125' E to Beg
12-3	Robert F. Barney (signed)	1251 Walnut		Beg 240' W of NE Cor Lot 3 Blk 1 Fairmount Sub Sec 12 T1S
12-3	Jennie Barney (signed)	"		R1W W 60' S 125' E 60' N to beg
11-28	Grace E. Markus (signed)	1261 Walnut		Beg 180' W of NE Cor Lot 3 Blk 1 Fairmount Sub Sec 12 T1S R1W W 60' S 125' E 60' N to beg
12-3	Roy P. Brewer (signed)			Beg at NE cor Lot 3 Blk 1 Fairmount Sub Sec 12 T1S R1W W 60' S 125'
12-3	V. Charlotte Brewer (signed)			E 60' N to beg
11-28	William A. Cooper (signed)	1275 Walnut		Beg 120' W of NE cor Lot 3 Blk 1 Fairmount Sub Sec 12 T1S R1W
11-28	Myrna M. Cooper (signed)			S 125' W 60' N 125' E to beg
11-28	Claude T. Hocker (signed)	1250 Pinyon Ave.		Beg 30' N & 239.6' W of SE cor Lot 3 Blk 1 Fairmount Sub sec
11-28	Betty C. Hocker (signed)			12 T1S R1W W to W line sd lot 3 N 125' E to A pt N of Beg S to beg
11-29	Preston W. Latham (signed)			Beg 30' N & 65.6' W of SE cor Lot 3 Blk 1 Fairmount Sub
11-29	Mazel M. Latham (signed)			Sec 12 T1S R1W N 125' W 58' S 125' E to beg
12-6	Edward E. Maurin (signed)	2005 N 13th		Beg 30' N of SE cor Lot 3 Blk 1 Fairmount Sub Sec 12 T1S R1W
12-6	Lucille J. Maurin (signed)	2005 N 13th		N 125' W 65.5' S 125' E to beg
12-6	S. Ralph Austin (signed)	1260 Pinyon		Beg 30' N & 181.6' W of SE Cor Lot 3 Fairmount Sub Sec 12 T1S
12-6	Mildred L. Austin	"		R1W W 58' N 125' E 58' S to beg

	(signed)				
11-8	Harold F. Wilson				Beg 60' W of NE cor Lot 3 Blk 1
	(signed)				Fairmount Sub Sec 12 T1S R1W
11-28	Gladys L. Wilson	1285 Walnut			S 125' W 60' N 125' E to beg
	(signed)				

STATE OF COLORADO)
)
COUNTY OF MESA)

AFFIDAVIT

_____, of lawful age, being first duly sworn, upon oath, deposes and says:

That he is the circulator of the foregoing petition;

That each signature on the said petition is the signature of the person whose name it purports to be.

(Signed) _____ William A. Cooper _____

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of December, 1960.

Witness my hand and official seal.

(Signed) _____ Fred E. Hagie _____
Notary Public

My Commission expires: February 11, 1963

(SEAL)

The following Resolution was presented and read:

RESOLUTION

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

Beginning at a point 30 feet North of the Northwest corner of Lot 3, Block 1, Fairmount Subdivision, Mesa County, Colorado, thence East 330 feet; thence South 330 feet; thence West 330 feet; thence North 330 feet to point 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, 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 7th day of December, 1960.

C. E. McCormick
President of the City Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk

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

PROP. ORD. Annexation McCoy Addn - So. of North Ave. bet 28¼ & 28½ Rds

The following entitled proposed ordinance was introduced and read: AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION." It was moved by Councilman Surface and seconded by Councilman Colescott that the proposed ordinance be passed for publication. Motion carried, seven members voting "AYE."

PROP. ORD. Assessing Sidewalk Dist. #15

The following entitled proposed ordinance was introduced and read: AN ORDINANCE APPROVING THE WHOLE COST OF THE IMPROVEMENTS MADE IN AND FOR SIDEWALK DISTRICT NO. 15, IN THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, PURSUANT TO ORDINANCE NO. 178, ADOPTED AND APPROVED THE 11TH DAY OF JUNE, 1910, AS AMENDED; APPROVING THE APPORTIONMENT OF SAID COST TO EACH LOT OR TRACT OF LAND OR OTHER REAL ESTATE IN SAID DISTRICT; ASSESSING THE SHARE OF SAID COST AGAINST EACH LOT OR TRACT OF LAND OR OTHER REAL ESTATE IN SAID DISTRICT; AND APPROVING THE

APPORTIONMENT OF SAID COST; AND PRESCRIBING THE MANNER FOR THE COLLECTION AND PAYMENT OF SAID ASSESSMENTS. It was moved by Councilman Surface and seconded by Councilman Colecott that the proposed ordinance be passed for publication. Motion carried, seven members of the Council voting "AYE."

ORD. #1123 EMERG 1961 Appropriations

The following entitled emergency ordinance was introduced and read: AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING CERTAIN SUMS OF MONEY TO DEFRAY THE NECESSARY EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, FOR THE FISCAL YEAR BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 1961 AND ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1961 AND FIXING THE SALARY OF THE CITY MANAGER OF SAID CITY AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. It was moved by Councilman Hadden and seconded by Councilman Wright that the ordinance be passed and adopted as an emergency ordinance, numbered 1123 and ordered published. Roll was called on the motion with all members of the Council voting "AYE." The President declared the motion carried.

ORD. #1222 PASSED Annexing Faith Addn, 1st & Orchard

The Proof of Publication to the proposed ordinance entitled AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, was presented and read. It was moved by Councilman Hadden and seconded by Councilman Meacham that the Proof of Publication be accepted and filed. Motion carried, seven members voting "AYE."

It was then moved by Councilman Meacham and seconded by Councilman Hadden that the Ordinance be called up for final passage. Motion carried, seven members of the Council voting "AYE."

The Ordinance was then read and upon motion of Councilman Colecott and seconded by Councilman Hadden was passed, adopted, numbered 1122 and ordered published. Roll was called on the motion with all members of the Council voting "AYE." The President declared the motion carried.

WEED REMOVAL DIST #1 Resolution assessing costs

The following Resolution was presented and read:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the City Council and Municipal Officers of the City of Grand Junction in the State of Colorado have complied with all of the provisions of law relating to removal of weeds, brush or rubbish on certain lots, parcels or tracts of land, pursuant to Chapter 29 of the 1953 Compiled Ordinances of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, and pursuant to the various proceedings under such section; and

WHEREAS the City Council has duly confirmed the report of the City Manager showing the various charges to be made as a result of the cutting or removal of weeds, brush and rubbish; and

WHEREAS, from said report, it also appears that the City Manager has determined the cost to each lot, parcel or tract of land covering the cost for work done on such lot, parcel, or tract of land, to be as follows:

WEED REMOVAL DIST. #1

ASSESSMENT ROLL

<u>Description</u>		<u>Total Amount</u>
East ½ of Lots 16 - 19 incl. and all of		
Lots 20 & 21, Blk 3 Slocomb Addn.		\$ 16.00
Beg. 208.6' South of the intersection of the		58.00
West line of 5th Street & the North line of the		
SE¼ NW¼ Sec. 23, T1S, R1W, West 145' South 95'		
East 145' North 95' to beginning.		
Beg. 420' East of SW corner Sec. 11, T1S, R1W,		20.00
North 400'. East 50' South 400' West to beginning		
Lots 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, Blk 5 Grand River Sub.		82.50
Lots 7 - 16, Blk 21		40.00
Lots 18 - 22, Blk Q, Keiths Addn		30.00
Lots 29 & 30, Blk 141		10.00
Lot 24, Blk 2, Crawford Addn		10.00
Lots 19 - 21, Blk 83		10.00
Lot 17, Blk 45		20.00
Lots 31 & 32, Blk 36		25.00
Lots 9 & 10, Blk 4, Del Rey Sub.		8.00
Lots 1 & 10, Blk (A) Park Terrace Sub.	(EACH)	\$ 2.72
Lots 1, 5, 7, 11, 12, 18-24, Blk B Park Terrace Sub.	(EACH)	2.69
Lots 1 - 7, 9-11, 15, 16, Blk C Park Terrace Sub.	(EACH)	2.69
Lot 16, Grand View Sub.		50.00

		\$ 449.50

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

SECTION 1. That the costs as hereinbefore set forth are hereby assessed to and upon each lot, parcel or tract of land and against such lots, parcels or tracts of land in the amounts which are severally hereinbefore set forth and described.

SECTION 2. That said assessments, together with all interest and penalties of default of payment thereof and all costs of collecting the same shall, from the time of the passage of this Resolution, constitute a perpetual lien against such lot, parcel or tract of land herein described.

SECTION 3. That the City Clerk of the City shall notify, in writing, the individual owners of such lots, parcels or tracts of land of the assessment against their property; and that said assessments shall be due and payable within twenty (20) days after the mailing of such notice.

SECTION 4. That upon failure to pay such assessment within the time provided, the same shall be a lien upon the respective lots, parcels or tracts of land from the time of such assessment, and the City Clerk shall certify the amount of the assessment to the County Treasurer of Mesa County, to be by him placed upon the tax list for the current year to be collected in the same manner as other taxes are collected, with a ten (10%) per cent penalty thereon to defray the costs of collection; and all of the laws of the State of Colorado for the assessment and collection of general taxes, including the laws for the sale of property for taxes and the redemption thereof, shall apply to and have full effect for the collection of all of such assessments.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 7th day of December 1960.

C. E. McCormick
President of the City Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk

It was moved by Councilman Surface and seconded by Councilman Hadden 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 and the Resolution duly passed and adopted.

DIAGONAL ROAD endorse - fr 12th or 7th

City Manager Lacy brought up the matter of the proposed "Diagonal Road" to the Airport, both from 7th Street and 12th Street. He stated that the County Commissioners were hoping that various groups would state their position so that they might be guided in the final decision. The Council had discussed this matter informally at various times, and it had been the consensus of opinion that they would favor a diagonal road from 7th Street to the Interstate Highway. Councilman Hadden expressed his opinion that the idea was good.

Councilman Wright stated that he was favorable to the idea if the County would widen 12th Street to the City limits.

It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Hadden that the City Council go on record as being in favor of the "Diagonal Road" with the condition that the County will widen 12th Street to the City limits, and if the road continues to 7th Street that they will also widen 7th Street to the City limits. Motion carried, seven members of the Council voting "AYE."

ZONING ORD. held over until 12-21-60 for 1st reading

It was moved by Councilman Meacham and seconded by Councilman Surface that the reading of the proposed Zoning Ordinance be held over until the next regular meeting of the Council on December 21. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

/s/ Helen C. Tomlinson
City Clerk