

Grand Junction, Colorado

November 1, 1961

**ROLL CALL**

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, met in regular session at 7:30 o'clock p. m. November 1, 1961. Councilmen present and answering roll call were Meacham, Hadden, Love, Colescott, Lowe, Wright and President McCormick. Also present were City Manager Lacy, City Attorney Ashby and City Clerk Tomlinson.

**INVOCATION**

The invocation was given by Rev. Ray J. Hawkins, Pastor, Church of the Nazarene.

**MINUTES**

It was moved by Councilman Lowe and seconded by Councilman Meacham that the minutes of the regular Council meeting held Oct. 18, 1961 be approved as written. Motion carried.

**City Group Life Insurance & AD&D** Accept Equitable Life Assurance Co. Bid

On October 16th, bids were accepted from sixteen companies for group life insurance for city employees. City Manager Lacy stated that it had taken some time to get the insurance policies and proposals analyzed and a tabulation made so that he could make a report to the Council on which proposal he thought would be best for the City administration and the employees.

There were two alternates in the bidding. No. 2 required that the City pay for the insurance for employees who left City service providing they had served twenty years or reached age 65 until they reached the age of 70. After age 65 employees can carry only one-half of the amount they had previously carried. Alternate No. 2 is the one that the City Employee Committee has favored ever since group insurance was first brought up and as it was bid as low or lower by most companies, Mr. Lacy stated that it is the plan that should be considered.

He showed the Council the tabulation sheet and stated that the low bid was presented by Republic National Life Insurance Company, a Dallas firm, presented by Leonard G. Cramer of Denver. There is no Grand Junction agent to service this policy, and there was a higher number of exclusions than the other policies and difference in the validation section; therefore, this bid was

not considered the best even though it was the lowest net premium for the first year.

American General Life Insurance Company, which is a stock company, was the low bidder with a premium of \$10.56 and Equitable Life Assurance Co., a mutual company, was second low with a bid of \$11.52. These amounts are the total cost per \$1,000 for life insurance and A.D.&D. per year and represent only the premium for the first year. After the first year, the premium depends on the group experience, and, according to the statistics furnished, it would appear that Equitable would possibly have the larger dividend as this is a common practice in mutual companies. The exclusions for life and A.D.&D. were very similar in both policies; American General having a little the edge in this regard. The administration is similar although it appeared that Equitable Life Assurance Co. had had a larger experience with cities and has evolved a very simple method of administration. Both companies have local agents. Mr. Lacy stated he did not think these policies could be considered on price along as the experience with the group is the basis for the establishment of the premium.

Councilman Wright asked Mr. Lacy how he arrived at the dividend of Equitable, and Mr. Lacy explained when the specifications for bidding were set up a hypothetical case was set up providing for an \$8,000 per year premium on a fixed amount of business and each company was asked what it would expect the dividend to be and what experience they could show for a group similar to that of the City of Grand Junction in size and payroll. American General showed an industrial group and Equitable showed the City of Greeley with a 33% dividend. The first year, Equitable had estimated that the City of Grand Junction's dividend would be approximately 26%. Mr. Lacy stated that after considering both policies very carefully that he and Mrs. Tomlinson, City Clerk, favored the Equitable policy but pointed out that it was nip and tuck between the two companies.

Mr. McArdle and Mr. White, representing American General, both spoke to the Council and answered questions concerning their policy, and Mr. Marvin Daniels of Equitable Life Assurance Co. spoke concerning his company. It was pointed out by both companies that the reserves would be owned by the City and that all reserves used only as benefits and for claims on the City group.

Councilman Lowe stated he believed City Manager Lacy was the most qualified person to make a recommendation on the group insurance as he has gone into the matter very thoroughly and in much more detail than the Council could, and he moved that the Council take

his recommendation and whichever he chooses, that the contract for group insurance be awarded to that company.

President McCormick pointed out that City Manager Lacy and City Clerk Tomlinson have already made the recommendation that Equitable Life has the most points in their favor and is the one they recommend. Councilman Lowe amended his motion to include that the contract for the group life insurance and A.D.&D. for the City of Grand Junction be awarded to Equitable Life Assurance Company of the U.S. Motion was seconded by Councilman Colescott. Roll was called on the motion with all members of the Council voting AYE. The President declared the motion carried. (7 Councilmen voted AYE)

President McCormick expressed regret that the contract could not be awarded to more than one company.

**ANNEXATION** NW Cor 7th & Patterson (Tupper) eligible for annex.

City Manager Lacy read from the Planning Commission's minutes of Oct. 25th concerning annexation of an area 200' x 250' located on the NW corner of 7th and Patterson as follows:

"Development Director Warner said that this is an open piece of ground with no expense to the City until it is built up. The water line goes past the property and the water tap will be paid for by the property owner. The person interested in the area would like to build an apartment house there; however, since there are restrictive covenants on all the deeds of the surrounding property he would have to get releases from all of the property owners around.

"The way in which the property is used would of course make a difference in the economic study; however, Mr. Warner said the figures presented are an average of whether it is developed as single family units or apartments. For a three-year period, the cost to the City would be approximately \$2,036 with a return of \$1,551. On a ten-year basis the cost would be approximately \$7,200 with the return being \$7,865. The owner would like to have the area zoned as R-3, or at least R-2; however, it would automatically be annexed as R-1-a at which time an analysis would be made as to what the zoning for the area should be."

The Planning Commission recommended that this area can be considered as eligible for annexation.

President McCormick stated that he thought it was time to square off some of the boundaries and wondered if an effort had been made to contact other people in this area. City Manager Lacy stated that according to state statutes, annexation is strictly

up to the property owners. There had been some interest shown in this area but no positive steps taken.

Pomona View election 19 to 18 against

Councilman Colescott stated that he thought they should review the City's policy and new annexations should pay some of the costs. He cited the example of the election of Pomona View held on Tuesday, Oct. 31st, which was rejected by a vote of 19 to 18 but the City had still put a lot of money into the preparation of petitions and checking and also paid the election costs.

City Manager Lacy stated that there is nothing that can be done as long as the state statutes remain as they are at the present time.

It was moved by Councilman Love and seconded by Councilman Lowe that the City Council ratify the Planning Commission's recommendation that this area is eligible for annexation and petition will be considered when presented to the Council. Motion carried. (7 Councilmen voted AYE)

**CHAMBER OF COMMERCE** Req to Bring Santa in by helicopter 11-24-61  
- granted

City Manager Lacy read a letter from Les Landry, Co-Chairman, Retail Trade Committee of the Chamber of Commerce. They are planning a program which will bring Santa Claus to Grand Junction the night of 11-24-61 via helicopter. The program is not complete, but they had discussed it with Police Chief Karl Johnson and he had suggested that the proposal be submitted to the Council. The suggested area would be from Rood to the alley on 4th Street in the vicinity of the Chamber of Commerce building. The helicopter would bring Santa in and leave; the children would meet him and candy would be given to them; then the helicopter would pick Santa up again. The Chamber would assist the Police Department with additional help if this is desired.

City Manager Lacy stated that the Committee is aware of the problems involved. The Mile High Helicopter Co. has checked the wires, poles, etc. and feel there is no problem. Both the Mile High Helicopter Service and the Chamber have liability insurance for such a project.

Councilman Meacham stated that providing everything is worked out from the legal standpoint of the City, and as it is a novel idea, he moved the Chamber of Commerce be granted permission as requested. Councilman Hadden seconded the motion. Motion carried. (7 Councilmen voted AYE)

**ORD. 1141 PASSED** Improvement Districts

The Proof of Publication to the following entitled proposed ordinance was presented and read: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTIONS 1, 4 AND 5 OF CHAPTER 81 OF THE 1953 COMPILED ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, SUCH CHAPTER CONCERNING IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS WITHIN THE CITY, TO PERMIT THE CITY COUNCIL TO USE THE PROCEDURES OF ARTICLE 4 OF CHAPTER 89 OF THE 1953 COMPILED STATUTES OF THE STATE OF COLORADO FOR THE CREATION OF IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS; AND TO ALTER THE PROCEDURES ON ASSESSMENT FOR STREET AND ALLEY INTERSECTIONS WITHIN THE CITY. It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Meacham that the Proof of Publication be accepted and filed. Motion carried. (7 Councilmen voted AYE)

It was moved by Councilman Meacham and seconded by Councilman Colescott that the ordinance be called up for final passage. Motion carried. (7 Councilmen voted AYE)

The ordinance was then read and it was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Meacham that the ordinance be passed, adopted numbered 1141 and ordered published. Roll was called on the motion with all members of the Council voting AYE. The President declared the motion carried. (7 Councilmen voted AYE)

**AUTHORIZE PAYMENT** Deputy City Atty's salary to City Atty Gerald J. Ashby, until new deputy is apptd or until end of year

City Attorney Ashby sated that Harry Claussen, Deputy City Attorney, had resigned on October 1, 1961. He had discussed with the Council at the informal meeting the matter of paying him the deputy's salary in addition to his salary until another deputy is appointed sometime later this year. It was assumed that this matter could be handled through the City Manager's direction but normal procedure should be that the Council, since it directs the office of the City Attorney, should approve such payment.

Councilman Wright stated that the Council is aware of this; that it had been discussed and meets with their approval. It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Meacham that City Attorney Ashby be paid the salary authorized for a deputy City Attorney in addition to his own salary effective Oct. 1 until such time as a deputy is appointed or until the end of this budget period. Roll was called on the motion with all members of the Council voting AYE. The President declared the motion carried. (7 Councilmen voted AYE)

**SCHOOL DIST. #51** Resol - releasing fr obligations on paving N 5th St. - Instr #4042

City Attorney Ashby stated that the Mesa County Valley School Dist. #51 would like to be released from obligations concerning the paving of Fifth Street between North Avenue and the north boundary extended of Glenwood Avenue so they can make final payment to Elam Construction Co. on their contract. He stated that City Manager Lacy had discussed this matter with the School District and Elam Construction Co. and they are willing to post a bond and he recommended that they do it by bond.

City Manager Lacy stated that this was for a strip of paving that was necessary when the storm sewer was put in and the paving that was put down was not the right mixture and it is very ripply. It has not been accepted by the City and will not be until it is done properly which cannot be done now until the spring of 1962. The sub-base has been put in but it is the asphaltic surfacing that is involved.

The following Resolution was presented and read:

RESOLUTION

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

That Mesa County Valley School District #51 be released from any and all obligations concerning the paving of 5th Street between North Avenue and the North boundary extended of Glenwood Avenue in said City, upon receipt of a bond from Elam Construction Company in proper form approved by the City Attorney of the City to guarantee to the City that the paving on said portion of 5th Street will be relaid in the spring of 1962.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Manager, on behalf of the City and as the act of the City be, and he is hereby, authorized to execute any release deemed necessary by the School District to accomplish the intent of this resolution.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 1st day of November, 1961.

\_\_\_\_\_  
President of the City Council

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk

It was moved by Councilman Hadden and seconded by Councilman Love 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. (7 Councilmen voted AYE)

**OPERATION FORESIGHT** Reaffirm one-way streets not part of Phases I & II - reaffirm resol.

City Manager Lacy stated that some people feel because the discussion of one-way streets came up prior to the circulation of petitions, that it is still not resolved until the Council has specifically taken recognition of the recommendations of the Committee and Planning Commission not to include one-way streets. Some people feel that after the petitions are all signed up, one-way streets would be designated even though the contract itself is not contingent on this. Neither the Committee nor the Planning Commission recommended one-way streets. The plan itself contains a traffic volume table based on the amount of traffic which is attempting to flow on a given width of street that has a given type of parking on it. There is a maximum set and when traffic volume reaches this maximum then either the parking or traffic circulation pattern must change to move into the next category to allow for safe movement of traffic at the higher volume. On the basis of this table, the Council is asked to reaffirm the fact that one-way streets are not a part of Phases I & II which are proposed for construction in 1962 and to reaffirm the Resolution which Council previously made on "Operation Foresight" which included this traffic volume table as a guide to parking and circulation pattern.

It was moved by Councilman Lowe and seconded by Councilman Colescott that the Council reaffirm the recommendation of the Operation Foresight Committee and the Planning Commission that one-way traffic on Rood or Colorado or other streets affected by the plan are NOT a part of Phases I and II of the "Operation Foresight" project as now being petitioned for construction in 1962, and to further reaffirm the previous adoption of the "Operation Foresight" plan including the "Traffic Volume and Parking Type Table" on page II-11 as a guide for future changes in traffic circulation pattern or the parking type according to traffic volume needs. Motion carried. (7 Councilmen voted AYE)

**PROPERTY** Sell Lots 31/32 Blk 133 (11th & Pitkin) to Mrs. Evelyn Watters, Grimsley's Auto Glass & Upholstery Co., 1106 Pitkin, for \$3200

City Manager Lacy stated that he had received an offer from Mrs. Evelyn Watters of Grimsley's Auto Glass & Upholstery Co., 1106 Pitkin, of \$2800 for Lots 31 and 32 Block 133. These lots, located just east of their building, are owned by the City and have been appraised at \$2,750. They want to use these lots for

parking and for future expansion. He stated that following Council's policy, he had attempted to see if this offer could be raised, more in line with what Public Service Company paid for four lots in the same area. After he explained the matter to Mrs. Watters, she raised her offer to \$3200. This offer of \$3200 is net to the City as no commission is to be paid.

Councilman Lowe stated that he believed when an existing business is growing and wants to expand and they are willing to pay above the appraised price, the best thing the Council can do is to accept the offer. It was moved by Councilman Lowe and seconded by Councilman Meacham that the City accept the offer of Mrs. Evelyn Watters, 1106 Pitkin Ave., of \$3,200 for Lots 31 and 32 Block 133 and that the City Attorney be instructed to draw up a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to sell this property to Mrs. Watters and authorizing him to sign the necessary deed. Motion carried. (7 Councilmen voted AYE)

**AGREEMENT** Authorize CM to sign agreement with County to do improvement work on E. Grand - Instr. 4428

City Manager Lacy stated that the County had asked the City to enter into an agreement with them for the repair of E. Grand Ave. The County, City and Grand Junction Drainage District have already embarked on a joint project for improving this area which is half in the City and half in the County.

The County intends to carry it on the freeway beyond the City limits as part of its program. They asked that the City sign the agreement which simply sets forth what the City and County respectively proposed to do. The Drainage District is not a party to the agreement because they have fulfilled most of the work they are called on to do. They laid the pipe for the storm sewer along the south side of the street. The street is to be excavated down to grade and there is more encasement of existing sanitary sewer lines which is the City's responsibility in the project. The County will do the excavation, put in the base material and spread it.

In addition to what is written in the agreement, since it was drawn up, it is apparent now that the storm sewer will be extended. The County will pay for all of the pipe involved and the City would pay for two man-holes. The Drainage District will install the pipe. The County intends to improve the bridge at Indian Wash and continue on out according to City specifications. This would not include paving at this time because of the weather, but it will be done in 1962. This is a result of County-City cooperation in road projects and the County is equally proud of this cooperative move.



It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Hadden that the City Manager be authorized to enter into this agreement with the County on the improvement of Grand Avenue. Roll was called on the motion with all members of the Council voting AYE. The President declared the motion carried. (7 Councilmen voted AYE)

#### **VETERANS DAY**

President McCormick reminded the Council there is a legal holiday coming up which was called Armistice Day but is now called Veterans' Day.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

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

/s/Helen C. Tomlinson  
City Clerk