

Grand Junction, Colorado

March 17, 1971

ROLL CALL

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction Colorado, met in regular session at 7:30 P.M. March 17, 1971, in the Civic Auditorium at City Hall. Councilmen present and answering roll call were: Raymond Paruch, Harry Colescott, Ray Meacham, Stanley Anderson, Theodore Naff, Robert Evans, and President of the City Council, Richard Youngerman. Also present were City Manager Richard Gray, City Attorney Gerald Ashby, and City Clerk Neva Lockhart.

MINUTES

It was moved by Councilman Colescott and seconded by Councilman Meacham that the minutes of the regular Council meeting held on March 3, 1971, be approved as written. Motion carried.

BID AWARD - STORM SEWERS, 1971 - SMITH CONSTRUCTION - \$31,418.31

Bids were opened at 2:00 P.M. Tuesday, March 16, 1971, for the 1971 Storm Sewer project. Bids were as follows:

Tilton Construction Company	\$42,149.64
Scheierman Construction Company	40,351.50
Elam Construction, Inc.	39,541.50
Smith Welding & Constr. Co.	31,418.31
Engineer's Estimate	39,341.50

City Engineer Hickman recommended the award of the contract to the low bidder, Smith Welding & Construction Company. The Smith Welding & Construction Company bid is considerably lower than the other bids and of Mr. Hickman's estimate. However, it was noted that this contractor has accomplished two other contracts for the City this year, and his work has been very acceptable, with his organization and personnel being very good. City Manager Gray joined with Mr. Hickman in recommending the award of the contract to Smith Welding & Construction Company.

It was moved by Councilman Anderson and seconded by Councilman Meacham that the 1971 Storm Sewers contract be awarded to Smith Welding & Construction Company in the amount of \$31,418.31. Motion carried.

BID AWARD - OVERLAY PARKING LOT, LINCOLN PARK - ELAM \$15,880

Bids were opened at 3:00 P.M. Tuesday, March 16, 1971, for the overlay bituminous paving of the parking lot at Lincoln Park.

Bids were:

United Sand & Gravel Company	\$17,765.00
Elam Construction, Inc.	15,880.00
Engineer's Estimate	19,275.00

City Engineer Hickman and City Manager Gray recommended the award of the contract to Elam Construction. Funds are budgeted in the 1971 Budget in the amount of \$20,000 for this project.

It was moved by Councilman Colescott and seconded by Councilman Anderson that the contract for the bituminous overlay of the Lincoln Park parking lot be awarded to Elam Construction Company in the amount of \$15,880. Motion carried.

HEARING - SANITARY SEWER DISTRICT 28-71

This was the date set for a hearing upon the creation of Sanitary Sewer District 28-71. This estimated \$470,000 proposed sanitary sewer system is to service the six newly annexed areas in the northern part of town. There being no written complaints or objections, and no one in the audience to protest, the President closed the hearing.

The following Resolution was presented and read:

R E S O L U T I O N

CREATING AND ESTABLISHING SANITARY SEWER DISTRICT NO. 28-71 WITHIN THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SANITARY SEWER WITHIN SAID DISTRICT AND PROVIDING FOR THE PAYMENT THEREFOR.

WHEREAS, on the 3rd day of February, 1971, the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, passed a Resolution Adopting Details, Plans and Specifications for Sanitary Sewer District No. 28-71 and authorizing Notice of Intention to Create said District; and

WHEREAS, Notice to Create said District was duly published; and

WHEREAS, no written complaints or objections have been made concerning the proposed improvements;

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

1. That said Sanitary Sewer District No. 28-71 be, and the same is hereby, created and established, and that construction of a sanitary sewer therein be, and the same is hereby, authorized and directed, in accordance with the details, plans and specifications prepared and filed therefor;

2. That the construction of the said sanitary sewer shall be

made by contract let to the lowest responsible bidder, except that if it be determined by the City Council that the bids are too high, and that the proposed improvements can be efficiently made by the City, the City may provide that the construction shall be made under the direction and control of the City Manager by hiring labor by the day or otherwise, and by purchasing all necessary material, supplies and equipment;

3. That the sanitary sewer in said District was duly ordered, after Notice duly given; that no remonstrance, protest or objection was filed against the creation or establishment of said District; or any of the proceedings adopted therefor; and all conditions precedent and all requirements of the laws of the State of Colorado, the Charter of said City, and Ordinance No. 178, as amended, being Chapter 18 of the Code of ordinances of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, have been strictly complied with;

4. That the description of the sanitary sewer, the boundaries of said Sanitary Sewer District, the amounts to be assessed, the number of installments and assessments, the time in which the cost shall be payable, the rate of interest on unpaid installments and the manner of apportioning and assessing such cost, shall be as prescribed in the Resolution adopted for said District on the 3rd day of February, 1971, and in accordance with the published Notice of Intention to Create said District.

5. That after the construction of the sanitary sewer has been let, the Council shall, by resolution, provide for the issuance of public improvement bonds for said Sanitary Sewer District No. 28-71 for the purpose of paying the cost and expenses of construction of said District.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 17th day of March, 1971.

/s/ R. G. Youngerman
President of the Council

ATTEST:

Neva B. Lockhart
City Clerk

It was moved by Councilman Paruch and seconded by Councilman Evans that the Resolution for the creation of Sanitary Sewer District 28-71 be passed and adopted as read. Roll was called on the motion with the following result:

Councilmen voting AYE: Raymond Paruch
Harry Colescott
Ray Meacham
Stanley Anderson
Theodore Naff

Robert Evans
Richard Youngerman

Councilmen voting NAY: None

The President declared the motion carried.

AIRPORT - WALKER FIELD, COLORADO, PUBLIC AIRPORT AUTHORITY -
HEARING CREATING

This date had been set for a hearing upon the creation of a Public Airport Authority. Mr. Bernard Dangler, 1630 Juniper Court, came before the Council to comment regarding the Airport and the proposed extension. Mr. Dangler said that in numerous articles he has read in recent months there have been thousands of layoffs in the aerospace industry, also, thousands of pilot and crew personnel layoffs. He noted that the Denver Post and The Daily Sentinel have reported different airlines are scheduling cutbacks in their flights. Mr. Dangler said he wondered if we are expanding a facility at a time when the airlines are cutting back on air activity. If plans are made to expand the facility and mortgage the properties which is owned by all the citizens, then Mr. Dangler felt he would be remiss as a citizen not to point out that this has to be paid off.

Councilman Meacham suggested that since this was a hearing on the formation of a Public Airport Authority rather than the extension of the runway, it might get mixed up if all proposed expansions at the Airport were considered along with the Airport Authority.

Mr. Dangler said that the creation of the Airport Authority would be for the purpose of expending about two and one-half million dollars of the taxpayers' money, and therefore, they go hand-in-glove.

President of the Council Youngerman commented that we are not mortgaging any property to set up the Airport Authority. It will all be run with revenue from the Airport. The Airport Authority itself has no power to tax.

Mr. Dangler said that his understanding is that the revenue from the Airport is a source of income to the City-County Authority. Mr. Dangler asked City Manager Gray where the money goes.

City Manager Richard Gray said that the revenue generated at the Airport goes to the Airport Fund to run the Airport. No money is taken from that Fund for either the County General Fund or the City General Fund. The Airport is owned fifty-fifty by the City of Grand Junction and the County of Mesa. At the present time, the Airport Board consists of three County Commissioners and three City Councilmen acting as an advisory board whose actions must be ratified by the City Council and the Board of County

Commissioners. The creation of the Airport Authority would make the Airport Board an autonomous unit.

Mr. Dangler asked City Manager Gray if the Airport was not considered an asset to the County, yielding a substantial block of income to this County, and pointing out that the million dollar debt would be a mortgage on that asset.

City Manager Gray replied that certainly the Airport is an "asset" to this County and City, but he would use the term in quotes in that it is not an income to Mesa County or the City of Grand Junction. It is an asset to this community to have the Airport, and it has been the best opinion of those on the Airport Board and those who advise the Airport Board that if this asset is to grow and continue to be an asset, then a runway extension is needed due to the altitude and heat factor here. A revenue bond issue is not a mortgage. It does not have the same general obligation debt commitment that a general obligation bond issue would have. If the Airport Authority decides to issue a million dollars worth of revenue bonds, the only pledge that the bondholder has is that revenues from the Airport will pay this off. If it doesn't, then the bondholder has no foreclosure power; there is no way he can come back against the property to recoup his investment.

Mr. Roger Scholbe, representing the Airport Committee of the Chamber of Commerce, came before the Council and said that the Committee strongly feels that the formation of an Airport Authority for Walker Field is a very definite, strong step in the right@direction, not only for the present improvements being considered but also for the future of the Airport and the entire area in Colorado West. The creation of an Airport Authority is a must for the economy of the area and for the continued growth of the area. Mr. Scholbe recommended that the formation of the Airport Authority be finalized by the Council at this meeting for the benefit of all in this area.

City Attorney Ashby read a letter and a review of the Public Airport Authority Law from O.R. Dowdell, Chairman of the Taxpayers' Association of Mesa County. Mr. Dowdell requested a point-by-point discussion of the review, as follows:

"March 17, 1971

City Council
City of Grand Junction
Grand Junction, Colorado 81501

Gentlemen:

I have prepared a review of the Public Airport Authority Law. I request this review, copy of which is attached, be discussed point by point and become a part of the record of this public

meeting.

If the Council or the City Attorney cannot explain the sections clearly, I request this meeting be recessed until such time as an opinion may be obtained from the State Attorney General's Office.
Respectfully submitted,
O.R. Dowdell, Chairman

Taxpayers Association of Mesa County"

Chapter 5- ARTICLE 5- PUBLIC AIRPORT
AUTHORITY LAW

Question 1. Section 5-5-2- "Purpose of Article" - states the airport authority will constitute a political subdivision of the state of Colorado. Please explain what is meant by political subdivision of the state; why the City of Grand Junction and Mesa County cannot operate an airport without becoming a political subdivision of the state; and what local powers will be relinquished to the state.

Answer: Of course, the City of Grand Junction and Mesa County are also political subdivisions of the State, and they can operate an Airport which they have been doing. The necessity for the setting up of the Airport Authority is perhaps twofold--one being that it permits that type of a vehicle that may issue revenue bonds as one single entity. These revenue bonds by statutory authority are double tax exempt. Any bonds issued by the City of Grand Junction would be only singly tax exempt. If the bonds, rather than being issued by the Public Airport Authority were issued by the City of Grand Junction besides this single tax exemption, there is an additional difficulty in securing what would be a satisfactory arrangement in regard to Mesa County and a pledge of revenue. So the design of this is to accomplish the legal entity that can most easily issue the revenue bonds plus the fact that the bonds become doubly tax exempt. There will be no local powers relinquished to the State; the powers will remain here--it is proposed in the by-laws, with it set up actually in the initial ordinance, that the composition of the Airport Authority will be three County Commissioners and three members of the City Council of the City of Grand Junction.

Question 2. Section 5-5-2 - states the financing, of the cost of acquiring airports by the authority will be handled by the issuance of bonds or other obligations - what will be or can be included as other obligations and does this mean that the authority will become the legal owner of the airport?

Answer 2. The Authority will become the legal owner of the Airport. It is anticipated that the properties now held jointly by the City of Grand Junction and the County of Mesa, and one piece of property now held by the County of Mesa alone, would be transferred to the Airport Authority. It becomes the legal

entity that will operate the Airport. The other obligations that reference is made--the present plan, as has been indicated here by the conversation, is solely the issuance of the revenue bonds. There is authority within the act to mortgage property of the Airport. This is not within the contemplation of anything that has been discussed at any time by anybody.

Question 3. Section 5-5-2 - states the bonds or other obligations will be issued without the incurrance of an indebtedness by the State or any of its political subdivisions - if the airport authority is a political subdivision of the state, Just who is responsible for the indebtedness incurred by the authority?

Answer 3. As Mr. Gray indicated to Mr. Dangler, when you talk about revenue bonds you repay revenue bonds out of the revenue of the Airport, and this is not what is referred to as indebtedness of the Authority or the indebtedness of the State or any of the political subdivisions. It is not a debt in the sense that they are talking about here, because it is payable solely out of the revenue.

Question 4. Section 5-5-4 - "Creation of authorities" - Subsection 2 states that the authority may be increased from time to time to include one or more additional counties or municipalities and that all rights, contracts, obligations, and property, both real and personal of such county or municipality used for or in relation to transportation by air shall vest in the Airport Authority, unless otherwise specifically provided by the resolution including them does this mean that after we in Mesa County incur a million dollars indebtedness, Garfield County, Montrose County, the city of Rifle, or any other county or municipality can become a bonafide partner and by resolution contribute nothing?

Answer 4. The inclusion of somebody else within the Authority, I assume, could be handled in almost any way that the Authority chose to handle it, including, I would presume, that they could come in without paying anything. It would be a part of our Airport if the Authority chose to do this; but Montrose County has an airport; the City of Rifle has an airport; I can't imagine Garfield County or any of these other counties joining in. You might have somebody like the town of Fruita, of the town of Palisade or somebody joining rather than some other County, because it wouldn't be of any benefit to them to come in and to work within our Airport Authority.

Question 5. Section 5-5-4 - Subsection 3 states the authority may be decreased if each of the members and the Board consent to the decrease and make provision for the retention or disposition of the assets and liabilities of the county or municipality; BUT, if the authority has any bonds outstanding, no such decrease shall be affected until at least 75% of the holders of the outstanding bonds of the authority consent to in writing, or

unless the board determines that such decrease will not affect adversely the rights of the holders of such outstanding bonds. Is it reasonable to assume that once the authority is obligated for a million dollars in bonds, 75% of the holders of the bonds will consent to dissolution of the authority or even to the withdrawal of one member county or municipality? When the representative from the bonding company was here in February he said all you had to do to withdraw was just to get out, which according to the law is a false statement.

Answer 5. When Mr. Dowdell was at the other hearing (the Board of County Commissioner's hearing we commented about this, and we commented in particular about what the representative of the bonding company had indicated. I am sure when the representative of the bonding company spoke, he was not speaking in the connotation that is here presented. I would say that having borrowed the money of these bondholders that you then have to obviously, cater in part to the bondholder. You could not do anything in regard to the Airport Authority that would prejudice the bondholder because, after all, he had loaned you his money and was entitled to some protection on that, at least to the extent of the obligation within the bond itself which would be the revenue. So I am not sure that it's unreasonable to have the requirement that at least protects him in regard to the money loaned. This is as any of us would have it on any money that we borrow.

Question 6. Section 5-5-4 - Subsection 6 states that the authority shall cease to exist upon filing with the secretary of state a certified resolution of each county or municipality composing the authority, requesting the termination of the authority; BUT adequate provisions shall be made for the payment of the outstanding bonds. This is also an apparent contradiction to statements made by the bonding company representative and to date has not been publicly corrected by the City Council or the City Attorney. The Council and the Attorney were present at this meeting.

Answer 6. I think approximately the same answer pertains to this one as pertained to the one before. There is an obligation generated by the borrowing of the money and by the issuance of the bonds and becomes something that is primary within this setup proposed. To that extent the bondholders have to be considered in regard to dissolution or in regard to withdrawal of members. And again I would state that I think that the representative from Boettcher, when he indicated that you can just get out by withdrawing, was, in the text that he was then talking, correct. He would not be correct in regard to these two sections upon which these two questions are based.

Question 7. Section 5-5-4 Subsection 7 states that the general assembly may, by law, authorize the governor, on behalf of the state, to join in the creation of any airport authority or to

join any existing airport authority. The law does not say they may come into the authority by invitation only, but their own choice. What advantage would there be to the local citizens if the state chooses to become a part of our so-called local airport authority?

Answer 7. Actually, they do come in only by invitation. I think that is implicit in the particular sections. Mr. Byrom indicated at the meeting of the Commissioners that there are instances where a particular area cannot hope to come up with the monies necessary to set up a proper Airport where the State is interested in coming in, or where there is a particular type of perhaps larger airport than would be normally contemplated by a particular area where the State will and does want to come in and is asked to come in by the people in the particular area; or maybe the State is even the moving party in setting up the Authority in that area. But they don't come in just because they say they want to come in; they come in because it's intelligent for them to come in, and it's intelligent for the local people to ask of them that they come in.

Question 8. Section 5-5-5 - "Board of Commissioners" - Subsection 6 states the state member of members of the Board shall be appointed by the governor, with the consent of the senate - Why give up local control to appointed officials?

Answer 8. In the instance of our local Authority for example the two entities will be the City of Grand Junction, if it is approved, and Mesa County. Mesa County will select its representatives, the City of Grand Junction will select its representatives, and certainly, if the State were a party to this, it should have the right to select its representatives. So you would give local control to the extent that you involve somebody other than local people within the Authority. So if you involve the State, you would have a nine-member board; you would have three members selected by the State; you would have three members selected by the City; and three members selected by the County.

Question 9. Section 5-5-5 - Subsection 5.i. states and any action on the part of the board to raise or increase revenue from any source whatsoever for the purposes of the authority shall be subject to approval of the board, please explain how the authority will be raising or increasing revenue and what is meant by from any source whatsoever.

Answer 9. I think the "from any source whatsoever" means just exactly that --it's to the interest of the Board, obviously, to get as much revenue from that Airport as it is possible. Because it is only with that revenue that they are going to pay off those bonds. It's only with that revenue that they are going to make any other necessary improvements out there. Mr. Byrom also indicated at the County Commissioners' Meeting, we are constantly searching out there for other sources of revenue hoping that the

sources of revenue that are presently out there will increase as they have in the past, and to that end this thing about the landing fees of the carriers, all of these things will be used to generate revenue income.

Question 10. Section 5-5-6 - "Powers of the authority" - Subsection (I) (f) To borrow money and to issue bonds payable in whole or in part from the income of the authority - how can the authority borrow money if as a political subdivision of the state it cannot incur indebtedness as stated in Section 5-5-2?

Answer 10. Again I would say that when they talk about indebtedness there, they are not talking about indebtedness as the issuance of revenue bonds. This is something other than that, and this is the indebtedness that is prohibited. But they may issue bonds which when they say payable in whole or in part from the income of the Authority. If there are other sources of revenue, then I would remind everybody again that the Authority has no taxing power, but if monies were contributed to it, if monies were given by the Federal Government to it, if monies were put into it by the City and the County, these would be within that frame of "in part" for the income of the Authority because they would be monies other than the income of the Authority.

Question 11. Section 5-5-6 further states that before any money shall be borrowed or any bonds issued, such borrowing or sale shall first be approved by the board. Said bonds shall be authorized by resolution of the Board without the necessity of submitting the question of their issuance to the qualified electors of the municipalities or counties constituting members of the authority, or at all. Said resolution shall prescribe the form of said bonds, the manner of their execution, which may be effected by the use of the facsimile signatures of the officers of the authority. This same section further outlines the terms of sale of bonds.

First of all, I am concerned that considering such a large sum of money is involved, the question of whether or not to create an airport authority is not included in the next county-wide election, but I am doubly concerned that business can be transacted by the use of facsimile or rubber-stamped signatures of the officers of the authority.

Answer 11. On the County-wide election, this is a matter of policy to which I could not comment, because it isn't up to me to determine policy. It is true that the revenue bonds of the Authority may be issued without a vote of the people. This business of "facsimile" or "rubber-stamped signatures" is not uncommon. It is used quite extensively in government; but it doesn't carry the connotation that I think is here indicated by the use of a "facsimile signature, all sorts of bad things may happen." Usually it is a matter of convenience. The facsimile signatures and the imprinting of those signatures is handled in

such a way that there is no chance that any problem will arise. I think Mr. Manchester, who was at the Commissioners' meeting, indicated that on most bonds there will be one valid signature and then all the rest will be facsimile. So this is not an uncommon thing, and it is a time-saver and it is not done in a way that creates any difficulty.

Question 12. Section 5-5-6 - Subsection (K) gives the authority the power to exercise the power of eminent domain for the condemnation of private property for public use to take any property necessary to exercise the powers in this article granted, either within or without the boundaries of the municipalities or counties constituting members of the authority. Nothing in this article shall be construed to limit the power of a county otherwise to acquire property through the exercise of the power of eminent domain.

Can one assume the authority, once established, can completely ignore county or even state boundary lines?

Answer 12. State boundary lines they could not ignore because the power of eminent domain for the County or the City or the Public Airport Authority would not extend into another State. I think the thing here is the intention to give the Authority that same power of condemnation that most legal entities have. It is broad enough to permit, in the event that you were near the boundary of a county, the condemnation of the land of another county which would not be a standard thing. But I don't think it is anything different here than that broad authority given for eminent domain for public entities of this type.

Mr. Dowdell nor any members of the Taxpayers' Association of Mesa County were present.

Councilman Colescott suggested that the three board members from the City Council be chosen every two years. City Attorney Ashby said that the Statutory Authority itself provides that the terms shall be for four years.

Councilman Paruch wanted it clarified that in the event a Councilman is appointed to the Authority for four years and he serves two years and then is not re-elected to the Council, then it is the City Council who appoints another Councilman to fill the vacancy. Councilman Paruch also asked about the two-thirds of the total membership of the Board of Commissioners constituting a quorum necessary for the transaction of any business to come before any regular or special meeting. But all questions involving the inclusion or exclusion of a municipality or county in or from this Authority for fixed specials shall require the affirmative majority vote of the entire membership. City Manager Gray said that for those fixed specials, there would have to be four "yes" votes, and if only four showed up for a quorum they would all four have to vote "yes."

Councilman Naff commented that he is in agreement that there is a need for the Airport Authority in that everything must be brought back to the City Council and the County Commissioners for ratification. He feels, however, that the public is being bypassed in the selling of the bonds.

President of the Council Youngerman explained that the Airport Authority is a vehicle whereby revenue bonds can be issued. The County cannot issue revenue bonds, but the City can. Elected officials should be able to act without having to take every issue to a vote of the people.

Councilman Colescott asked about the budget for the Airport. City Manager Gray said that if the Authority is formed as an autonomous unit and if the Authority is contracting with the City to provide the Personnel to service it, then the City Manager, the Finance Director, and the Airport Director would prepare a budget and submit it to the Airport Authority. The final decision of the Authority on this budget within the revenues that they project from the Airport would be final, and it would not come to the City Council as it has in the past. It would not go to the Board of County Commissioners as it has in the past. It would stop at the Airport Authority. If the City is the contracting agency, Mr. Gray would suggest that probably in future City budgets, the Airport budget would be shown but would be set in the back as are other special funds. The City would be administering it, but it would be the Authority's budget, not the City Council's.

Councilman Anderson commented that the State Statute requires that all political subdivisions prepare a budget and submit it for expenditure of public funds, even though the By-Laws of the Authority does not mention a budget.

The President of the Council closed the hearing.

City Attorney Ashby said that the ordinance, which was prepared by bond counsel, provides, as did the Resolution for the County Commissioners a place within the ordinance itself to designate those three members of the Council who are to be the initial members of the Board.

It was moved by Councilman Meacham and seconded by Councilman Evans that the present three members of the City Council, Richard Youngerman, Ray Meacham, and Stanley Anderson, be named as the original three members to the Airport Authority. Motion carried.

City Attorney Ashby said that the ordinance was prepared as an emergency ordinance which, if passed, would become effective upon its passage and publication within three days. In order for it to be passed as an emergency ordinance, it requires the affirmative vote of all seven members of the Council.

The following entitled Emergency ordinance was presented and read: AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, ACTING JOINTLY WITH THE COUNTY OF MESA TO CREATE A PUBLIC AIRPORT AUTHORITY, DESIGNATING THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE AUTHORITY TO REPRESENT THE CITY ON SAID BOARD AND THE TERMS THEREOF; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

It was moved by Councilman Anderson and seconded by Councilman Evans that the Emergency Ordinance be passed by roll call, adopted, numbered 1388, and ordered published. Roll was called on the motion with the following result:

Councilmen voting AYE: Raymond Paruch
 Harry Colescott
 Ray Meacham
 Stanley Anderson
 Robert Evans
 Richard Youngerman

Councilman voting NAY: Theodore Naff

A motion was made by Councilman Meacham and seconded by Councilman Anderson that the proposed ordinance to create a Public Airport Authority be passed for publication. Motion carried.

As a matter of discussion, Councilman Anderson said this would put off the adoption of an Airport Authority for forty-four days. The situation would then be that the Airport Authority would not be in a position to issue revenue bonds in a now-favorable market. In fact, the market of revenue bonds has been increasing in cost in the last several weeks. The Twenty Bond Buyer's Index has risen from around 5.14 to 5.37 in the last two to three weeks. If this is an indication of future trends, by the time that we are ready to issue bonds for an Airport Authority in another forty-four to sixty or seventy-five days as the case may be, the Bond Buyer's Index could very well be up around six once again. This might mean an additional cost of somewhere around \$40,000 to \$50,000 over the life of the issue of this bond which is anticipated to be sixteen years. If we do intend to create an Airport Authority at any rate, it would be well to create it as an emergency ordinance, get the job done, and be in a position to sell these bonds in a market more favorable to the sale of these bonds at this point in time. Councilman Anderson said he appreciates the fact that Councilman Naff has the prerogative to vote the way he wishes, but since the intent is to create the Authority anyway, perhaps Mr. Naff would be inclined to change his vote.

Councilman Naff said that since the Airport Authority would be created anyway, and with the bond market situation as it is, he would change his vote for the emergency ordinance. However, he

wanted the record to show he had first voted NAY.

A motion was then made by Councilman Anderson and seconded by Councilman Meacham that the Emergency ordinance be passed, adopted, numbered 1388, and ordered published. Roll was called on the motion with all seven members of the Council voting AYE. The President declared the motion carried.

Councilman Meacham left the meeting at this time.

DAYS - BOOKCLIFF JUNIOR HIGH FRENCH CLUB REQUEST TO SELL GARDEN SEEDS - GRANTED

Charles Brown and Randy Williams of the Bookcliff Junior High School French Club appeared before the Council to request permission to sell gardening seeds in the Shopping Park on Saturday, March 20, 1971. The group plans to use the proceeds to help pay for a trip to Quebec.

It was moved by Councilman Anderson and seconded by Councilman Naff that the Bookcliff Junior High French Club be granted permission to sell gardening seeds in the Shopping Park on Saturday, March 20. Motion carried.

DAYS - DOWNTOWN RETAIL MERCHANTS REQUEST CLOSE MAIN STREET BETWEEN 5TH AND 6TH ON MARCH 27 - GRANTED

Mr. Guy Stephens representing the Downtown Retail Merchants, appeared before the Council to request permission to close the Shopping Park between 5th Street and 6th Street on Saturday, March 27, for a fashion show and art demonstration. They want to have the street closed early in the morning and should be ready for opening early in the afternoon.

It was moved by Councilman Paruch and seconded by Councilman Anderson that the Downtown Retail Merchants be granted permission for the closure of the Shopping Park between 5th and 6th Streets on Saturday, March 27, 1971. Motion carried.

SUPPORT MERCHANT POLICE ORDINANCE

Mr. Stephens also said that the Downtown Retail Trade Committee would like to go on record in support of the proposed ordinance in regard to the merchant police.

N. 6TH STREET - BUY RIGHT-OF-WAY TO EXTEND FROM BOOKCLIFF TO CENTER

Mr. Don Warner, Development Director, appeared before the Council to explain that it will take a total of \$9,215 to acquire the right-of-way to extend 6th Street from Bookcliff Avenue to Center Avenue -- \$9,000 for the purchase of the house and the east part of the right-of-way from Doctor Rigg and \$215 for the west part

of the right-of-Way from Mr. Shaw. Action on the acquisition of this right-of-way was tabled at the January 20, 1971, Council meeting.

It was moved by Councilman Colescott and seconded by Councilman Naff for the City Manager to authorize the checks and to sign the necessary papers for the purchase of the right-of-way from Doctor Rigg and Mr. Shaw. Motion carried, with Councilman Evans voting NAY.

ORDINANCE NO. 1389 - I.D. ST-70 ASSESSMENTS

The Proof of Publication to the following entitled proposed ordinance was presented and read: AN ORDINANCE APPROVING THE WHOLE COST OF THE IMPROVEMENTS MADE IN AND FOR IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. ST-70, 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; APPROVING THE APPORTIONMENT OF SAID COST AND PRESCRIBING THE MANNER FOR THE COLLECTION AND PAYMENT OF SAID ASSESSMENTS. It was moved by Councilman Anderson and seconded by Councilman Paruch that the Proof of Publication be accepted and filed. Motion carried.

It was moved by Councilman Anderson and seconded by Councilman Evans that the proposed ordinance be called up for final passage and read. Motion carried.

The ordinance was read. There being no comments, it was moved by Councilman Colescott and seconded by Councilman Naff that the ordinance be passed, adopted, numbered 1380, and ordered published. Roll call was called on the motion with all members of the Council present voting AYE. The President declared the motion carried.

ORDINANCE NO. 1390 - EASEMENT VACATION - OLYMPIC ACRES SUB

The Proof of Publication to the following entitled proposed ordinance was presented and read: AN ORDINANCE VACATING AN EASEMENT IN THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION. It was moved by Councilman Anderson and seconded by Councilman Evans that the Proof of Publication be accepted and filed. Motion carried.

It was moved by Councilman Naff and seconded by Councilman Paruch that the proposed ordinance be called up for final passage and read. Motion carried.

The ordinance was read. There being no comments, it was moved by Councilman Naff and seconded by Councilman Anderson that the ordinance be passed, adopted, numbered 1390, and ordered published. Roll was called on the motion with all members of the

Council present voting AYE. The President declared the motion carried.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE - MERCHANT POLICE TABLED

Councilman Anderson asked for a deferment on the proposed ordinance regulating merchant police so that a pre-agenda meeting with Chief of Police Karl Johnson, members of the merchant police, and the City Council can be arranged for discussion. A Monday noon meeting on March 29, 1971, was scheduled.

PEACH ANNEXATION - 20 ACRE TRACT NORTH OF PATTERSON ROAD BETWEEN 27 1/2 AND 27 3/4 ROAD

The Peach Annexation is for a twenty-acre tract north of Patterson Road between 27 1/2 Road and 27 3/4 Road. One hundred per cent signatures are on the petition, as follows:

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 East 25 feet of the South Half of the Southeast one-quarter of the Southwest one-quarter of Section 1 Township 1 South, Range 1 West, Ute Meridian, except the South 30 feet thereof.

Also, the South One Half of the Southwest One Quarter of the Southeast One-Quarter of Section 1, Township 1 South, Range 1 West, Ute Meridian except the South 30 feet thereof. All in Mesa County, Colorado.

As ground therefor, I the petitioner, respectfully state that annexation to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, is both necessary and desirable and that the said territory is eligible for annexation in that the provisions of the Municipal Annexation Act of 1965, Sections 3 and 4 have been met.

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 one hundred percent of the area of such territory to be annexed, exclusive of streets and alleys; that the mailing address of each signer and the date of signature are set forth hereafter opposite the name of each signer, and that the legal description of the property owned by each signer of said petition is attached hereto.

WHEREFORE, these petitioners pray that this petition be accepted

and that said annexation be approved and accepted by ordinance.

Date	Signature	Address	Property Description
3-8-71	Warie L. Peach	624 27 1/2 Rd	The South Half of the Southwest One Quarter of the Southeast One Quarter
3-8-71	Melden A. Peach	624 27 1/2 Rd	of Section 1, T1S, R1W, U.M., also, East 25 feet of the South Half Southeast one Quarter of the Southwest One Quarter Section 1, T1S, R1W, U.M., except the South Quarter
			30 feet thereof, also, the South One Half of the Southeast one Quarter of Section 1, T1S, R1W, U.M., the South 30 feet thereof. All in Mesa County, Colorado.

STATE OF COLORADO

Ss

AFFIDAVIT

COUNTY OF MESA

Belva J. Bamford, 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) Belva J. Bamford

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 16th day of March, 1971.

Witness my hand and official seal.

(Signed) Donald H. Warner
Notary Public

My Commission expires: April 3, 1971

The following Resolution was presented and read:

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, on the 15th day of March, 1971, a petition was submitted to the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, for annexation to said City of the following property, to-wit:

The East twenty-five (25) feet of the South Half of the Southeast one-Quarter of the Southwest One-Quarter of Section 1, Township 1 South, Range 1 West, Ute Meridian, except the South Thirty (30) feet thereof;

ALSO, the South One Half of the Southwest One Quarter of the Southeast One-Quarter of Section 1, Township 1 South, Range 1 West, Ute Meridian, except the South Thirty (30) feet thereof, All in Mesa County, Colorado.

WHEREAS, the Council has found and determined and does hereby find and determine, that said petition is in substantial compliance with statutory requirements therefor, that one-sixth of the perimeter of the area proposed to be annexed is contiguous with the City, that a community of interest exists between the territory and the City, that the territory proposed to be annexed is urban or will be urbanized in the near future, that the said territory is integrated or is capable of being integrated with said City, and, that no election is required under the Municipal Annexation Act of 1965, as the owners of one hundred percent of the property have petitioned for annexation;

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

That the said territory is eligible for annexation to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, and should be so annexed by ordinance.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 17th day of March, 1971.

(Signed) R. G. Youngerman
President of the Council

ATTEST

(Signed) Neva B. Lockhart
City Clerk

It was moved by Councilman Anderson and seconded by Councilman Evans that the Resolution be passed and adopted as read. Roll was called upon the motion with all members of the Council present voting AYE. The President declared the motion carried.

The following entitled proposed ordinance was introduced and read: AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO. It was moved by Councilman Anderson and seconded by Councilman Paruch that the proposed ordinance be

passed for publication. Motion carried.

ANNEXATION - UNITY CHURCH, 41 ACRE TRACT BETWEEN 12TH & HORIZON DRIVE - PETITION - RESOLUTION

The Unity Church Annexation is a forty-acre tract between 12th Street and Horizon Drive. The petition has one hundred per cent signers, as follows:

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:

All of the Northeast Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 2, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian South and East of Horizon Drive right of way excepting the East 40 feet of said Northeast Quarter of the Southeast Quarter.

As ground therefor, the petitioners respectfully state that annexation to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado is both necessary and desirable and that the said territory is eligible for annexation in that the provisions of the Municipal Annexation Act of 1965, Sections 3 and 4 have been met.

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 one hundred per cent of the area of such territory to be annexed, exclusive of streets and alleys; that the mailing address of each signer and the date of signature are set forth hereafter opposite the name of each signer, and that the legal description of the property owned by each signer of said petition is attached hereto.

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

<u>Date</u>	<u>Signature</u>	<u>Property Description</u>
3-10-71	A. H. Gould (s)	All of the Northeast quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Sec 2 T1S, R1W, of UM, EXCEPT the
	following:	
3-16-71	Anne B. Gould (s)	1. Commencing at the NE corner of said NE 1/4 SE 1/4 of said
Section		2, thence North 89°59'

West 528 3-10-71 Mabel B. Donaldson feet, the South 330
ft; thence South 89°59' East

528 ft.; thence
3-10-71 Dean W. Donaldson

- North to the point of beg.
- 2. Right of way for the Grand Valley Irrigation Company, recorded in Book 71 at Page 430 of records of Mesa County.
- 3. Conveyance to Mesa County recorded in Book 877 at Page 361 of the records of Mesa County.
- 4. Conveyance to Mesa County recorded in Book 877 at Page 363 of the records of Mesa County.

corded
the

3-10-71 Dean W. Donaldson
3-10-71 Mabel B. Donaldson
3-10-71 Jeanine Kendall (s)
Secy of Board of Unity of G.J.
3-10-71 George Green (s)
Pres of Board of Unity of G.J.

Commencing at the NE corner of the NE 1/4 of the SE 1/4 of Sec 2, T1S, R1W of the UM, thence North 89°59' West 528 ft, thence South 330 ft, thence South 89°59' East 528 ft, thence North to point of beginning.

- - - - -

STATE OF COLORADO)
) Ss
COUNTY OF M E S A)

AFFIDAVIT

Arch H. Gould, 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) Arch H. Gould

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 16th day of March, 1971.

Witness my hand and official seal.

(Signed) Donald H. Warner, Jr.
Notary Public

My Commission expires: April 3, 1971

The following Resolution was presented and read:

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, on the 15th day of March, 1971, a petition was submitted to the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, for annexation to said City of the following property, to-wit:

All of the Northeast Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 2, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian South and East of Horizon Drive right of way excepting The East forty (40) feet of said Northeast Quarter of the Southeast Quarter.

WHEREAS, the Council has found and determined, and does hereby find and determine, that said petition is in substantial compliance with statutory requirements therefor, that one-sixth of the perimeter of the area proposed to be annexed is contiguous with the City, that a community of interest exists between the territory and the city, that the territory proposed to be annexed is urban or will be urbanized in the near future, that the said territory is integrated or is capable of being integrated with said City, and, that no election is required under the Municipal Annexation Act of 1965, as the owners of one hundred percent of the property have petitioned for annexation;

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

That the said territory is eligible for annexation to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, and should be so annexed by Ordinance.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 17th day of March, 1971.

(s) R. G. Youngerman
President of the Council

ATTEST:
(s) Neva B. Lockhart
City Clerk

It was moved by Councilman Paruch and seconded by Councilman Anderson that the Resolution be passed and adopted as read. Roll was called upon the motion with all members of the Council present voting AYE. The President declared the motion carried.

The following entitled proposed ordinance was introduced and read: AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO. It was moved by Councilman Anderson and seconded by Councilman Evans that the proposed ordinance be passed for publication. Motion carried.

ELECTION - REGULAR 4-6-71 - NOTICE - RESOLUTION

The following Resolution was presented and read:

R E S O L U T I O N

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

That the election notice hereinafter set out be the Notice of the General Municipal Election to be held in the City on April 6, 1971, and, further that same be published in accordance with election procedures:

E L E C T I O N O T I C E

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO
NOTICE OF GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON
TUESDAY, THE 6TH DAY OF APRIL, 1971

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION WILL BE HELD ON TUESDAY, THE 6TH DAY OF APRIL, 1971, IN THE POLLING PLACES HEREINAFTER DESIGNATED IN THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO.

That said General Municipal Election will be held at the several polling places in the several districts of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, in the State aforesaid as follows:

DISTRICT "A", POLLING PLACE	Williams Chrysler/Plymouth Garage, 224 N. 7th St.
DISTRICT "B" POLLING PLACE	Grand Junction High School 1400 N. 5th St. Gym
DISTRICT "C" POLLING PLACE	Orchard Avenue School 18th St. & Orchard Ave.
DISTRICT "D" POLLING PLACE	Mesa College Physical Education Building 12th St. & Orchard Ave.
DISTRICT "E" POLLING PLACE	Lincoln Park Auditorium Lincoln Park

Upon the date and at the places designated aforesaid, the polls will be open from the hour of 7 o'clock A. M. to and including and will be closed at the hour of 7 o'clock P.M. Voting machines will be provided in each polling place for the election. The election will be held and conducted as nearly as may be, as prescribed by law for the election of municipal officers. Registration for the said election will take place in the manner now provided by Ordinance and law.

That at said election a member of the City Council will be elected from each of two election districts (i.e. Districts "B" and "C") and one from the City at Large.

DISTRICT "B"

Fred R. Allen
Bernard Dangler
A. W. Douglas
Lawrence L. Kozisek
Ray A. Meacham
(Ray A. Meacham withdrew his nomination on March 19, 1971.)

DISTRICT "C"

Stanley Anderson
James Witt

CITY AT LARGE

Charles Boyes
Silas Grantham
Harold W. West

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, has caused this Notice to be published and posted as required by law, and dated this 17th day of March, 1971.

Neva B. Lockhart
City Clerk

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 17th day of March, 1971

Richard G. Youngerman
President of the Council

Attest:

Neva B. Lockhart
City Clerk

It was moved by Councilman Anderson and seconded by Councilman Colescott that the Resolution be passed and adopted as read. Roll was called on the motion with all members of the Council present voting AYE. The President declared the motion carried.

ELECTION - JUDGES OF ELECTION - RESOLUTION

The following Resolution was presented and read:

R E S O L U T I O N

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Grand Junction:

That the following persons be, and they are hereby, appointed as Judges and Alternates of the Regular Municipal Election to be

held in the City on April 6, 1971:

DISTRICT "A"

Judges

Opal Bakker
Viola Hartman
Marie Nowlan
Fay Elsberry
Margie Lopas

Alternates

Mildred Ekinan
Mae Tracy
Mabel White

DISTRICT "B"

Elsie Eggers
Carol Cadez
Edith Clodfelter
Grace Lacko
W. E. Swann

Edna White
Treva Williams
Mildred Sand

DISTRICT "C"

Ethel Sutrina
Elva Lindsay
Clare Peeso
Carol LaCour
Erna Schlesselman

Gwendoline Bush
Ermine Egger
Eudona Ficklin

DISTRICT "D"

Nora Peterson
Esther Knowles
Jessie Daskam
Esther Granat
Leona Watson

Earl D. Hilles
Marilyn Johnson
Charles Love

DISTRICT "E"

Cora Hutton
Kathryn Harper
Lillie Keplinger
Genevieve Erskine
Mildred Collins

Reba Wing
Ann Moss
Velma Andrew

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 17th day of March, 1971.

R. G. Youngerman
President of the Council

ATTEST:

Neva B. Lockhart
City Clerk

It was moved by Councilman Anderson and seconded by Councilman Naff that the Resolution be passed and adopted as read. Roll was called on the motion with all members of the Council present voting AYE. The President declared the motion carried.

ELECTION - DISTRICT "A" TO COUNT ABSENTEE BALLOTS - RESOLUTION

The following Resolution was presented and read:

R E S O L U T I O N

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

That the absentee ballots, if any, cast in the Regular Municipal Election to be held on Tuesday, April 6, 1971, be counted by the Judges of Election for the City's District "A".

Passed and adopted this 17th day of March, 1971.

R. G. Youngerman
President of the City Council

ATTEST:

Neva B. Lockhart
City Clerk

It was moved by Councilman Anderson and seconded by Councilman Paruch that the Resolution be passed and adopted as read. Roll was called on the motion with all members of the Council present voting AYE. The President declared the motion carried.

WATER BILL ADJUSTMENT - DAVID W. JENSEN, 2605 GRAND AVENUE - \$48

City Manager Gray read a letter from Mr. David W. Jensen, 2605 Grand Avenue, requesting a water bill adjustment. Mr. Jensen said that on the 27th of January he had a break in the service line. The water was turned off for two days while the service line break was repaired. City Manager Gray read a "memo" from Utilities Director Plowman in which Mr. Plowman reported the use of 186,000 gallons of water during the break on January 27 at a cost of \$57.65. Usage at this address one year ago was 23,000 gallons at \$8.75. Mr. Gray and Mr. Plowman recommended an adjustment of \$48.90 to Mr. Jensen's account.

It was moved by Councilman Colescott and seconded by Councilman Anderson that an adjustment of \$48.90 be made to the account of Mr. David W. Jensen, 2605 Grand Avenue. Motion carried.

CITY HALL - RE-ALLOCATION OF CITY OFFICE SPACE

City Manager Gray reported that it has been seven years since there has been any interior painting at City Hall. Funds are

budgeted in 1971 for this purpose. During inspection for this work, it was noted that the most crowded condition exists in the Engineering Department where eight employees are working in approximately 400 square feet of office space. It was suggested that the office of Airport Director/Assistant City Engineer be moved into the office currently occupied by Personnel Director Harvey Rose. Then the present office that Mr. Byrom is occupying in the Engineering Department could be opened to give an additional 150 square feet of floor space for drafting tables and work area. Mr. Rose would move into the office that Mr. Gray now occupies and Mr. Gray's office would be moved into the Conference Room. It is believed that this would increase the work efficiency without significantly reducing any City Hall meeting space. City Manager Gray noted that just by moving some furniture, desperately needed additional floor space can be gained for the Engineering Department without the need for construction. The Council agreed to view the planned changes after the Council meeting.

WATER - MC FARLAND ESTATES & POMONA VIEW SUBDIVISIONS TO BE SERVED BY UTE W.C.D. - MAINS NOT UP TO CITY STANDARDS

City Manager Gray reported that the First Fruitridge Pipeline Company had been servicing the McFarland Estates Subdivision area and the Pomona View Subdivision (this area was one of the six annexed to the City last September) prior to 1964 with water they bought from the City. In 1964, they switched from the City to the Ute Water Conservancy District. According to an agreement the City signed with Ute District in 1967, it appears that these customers in the McFarland Estates Subdivision and the Pomona View Subdivision would be the Ute customer either on a bulk water basis by the City buying the water from the Ute and reselling it to the City residents, or for them to deal directly with the Ute Conservancy District. The problem here is that this area has water lines that are not up to the City standard for the fire protection rating. It is going to take, on the part of the water utility servicing this area, an expenditure of approximately \$40,000 to \$50,000 to put 6 inch and 8 inch mains in this area to meet the City standard for the fire protection rating. City Manager Gray read the following letter which is to be mailed to the residents in this area:

"UTE WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT
Post office Box 460
Grand Junction, Colorado 81501

March 26, 1971

It is mandatory to improve the water distribution system that was serviced by the First Fruitridge Pipe Line Co. At the present time, this distribution system does not meet the Fire Underwriters criteria for a class six fire protection rating. With proper planning and budgeting, these improvements will be made

within the next couple of years.

The City had two alternatives: (1) buy water from the Ute District and resell it to the residences involved or (2) allow the Ute District to service the area involved.

Since there will have to be a large expenditure of money to improve the distribution system, the City could not make these improvements without a drastic increase in their water rates to your area. It is believed that the Ute District can make the necessary improvements for proper fire protection while maintaining their current individual rate structure.

Therefore, we are transferring your water account to the Ute Water Conservancy District. Your property lies within the boundaries of the Ute District and the Ute District has the right to claim you as one of their users. In addition, you will be receiving service from the water utility that you have been supporting with a two mill property tax levy for some years.

If you have any questions concerning this, please feel free to call us.

Sincerely,

H. L. Plowman	Riney P. Wilbert
Utilities Director	Manager
City of Grand Junction	Ute Water Conservancy District"

The recommendation is that these customers will become individual Ute customers and Ute will go in to make the necessary improvements in the pipes to bring them up to the standards required.

LINCOLN PARK - PROTECTIVE FENCE AROUND GOLF COURSE - SUGGEST SIDEWALK ALONG NORTH AVENUE

Councilman Paruch commented about how nice the protective fence is around the golf course. He would like Council to reconsider the sidewalk along North Avenue. President of the Council Youngerman said this could be considered in next year's budget.

STREET REPAIRS - COMPLAINTS REGARDING UTILITY CUTS & MENDING HOLES

Also, Councilman Paruch has been receiving numerous complaints regarding the utility cuts and the mending of holes in the streets after the street has been re-surfaced. These seem to be rough and depressed.

City Manager Gray said that in the current issue of the American City magazine is an article stating that some cities are trying a process whereby all cuts of this nature are being

repaired with Portland cement and then a light, slurry seal over the top to match the color and composition. They have found that the Portland cement will hold up and not depress.

TRAFFIC - SPEED LIMITS ON NORTH AVENUE & TRAFFIC LIGHT ON WEST AVENUE & HWY 340

Councilman Anderson said that the speed limit on North Avenue in front of the Teller Arms Shopping area is 40 miles per hour in the westbound lane and is 35 miles per hour in the eastbound lane. He requested that Gus Byrom Traffic Engineer, check into this and also check to see whether there have been any accidents along this area. City Manager Gray said that this would be checked out with the State Highway Department. Councilman Colescott requested the City Manager to inquire about the traffic light for the intersection at West Avenue and State Highway 340 at the same time.

ADJOURNMENT

The President declared the meeting adjourned.

/s/ Neva B. Lockhart
City Clerk