

Grand Junction, Colorado

October 21, 1981

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, convened in regular session the 21st day of October, 1981 at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at City Hall. Those present were Council members Betsy Clark, Frank Dunn, Dale Hollingsworth, Robert Holmes, Karl Johnson, Gary Lucero, and President of the Council Louis Brach, a quorum. Also present were City Manager Jim Wysocki, City Attorney Gerald Ashby, and City Clerk Neva Lockhart.

The President of the Council called the meeting to order and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

INVOCATION

Reverend Fred Parker, New Horizon Foursquare Church.

MINUTES

Councilman Lucero corrected the minutes of the regular meeting October 7, 1981, under the topic "Resolution of Findings - Mesa College application for 3.2% beer" to show that Council members HOLMES and DUNN voted NO. Upon motion by Councilman Lucero, seconded by Councilwoman Clark and carried, the minutes of October 7, 1981, were approved as corrected.

WILLIAM G. O'DWYER APPOINTED TO PLANNING COMMISSION - TERM TO EXPIRE JANUARY, 1985

By secret ballot, William G. O'Dwyer was appointed to the Planning Commission to serve the term left vacant by the recent resignation of Tom Price. Mr. O'Dwyer's term runs through January, 1985.

OCTOBER 24 THROUGH 28, 1981, PROCLAIMED "AFRICAN EDUCATOR DAYS"

The President of the Council proclaimed October 24 through 28, 1981, "African Educator Days" in the City of Grand Junction in recognition of the selection of the City of Grand Junction being one of six communities to entertain three African educators sponsored by the American Association of University Women, Grand Junction Branch.

LIQUOR AND BEER LICENSE RENEWALS

Upon motion by Councilman Hollingsworth, seconded by Councilman Dunn and carried, with Councilman HOLMES voting NO, the applications by the following businesses for the renewal of liquor and beer licenses were approved:

1. Gas Rite, 745 Horizon Drive (3.2% Beer)
2. Redlands Liquor, 2516 Broadway (Liquor Store)

3. Circle K Store, 2685 UnawEEP (3.2% Beer)
4. Reverse R Bar, 122 S. Fifth Street (Tavern)
5. Safeway Store No. 603, 2686 Hwy 50 (3.2% Beer)

TAVERN LIQUOR LICENSE APPROVED FOR QUINCY BAR & GRILL, 609 MAIN STREET

Upon motion by Councilman Hollingsworth, seconded by Councilman Dunn and carried with Councilman HOLMES voting NO, the application by Phillip L. Freitas for a tavern liquor license at Quincy Bar & Grill, 609 Main Street, was approved. This change of ownership is dissolving the partnership between Phillip L. Freitas and Gordon E. Rhodes.

HOTEL-RESTAURANT LIQUOR LICENSE APPROVED FOR EL ESCONDIDO, INC., 509 28 1/2 ROAD

Upon motion by Councilman Hollingsworth, seconded by Councilman Dunn and carried with Councilman HOLMES voting NO, and Councilman LUCERO ABSTAINING, the application by El Escondido, Inc., for hotel-restaurant liquor license at 509 28 1/2 Road, was approved. This is a change of ownership from single ownership by Levi Lucero to corporate ownership by the Lucero family.

HEARING - PROPOSED ORDINANCE - ZONE NORTH 12TH STREET ENCLAVE ANNEXATION TO RSF-4, SOUTHEASTERLY OF HORIZON DRIVE, W OF 27 1/2 ROAD, N OF F 1/4 SECTION LINE

A hearing was held after proper notice on the petition to zone North 12th Street Enclave Annexation RSF-4. There were no opponents, letters, or counterpetitions. The following entitled proposed ordinance was read: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ZONING MAP, A PART OF CHAPTER 32 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, BY ADDING THE ZONING OF CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION. Upon motion by Councilman Johnson, seconded by Councilman Dunn and carried, the proposed ordinance was passed for publication.

HEARING - PROPOSED ORDINANCE - VACATING OF RIGHTS OF WAY AND UTILITY EASEMENTS E AND W OF LAVETA STREET, N OF UNAWEEP AVENUE

A hearing was held after proper notice on the request to amend the First Street Corridor Policy. There were no opponents, letters, or counterpetitions. Upon motion by Councilman Hollingsworth, seconded by Councilman Dunn and carried, the amended First Street Corridor Policy was approved.

HEARING - CONDITIONAL USE FOR TOTAL FAMILY MINISTRIES BUILDING, 2702 PATTERSON ROAD

A hearing was held after due notice on the petition by the

Bookcliff Baptist Church for conditional use to permit total family ministries building at 2702 Patterson Road. This is an expansion of a conditional use in a residential single-family zone at 8 units per acre. There were no opponents, letters, or counterpetitions. Upon motion by Councilman Hollingsworth, seconded by Councilman Dunn and carried, the conditional use was granted the Bookcliff Baptist Church for total family ministries building subject to the conditions of the Planning Commission.

HEARING - FRUITRIDGE MINOR SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT, 800 FEET E OF FIRST STREET, S OF PATTERSON ROAD

A hearing was held after proper notice on the petition by Walter K. Waymeyer for the Fruitridge Minor Subdivision final plat of four lots on 2.7 acres in a residential single-family zone at approximately five units per acre located 800 feet east of First Street, south of Patterson Road. There were no opponents, letters, or counterpetitions. Upon motion by Councilman Hollingsworth, seconded by Councilman Dunn and carried, the petition for Fruitridge Minor Subdivision final plat was approved subject to the conditions of the Planning Commission.

HEARING - PROPOSED ORDINANCE - REZONE FROM RSF-8 TO PB AND APPROVING ATRISCO OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - PROPERTY LOCATED 728 FEET N OF NORTH AVENUE, E OF 28 1/2 ROAD

A hearing was held after proper notice on the petition by Atrisco Investment Company, Levi Lucero, to rezone from RSF-8 to PB and the Atrisco Outline Development Plan. The petition is to change from a residential single-family use at 8 units per acre to a planned business use on .34 acres located 728 feet north of North Avenue and east of 28 1/2 Road. There were no opponents, letters, or counterpetitions. Upon motion by Councilman Hollingsworth, seconded by Councilman Dunn and carried with Councilman LUCERO ABSTAINING, the Atrisco outline development plan was approved subject to the conditions of the Planning Commission.

The following entitled proposed ordinance was read: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ZONING MAP, A PART OF CHAPTER 32 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, BY CHANGING THE ZONING OF CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION. Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilwoman Clark and carried with Councilman LUCERO ABSTAINING, the proposed ordinance was passed for publication.

RESOLUTION OF FINDINGS AND DECISION RE: APPLICATION BY MESA COLLEGE, 1175 TEXAS AVENUE, FOR A 3.2% BEER LICENSE FOR ON-PREMISE CONSUMPTION-APPROVED

The following Resolution was read:

RESOLUTION

OF DECISION ON THE APPLICATION FOR A FERMENTED MALT BEVERAGE

LICENSE BY MESA COLLEGE AT 1175 TEXAS AVENUE, GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO.

A public hearing having been held on September 16, 1981, on the application by Jay Jefferson for the Trustees of the Consortium of State Colleges in Colorado no behalf of Mesa College for a 3.2 Beer license permitting the sale of malt beverages for consumption on the premises at 1175 Texas Avenue, and the City Council, having considered the evidence adduced at said hearing, FINDS:

1. The hearing was properly held after due notice under the Beer Code.

2. The City caused a survey to be made of an area bounded on the west by 9th Street, on the north by Orchard Avenue, 15th Street on the east and Hill Avenue on the south.

3. The results of the survey conducted by the City were that 227 persons in the neighborhood favored the issuance of the license, stating that the needs of the neighborhood were not being met by existing outlets. Of this total, 73 indicated that they were inhabitants of the area, 55 indicated they were owners of property within the area, and 35 stated they were employees or business lessees within the survey area. The survey also developed that 353 persons in the neighborhood opposed the issuance of the license believing the needs of the neighborhood were being met by other outlets. Of this total, 124 were inhabitants of the neighborhood, and 166 were employees or business lessees in the area. A petition being 36 signatures was submitted in opposition to the granting of the license, and several letters were received in opposition. Members of the college faculty spoke in favor of the issuance as did several members of the student body. Several persons spoke in opposition to the issuance of the license.

4. Mesa College is one of the last, if not the last, four-year college in the state which does not have a license to sell beer on campus.

5. There are in excess of 2000 students presently enrolled at the college.

6. There are four similar outlets in the survey area. There are six (including the four) within one mile radius of the proposed location.

7. The required character determinations were favorable to the applicant.

CONCLUSION

The Council is required by the Beer Code to consider the desire of the inhabitants and the needs of the neighborhood. In the past, the Council has chosen to make these determinations through an analysis of the survey conducted at its direction. While the

results of the survey conducted in this instance are not as overwhelming as some have been, they would indicate without other consideration, that the needs of the neighborhood were being met by other outlets, and that the desire of the inhabitants is that the license not issue. However, the Council feels that the survey process did not function well as it did not function well in the case of the Southland outlet at 7th and Patterson Road. It is readily apparent that with over 2000 students at the college, not true survey was made of that properly to be considered segment of the area.

Accordingly, with the recognition that case law has indicated that the licensing authority is not required to rely solely on the numbers for and the numbers against but may consider other factors, the Council believes the license should issue. As a part of this consideration, the Council believes that this will relieve some of the pressure on other outlets in the neighborhood, outlets which have been of consideration concern to inhabitants of the neighborhood, influencing, it is believed their attitudes in considering this application. The fact that such outlets regularly exist on college campuses indicates that they fulfill a need peculiar to that neighborhood somewhat unrelated to the off-campus neighborhood.

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

That the application of Mesa College for a fermented malt beverage license for consumption of beer on the premises at 1175 Texas Avenue in the City be granted.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 21st day of October, 1981.

President of the Council

Attest:

City Clerk

Upon motion by Councilwoman Clark, seconded by Councilman Hollingsworth and carried with Council members HOLMES and DUNN voting NO and Councilman JOHNSON ABSTAINING, the Resolution was passed and adopted as read.

Councilman Hollingsworth stated that at the time Mesa College made a proposal to use a house adjacent to the campus for housing, a similar discussion was held. At that time, Councilman Hollingsworth recommended that the City visit with the officials at Mesa College to determine their needs and desires as it relates to the City's. According to Councilman Hollingsworth that

discussion with the college officials has not occurred. He continued that Mesa College officials were generous enough the other evening to hold a meeting indicating their willingness to participate. Councilman Hollingsworth restated that a meeting is needed and requested one within a reasonable time.

Councilman Holmes stated that alcohol is America's number one drug problem, and by Council's action tonight in granting a license to Mesa College it has not only refused to recognize that problem, it has become a party to that problem. He believes the community and the young people deserve more than has been given to them tonight. He believes the Council has been derelict in its responsibility to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens by its actions in this matter tonight.

RESOLUTION OF FINDINGS AND DECISION RE: APPLICATION FOR BEER-WINE LICENSE BY SHANARA, INC., DBA ROUND THE CORNER RESTAURANT, 504 29 ROAD - APPROVED

The following Resolution was read:

RESOLUTION

OF DECISION ON APPLICATION FOR BEER-WINE LICENSE BY SHANARA, INC., DBA ROUND THE CORNER RESTAURANT TO BE LOCATED AT 504 29 ROAD, GRAND JUNCTION.

A public hearing having been held on October 7, 1981, on the application by Shanara, Inc. for a beer-wine license for Round the Corner Restaurant at 504 29 Road, Grand Junction, and the City Council having considered the evidence adduced at said hearing, FINDS:

1. That the hearing was held on October 7, 1981, on the application after proper notice thereof under the Liquor Code.
2. That the survey conducted by the City indicated that the needs of the neighborhood were not being met by other outlets within the neighborhood and there was a need for this outlet in that 997 persons so stated while 414 felt the needs were being met by the other outlets.
3. Several persons spoke at the hearing in opposition to the issuance of the license both on the question of the desirability of the license and some with emphasis on a parking problem which exists at the site. The applicant was advised that the parking requirement had to be met as this was a condition related to the operation of the restaurant which could require the closing of the restaurant if the condition was not met.
4. That the characters of the applicants are good as determined by checking done by the Police Department and by letters attesting to their good characters, the applicant's being the officers of said corporation making application.

5. The evidence supports the position that the license should issue.

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

That the application of Shanara, Inc. for a beer-wine license for Round the Corner Restaurant be granted to the applicant.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 21st day of October, 1981.

President of the Council

Attest:

City Clerk

Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilman Hollingsworth and carried by roll call vote with Councilman HOLMES voting NO and Council members JOHNSON and LUCERO ABSTAINING, the Resolution was passed and adopted as read.

RESOLUTION OF FINDINGS AND DECISION RE: APPLICATION FOR 3.2% BEER LICENSE BY MESA P.I.C., A PARTNERSHIP, DBA HAPPY JOE'S PIZZA & ICE CREAM PARLOR, MESA MALL, SPACE 232 - APPROVED

The following Resolution was read:

RESOLUTION

OF DECISION ON APPLICATION FOR HOTEL-RESTAURANT LIQUOR LICENSE BY JANET JOHNSON FOR HAPPY JOE'S PIZZA AND ICE CREAM PARLOR TO BE LOCATED AT 2424 HIGHWAY 6 & 50, SPACE 232, MESA MALL, GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO.

A public hearing having been held on October 7, 1981, on the application by Janet Johnson for a hotel-restaurant liquor license for Happy Joe's Pizza and Ice Cream Parlor at 2424 Highway 6 & 50, Space 232 in Mesa Mall, Grand Junction, and the City Council having considered the evidence adduced at said hearing, FINDS:

1. That the hearing was held on October 7, 1981, on the application after proper notice thereof under the Liquor Code.

2. That the survey conducted by the City indicated that the needs of the neighborhood were not being met by other outlets within the neighborhood and there was a need for this outlet in that 227 persons so stated while 75 felt the needs were being met by the other outlets.

3. That no one appeared at the hearing in opposition to the granting of the license and no petitions or letters of disapproval were received by the City Council.

4. That the characters of the applicants are good as determined by checking done by the Police Department and by letters attesting to their good characters, the applicants being the members of the partnership making the application.

5. The applicant originally sought a 3.2% Beer license for consumption on the premises. She was advised that she would not be permitted multiple licensing under this type of license. That opinion was in error. The applicant still desires only the 3.2% license.

6. The City Council believes that a survey for a 3.2% beer license would not reflect a different conclusion were one conducted as it is, in a sense, a lesser license than a hotel-restaurant license.

7. The evidence supports the position that a license for a 3.2% fermented malt beverage license for on-premise consumption should issue to the applicant.

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

That a 3.2% beer license for consumption on the premises issue to Janet Johnson for Happy Joe's Pizza and Ice Cream Parlor to be located at 2424 Highway 6 & 50, Space 232, Mesa Mall, Grand Junction, Colorado.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 21st day of October, 1981.

President of the Council

Attest:

City Clerk

Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilwoman Clark and carried by roll call vote with Councilman HOLMES voting NO and Councilman JOHNSON ABSTAINING, the Resolution was passed and adopted as read.

HEARING - APPLICATION BY CITY MARKET, INC., FOR 3.2% BEER LICENSE PERMITTING SALES FOR OFF-PREMISE CONSUMPTION AT STORE #28, 2770 HWY 50 SOUTH

A hearing was held after proper notice on the application by City

Market, Inc., for a 3.2% beer license which permits sales in sealed containers for off-premise consumption at Store #28, 2770 Highway 50 South. The following report was read:

"On September 11, 1981, City Market, Inc., filed an application for a 3.2% beer license which permits sales in sealed containers for off-premise consumption at Store No. 28, 2770 Highway 50 South. Corporate officers are:

President: Joseph C. Prinster

Vice Pres: Leo T. Prinster

Sec/Treas: Eugene F. Haggerty

Manager: Phyllis J. Norris

The display ad giving notice of hearing was published in The Daily Sentinel Friday, October 9, 1981, and the sign giving notice of hearing was posted October 9, 1981.

A survey of the area from 27 1/2 Road on the west to Sunrise Lane and Newport Place on the north to 28 Road on the east to Highway 50 on the south has been concluded. Results:

1. Yes, I am in favor of the issuance of the license as I believe the needs of the neighborhood are not being met by existing outlets. 47

a. An owner of property in the neighborhood. 38

b. An employee or business lessee of property in the neighborhood. 1

c. An inhabitant of the neighborhood. 13

2. No, I am not in favor of the issuance of the license as I believe the needs of the neighborhood are being met by existing outlets. 16

a. An owner of property in the neighborhood. 12

b. An employee or business lessee of property in the neighborhood. 2

c. An inhabitant of the neighborhood. 3

We have received no letters or counterpetitions.

A report from the Police Department advises that during the background investigation nothing of a derogatory nature was found regarding the corporate officers and manager.

Similar-type outlets within the survey area: 0.

Similar-type outlets within one mile: 4."

The map showing similar-type outlets was reviewed. Mr. Joe Prinster, President of the corporation, was present for the hearing. There were no opponents, letters, or counterpetitions. A Resolution of findings and decision is scheduled on the November 4, 1981, City Council agenda.

HEARING - APPLICATION BY GRAND JUNCTION DOWNTOWN ASSOC. FOR MALT, VINOUS AND SPIRITUOUS LIQUOR SPECIAL EVENTS PERMIT NOVEMBER 6, AT TWO RIVERS PLAZA FROM 6:00 P.M. TO 2:00 A.M. DUCKS UNLIMITED DINNER MEETING WITH COCKTAILS (4TH PERMIT) - APPROVED

A hearing was held after proper posting of property on the application by the Grand Junction Downtown Association for a malt, vinous and spirituous liquor special events permit on November 6, 1981, from 6 p.m. to 2 a.m. at Two Rivers Plaza for the Ducks Unlimited dinner meeting with cocktails. There were no opponents, letters, or counterpetitions. Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilman Johnson and carried with Councilman HOLMES voting NO, the application was approved.

HEARING - APPLICATION BY GRAND JUNCTION DOWNTOWN ASSOC. FOR MALT, VINOUS AND SPIRITUOUS LIQUOR SPECIAL EVENTS PERMIT DECEMBER 12, AT TWO RIVERS PLAZA FROM 5:00 P.M. TO 2:00 A.M. CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION EMPLOYEES CHRISTMAS DINNER DANCE (6TH PERMIT) - APPROVED

A hearing was held after proper posting of property on the application by the Grand Junction Downtown Association for a malt, vinous and spirituous liquor special events permit on December 12, 1981, at Two Rivers Plaza from 5 p.m. to 2 a.m. for the City of Grand Junction Employees Christmas dinner-dance. There were no opponents, letters, or counterpetitions. Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilman Johnson and carried with Councilman HOLMES voting NO, the application was approved.

HEARING - APPLICATION BY GRAND JUNCTION DOWNTOWN ASSOC. FOR MALT, VINOUS AND SPIRITUOUS LIQUOR SPECIAL EVENTS PERMIT NOVEMBER 12, AT TWO RIVERS PLAZA FROM 5 P.M. TO 2 A.M. - WESTERN SLOPE CHAPTER OF CPA DINNER AND COCKTAILS (5TH PERMIT) - APPROVED

A hearing was held after proper posting of property on the application by the Grand Junction Downtown Association for a malt, vinous and spirituous liquor special events permit on November 12, 1981, at Two Rivers Plaza from 5 pm. to 2 a.m. for the Western Slope Chapter of CPA dinner and cocktails. There were no opponents, letters, or counterpetitions. Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilman Johnson and carried with Councilman HOLMES voting NO, the application was approved.

HEARING - APPLICATION BY LATIN-ANGLO ALLIANCE FOR MALT, VINOUS AND SPIRITUOUS LIQUOR SPECIAL EVENTS PERMIT NOVEMBER 14 AT TWO RIVERS PLAZA FROM 8:00 P.M. TO 2:00 A.M. ANNUAL FIESTA (3RD PERMIT) -

APPROVED.

A hearing was held after proper posting of property on application by Latin-Anglo Alliance for malt, vinous and spirituous liquor special events permit for November 14, 1981, at Two Rivers Plaza from 8 p.m. to 2 a.m. for the annual Fiesta. There were no opponents, letters, or counterpetitions. Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilman Johnson and carried with Councilman HOLMES voting NO, the application was approved.

HEARING - MERIDIAN PARK FINAL PLAT, NE CORNER 27-3/4 ROAD AND HWY 50 DECISION NOVEMBER 4, 1981

A hearing was held after proper notice on the petition by Ray Phipps for Meridian Park Final Plat for a business park on 25.74 acres in a Highway Oriented Zone at the northeast corner of 27-3/4 Road and Highway 50. Bob Goldin, Planner, reviewed the preliminary and final plans. He noted that the Planning Commission recommended approval of the preliminary plan which shows an internal road and no access to B 1/2 Road based on the City Engineer's requirements being met which were all improvements for the right of way, the piping, and the internal access road going in at the time of development rather than through power of attorney.

Tom Logue, Paragon Engineering, and Ray Phipps, the petitioner, were present for the hearing. Mr. Logue said the question at hand basically revolves around improvements to B 1/2 Road. Mr. Logue noted the unique situation of an existing combination irrigation and storm drainage ditch that lies parallel to and south of the present B 1/2 Road alignment. This ditch drains a considerable area, approximately 80 acres, and requires the installation of a 48-inch culvert. He stated that this particular project does not contribute substantially to that drainage basin. The petitioner is being asked by the City Engineer to complete those necessary drainage improvements as well as the additional pavement, curb, gutter and sidewalk that is appropriate for that designated road. While the petitioner's property does not contribute one hundred percent to the drainage he has been asked to contribute one hundred percent to the tiling of the existing storm ditch. That was the outcome of the preliminary plan. Subsequently, the petitioner submitted the final plan showing a common driveway access to B 1/2 Road which would be utilized for access to those lots and does not include east-west access road on the south side. In discussions with the Planning Staff and the Planning Commission, the petitioner indicated that he is willing to develop in the manner indicated on the preliminary plan -- develop the internal access and construct it in accordance with City standards for a commercial road and at the same time provide the City with a power of attorney for participation to B 1/2 Road improvements inasmuch as he will not be utilizing that road for access to his site. In discussions with the City Engineer it was felt that the primary reason for completing those improvements initially was due primarily to the fact that the City Market development immediately to the west has completed those improvements. Those improvements,

however, were required in order to accommodate the site plan for City Market which has two accesses to B 1/2 Road. Mr. Logue stated that the property in question is zoned Highway Oriented. It is anticipated that the bulk of the traffic to the development will utilize Highway 50 for its primary access.

Ray Phipps, petitioner, stated he is willing to contribute his fair share to the improvements to B 1/2 Road including the tiling of the ditch on the north part of the site by way of a power of attorney. He pointed out, however, that his site would contribute nothing to that ditch.

None of the water from his site would drain to that ditch. Planning Commission's desire is that the site not have access to B 1/2 Road, yet the petitioner has been asked to improve it. Another item pointed out by Mr. Phipps for consideration and which makes it really difficult is the one lot that the City is asking the developer to build two roads to service it. Mr. Phipps stated that it is just economically unfeasible. He believes that if he were the only benefactor to the ditch, the requirement for its improvement would be reasonable, but the site does not benefit at all other than the fact that the ditch would be covered. He also stated that he believes his site will contribute a minimal amount of traffic to B 1/2 Road. Eventually, according to Mr. Phipps, B 1/2 Road will have to be improved, and he is willing to contribute his share. He stated that if the City approves the second plan, he will improve B 1/2 Road and the ditch. (The second plan provides access to B 1/2 Road and does not include the internal street.) It was pointed out that the petitioner is participating in the County's street improvement district for 27-3/4 Road this year. Acceleration and deceleration lanes at the intersection were placed with these improvements.

There were no opponents, letters, or counterpetitions.

It was moved by Councilman Johnson, seconded by Councilman Holmes, to approve the City Engineer's and the Planning Commission's recommendation for this development. Roll was called upon the motion with the following result: Council members voting AYE: JOHNSON, HOLMES, CLARK. Council members voting NO: LUCERO, HOLLINGSWORTH, DUNN, BRACH.

Upon motion by Councilman Johnson, seconded by Councilwoman Clark and carried, the Meridian Park final plat was tabled until November 4, 1981, for factfinding.

HEARING - DEVELOPMENT IN H.O. - THE YEAGER BUILDING LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 400 FEET NORTH OF B 1/2 ROAD ON SHERMAN DRIVE

A hearing was held after proper notice on the petition by Peter and Marie Yeager for development in Highway Oriented Zone for the Yeager Building on approximately .45 acres approximately 400 feet north of B 1/2 Road on Sherman Drive. Bob Goldin, Planning Staff, reviewed the petition. Technically, there is no problem with the

usage involved nor the site plan itself, but there is the issue of the fire-flow adequacy which was turned over to the City Attorney due to the liability factors involved. The City Attorney said that during the course of this review, he was surprised to find that the City has apparently done some of this and a review is being done to see how many sites are involved. In this situation, there is a water line which the City proposes, at least under present plan, to extend past this property sometime next summer. At such time as the extension is made, the Yeagers have agreed that they will hook onto the line, and when they do that they will have adequate fire flow. In the interim, they do not have adequate fire flow. On Monday, Mr. Ashby had indicated to Council that he thought he could get an indemnification agreement which would protect the City, not necessarily the citizens, from the type of thing that might occur -- somebody being killed in a fire who might have been saved if there had been adequate fire flow -- or perhaps this building catching on fire by some non negligent cause and then other buildings catching on fire and burning as a result of that fire that might not have burned if adequate fire flow was provided. In talking to the attorney who represents the Yeagers, Mr. Ashby discovered that that is not something that one can get insurance against. The best indemnification to be obtained from the Yeagers is that they, of course, will carry adequate protection on their own building and they would recognize that fact that the City Council was not insistent upon the observance by them of the Building Code and they would hold the Council and the City harmless in that particular regard. Mr. Ashby was sure the Yeagers would enter into some sort of agreement with the City that they would hold the City harmless from these other events indicated, but if there is nothing to back up that hold harmless agreement and if they were wiped out, the City in fact would not be protected -- as is true on all of these other buildings that the City has been working with. He felt it only fair to indicate to Council that the City is going to be sued on the basis that it does not follow its own regulations if, in fact, it does not follow them. He added, however, that that does not mean the Council cannot weigh the risks and weigh the entire proposition and maybe by the time the Yeagers complete their building an adequate fire line will be installed.

Bill Ryden, representing the Yeagers, indicated that if the Yeagers get a building permit the first of November, the building can be constructed within 90 days. The building will house a cabinet shop. Mrs. Yeager pointed out to Council that they have simply outgrown their present building and are presently using a building across the street to handle the overflow, but that this is not a satisfactory arrangement. Mr. Ryden stated that the Yeagers are willing to commit to the building of their portion of the water line at the time their building is being constructed. Mrs. Yeager stated they also have chemical extinguishers in their present operation. They have also agreed to install a direct alarm system to the Fire Station in their new building. It is calculated that a unit could be at the scene within one minute of receiving the alarm. Also planned for the new building is an exhaust system

to carry the sawdust to a container outside the new building.

There were no opponents, letters, or counterpetitions. The President closed the hearing.

Upon motion by Councilman Holmes, seconded by Councilman Johnson and carried, the application by the Yeagers was approved subject to the City Attorney, the City Manager, the Fire Department personnel, and the Yeagers meeting for a review of the budget to see if there is a way that the water line can be built sooner than next summer to accommodate the needs of that neighborhood.

Councilman Hollingsworth was inclined to sympathize with the Yeagers while at the same time adhering to the City's regulations. He urged that everything possible be done to accommodate the Yeagers as they are providing employment for the community as evidenced by their track record. He feels that the building is the proper use for that area. The difficulty the City is facing is attempting to undo regulations that were improperly adhered to or no regulations at all in years past. It is not just this building; he believes the City must be cognizant of the danger of the other facility as well as the homes in the area.

HEARING - ZONING RUSTY SUN ANNEXATION TO PR-8.4 AND RUSTY SUN SUBDIVISION PRELIMINARY PLAN, NW CORNER 29 AND F ROADS - DECISION NOVEMBER 4, 1981

A hearing was held after proper notice on the petition by Seago Services, Jim Lindell, to zone Rusty Sun Annexation to Planned Residential at 8.4 units per acre on 7.43 acres, and the preliminary plan for Rusty Sun Subdivision. The property is located on the northwest corner of 29 and F Roads. Bob Goldin, Planning Staff, reviewed the preliminary plan and the petition to zone PR-8.4. He noted the neighborhood opposition to the impact on the neighborhood itself in the PR 8 zone requested is not compatible with the existing surrounding zones of County R-2 which is single-family. There were no questions about the impact on the roadways; Patterson, specifically, for Darla Jean and Indian Village Subdivisions. Also questioned was the impact on 29 Road. He indicated the Planning Commission has no problems with the preliminary plan. Indian Wash is dedicated park land.

Tom Logue, Paragon Engineering, represented the petitioners who were present. The proposal is for 62 townhome units on 7.4 acres. Mr. Logue noted the major shift not only in Grand Junction and Mesa County but also the western United States as to housing types. he cited the growth projections which indicate the need for 20,000 new homes in the area over the next four to five years, and submitted that this proposal would help meet those housing requirements for new residents moving to the Grand Junction area. The development will be utilizing two primary access roads. One from 29 Road presently classified a major arterial, and the other East Indian Creek Drive which intersects with Patterson Road, another major arterial. Mr. Logue estimated that with the

development of this nature, there will be 375 vehicle trips generated from the total number of units. Of those, 75 will utilize the East Indian Creek Drive as access. All the necessary utilities required for the development are located in the adjoining roadways and available for extensions. He outlined other services around the area, and in view of these stated that the character of the neighborhood is changing and the living environment in Grand Junction as a whole is changing. He felt that the proposed 8.4 is justified. He cited the compatibility of the proposed structures on the site with the surrounding neighborhood.

Don Romek, 2151 McKinley, President of Se-go Services, appeared in behalf of the proposal. He stated that during the initial preliminary plan for Indian Village Subdivision, it was really the County and City Planners who indicated they wanted the multi-family housing in there, so this plan is an effort to carry out their desires of several years ago.

Don Patton, 2980 F 1/4 Road, opposed the proposed zoning and the preliminary development plan of the Rusty Sun Annexation for the following reasons:

As Regards Zoning:

According to Principles and Practice of Urban Planning by the International City Managers' Association, one of the principle requirements for a planned unit development is that the overall number of dwelling units be no greater than would have been permissible in the tract if it had been divided into lots of the appropriate size under the present zoning. In agreement with this concept, the General Provisions of the City and County Zoning Resolutions stated that the density of the Planned Development shall be compatible with the development patterns and densities in the vicinity. A Planned Unit Development would provide the most efficient use for this tract of land, but should be at a density comparable to 4 units per acre to be compatible with the neighborhood.

As Regards Development:

1. Stormwater Detention Facilities: No provisions have been made by the Petitioner or his Engineer for stormwater detention facilities as required by C.R.S. Section 30-28-133. Said section goes on to state that the detention facilities must be designed for the one hundred year storm which is in excess of the historic runoff.

Because of the impervious nature of developed surfaces, the peak runoff from this development can be expected to be up to three times greater in magnitude depending upon the degree of development for the 100 year storm event.

Detention facilities, properly designed, would arrest the increased runoff; detain it through storage and release it at a

slow rate to the Indian Wash. This can significantly reduce downstream pipe and channel size requirements.

2. Solar Access: C.R.S. Section 30-28-133 requires that subdivision regulations "provide for the protection and assurance of access to sunlight for solar energy devices by considering the use of restrictive covenants or solar easements, height restrictions, side yard and setback requirements, street orientation and width requirements, or other permissible forms of land use controls."

Mr. Patton submitted an exhibit for review and stated that if these townhouses are constructed at the maximum allowable height (i.e., 35 feet) allowed by zoning and at the location shown on the preliminary plan with a 15 foot setback, they will stand between the sun and seven houses in the Darla Jean Subdivision for four winter months. The resulting shadow on the south elevation of these houses will significantly increase heating costs for these homes from mid-November through mid-January.

3. F and 29 Road Intersection: Mr. Patton analyzed the capacity and level of service for the F and 29 Road intersection based upon traffic volumes provided by Armstrong Engineers and the Mesa County Road Department. Level of Service is an evaluation of:

- a. Speed and travel time;
- b. Traffic interruptions or restrictions;
- c. Freedom to maneuver;
- d. Safety;
- e. Driving comfort and convenience;
- f. Vehicle operating costs.

Level of Service designations range from "A", which is a free flow condition with no congestion, to the other end of the spectrum, "F", which is a forced flow condition with vehicular back-ups and associated stop and go operation.

He found that the Level of Service for the F and 29 Road intersection is "D" which is beginning to tax the capabilities of the intersection -- delays will occur at peak flows. Included in this analysis was the provision of a traffic signal at the intersection.

The 6% increase in volumes at peak hours generated from the Rusty Sun Subdivision will not have an appreciable effect on the level of service or capacity of the intersection. More importantly, what is required to improve the capacity and level of service for the intersection is widening both roads to four lanes. He stated that traffic volumes warrant this now. If development is to continue,

it is imperative that the City and County construct these essential improvements.

In summary, Mr. Patton recommended the overall density of this development be limited to 4 units per acre. The reduced density will allow for detention facilities that may also service as recreational and green areas when not detaining stormwater. In addition, the reduced density will allow for greater setback distances to allow for solar access. Recommended setbacks are:

For 35 foot Building Height . . . 60 Feet

For 30 foot Building Height . . . 48 Feet

For 25 foot Building Height . . . 35 Feet

According to Mr. Patton, it is imperative that the City and County widen F and 29 Roads to 4-lane facilities, most certainly if development is to continue. Further neglect of this responsibility will result in congestion and forced flow conditions for the users of these roads.

Mr. Patton noted a petition that was presented to the Planning Commission at its hearing on this matter which contained approximately 86 signatures of people who are opposed to this development.

Charlie Smaltz, 2891 F 1/4 Road, stated that he is opposed to this development although he is not opposed to developing area. He is opposed to the high density of this proposal. He recognizes that the Planning Commission members are not elected officials. At the Planning Commission hearing on this item there was the petition containing 80 to 86 signatures opposing the proposal and half a dozen people spoke opposing the proposal. Yet when it came time for voting there was no discussion. It was a unanimous decision. He pointed out that the Council members as elected officials represent no one surrounding the proposed development as they are County residents, yet he feels that the people bordering this area are vehemently opposed to this proposal and that the Council as elected officials should take this under consideration when making its decision and represent the feelings of this group regarding this proposal. Mr. Smaltz discussed the approval of certain plans based on the possible tax revenues. Mr. Smaltz says the trouble is the public is not seeing any of these tax revenues put into use in the streets. He noted particularly 29 and F Roads. Mr. Smaltz predicted that both the City and the County governments are going to have many individuals upset at their up and coming decisions unless something is done regarding the road systems. He asked council to consider the quality of life in this area when making its decision.

Mr. Logue stated that the plan was two-story structures, generally not exceeding 25 feet plus or minus a foot. In the Planning Residential zone building heights and building setbacks are a

negotiated number. The Grand Junction Code does not specify exact setbacks. They are a proposal and they are negotiated with the Planning Commission and the City Council. The underlying zone will allow them to build a building 35 feet in height, 25 feet from the property line. The proposal submitted is with two-story structure, 25 feet in height and the setback varies. The preliminary grading and drainage plan was submitted to the City Engineer for review, and as Mr. Logue recalls his comments basically were to the potential for flooding along Indian Wash. That is a possibility in the event of a 100 year frequency storm, and a copy of the flood studies done in conjunction with the proposed 29 and Patterson Road improvements was submitted.

There were no other opponents, letters, or counterpetitions. The hearing was closed. A Resolution of findings and decision is scheduled for November 4, 1981.

The President declared a five-minute recess. Upon reconvening all Council members were present.

ORDINANCE NO. 2008 - REPEALING AND REENACTING CHAPTER 22, SECTION 6, CODE OF ORDINANCES, PERTAINING TO LOST, STOLEN, CONFISCATED, OR ABANDONED PERSONAL PROPERTY HELD BY POLICE DEPARTMENT

Upon motion by Councilman Hollingsworth, seconded by Councilwoman Clark and carried, the Proof of Publication to the following entitled proposed ordinance was accepted for filing: AN ORDINANCE CONCERNING LOST, STOLEN, CONFISCATED OR ABANDONED PERSONAL PROPERTY HELD BY THE POLICE DEPARTMENT.

Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilman Holmes and carried, the proposed ordinance was called up for final passage and the title only was read.

There were no comments. Upon motion by Councilman Johnson, seconded by Councilman Holmes and carried by roll call vote, the Ordinance was passed, adopted, numbered 2008, and ordered published.

ORDINANCE NO. 2009 - PROHIBITING SMOKING IN THEATERS

Upon motion by Councilman Hollingsworth, seconded by Councilman Lucero and carried, the Proof of Publication to the following entitled proposed ordinance was accepted for filing: AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SMOKING IN THEATERS.

Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilman Johnson and carried, the proposed ordinance was called up for final passage and read.

There were no comments. Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilman Holmes and carried by roll call vote, the Ordinance was passed, adopted, numbered 2009, and ordered published.

EMERGENCY ORDINANCE NO. 2010 - AMENDING ASSESSMENTS FOR I.D. ST-80, PHASE A, PATTERSON ROAD AT WILLOWBROOK AND PARK LANE SUBDIVISIONS

Upon motion by Councilman Johnson, seconded by Councilwoman Clark and carried, the Proof of Publication to the following entitled proposed ordinance was accepted for filing: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 1959 WHICH WAS THE ASSESSING ORDINANCE FOR IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. ST-80, PHASE A, IN THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION.

Upon motion by Councilman Hollingsworth, seconded by Councilwoman Clark and carried, the proposed ordinance was called up for final passage and read.

There were no comments. Upon motion by Councilman Johnson, seconded by Councilman Holmes and carried by unanimous vote of the Council, the Ordinance was passed and adopted as an emergency ordinance, numbered 2010, and ordered published.

INDUCEMENT RESOLUTION FOR \$2,500,000 IRBs FOR VILLAGE FAIR, SW CORNER OF 12TH STREET AND PATTERSON ROAD - APPROVED

The following Resolution was read:

RESOLUTION OF INDUCEMENT ADOPTED CONCERNING INDUSTRIAL REVENUE BONDS FOR THE VILLAGE FAIR SHOPPING CENTER

RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE ISSUANCE OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT REVENUE BONDS; GIVING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL TO A PROJECT UNDER THE COUNTY AND MUNICIPALITY DEVELOPMENT REVENUE BOND ACT AND THE ISSUANCE OF REVENUE BONDS TO DEFRAY THE COSTS THEREOF AND AUTHORIZING THE PREPARATION OF NECESSARY DOCUMENTS.

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

Section 1. Recitals.

1.01. The legislature of the State of Colorado, in the County and Municipality Development Revenue Bond Act, Title 29, Article 3, Colorado Revised Statutes 1973, as amended ("the Act"), has found and declared it to be a public purpose for municipalities to promote industry and develop trade or other economic activity by inducing profit or non-profit corporations, federal governmental offices, hospitals, and agricultural, manufacturing, industrial, commercial, or business enterprises to locate, expand, or remain in this State, to mitigate the serious threat of extensive unemployment in parts of this State, to secure and maintain a balanced and stable economy in all parts of this State, and to further the use of its agricultural products or natural resources.

1.02. In furtherance of the foregoing purposes, the legislature has authorized municipalities to issue revenue bonds under the Act for the purpose of defraying the cost of financing, acquiring, improving, and equipping any "project" including any land, building, or other improvement and all real or personal properties, whether or not in existence, suitable or used for or in connection with commercial enterprises, including, without limitation, enterprises engaged in storing, warehousing, distributing, selling or transporting any products of agriculture, industry, commerce, manufacturing or business; the legislature has authorized municipalities to enter into a "financial agreement" with the use of the project for the purpose of providing revenues to pay the bonds so authorized, and to secure the payment of such bonds as provided in the Act.

1.03. Pursuant to the authority of the Act, it has been proposed that the City issue its revenue bonds in an amount sufficient to defray the cost of financing, acquiring, improving, and equipping certain real and personal properties at Village Fair Subdivision in the City of Grand Junction to be used by Village Fair, Ltd., a Colorado Limited partnership (the "Developer"), as an office building and retail shopping center facility (the "Project"), and that the City enter into a financing agreement with the Developer, pursuant to which the Developer will agree to pay the City amounts sufficient to pay when due the principal of, premium, if any, and interest on the revenue bonds and to cause the Project to be constructed. The Project is estimated to cost \$3,000,000.

1.04. The existence of the Project would improve the sound economic growth of the State of Colorado and the City of Grand Junction, would provide increased opportunities for employment for residents of the City and surrounding area and would further the public purposes set forth in Section 1.01 hereof. The Project is located within the City limits of the City.

1.05. The City has been advised that conventional, commercial financing to pay the capital cost of the Project is available only on a limited basis and at such high costs of borrowing that the economic feasibility of operating the Project would be significantly reduced, but with the aid of municipal financing, and its resulting low borrowing costs, the Project is economically more feasible.

1.06. The City has been advised that revenue bonds of the City could be issued and sold upon favorable rates and terms to finance the Project.

1.07. The Project constitutes a "project" as defined in Section 29-3-103(10) of the Act.

Section 2. Approvals and Authorizations.

2.01. On the basis of the information given the City to date, it appears that it is in the best interest of the City for the City

to issue its industrial development revenue bonds under the provisions of the Act to finance all or part of the costs of the Project.

2.02. The Project is hereby given preliminary approval by the City and the issuance of revenue bonds for such purpose, in an amount sufficient to pay project costs but not to exceed \$2,500,000, is hereby approved, subject to further approval by this Council of the necessary legal documents.

2.03. Prior to or simultaneously with the issuance of the bonds, the City will enter into a financing agreement with the Developer with respect to the Project. The financing agreement shall provide for payment by the Developer to the City of such revenues as will be sufficient to pay the principal of, premium, if any, and interest on the revenue bonds, and to build up and maintain any reserves reasonably deemed advisable by this Council in connection therewith.

2.04. The President of the Council, City Clerk, City Attorney and other officers, employees and agents of the City are hereby authorized to initiate and assist in the preparation of such documents as may be appropriate to the Project.

Section 3. Special Obligations.

In all events, it is understood, however, that the principal of and interest on the revenue bonds issued to finance the Project shall be payable solely out of the revenues derived from the financing of the Project. The bonds and interest coupons, if any, appurtenant thereto shall never constitute the debt or indebtedness of the City within the meaning of any provision or limitation of the State Constitution, statutes, or home rule charter, and shall not constitute nor give rise to a pecuniary liability of the City or charge against its general credit or taxing powers. Such limitation shall be plainly stated on the face of each bond.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 21st day of October, 1981.

President of the Council

Attest:

City Clerk

Upon motion by Councilman Hollingsworth, seconded by Councilman Dunn and carried with Councilman HOLMES voting NO, the Resolution was passed and adopted as read.

This proposal is for a service-oriented neighborhood shopping center on a 4.9 acre site containing approximately 51,000 square feet for retail and office space. Thirty thousand square feet is for a three-story office building, 4,500 square feet for a financial institution. Of the 16,500 square feet proposed for retail, 7700 will be for restaurant facilities.

RESOLUTION AMENDING AND CONFIRMING RESOLUTION OF INDUCEMENT ADOPTED AUGUST 6, 1980, CONCERNING INDUSTRIAL REVENUE BONDS FOR COMMONS OFFICE BUILDING PROJECT - \$8,250,000 - APPROVED

The following Resolution was read:

RESOLUTION AMENDING AND CONFIRMING RESOLUTION OR INDUCEMENT ADOPTED AUGUST 6, 1980 CONCERNING INDUSTRIAL REVENUE BONDS FOR COMMONS OFFICE BUILDING PROJECT

RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION AMENDING AND CONFIRMING A RESOLUTION ADOPTED ON AUGUST 6, 1980, RELATING TO THE ISSUANCE OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT REVENUE BONDS; GIVING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL TO A PROJECT UNDER THE COUNTY AND MUNICIPALITY DEVELOPMENT REVENUE BOND ACT AND THE ISSUANCE OF REVENUE BONDS TO DEFRAY THE COSTS THEREOF AND AUTHORIZING THE PREPARATION OF NECESSARY DOCUMENTS.

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

Section 1. Recitals.

1.01. The recitals set forth in Section 1 of the Resolution of Inducement of the City Council dated August 6, 1980 (the "Inducement Resolution") are hereby incorporated by reference with the same force and effect as if herein set forth in full.

1.02. The First National Bank of Denver has issued its preliminary approval dated October _____, 1981, for the purchase of the industrial revenue bonds of the City in the amount of \$8,250,000.

1.03. The Project is presently estimated to cost approximately \$9,250,000.

Section 2. Approvals and Authorizations.

2.01. The preliminary approval of the Project previously given by the City is hereby confirmed and the issuance of revenue bonds for such purpose and in an amount sufficient to pay project costs but not to exceed \$8,250,000 approved, subject to approval by this Council of the necessary legal documents and of the approval by the purchasers of the bonds as to the details of the bond issue and provisions for their payment.

Section 3. Confirmation of Resolution of August 6, 1980.

The provisions of the Inducement Resolution, as amended by this resolution, are hereby confirmed, ratified and approved with the same force and effect as if herein set forth in full.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 21st day of October, 1981.

President of the Council

Attest:

City Clerk

Upon motion by Councilman Johnson, seconded by Councilman Dunn and carried by roll call vote with Councilman HOLMES voting NO, the Resolution was passed and adopted as read.

RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL OF PROPOSED MESA COUNTY SALES TAX

The following Resolution was read:

RESOLUTION

OF APPROVAL OF PROPOSED MESA COUNTY SALES TAX.

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Grand Junction has met with the Board of County Commissioners of the County of Mesa on several occasions in consultation concerning the proposed County sales tax to be voted upon by the Mesa County electorate on November 3, 1981; and

WHEREAS, the Council is convinced from those discussions that the best interest of all of the citizens of the County would be served by the passage of the sales tax, as the program contemplated by the Board is sound and the monies are badly needed to carry out those functions now demanded in the County of Mesa;

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

That, while the City Council is charged essentially with the concerns of those within the City limits only, it believes that here that interest merges with the interest of those who do not live within the cities of the County, and it therefore strongly urges that all citizens of the County work to support the passage of the sales tax on November 3rd.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 21st day of October, 1981.

President of the Council

Attest:

City Clerk

Upon motion by Councilman Hollingsworth, seconded by Councilman Johnson and carried by roll call vote with Councilman HOLMES voting NO, the Resolution was passed and adopted as read.

Upon motion by Councilman Johnson, seconded by Councilwoman Clark and carried with Councilman HOLMES voting NO, the President was authorized to sign the letter directed to the Mesa County Commissioners.

RESOLUTION PERMITTING NATIONAL RAILWAY HISTORICAL SOCIETY, RIO GRANDE CHAPTER, TO INSTALL MARKER AT SOUTH AVENUE AND 4TH STREET - APPROVED

The following Resolution was read:

RESOLUTION

PROVIDING FOR THE LOCATION OF AN HISTORICAL MONUMENT.

WHEREAS, through the good works of the Rio Grande Chapter of the National Railway Historical Society it appears that a marker may be placed in City road right-of-way at the Northwest Corner of Fourth and South on the last remaining exposed section of the tracks for the trolley which operated in the City for many years; and

WHEREAS, the City Council believes the commemoration of the historical past of the City is important to the City and its inhabitants;

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

That permission be given for the installation of the commemorative marker within the City right-of-way at Fourth and South Avenues in the City.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 21st day of October, 1981.

President of the Council

Attest:

City Clerk

Upon motion by Councilman Johnson, seconded by Councilman Holmes and carried by roll call vote, the Resolution was passed and adopted as read.

FORMER MAYOR KOZISEK SENDS GREETINGS

Mr. Charles Teed, 510 West Mesa Avenue, reported that he spent last Thursday evening with former Mayor, Larry Kozisek, and his wife in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin. Larry sent greetings to the citizens of Grand Junction.

MEETINGS

Councilman Dunn reported that he welcomed the Grand Lodge and Rebecca Assembly at the Ramada Inn; welcomed the legal secretaries; conducted sixteen foreign people on an oil shale tour, and attended a COG meeting.

RECREATION

Councilwoman Clark reported on a recent Recreation Board meeting.

OCTOBER 24, 1981 HANDICAPPED AWARENESS DAY AT EMERSON SCHOOL

Councilman Holmes reminded the audience of Handicapped Awareness Day October 24 at Emerson School.

ADJOURNMENT

The President adjourned the meeting.

Neva B. Lockhart

Neva B. Lockhart, CMC
City Clerk