

GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL

September 18, 1991

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, convened in regular session the 18th day of September, 1991, at 7:30 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium at City Hall. Those present were Jim Baughman, John Bennett, Bill Bessinger, Bill McCurry, Paul Nelson, Reford Theobald, and President of the Council Conner Shepherd. Also present were City Manager Mark Achen, City Attorney Dan Wilson, and City Clerk Neva Lockhart.

Council President Shepherd called the meeting to order and Councilman Nelson led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

INVOCATION - President of the Council Conner Shepherd.

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

Upon motion by Councilman Bessinger, seconded by Councilman McCurry and carried, the minutes of the September 4, 1991, City Council Meeting were approved as submitted.

PROCLAMATION DECLARING OCTOBER 1--31, 1991, AS "KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS DAYS FOR THE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED"

MS. ROSEMARY LICHLYTER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE REPORTS ON A GRANT THEY HAVE RECEIVED

Ms. Rosemary Lichlyter of the National Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse reported that the organization has been approved to receive a \$1.5 million Federal grant, 5-year period, to prevent substance abuse in Mesa County. The current community partnership concept is comprised of five private and fifteen public entities. Goals of the project are:

1. Identifying;
2. Surveying the community's needs;
3. Reducing alcohol use among our children and adolescents;
4. Strengthening families;
5. Making sure that this project becomes self-sustaining so that this project does not die when the grant monies have been used up.

HAROLD ELAM, 1225 S. 7TH STREET, DISCUSSES SOUTH SEVENTH STREET CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Harold Elam, 1225 N. 7th Street, stated that over the past few years, each year the City, in its budget, has had a program set up to do something on South Seventh Street, basically, try to get it

repaved so that it is travelable. Last year the City Council authorized the Engineering Department to hire an engineering firm to get existing grades to make that the project that has been originally thought about for the last five years that they need to re-establish the drainage where they could while they were doing the project. Sometime in late Fall, early Winter, the City decided that, because the Downtown Development Authority could get the City some money, and instead of just doing a basic tearing the asphalt off the street, re-establishing the crown, the Council decided it was going to do a total street reconstruction. Council threw it on the Engineering Department that is already understaffed. They hired the same consultant. According to Mr. Elam the consultant probably doesn't really know anything about designing streets, and right now they have a big mess down there. One year ago he asked, "Are you going to do something major?" He was told, "No, it's just to make sure that we are establishing the drainage." This Spring when he saw the plans he kept asking "What's the long-range plan for South Seventh Street and the whole area?" Mr. Elam realized that the City has only two accesses to the area, 7th Street and 9th Street, or 5th Street via Noland. No one could tell him what the long-range plans were. Was it going to be kept Industrial or were they going to Commercial? What are we doing? He kept trying to get intersections with curves large enough to carry the type traffic that an Industrial area would use. But no one could tell him what they were designing 7th Street for. The City's Engineering Department bent over backwards to try to accommodate him on whether he wanted parking area, driveway cuts, did he want to leave the driveway cuts as is, or did he want them changed? He appreciated their concern. He kept asking, "What are we doing? Are we going to allow parking along Seventh Street? Are we going to discourage it? What is going on?"

Now Mr. Elam is going to end up with a chain-link fence where the top of the back of the sidewalk will not even reach the bottom of the concrete that he has around the posts in order to hold the original fence in. The area that he gave up as a parking area because he had bought other property right next to his office, paved the parking lot, right now the back top of the sidewalk is going to end up at the bottom of the asphalt that he put in just two weeks ago. He supposed that it is his problem to re-establish the drainage and the appearance because it happens to be on his side of the property.

Because it is going to be a major league construction the City wanted to underground all the utilities, specifically, electrical, telephone, and cable TV. When Public Service started putting in the gas line, Mr. Elam walked out and said to the workers, "You know this is going to be re-constructed. They're thinking about excavating it two feet and replacing it with pit rock. Are you guys getting your line low enough that it won't be in the way of the contractor when he gets ready to do his work?" "Oh, yah, we won't have any problem." Right now Mr. Elam, as the contractor for the project, is fighting right along the top of the gas line with his excavation. No one bothered to go down there and establish any

grades for those people or anything else. They put in underground electrical, unbeknownst to any of the property owners. They decided they are going to put in street lights. Unfortunately for Mr. Elam, he didn't follow the definition of "assume" that they would be at the intersections. And they started to cut a hole in the middle of Mr. Elam's asphalt, and placed one in the middle of his front door. He got them to move it part way up the street.

Also, after the electrical was reconnected and they cut up his asphalt and everything else to put it underground, which he agreed to, and which has not been patched back yet (he guessed that was his responsibility too), for some reason he started blowing a bunch of fuses. And when Public Service undergrounds, instead of 220, he got 200 volts. A lot of the older motors will not steam 200 volts. As the voltage is pulled down the heat rises in the motor and fuses blow. He was sure that two of his PC computers have cratered their logic boards because of some of that. He didn't seem to have any of those problems before.

Mr. Elam felt that the City's staff is trying to do everything it can. He felt that the City should go back to engineering its own projects rather than letting some consultant do it. He felt that there is a big mess down on Seventh Street and felt that the City should shut the whole project down at this point and get some things straightened out before construction goes any further. People still are not going to be happy with what the City is doing down there. Houses down there had drainage before. Why is the City digging holes in the ground trying to drain it even deeper. He stated it won't work. The City should be raising the street.

City Manager Mark Achen stated the engineering issue resulted in an emergency meeting today in which the City considered whether it ought to continue with the project, or shut it down again, which would be the second time it has been shut down because of exactly the kind of problems that Mr. Elam has pointed out. It has become evident to the City's Engineering Staff that the impact of the change of grade of the street upon adjacent properties is not all positive. There are a number of properties where the City is going to have to decide exactly how it is impacting them and how it can minimize that. Primarily, it is a grade problem. There are a lot of utilities that influence the City's ability to work down there in what room it has to work with to design the street. There was an effort underway when the project was designed to try to improve the drainage. He understood the point that if we're going to make it worse, it certainly is not a good project.

The property where Mr. Elam is located and immediately across the street are situations where their ground elevation is one foot or more above the back of the sidewalk. So the City has transition problems that were not anticipated or designed for. And at the other end of the construction project there is the opposite problem where the street grade is above the adjacent properties. That is a condition that exists today, and the City is making it worse. The City met today and tried to decide whether it is going

to stop the project and take it in-house and redesign it and have the problem of having an unfinished street for approximately another six to nine months because of all the time requirements the City has on other things that it has going, or whether it will try to do the best it can with the project.

Mr. Elam stated that he would rather wait and get something that everyone can live with than have the existing mess. He felt that the City staff got pushed into something before it was ready to do it and had ample time to analyze everything down there with the total reconstruction the way it is. He stated that the bike path and the landscaping is a dead issue. He felt it is going to go in whether he likes it or not. And that's the way he's building it.

Councilman Theobald disagreed with Mr. Elam's characterization of the neighborhood as being purely Industrial. Obviously to the people who live in the area, it is not. He disagreed with the description of the landscaping, including Mr. Elam's description of trees in his section of the street, which are not planned. There will not be trees along that section. Mr. Elam had made reference to it, and it implied that there were. Mr. Theobald wanted to straighten that out because Mr. Elam made a lengthy statement over discussion and debate as to what that street was going to be as a major corridor to a major access to the Riverfront was discussed and debated at length several months ago. Mr. Theobald felt it was very frustrating for what he thought was a closed debate to be brought up again as a peripheral tangential issue to some bad engineering that the City has brought in from Banner & Associates, when the real point is the engineering company that the City brought in has made some mistakes, has not done a very satisfactory job, and as such, the City is now going to have to do something to solve that. He felt that it is also very frustrating for Mr. Elam to imply that the mistakes by Banner are the City's fault and the fault of simply wanting to build a corridor to the Riverfront instead of just simply putting new asphalt down on the street. He understood Mr. Elam's concerns. He understood the problems that he is encountering as a property owner aside from his dual role in this as also the contractor.

Mr. Elam stated that his real concern is the drainage situation and having a big pond down on the end of 7th Street where it is downhill from Struthers or either direction.

City Manager Mark Achen stated that the City is not at the point where it knows the solution and the feasibility of that solution, but today the City decided that it needs additional off-site, in other words, behind the right-of-way, survey information so that it can get cross sections that go back far enough to show it how the project matches with the adjacent properties. By personal observation you can tell there is a problem, but to quantify that problem, additional survey data is required. The City has made a decision regarding the major sewer line that goes through the middle of the project that is an influence or an obstacle for some of the grade issues because it is so close to the surface. Those

efforts to deal with those issues are going to occur in the next week, and Mr. Achen is hoping that by the end of next week the City will know whether this is really feasible. The problem is that the City has a contract with Elam Construction that is underway. He continues to work, and at this point, the City is going on the assumption that it appears feasible that the City will find solutions. So the City concluded not to stop the project today. But by the end of next week there is a possibility that the City might conclude that "No, the solution is not easy to obtain." And the City is going to have to stop and do a lot more engineering design to make it work.

The City Attorney felt it is possible the engineering firm of Banner & Associates could be held liable for the delays in construction and/or cost overruns due to the delays.

Mr. Elam complimented the City Engineering Department for its efforts and frustrations involved in working with the property owners in the area. As a Grand Junction tax payer, he asked the City not to jump off and do things. Sometimes when the City has other plans that have sort of been developed as to what it's going to do, and it gets a windfall of money, and it suddenly wants to turn the whole thing quickly upside down, it doesn't always work as fast as the City thinks it does. That has been part of the problem in trying to get it designed to fit what was there. He clarified that the landscaping has nothing to do with it. He is concerned about the grades and what the Contractor is doing in front of his business. It didn't matter who the contractor for the project might have been, himself or someone else, he would still have come before Council complaining because of what he walked out and found going on this morning. He felt that the existing drainage problems are being multiplied without any real consideration of the side streets.

City Engineer Don Newton stated that he met with the property owners after the initial conceptual design was completed before the project was finally designed. At that point, all the City had was the plan that showed the architectural renderings for the landscaping, the road layout, and sidewalks, street lighting, etc. He stated that the City has had major problems in conflict with the existing utilities. Every time the City attempts to dig a trench to install a pipe or a storm inlet it runs into a large telephone concrete case system or run into a sanitary sewer line or some other utility. Yesterday it was discovered that the drains on the street were not matching the existing properties. The contractor went out and staked the grades for new sidewalk and then started excavating for the base course that goes in the sidewalk, and it became apparent that some areas were as much as one foot below the adjacent properties, and in other areas as much as one foot and three inches above the adjacent property. Mr. Newton discussed the problems at length.

Mr. Ken Brotsky, principle of the firm of Banner & Associates, was present to speak to Council. He stated that Banner & Associates

was not involved in the nature of the street, whether it would be an Industrial street or a thoroughfare to the Riverfront. He stated his company will take responsibility for the project management due to design. The area is extremely flat. There were major drainage problems before. He knew he would have to improve on the drainage. There is not much existing storm sewer available. The decision was made due to budget constraints. Building a completely new underground storm sewer system would have solved a lot of the problems if that could have been done. As a result you have to create some high and low spots in the street in order to get positive down the gutters. Mr. Brotsky felt that the current grades are the best grades possible without installing a completely new underground storm sewer system. He admitted that his company had some problems with survey data on some of the intersection streets. His company has met with City staff to address the problems, and taking care of some redesign of the sanitary sewer. He stated that Banner & Associates is not involved in the location of the street lights. It does not design street light systems.

MS. PENNY HEUSCHER TO DISCUSS ABANDONED CARS ON UNAWEEP AVENUE

Ms. Penny Heuscher was not present to discuss this item. Councilman Bessinger commented on Ms. Heuscher's letter regarding abandoned cars at 830 Unawep Avenue. The City's Community Development Code Enforcement Office will be contacted for a response to this problem.

CONSIDERATION OF BIDS - AWARD OF CONTRACTS

Water Line Replacement, 1991, West Mesa, First Street to Bass Street - Lyle States Construction - \$87,868.80

Watson Island Trail - United Companies of Mesa County - \$101,140.00

Upon motion by Councilman Nelson, seconded by Councilman McCurry and carried with Councilman BESSINGER voting NO on the second item, the bids were accepted, contracts were awarded as noted, and the City Manager was authorized to sign said Contracts.

HEARING #9-91 - PROPOSED ORDINANCE - ZONING DIAMOND SHAMROCK ANNEXATION NO. 2 TO LIGHT COMMERCIAL (C-1), LOCATED ON THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF 29 ROAD AND NORTH AVENUE - CONTAINING 0.62 ACRES

A hearing was held after proper notice on the zoning of Diamond Shamrock Annexation No. 2 to Light Commercial (C-1), located on the southeast corner of 29 Road and North Avenue containing 0.62 acres. Bennett Boeschstein, Community Development Director, reviewed the proposed zoning. There were no opponents, letters or counterpetitions. The hearing was closed.

The following entitled proposed ordinance was presented and read:

ZONING CERTAIN LANDS ANNEXED TO THE CITY LOCATED ON THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF NORTH AVENUE AND 29 ROAD. Upon motion by Councilman Theobold, seconded by Councilman McCurry and carried, the proposed ordinance was passed for publication.

HEARING #29-91 - PROPOSED ORDINANCE - ZONING FOUNTAINHEAD ANNEXATION TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL 12 UNITS PER ACRE (PR-12) AND RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY-RURAL (RSF-R), LOCATED NORTH OF G ROAD BETWEEN 24 AND 25-1/4 ROADS - CONTAINING 136.22 ACRES

A hearing was held after proper notice on the zoning of Fountainhead Annexation to Planned Residential 12 units per acre (PR-12) and Residential Single-Family-Rural (RSF-R), located north of G Road between 24 and 25-1/4 Roads containing 136.22 acres. Bennett Boeschstein, Community Development Director, reviewed the proposed zoning. There were no opponents, letters or counterpetitions. The hearing was closed.

The following entitled proposed ordinance was presented and read: ZONING CERTAIN LANDS ANNEXED TO THE CITY LOCATED NORTH OF G ROAD BETWEEN 24 AND 25-1/4 ROADS. Upon motion by Councilman Theobold, seconded by Councilman Bessinger and carried, the proposed ordinance was passed for publication.

RECOGNITION OF MESA COLLEGE STUDENTS IN ATTENDANCE AT MEETING

HEARING #28-91 - PROPOSED ORDINANCE - ZONING FIRST AND PATTERSON ANNEXATION PLANNED BUSINESS 10 UNITS PER ACRE (PR-10), PLANNED BUSINESS (PB) WITH ALLOWANCES AND RESTRICTIONS PER ANNEXATION AGREEMENT, RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY 4 UNITS PER ACRE (RSF-4), AND RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY-RURAL (RSF-R), LOCATED NORTH AND SOUTH OF PATTERSON ROAD AND WEST OF FIRST STREET - CONTAINING 41.24 ACRES

A hearing was held after proper notice on the proposed zoning of First and Patterson Annexation to Planned Business 10 units per acre (PR-10), Planned Business (PB) with allowances and restrictions per annexation agreement, Residential Single-Family 4 units per acre (RSF-4), and Residential Single-Family-Rural (RSF-R), located north and south of Patterson Road and West of First Street containing 41.24 acres. Community Development Director Bennett Boeschstein reviewed the proposed zoning. There were no opponents, letters or counterpetitions. The hearing was closed.

The following entitled proposed ordinance was presented and read: ZONING CERTAIN LANDS ANNEXED TO THE CITY LOCATED NORTH AND SOUTH OF PATTERSON ROAD AND WEST OF FIRST STREET. Upon motion by Councilman Theobold, seconded by Councilman Bessinger and carried with Councilman BAUGHMAN ABSTAINING, the proposed ordinance was passed for publication.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE - USE OF CONSUMER PRICE INDEX AS AN ANNUAL GUIDE FOR CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION FEE AND CHARGE INCREASES AND RESOLUTION NO. 58-91 - FEE AND CHARGE CHANGES FOR THE CITY OF

GRAND JUNCTION - TABLED TO OCTOBER 16, 1991

The following entitled proposed ordinance was presented and read: USE OF CONSUMER PRICE INDEX AS AN ANNUAL GUIDE FOR CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION FEE AND CHARGE CHANGES. Upon motion by Councilman Theobald, seconded by Councilman McCurry and carried, the proposed ordinance and Resolution No. 58-91 was tabled to October 16, 1991.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE ADDING SECTION 5-5-1 N. (ESTABLISHING PARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DOWNTOWN) TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE

Bennett Boeschstein, Community Development Director, reviewed this item. Mr. J. D. Snodgrass, representing the Downtown Development Authority, was present. The following entitled proposed ordinance was presented and read: ADDING SECTION 5-5-1 N. (ESTABLISHING PARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DOWNTOWN) TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE. Upon motion by Councilman Theobald, seconded by Councilman McCurry and carried, the proposed ordinance was passed for publication.

ORDINANCE NO. 2537 - AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, TO PLEDGE CERTAIN SALES TAX REVENUES TO GUARANTEE CERTAIN OUTSTANDING BONDS OF THE GRAND JUNCTION WEST WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT, MESA COUNTY, COLORADO, AS PART OF A COMPREHENSIVE ANNEXATION PLAN; APPROVING THE FORM OF THE GUARANTEE; PROVIDING FOR THE PAYMENT OF ANY CLAIMS ON THE GUARANTEE FROM A PORTION OF THE REVENUES OF THE SALES AND USE TAX IMPOSED BY THE CITY; AND PROVIDING OTHER DETAILS IN CONNECTION THEREWITH

Upon motion by Councilman McCurry, seconded by Councilman Bessinger and carried, the ordinance was called up for final passage and read by title only: AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, TO PLEDGE CERTAIN SALES TAX REVENUES TO GUARANTEE CERTAIN OUTSTANDING BONDS OF THE GRAND JUNCTION WEST WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT, MESA COUNTY, COLORADO, AS PART OF A COMPREHENSIVE ANNEXATION PLAN; APPROVING THE FORM OF THE GUARANTEE; PROVIDING FOR THE PAYMENT OF ANY CLAIMS ON THE GUARANTEE FROM A PORTION OF THE REVENUES OF THE SALES AND USE TAX IMPOSED BY THE CITY; AND PROVIDING OTHER DETAILS IN CONNECTION THEREWITH.

There were no comments. Upon motion by Councilman McCurry, seconded by Councilman Bessinger and carried by roll call vote with Councilman BAUGHMAN voting NO, the Ordinance was passed and adopted, numbered 2537, and ordered published.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING A WATERSHED DISTRICT AND ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS FOR WATERSHED DISTRICT PERMITS

The following entitled proposed ordinance was presented and read: ESTABLISHING A WATERSHED PROTECTION DISTRICT ENCOMPASSING THE

KANNAH CREEK DRAINAGE BASIN AND WHITEWATER CREEK DRAINAGE BASIN; ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS FOR WATERSHED DISTRICT PERMITS IN CONNECTION WITH VARIOUS ACTIVITIES WITHIN SAID WATERSHED DISTRICTS; PROHIBITING ANY PERSON FROM ENGAGING IN CERTAIN ACTIVITIES WITHIN SAID WATERSHED PROTECTION DISTRICTS WITHOUT FIRST OBTAINING A WATERSHED DISTRICT PERMIT; AND PROVIDING A PENALTY FOR THE VIOLATION OF THIS ORDINANCE. Upon motion by Councilman Theobold, seconded by Councilman Bessinger and carried, the proposed ordinance was passed for publication.

RESOLUTION NO. 59-91 STATING THE OFFICIAL POSITION OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION ON THE PROPOSED TRANSCOLORADO GAS TRANSMISSION PIPELINE PROJECT - TABLE TO NOVEMBER 6, 1991

The following Resolution was presented and read: (Full copy in P.R.). Mr. Jim Robb, local counsel for TransColorado Pipeline Company, was present. He requested that Council table the Resolution in order to allow a meeting with TransColorado, City Staff, and City Council to consider the two alternatives addressed in said Resolution. Mr. Robb, speaking on behalf of TransColorado, stated that they would pay reasonable expenses to have the City hire an independent consultant.

Upon motion by Councilman Theobold, seconded by Councilman Nelson and carried with Council members BENNETT, BESSINGER and BAUGHMAN voting NO, Resolution No. 59-91 stating the official position of the City of Grand Junction on the proposed TransColorado Gas Transmission Pipeline Project was tabled to November 6, 1991, for reconsideration.

AUTHORIZING THE CITY ATTORNEY TO QUANTIFY THE DAMAGES INCURRED ON THE SOMERVILLE RANCH BY AGENTS OF TRANSCOLORADO AND TO NEGOTIATE A PROPOSED SETTLEMENT, IF POSSIBLE, FOR REVIEW BY THE COUNCIL

Upon motion by Councilman Bessinger, seconded by Councilman Baughman and carried, the City Attorney was authorized to quantify the damages incurred on the Somerville Ranch by agents of TransColorado and to negotiate a proposed settlement, if possible, for review by City Council.

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

WESTERN COLORADO CENTER FOR THE ARTS' REQUEST FOR LOAN OF \$550,000 FOR RELOCATION OF ARTS CENTER

Ron Lappi, Administrative Services Director, reviewed costs to the City at various interest rates to accomplish a \$505,000 loan (with the Downtown Association pledging a \$50,000 loan) to Western Colorado Center for the Arts for the purchase of a downtown location (building).

Upon motion by Councilman Bessinger, seconded by Councilman Baughman and carried with Council members NELSON and SHEPHERD

voting NO, the request was denied.

MOTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SIGN, ON BEHALF OF THE CITY AS CO SPONSOR, AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO THE GRANT AGREEMENT BETWEEN FAA AND THE SPONSORS FOR THE AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT NO. 3-08-0027-06 AT WALKER FIELD - AMENDMENT INCREASES THE FEDERAL OBLIGATION BY \$87,622.17

Upon motion by Councilman Bennett, seconded by Councilman Bessinger and carried the Mayor was authorized to sign, on behalf of the City as co-sponsor, Amendment No. 2 to the Grant Agreement between FAA and the sponsors for the Airport Improvement Project No. 3-08-0027-06 at Walker Field, increasing the Federal obligation by \$87,622.17.

BUDGET WORKSHOP SCHEDULED FOR SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1991

REVIEW OF PROPOSALS FOR THE VISION PROJECT

The Quality of Life Committee discussed the review of proposals for the Vision Project today. Councilman Theobold reported that five proposals were received out of which three seemed to be of good quality, although the numbers in the proposals were not comparable. The Committee will set up another meeting to analyze the proposals in detail and make recommendations at a future date. Assistant to the

STATE OF COLORADO)
COUNTY OF MESA)
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION)

CERTIFICATION

I, NEVA B. LOCKHART, City Clerk, City of Grand Junction, Colorado, do hereby certify that on October 9, 1991, after listening to the tapes of the September 18, 1991, City Council meeting regarding Resolution No. 59-91, the offer by Mr. Robb, attorney representing TransColorado Gas Transmission Pipeline Project, was the agreement to "foot a reasonable expense to have the City engage a consultant."

DATED this 9th day of October, 1991.

Neva B. Lockhart

Neva B. Lockhart, CMC

City Clerk

City Manager Jody Kole stated that she will be meeting with the top three candidates to try to find out if their fees are negotiable, then meet with the Quality of Life Committee on October 7, 1991, 1:00 p.m., and report back to City Council at its Workshop on Monday, October 14.

SENIOR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

Councilman Bessinger felt that the persons in charge of transporting the elderly and handicapped are getting off-track by trying to supply mass transportation for everyone (teenagers and all) in the valley. Mayor Shepherd stated that Mesa County has taken the lead on mass transit in the County (Agreement in 1981).

HOUSING

Councilman Bessinger questioned Council as to whether it wants to be 100% successful in supplying housing for all those in need of housing. Consensus of Council was that it is impossible to accomplish, but wished to continue to work within the realms of the current process and leadership.

ADJOURNMENT

The President adjourned the meeting.

Neva B. Lockhart, CMC
City Clerk