

GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL November 6, 1991

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, convened in the regular session the 6th day of November, 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 Deputy City Clerk Teddy Martinez.

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

INVOCATION - Rev. Jack Olsen, Columbus Evangelical Free Church.

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

Upon motion by Councilman McCurry, seconded by Councilman Bessinger and carried, the minutes of the Regular City Council Meeting October 16, 1991, the Special City Council Meeting October 28, 1991, and the Special City Council Meeting October 30, 1991, were approved as submitted.

PROCLAMATION DECLARING NOVEMBER 17-23, 1991, AS "AMERICAN EDUCATION WEEK"

PRESENTATION OF APPRECIATION PLAQUES TO STEVE POUST, R.T. MANTLO, AND EARL PAYNE FOR THEIR SERVICE ON THE GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, HOUSING AUTHORITY

RON HALSEY, REPRESENTING MESA COUNTY COALITION ON DISABILITY, DISCUSSES NEED FOR PUBLIC RESTROOMS (HANDICAP ACCESSIBLE) IN DOWNTOWN AREA OF GRAND JUNCTION

Mr. Ron Halsey, representing Mesa County Coalition on Disability, stated that the National Organization on Disability has established a nation-wide program called "Calling on America." This program was initiated by Jim Brady, the former aide to President Reagan, to help implement the Americans with Disabilities Act. They are challenging local communities to establish community partnerships to initiate projects that will meet local needs of persons with disabilities. A County-wide Partnership Program has been initiated, and conducted its first meeting in July, 1991, at which time goals were adopted for 1991. One of the goals was to work on initiating a public restroom facility in the downtown Grand Junction area, with the facility being accessible to all citizens, open only during business hours, and only during special events being held in the downtown area. Mr. Halsey stated that two locations for the restrooms have been suggested: (1) the lot right behind Woolworths, in the northeast corner; and (2) the walkway between 5th and 6th Street on Main. Both areas are adjacent to the alley where there would be convenient hookup for water and sewer taps.

Mr. Halsey stated that a petition will be filed on November 8, 1991, containing over 500 signatures, indicating broad community support for this project. He solicited a commitment on the part of the Grand Junction City Council without establishing a specific dollar amount. Mayor Conner Shepherd responded that the Downtown Development Authority has expressed a willingness to cooperate with the City Council with a matching fund program to encourage the Downtown Association to participate. The Downtown Development Authority also felt that the Mesa County Coalition on Disability could attempt to secure some of the private foundations and possibly some grants. Mr. Halsey stated that his organization would gladly research these items. Mayor Shepherd stated that the stumbling block right now is the ongoing operations and maintenance costs of such a facility. The funding of such a project will be considered.

RESOLUTION NO. 74-91 APPOINTING ELAINE INGVERTSEN TO AIRPORT AUTHORITY

The following Resolution was presented: (See next page.).

Upon motion by Councilman Theobald, seconded by Councilman Bennett and carried by roll call vote, Elaine Ingvertsen was appointed to a four-year term on the Walker Field, Colorado, Airport Authority.

LACK OF LIGHTING AND VISIBILITY AT CITY/COUNTY AUDITORIUM

Councilman Nelson responded to a recent Letter to the Editor regarding lack of lighting and visibility at the City/County Auditorium. He stated that the City is working at correcting this problem.

LANA TURROU, REPRESENTING GRAND JUNCTION AREA FILM COMMISSION, REQUESTS CITY FUNDS

Lana Turrou, Representing Grand Junction Area Film Commission, explained that its Board formed shortly after the State requested that communities participate with the Boards to promote Colorado to the film industry. The State recognizes this effort as a very viable economic development venture. Over the past two years the Commission has expended approximately \$9,358 (includes some in-kind services). The Commission has generated approximately an income of \$478,400. She stated that there are 8 other commissions in Colorado, and 10 communities provide contacts to work with the State of Colorado. Budgets range from \$2,000 to \$37,000. Ms Turrou explained that the Grand Junction Area Film Commission is requesting funds from the City Council particularly because of the requirement for Film Commission

RESOLUTION NO. 74-91

RE-APPOINTING ELAINE INGVERTSEN AS CITY REPRESENTATIVE ON THE BOARD OF THE WALKER FIELD, COLORADO, PUBLIC AIRPORT AUTHORITY

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

That Elaine Ingvertsen be appointed as City representative to the Walker Field, Colorado, Public Airport Authority Board for a regular four-year term on that Board, which term expires October, 1995.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 6th day of November, 1991.

Conner W. Shepherd

President of the Council

Attest:

Theresa F. Martinez

Deputy City Clerk

to receive governmental funds. She also felt that so far the Commission's efforts have paid off quite nicely. It is an industry where the community gets a good return on its investment. The State of Colorado estimates that it costs the State less than 1% of the total income.

Mayor Conner Shepherd questioned who requires the government funding. Ms Torrou replied the Association of Film Commissioners International. The State of Colorado complies with that as well. The Grand Junction Area Film Commission had belonged to the Association of Film Commissioners International. When the Commission was first formed it seeked funding from the Chamber of Commerce. Now it needs to get more community funding as well as governmental. That is a requirement of both AFCI and the State.

Ms Torrou further explained that the AFCI requires that a commission receive 30% of its funding from governmental funds, which would total \$5,000 for the Grand Junction Area Film Commission based on its 1992 budget. She stated that they have had informal discussions with Debbie Kovalik, Director of the Visitors & Convention Bureau. Debbie Kovalik was present and spoke to Council also. Ms. Torrou commented that approximately one third of the commissions work in cooperation with the VCBs. The Grand Junction Area Film Commission is currently housed with the Fruita Chamber of Commerce, and will be requesting funds from Fruita and other municipalities in the area.

Consensus of Council was that since the VCB is a board that is used to dealing with marketing issue, it would be more appropriate for the VCB to deal with this request.

RESOLUTION NO. 70-91 ACCEPTING PETITION FOR INTERSTATE EAST ANNEXATION CONTAINING APPROXIMATELY 35 ACRES LOCATED NORTH OF G ROAD LYING EAST AND WEST OF 23-1/2 ROAD AND GIVING NOTICE OF

HEARING

The following Resolution was presented: (See next page.).

Upon motion by Councilman Bennett, seconded by Councilman McCurry and carried by roll call vote, the Resolution was passed and adopted.

RESOLUTION NO. 71-91 ACCEPTING PETITION FOR GRAND JUNCTION WEST ANNEXATION CONTAINING ONE-HALF PLUS SQUARE MILE LOCATED BETWEEN 22 TO 23-1/4 ROAD, SOUTH OF I-70, AND NORTH OF U.S. HIGHWAY 6 & 50 AND GIVING NOTICE OF HEARING

The following Resolution was presented: (See next page.).

Upon motion by Councilman Bennett, seconded by Councilman Theobold and carried by roll call vote with Councilman BAUGHMAN voting NO, the Resolution was passed and adopted.

RESOLUTION NO. 72-91 ACCEPTING PETITION FOR PERSIGO ANNEXATION CONTAINING ONE-HALF PLUS SQUARE MILE LOCATED BETWEEN 21-1/2 ROAD TO 22 ROAD

The following Resolution was presented: (Full copy in P.R.). Upon motion by Councilman Bennett, seconded by Councilman Nelson and carried with Councilman BAUGHMAN voting NO, the Resolution was passed and adopted.

CONSIDERATION OF BIDS - AWARD OF CONTRACTS

Visitors & Convention Bureau Full Color Visitor Guide (275,000 Copies) - Mountain West Printing - \$38,733

Change Order No. 1 to Contract for S. 7th Street Reconstruction - Elam Construction - \$64,325.05

Upon motion by Councilman Theobold, seconded by Councilman McCurry and carried, the above Contracts were approved in the amounts noted, and the City Manager was authorized to sign Contracts.

ORDINANCES ON FINAL PASSAGE

Proofs of Publication on the following Ordinances proposed for final passage have been received and filed. Copies of the Ordinances proposed for final passage were submitted to the City Council prior to the meeting.

ORDINANCE NO. 2542 - VACATING AN EASEMENT ON PROPERTY WITH A STREET ADDRESS OF 275 HOLLY LANE

Upon motion by Councilman Theobold, seconded by Councilman McCurry and carried, the following entitled proposed ordinance was called up for final passage and read by title only: VACATING AN EASEMENT LOCATED ON PROPERTY WITH A STREET ADDRESS OF 275 HOLLY LANE.

There were no comments. Upon motion by Councilman McCurry, seconded by Councilman Baughman and carried by roll call vote, the Ordinance was passed, adopted, numbered 2542, and ordered published.

ORDINANCE NO. 2543 - MAKING MUNICIPAL COURT A QUALIFIED COURT OF RECORD, CHAPTER 18.5, CODE OF ORDINANCES

Upon motion by Councilman Theobald, seconded by Councilman McCurry and carried, the following entitled proposed ordinance was called up for final passage and read by title only: CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO.

Upon motion by Councilman Bennett, seconded by Councilman McCurry and carried by roll call vote, the Ordinance was passed, adopted, numbered 2543, and ordered published.

RESOLUTION NO. 70-91

ACCEPTING A PETITION FOR THE ANNEXATION OF LANDS TO THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, AND SETTING A HEARING ON SUCH ANNEXATION (INTERSTATE EAST ANNEXATION) CONTAINING APPROXIMATELY 35 ACRES LOCATED NORTH OF G ROAD LYING EAST AND WEST OF 23-1/2 ROAD

WHEREAS, on the 6th day of November, 1991, a petition was submitted to the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, for annexation to said City of the following property situate in Mesa County, Colorado, and described as follows:

The S 1/2 NW 1/4 SE 1/4 Section 32 T1N R1W except the N 1/2 SW 1/4 SE 1/4 said section 32 and

Beginning S 0 deg. 01 min. 27 sec. W 660.11 feet from the Center of section 32 T1N R1W thence S 0 deg. 01 min. 27 sec. W 462.02 feet thence S 89 deg. 55 min. 32 sec. W 659.72 feet thence S 0 deg. 00 min. 31 sec. W 198.09 feet thence S 89 deg. 55 min. 32 sec. W 659.67 feet thence N 0 deg. 00 min. 26 sec. E 660.15 feet thence N 89 deg. 55 min. 44 sec. E 1319.70 feet to beginning; and

Lots 4, 5, and 6, Block 3, Interstate Commercial Park Subdivision,

WHEREAS, the Council has found and determined that the petition complies substantially with the provisions of the Municipal Annexation Act and a hearing should be held to determine whether or not the lands should be annexed to the City by Ordinance;

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

That a hearing will be held on the 18th day of December, 1991, in the City-County Auditorium in City hall of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, at 7:30 o'clock p.m. to determine whether one-sixth of the perimeter of the area proposed to be annexed is

contiguous with the City; whether a community of interest exists between the territory and the City; whether the territory proposed to be annexed is urban or will be urbanized in the near future; whether the territory is integrated or is capable of being integrated with said City; whether any land in single ownership has been divided by the proposed annexation; whether any land held in identical ownership comprising more than twenty acres which, together with the buildings and improvements thereon, has an assessed valuation in excess of two hundred thousand dollars is included without the landowner's consent; whether any of the land is now subject to other annexation proceedings; and whether an election is required under the Municipal Annexation Act of 1965.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 6th day of November, 1991.

President of the Council

Attest:

City Clerk

RESOLUTION NO. 71-91

ACCEPTING A PETITION FOR THE ANNEXATION OF LANDS TO THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, AND SETTING A HEARING ON SUCH ANNEXATION (GRAND JUNCTION WEST ANNEXATION) CONTAINING ONE-HALF PLUS SQUARE MILE LOCATED BETWEEN 22 TO 23-1/4 ROAD, SOUTH OF I-70, AND NORTH OF U.S. HIGHWAY 6 & 50

WHEREAS, on the 6th day of November, 1991, a petition was submitted to the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, for annexation to said City of the following property situate in Mesa County, Colorado, and described as follows:

The Northerly one foot of the southerly three feet of public right-of-way of Interstate 70 extending from the West right-of-way line of 24 Road to a point 38 feet east of the west section line of section T1N R1W and the southerly 3 feet of public right-of-way of Interstate 70 from a point 38 ft. east of the west section line of section 32 T1N R1W to the NE Corner Lot 6 Sellars Sub Replat #1, Section 31 T1N R1W and that part of the N 1/2 said section 31 lying south of the I-70 right-of-way; and

The west 38 feet of section 32 T1N R1W lying between the South right-of-way line of Interstate 70 and the North right-of-way line of G Road; and

All of the SE 1/4 Section 31 T1N R1W; and

All of the SW 1/4 Section 31 T1N T1W lying northeasterly of U. S.

Highway 6 & 50, except right-of-way for Interstate 70; and

Lots 1, 2, and 3 of the replat of Lot 18 Smith & Bailey's Riverside Sub, Section 6, T1S R1W including all right-of-way for G Road abutting said lots; and

That part of Lots 16 and 17, Smith & Bailey's Riverside Sub Section 6, T1S R1W lying west of the Independent Ranchman's Ditch and North of U.S. Highway 6 & 50; and

Beginning at the intersection of the northerly right-of-way line of U.S. Highway 6 & 50 and the west line of the NE 1/4 NE 1/4 Section 6 T1S R1W, thence S 56 deg. 44 min. 04 sec. E 419.54 feet thence N 33 deg. 40 min. 59 sec. W 632.52 feet thence South 296.20 feet to beginning; and

All of Midwest Commercial Subdivision Section 6 T1S R1W including all public right-of-way for G Road adjacent to said subdivision; and

Lot Two Grand Park Plaza Subdivision Section 32 T1N R1W; and

Lots 1-5 of Monument View Commercial Park Subdivision, including all public right-of-way for G Road and 23 Road adjacent to said subdivision.

WHEREAS, the Council has found and determined that the petition complies substantially with the provisions of the Municipal Annexation Act and a hearing should be held to determine whether or not the lands should be annexed to the City by Ordinance;

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

That a hearing will be held on the 18th day of December, 1991, in the City-County Auditorium in City hall of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, at 7:30 o'clock p.m. to determine whether one-sixth of the perimeter of the area proposed to be annexed is contiguous with the City; whether a community of interest exists between the territory and the City; whether the territory proposed to be annexed is urban or will be urbanized in the near future; whether the territory is integrated or is capable of being integrated with said City; whether any land in single ownership has been divided by the proposed annexation; whether any land held in identical ownership comprising more than twenty acres which, together with the buildings and improvements thereon, has an assessed valuation in excess of two hundred thousand dollars is included without the landowner's consent; whether any of the land is now subject to other annexation proceedings; and whether an election is required under the Municipal Annexation Act of 1965.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 6th day of November, 1991.

President of the Council

Attest:

City Clerk

RESOLUTION NO. 72-91

ACCEPTING A PETITION FOR THE ANNEXATION OF LANDS TO THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, AND SETTING A HEARING ON SUCH ANNEXATION (PERSIGO ANNEXATION) CONTAINING ONE-HALF PLUS SQUARE MILE, LOCATED BETWEEN 21-1/2 ROAD TO 22 ROAD, FROM I-70 TO H ROAD

WHEREAS, on the 6th day of November, 1991, a petition was submitted to the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, for annexation to said City of the following property situate in Mesa County, Colorado, and described as follows:

The North one foot of the south 4 feet of public right-of-way of Interstate 70 from the West right-of-way line of 24 Road to the east line, extended, of Lot 6 Sellars Sub Replat No. 1; and

All of the public right-of-way of I-70 lying in the SW 1/4 Section 31 T1N R1W; and

All of the NE 1/4 Section 36 T1N R2W except the North 30 feet; and

All of the NE 1/4 NW 1/4 Section 36 T1N R2W lying southeasterly of a right-of-way for Prichard Wash recorded in B229 P27 and B230 P12 of the Mesa County Clerk and Recorder; and

All of the SE 1/4 NW 1/4 and NE 1/4 SW 1/4 and NW 1/4 SE 1/4 Section 36 T1N R2W lying North of I-70 Right-of-way; and

The NE 1/4 SE 1/4 Section 36 T1N R2W except that portion platted as Railhead Industrial Park Amended; and

All of the SW 1/4 SE 1/4 and SE 1/4 SW 1/4 Section 36 T1N R2W lying North of the I-70 right-of-way.

WHEREAS, the Council has found and determined that the petition complies substantially with the provisions of the Municipal Annexation Act and a hearing should be held to determine whether or not the lands should be annexed to the City by Ordinance;

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

That a hearing will be held on the 18th day of December, 1991, in the City-County Auditorium in City hall of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, at 7:30 o'clock p.m. to determine whether one-

sixth of the perimeter of the area proposed to be annexed is contiguous with the City; whether a community of interest exists between the territory and the City; whether the territory proposed to be annexed is urban or will be urbanized in the near future; whether the territory is integrated or is capable of being integrated with said City; whether any land in single ownership has been divided by the proposed annexation; whether any land held in identical ownership comprising more than twenty acres which, together with the buildings and improvements thereon, has an assessed valuation in excess of two hundred thousand dollars is included without the landowner's consent; whether any of the land is now subject to other annexation proceedings; and whether an election is required under the Municipal Annexation Act of 1965.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 6th day of November, 1991.

Conner W. Shephard

President of the Council

Attest:

Neva B. Lockhart, CMC

City Clerk

ORDINANCE NO 2544 - AMENDMENT TO CODE OF ORDINANCES, CHAPTER 19, SECTION 6, ON DEFINITION OF DISORDERLY HOUSE

Upon motion by Councilman Theobold, seconded by Councilman McCurry and carried, the following entitled proposed ordinance was called up for final passage and read by title only: AMENDING CHAPTER 19, SECTION 19-6 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO.

Upon motion by Councilman McCurry, seconded by Councilman Bessinger and carried by roll call vote, the Ordinance was passed, adopted, numbered 2544, and ordered published.

ORDINANCE NO 2545 - MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS TO THE 1991 BUDGET OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

Upon motion by Councilman Theobold, seconded by Councilman McCurry and carried, the following entitled proposed ordinance was called up for final passage and read by title only: AN ORDINANCE MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS TO THE 1991 BUDGET OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION.

Upon motion by Councilman Theobold, seconded by Councilman Bessinger and carried by roll call vote, the Ordinance was passed, adopted, numbered 2545, and ordered published.

ANIMAL CONTROL CONTRACT FOR 1992

Upon motion by Councilman Bennett, seconded by Councilman McCurry and carried with Councilman BESSINGER voting NO, the Animal Control Contract with Mesa County for 1992 was approved.

MUNICIPAL ANNEXATION PLAN - ANNUAL REVIEW

Community Development Director Bennett Boeschstein reviewed the Municipal Annexation Plan (see next page). Upon motion by Councilman Theobold, seconded by Councilman McCurry and carried, the Municipal Annexation Plan was approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 73-91 AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMIT TO NORTHWOOD ASSOCIATES FOR EXISTING SIDEWALK AND APPURTENANCES FOR NORTHWOOD APARTMENTS IN PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY AT 3505 N. 12TH STREET

The following Resolution was presented and read: (See next page.). Upon motion by Councilman Bennett, seconded by Councilman Baughman and carried by roll call vote, the Resolution was passed and adopted as read.

NEW RESTAURANT AT WALKER FIELD AIRPORT

Council members Bennett and Theobold gave a positive report on the new restaurant, Dutch's Airport Cafe & Lounge, which has recently opened at Walker Field Airport.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion by Councilman McCurry, seconded by Councilman Bessinger and carried, the meeting was adjourned.

Theresa F. Martinez

Theresa F. Martinez, CMC
Deputy City Clerk

RESOLUTION NO. 73-91

CONCERNING THE ISSUANCE OF A REVOCABLE PERMIT TO NW ASSOCIATES, LTD.

WHEREAS, NW Associates, Ltd., a Colorado Limited Partnership, which represents that it is the owner of Northwood, a subdivision of a part of the City of Grand Junction located in the SE1/4 NE1/4 of Section 2, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, also known as 3505 and 3559 North 12th Street, has petitioned the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, for a revocable Permit to allow existing sidewalk and landscape improvements, a lighted sign and three (3) flag poles in the public right-of-way for North 12th Street as shown on the attached Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Grand Junction has determined that such action would not at this time be detrimental

to the inhabitants of the City;

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

That the City Manager, on behalf of the City and as the act of the City, is hereby directed to grant the attached Revocable Permit to the above-named Petitioner, its heirs, successors and assigns, to allow existing sidewalk and landscape improvements, a lighted sign and three (3) flag poles within the public right-of-way aforescribed, subject, however, to the several terms, covenants and conditions contained in the attached Revocable Permit.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 6th day of November, 1991.

Conner W. Shephard

President of the Council

Attest:

City Clerk

REVOCABLE PERMIT

WHEREAS, NW Associates, Ltd., a Colorado Limited Partnership, which represents that it is the owner of Northwood, a subdivision of a part of the City of Grand Junction located in the SE1/4 NE1/4 of Section 2, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, also known as 3505 and 3559 North 12th Street, has petitioned the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, for a Revocable Permit to allow existing sidewalk and landscape improvements, a lighted sign and three (3) flag poles in the public right-of-way for North 12th Street as shown on the attached Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Grand Junction has determined that such action would not at this time be detrimental to the inhabitants of the City;

NOW, THEREFORE, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ACTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO:

There is hereby granted to NW Associates, Ltd., a Colorado Limited Partnership, its heirs, successors and assigns, a Revocable Permit to allow existing sidewalk and landscape improvements, a lighted sign and three (3) flag poles within the public right-of-way aforescribed; provided, however, that the issuance of this Revocable Permit shall be conditioned upon the following:

1. The Petitioner shall, at the Petitioner's expense, maintain the sidewalk in good repair and keep the same open for use by the

general public;

2. The landscape improvements shall be maintained in a manner which will not limit sight distance or create any other hazardous situation or dangerous condition for vehicular or pedestrian traffic;

3. The existence and maintenance of the sidewalk, landscape improvements, lighted sign and flag poles shall be subordinate to all existing utilities and irrigation facilities and all preexisting easements;

4. The Petitioner will not hold the City liable for any damages caused to the aforementioned improvements as a result of the City's or any other Public Utility's maintenance or future installation of roadway improvements or public utilities within the aforescribed public right-of-way;

5. This Revocable Permit shall be issued only upon the concurrent execution by the Petitioner of an agreement that the Petitioner will save and hold the City, its officers, employees and agents harmless from, and indemnify the City, its officers, employees and agents, with respect to any claims or causes of action however stated arising out of the encroachment or use granted, and that upon revocation of this Permit, the Petitioner will, within thirty (30) days of notice of revocation, peaceably surrender said right-of-way to the City and, at its own expense, remove any encroachment so as to restore the right-of-way to its original condition.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 1991.

Mark K. Achen

Mark K. Achen, City Manager

Attest:

City Clerk

Acceptance:

NAME

NW Associates, Ltd., a Colorado Limited Partnership

NAME

AGREEMENT

NW Associates, Ltd., a Colorado Limited Partnership, for itself, its heirs, successors and assigns, does hereby agree that it will abide by each and every condition contained in the foregoing Permit; that it shall indemnify the City of Grand Junction, its officers, employees and agents, and hold it, its officers, employees and agents harmless from all claims and causes of action as recited in said Permit; and that upon revocation of the Permit, it agrees to within thirty (30) days peaceably surrender said public right-of-way to the City and, at its own expense, remove any encroachment so as to restore the right-of-way to its original condition.

DATED at Grand Junction, Colorado, this _____ day of _____, 1991.

NW Associates, Ltd., a Colorado Limited Partnership

NAME

Attest:

NAME

STATE OF COLORADO)	
)	SS:
COUNTY OF)	

The foregoing Agreement was acknowledged before me this _____ day of _____, 1991, by _____ as _____ and by _____ as _____ of NW Associates, Ltd., a Colorado Limited Partnership.

Witness my hand and official seal.

My Commission expires: _____

Notary Public

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

PURPOSE AND INTENT

CHAPTER TWO

PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

CHAPTER THREE

TRANSPORTATION

CHAPTER FOUR

PARKS, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACES

CHAPTER FIVE

LAND USE

APPENDIX

CHAPTER ONE

PURPOSE AND INTENT

CHAPTER ONE

PURPOSE AND INTENT

A. As an urban center, Grand Junction cannot allow itself to stagnate. Many examples may be found across the country where suburbanization has constructed the urban core and sapped its economic and social health. The City believes that it is appropriate for urbanized and urbanizing areas to be within the corporate limits of a municipality. County governments are not designed to adequately deal with urban service demands and problems. Numerous higher density County subdivisions are experiencing severe problems with street maintenance, drainage, fire protection, water supply, and other urban services and facilities. Many subdivisions have streets that were never accepted for maintenance, while others have streets inadequate to allow the passage of fire apparatus.

The County Sheriff's office is inadequately staffed to provide urban law enforcement services. It does not provide services, such as traffic enforcement, that are customarily required in highly developed residential or commercial areas. The City's Police Department provides a full, urban law enforcement service.

Mesa County has eliminated its Parks and Recreation Department. County park areas remain partially developed and receive minimal maintenance. The only public swimming facilities and golf courses are located in the urban area. There are a variety of neighborhood

and community parks within the corporate limits, which are substantially developed and maintained at an above average level. In addition to open park areas within the City, there are other facilities such as a convention center, an auditorium, two softball complexes, an indoor year-round swimming pool, an outdoor swimming pool complex, and a stadium complex which provides for a variety of community events.

B. Emphasis should also be placed on the annexation of undeveloped areas where urban development can be expected to occur. This will allow better planning for the provision of urban services, avoid inconsistent development standards, and reduce new layers of costly special service boundaries. By ensuring that new development addresses urban problems at the development approval stage, the costs to the taxpayers of remedying these problems later can be avoided.

C. This plan contemplates potential annexations within boundaries defined in Appendix I. Any amendments of this plan that may, over time, expand the defined study area shall also amend over applicable chapters of this plan to include the expanded area.

D. It is hereby intended that all areas shown in the Walker Field Airport Master Plan shall be included in, and be part of, the defined study area as shown in Appendix I. The Walker Field Airport Master Plan is hereby, by reference, made part of this plan.

E. In accordance with CRS 31-12-101, et seq. the City will prepare an impact statement on all proposed annexations over ten acres. Such impact statement will address the provision of city services to the annexed area including the type of services provided, the timing of those services, and the cost/benefit to the City in annexing the area.

CHAPTER TWO

A. WATER

B. WASTEWATER

C. SANITATION

D. POLICE

E. FIRE

CHAPTER TWO

PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES

A. WATER

Treated water service within the annexation study area is provided by the City of Grand Junction, the Clifton Water District, and the

Ute Water Conservancy District. The area served by the City generally encompasses the central core of the City as it existed in the mid-1950s. Specifically, it includes an area bounded by 29 Road on the east, 25 1/2 Road on the west, Patterson Road on the north, and Orchard Mesa on the south. The City also serves additional areas within its corporate limits through purchases of water from the Ute Water Conservancy District. For historical and legal reasons, presently in some areas of the City, the City serves and bills for water service, but with water purchased from the Ute District. These areas include Orchard Mesa and North 12th Street in the Lakeside area. The City also serves areas that are outside of its corporate boundaries, inside of the Ute District, but not served by the Ute District. These areas are west of 1st Street and north of Patterson Road in the F 1/2 and Galley Road area.

The Clifton Water District's service area is bounded by 30 Road on the west, 33 1/2 Road on the east, G Road on the north, and the Colorado River on the south. Additional area annexed into the Clifton District includes the Whitewater area south of the City of Grand Junction.

The Ute Water Conservancy District currently provides water service to the balance of the annexation study area surrounding the areas served by the City and Clifton. There are the exceptions as previously noted and some neighborhoods on the Redlands which are served by private water company wells. Though such areas are not served by Ute distribution lines, they nevertheless pay the Ute mill levy for debt retirement. Urban water service will be available to all annexed areas.

B. WASTEWATER SERVICES

In 1984 the Persigo Wastewater Treatment Plant was put into service. Owned, in part, and operated entirely by the City of Grand Junction, the Persigo Plant has an average capacity of twelve and a half (12.5) million gallons per day. Peak operations of short duration could handle up to twenty (20) million gallons per day. The plant currently operates with a load of seven and a half (7.5) million gallons per day. Plant sizing was determined from the "201 planning studies" which established the plant size based on projected development of the 201 area.

The 201 planning area extends from 19 1/4 Road on the west to 33 Road on the east, and from the Interstate on the north to A 1/2 Road on the south. It also includes the airport and wastewater treatment plant which are north of the Interstate.

C. SANITATION

Trash collection services are provided by the City for residential and commercial customers. Residential customers within the city limits are provided this service automatically. Commercial hauling within the city limits is on a competitive basis with the City

competing with other haulers for the commercial business. Annexation would not affect this arrangement.

D. POLICE SERVICES

The Grand Junction Police Department is a full-service agency which is under the direction of the Chief of Police. The Department is responsible for the enforcement of all state and municipal laws and ordinances within the incorporated city limits of Grand Junction.

The Police Department is staffed with 99 employees and is divided into two divisions. The Operations Division is commanded by a Captain and is responsible for the daily operations of the Uniform Patrol Section and Investigations Section. The Services Division is also headed by a Captain and is responsible for the support elements within the Department such as crime prevention, records, community relations, the School Resource Program, crime lab, court liaison, training and budgetary positions.

The Police Department has a cooperative working relationship with other Mesa County agencies within the criminal justice system. There are programs of combined City/County personnel which are in effect and which endeavor to maximize the resources of the City in combatting crime.

Should the City of Grand Junction annex additional areas, the Police Department would have to assess the potential impact on a case-by-case basis. Criteria to be applied would include the geographical dimensions of the annexed area and its population. Other factors would include the amount of resident population versus business population, actual calls for service, and road miles. The Department could then ascertain whether the area could receive police service delivery utilizing current resources. If expected service exceeds current resources, then additional personnel and equipment would be requested. Proposed annexations will be reviewed for their expected levels of activity and a schedule will be developed for providing full law enforcement services to the annexed area. Full services would be provided to any annexed area within a three year period.

E. FIRE PROTECTION

The City Fire Department provides fire protection for the Grand Junction community. It also provides services to the Grand Junction Rural Fire District through a contract. Each entity pays its own capital costs. Other charges to the rural district, such as manpower, are based on a percentage of the total number of calls received in relation to the total operating budget. This total service area includes approximately 88 square miles.

The Grand Junction Fire Department has a mutual aid agreement with the fire fighting units in Clifton, Fruita, Central Orchard Mesa, East Orchard Mesa, Palisade and Glade Park. This mutual aid

agreement provides for each fire fighting unit to assist the other in cases of emergency.

Within the operational area of the Department, there have been some problems identified. Of primary concern are inadequately-sized water mains and a lack of sufficient fire hydrants within areas served by the Ute Water District. Residents of areas with inadequate water supplies are encouraged to form improvement districts to upgrade the area's fire fighting capabilities.

CHAPTER THREE TRANSPORTATION

CHAPTER THREE TRANSPORTATION

Air Transportation - Air transportation into and out of the central Grand Valley is provided through the Walker Field Airport. This facility is controlled and operated by the Walker Field Airport Authority. Annexations have no effect upon air transportation services.

Rail Transportation - Rail transport is provided by the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad, the main line of which runs the length of the Grand Valley. Annexation would have no effect on rail transport.

Other Mass Transit - Various bus and taxi companies are operating under PUC licenses in both incorporated and unincorporated areas. A service area is established for each company which is unaffected by annexation. Mesa County, through the federal Urban Mass Transit Program, provides elderly and handicapped transportation to both City and County residents. This program is also unaffected by annexation.

MPO - The Metropolitan Planning Organization is responsible for road, street, and highway planning within MPO's designated urban area. The MPO is responsible for a five year transportation Improvement Program (updated yearly) as well as an annual Unified Planning Work Program. Through efforts such as accident reporting, traffic counting, demographic updates, area studies, and others, recommendations are made for improvements or modifications to the transportation system. These recommendations are adopted by both the City Council and County Commissioners as part of the Transportation Improvement Program. Since this is a joint City/County effort, it would not be affected by annexation.

In addition to the MPO process the City also has its own capital improvements programming process for upgrades and preventative maintenance of the street system. A comprehensive pavement management system allows the City to test its streets and efficiently determine the type and timing of maintenance efforts. The annexation impact report will examine road and street needs in newly annexed areas.

There are currently no changes proposed for the state and federal highways within the urban area.

The yearly MPO Transportation Improvement Program and Unified Work Program are hereby, by reference, made part of this plan.

CHAPTER FOUR PARKS AND RECREATION

CHAPTER FOUR PARKS AND RECREATION

Parks facilities and recreation programs within the City are provided and managed by the Grand Junction Parks and Recreation Department. As well as providing services to the approximately 29,000 citizens of Grand Junction, programs and facilities are also available to residents of surrounding Mesa County. Since Mesa County abolished its Parks Department, the City is, and has been, the primary parks and recreation provider in the urban area. Program fees are slightly higher to non-city residents. Each area to be annexed will be evaluated for the availability of park and recreation facilities.

A. Park Facilities

The City of Grand Junction currently has 123.93 acres of developed park land (excluding two golf courses), one indoor and outdoor swimming pool, the Lincoln Park Auditorium, and the Two Rivers Plaza convention center. The Lincoln Park Stocker Stadium features a lighted football field, all-weather track, and baseball field, plus full team, press box, and fan facilities. The Lincoln Park Golf Course is a 9-hole facility located within the city limits, while Tiara Rado is an 18-hole course located adjacent to the Colorado National Monument. The City also manages two softball complexes featuring four lighted softball fields.

B. Recreation Programs

The Recreation Department sponsors many individual recreation programs such as volleyball, softball, tennis, fitness programs, learn-to-swim classes, tournament and open golf, gymnastics, arts and crafts, basketball, wrestling, and Senior Citizen Center activities. The softball program is the largest on the Western Slope with over 125 teams participating in 18 leagues. A total of 15 tournaments are hosted each season with over 375 teams involved.

Four School District #51 athletic varsity teams as well as the N.A.I.A. Mesa State College Mavericks utilize Stocker Stadium. This facility has also been host to the National Junior College World Series since 1959.

C. Colorado Riverfront Project

The Colorado Riverfront Project concept is a linear greenway along the Colorado River consisting of various activity nodes connected by the Colorado River Trail. The project will ultimately extend the entire length of the river in Mesa county with the primary focus on the urban areas. Concepts include maintaining or restoring native riparian habitat with special considerations given to environmentally sensitive areas. Activity nodes will include facilities for fishing, picnicking, interpretive trails, boating access, and potential state park facilities.

D. Future Needs

Emphasis needs to be placed on adding larger parks (+15-25 acres) to the existing system as well as a regional facility of 200+ acres. Several areas have been identified for potential future development. In addition to various properties associated with the Riverfront Project, there are: Berry Park (78 acres at 24 and H Roads), Burkey Park (10 acres at 30 and F Roads), and Burkey O.M. Park (10 acres at 28 1/2/ Road and Hwy 50). An additional 18-hole golfcourse, and/or adding nine holes of play at Tiara Rado, may be needed, pending increased golf demand. The City will examine county properties dedicated for parks and open space to determine their suitability for these purposes. When suitable properties are annexed, the City will request a transfer of owner-ship to put their management under City supervision.

CHAPTER FIVE LAND USE

CHAPTER FIVE LAND USE

Planning and Development in the Grand Valley has been typical of rural areas in the west which have experienced sudden large scale growth. Development of any kind and in any location was viewed as being good for the area with little or no consideration for the future public costs of uncontrolled development.

Although municipalities are typically the most efficient unit of government for the provision of urban services, the majority of the recent urban growth has taken place in unincorporated areas. As a result of this sprawl development pattern, municipalities have essentially been pre-empted as efficient service providers while the County government, special service entities, and the community at large are facing a rapidly increasing economic burden.

Uncontrolled and scattered growth in the unincorporated areas surrounding Grand Junction has also impacted City services and facilities while providing only minimal funding to mitigate these impacts. It is critical to the future well being of the City and the urban area that the City play a stronger role in development activity occurring in the surrounding area.

Infill development is also important in establishing efficiency in service delivery. Efforts to encourage infill development in the City have, in the past, been hampered by the subsidization of sprawl development in scattered rural areas. Recognition of the negative effects of this pattern may assist future infill potential within the present urban area.

Future Trends

The near future outlook for growth in the Grand Valley appears to be at low to moderate levels ranging from 1% to 3% annually. This is a very manageable growth level that should allow the area to recover from the effects of the latest oil shale boom/bust cycle and allow time for proper planning to avoid similar occurrences in the future.

A Future Land Use Plan, though flexible to meet changing needs, must also be specific enough to accomplish the desired results of a balanced and cost effective development pattern.

The following are summaries of projected future land use for the area. The more specific land use plan for the defined annexable area is shown in Appendix I. In developing this plan the City has used the following adopted land use plans and policies:

- Colorado West Development Park: A Land Use and Transportation Study
- Walker Field Master Plan of Development
- Grand Junction/Mesa County Parks & Recreation Master Plan
- Mesa County Land Use and Development Policies
- Colorado River State Recreation Area Concept Plan

Some minor adjustments have been made to these plans to allow for consistent ranges of density and use. In areas not covered by the above plans, the land use shown has been developed by generalizations of existing zoning. It is the intent that future updates of this plan will refine and more thoroughly study the future land use of these areas.

1. Infill Development

The first criterion to be applied to new development is whether it should be in undeveloped or underdeveloped areas within the city limits. This should not, however, preclude new annexation. Areas within the city limits generally have the full range of urban services and facilities available. Infill development would allow more efficient use of these services on a cost-benefit basis while also adding to the overall tax base.

The infill development must, however, respect the uses and integrity of existing neighborhoods and the desire to attract infill uses should not overrule the basic concepts of planning and land use relationships. The Future Land Use plan for the existing

city limits should basically be an expansion and enhancement of most of the present major use areas.

2. Northwest Area

The northwest area is expected to be the valley's primary growth area for the next 10 to 20 years. The area has good accessibility, is close to presently developed areas, and has large parcels of land available for development. Mesa Mall and adjacent uses already provide the area with a commercial focus, while surrounding zoning is available for a wide variety of residential, commercial, and industrial development in a planned context.

3. Redlands Area

With the opening of the Redlands Parkway and the upgrading of sewer and water facilities, residential development in the Redlands can be expected to continue at a slow but steady pace. Pressures for business development will increase with the population base, but average residential densities will likely continue in the low to medium range (2-8 units/acre or less). No significant change in the character of land use is expected for a number of years. Due to the low densities and sprawl development, it has been difficult, if not impossible, to provide adequate facilities and services to the area.

4. Northeast Area

The northeast area received the majority of the growth in the Grand Junction area during the oil shale boom and bust. Development is typical of the sprawl pattern in the valley with much of the development being single family detached housing at 4 units/acre. A commercial strip exists along I-70 Business Loop and North Avenue with a retail/commercial node at 30 Road and I-70B. A larger commercial area occurs at 32 Road and I-70B extending east into the Clifton "Downtown" area. Some high density apartment complexes exist east of 29 Road between Patterson Road and North Avenue.

5. Orchard Mesa

Development on Orchard Mesa has proceeded very slowly, even through the oil shale boom, compared with other areas around Grand Junction. Although many services and facilities are available, the area has not generally experienced much development. The Highway 50 corridor is a mixed retail/commercial strip that is currently under-utilized. The area is also characterized by many non-conforming commercial uses intruding into residential zones. Residential development is a mix of lower density single family units and higher density apartment or townhouse units. The higher density uses are generally the newer structures built during the oil shale boom of the early 1980s.

6. Southeast (Pear Park/Chatfield)

Although some development has occurred in the Pear Park area, it is scattered and diverse. The area from the present city limits (15th Street) to 28 Road has developed with small industrial uses, while areas further to the east have developed with various densities of single family detached, mobile homes and some multi-family housing. Numerous parcels also remain in agricultural uses. Existing zoning and uses point to a potential for increased industrial in the 28 Road area. Industrial uses are also anticipated south of the D & RGW railroad in the area of 31 and 23 Roads.

7. North Area

The area north of Grand Junction has developed as a low density residential/small agricultural area with generally large, expensive homes. Horizon Drive from G Road to the airport has developed primarily with highway/tourist oriented businesses such as motels and restaurants. Professional office complexes are dominant along intersecting streets north of I-70.

The City must continue to push for high quality development in the northwest area and actively pursue annexation prior to development design and approval.

8. Floodplain

The floodplain of the Colorado River is included in parts of all development areas. A strong stance needs to be continued against developing in the floodplain to avoid future costs of flood control and recovery. Once development occurs, the property owners will expect the City or County to protect them in high water situations.

GRAND JUNCTION COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ANNEXATIONS FOR THE YEAR 1991 STATUS AS OF NOVEMBER 1, 1991

ANNEXATION NAME	APPX ACRES	LOCATION	STATUS	COMMENTS
1. Blue Heron Area	appx 80	South of River Rd from Redlands Parkway East.	City can petition for annexation. Tentative date is Fall 1991. Scheduled for Council Hearing on November	Most of this area is City property donated for the Riverfront Project. City property could be

			20, 1991.	leveraged for additional industrial parcels to the east. Land Use: Open Space, Industrial Utilities: Ute Water, City/County Sewer.
2. Alpine Meadows Subdivision	25	G 3/4 Rd and 27 Rd South of Paradise Hills.	Power of Attorney. Meeting held with developer on Aug. 8, 1991. Scheduled for Council Hearing on November 20, 1991.	New subdivision with 47 dwelling units connecting to sewer. Land Use: Residential Utilities: Ute Water, City/County Sewer.
3. Wilson Ranch	25	25 1/2 Rd & G 3/8 Rd.	Power of Attorney. Scheduled for Council Hearing on November 20, 1991.	New subdivision connecting sewer. Land Use: Residential Utilities: Ute Water, City/County Sewer. City has received Power of Attorney.
4. Junction West (Northwest Phase II)	Appx 370	Generally south of Interstate 70, North of U.S. Hwy 6 & 50 from 23 Road to	Perimeter description has been prepared. Public meeting held on July 8,	Preparation of a petition and legal description is awaiting resolution of a

		22 Road.	1991 at 7:00 p.m. at the Westgate Inn. Scheduled for Council acceptance of petition on Nov. 6, 1991.	proposal to re-finance Water & Sanitation District Bonds. This would result in volunteer petitions in addition to Powers of Attorney and increase the size of the area annexed. Land Use: Western Slope Auto, Westgate Inn, mixed commercial, industrial, vacant, residential in southwest corner. Utilities: Ute Water, City/County Sewer.
5. Persigo (Northwest Phase III)	Appx 240	Generally north of Interstate 70, south of H Road from 22 to 21.5 Roads.	Perimeter description has been prepared. Public meeting held on July 8, 1991 at the Westgate Inn. Annexation anticipated in September 1991. Scheduled	Preparation of a legal description and petition are awaiting resolution of Grand Junction West Annexation. In addition, possible voluntary signatures

			for Council acceptance of petition on Nov. 6, 1991.	will affect the size of the area annexed. Land Use: Persigo Sewer Plant, Valley West Industrial Park. Utilities: Ute Water, City/County Sewer (Valley West Sanitation District).
6. Interstate East	70	North of G Road from 23 1/4 to 23 3/4 Roads.	Power of Attorney has been received for four properties. Scheduled for Council acceptance of petition Nov. 6, 1991.	No response from Occidental Oil Corporation on request to sign petition. Power of Attorney will be used to leverage additional parcels. Land Use: Vacant Land Utilities: Ute Water, No Sewer. Additional Powers of Attorney are anticipated and will increase the size of this annexation.

7. Drychester Retail II	60 acres	29 1/2 to 30 Rd & North Avenue	Petition for annexation accepted. Council Hearing scheduled on December 4, 1991.	Waiting on receipt of petition. Land Use: Commercial/ residential Utilities: Ute Water, Fruitvale Sanitation
8. Baseline (North Area Phase I)	200	Generally from 7th St to 12th St, North of G Rd to Interstate 70.	See comments. Western Colorado Title in process of developing list of owners & legal description s. Annexation anticipated in Fall/Winter 1991-92.	An annexation boundary has been identified and correlated with Power of Attorneys and leveraged properties. Processing will begin after the Northwest Annexations are resolved. Land Use: Cambridge Subdivision , Country Club, Park Subdivision (residential) Utilities: City Water/Ute Water, City/County Sewer.
9. H Road South (North Area Phase II)	80	North of Interstate 70 to H Rd between 7th & 12	Petition prepared. Small neighborhood meetings	This annexation is dependant on

		Streets, (Saccomanno Property)	scheduled this fall. Annexation anticipated in Fall/Winter 1991-1992.	voluntary signatures from Dr. Saccomanno and other property owners. Land Use: Vacant Land south of Paradise Hills, Alpine, Meadows Subdivision (residential). Utilities: City Water/Ute Water, City/County Sewer. Have Power of Attorney on Alpine Meadows Subdivision .
10. Paradise Hills (North Area Phase III)	120	North of H Rd, between 7th & 12th Streets.	Annexation anticipated in Fall of 1991.	Land Use: Residential Utilities: Ute Water, City/County Sewer.
11. Roundhill	Unknown	Generally north of Horizon Drive & West of 12th St.	Powers of Attorney. Not more than 50%. Need to hold a neighborhood meeting.	Land Use: Residential Utilities: Ute Water, City/County Sewer
12. Larkspur	10	North of F 1/2 Road & West of 7th Street.	See comments.	Several property owners are desirable of sewer service.

				Extension of sewer lines is being considered and would result in annexation. Presently considered dormant. Land Use: Residential Utilities: Ute Water, City/County Sewer.
13. Ridges/Bella Pago	1,200	Redlands, South of Hwy 340.	Next steps - legal documents prepared by City Attorney & Ridges Metro Attorney, District Court petitioned. Ridges residents vote, District Court decision City Council votes, then Annexation takes place	Fiscal impact analysis and debt re-financing studies are completed. Community meetings have begun. Second meeting held on August 20, 1991 at the Scenic Elementary School. Land Use: Residential, Small Business, Vacant Land Utilities: Ute Water, City/County Sewer (Ridges Metro Sanitation District). Second meeting

				held on August 20, 1991. Ridges Metro District has voted to dissolve and annex. Community Hospital owned tracts may be included.
--	--	--	--	--

ANNEXATION NAME	APPX ACRES	LOCATION	COMPLETION DATE	COMMENTS
14. School District #51	--	Various locations through County.	Meeting held on Sept 19, 1991 with School District officials.	Letter follow-up and future meeting of Mayor and full board.

COMPLETED ANNEXATIONS FOR THE YEAR 1991

ANNEXATION NAME	APPX ACRES	LOCATION	COMPLETION DATE
1. Knoch	11.5	South of Hale Avenue & Northeast of the Colorado River	Effective May 19, 1991. Ordinance No. 2516
2. Diamond Shamrock #1	6.7;tb Broadway & Monument Road	Effective June 21, 1991 Ordinance No. 2518	
3. Interstate	East of 23rd,	Effective	Ordinance No.

(Northwest Phase I) 42 East of 23rd, South of Interstate 70 42	South of Interstate 70	August 4, 1991	2522
4. Diamond Shamrock #2	.10	Southeast corner of 29 Rd & North Ave	Effective August 18, 1991 Ordinance No. 2525
5. First & Patterson	45	SW & NW corners of 1st St & Patterson Rd	Effective October 8, 1991 Ordinance No. 2530
6. Foster	1.32	West of Cascade Dr & South of Homestead	Effective Sept. 8, 1991 Ordinance No. 2528
7. Fountainhead Subdivision	35	North of G Rd & West of 25 Rd	Effective Sept. 8, 1991 Ordinance No. 2527