

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**

January 3, 1996

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, convened into regular session the 3rd day of January,, 1996, at 7:34 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium at City Hall. Those present were Linda Afman, Jim Baughman, David Graham, R.T. Mantlo, Janet Terry, Reford Theobald and President of the Council Ron Maupin. Also present were City Manager Mark Achen, City Attorney Dan Wilson, and City Clerk Stephanie Nye.

Council President Maupin called the meeting to order and Councilmember Mantlo led in the Pledge of Allegiance. The audience remained standing during the invocation by Rev. Charles Wallick, Veterans Hospital Chaplain.

CONSENT ITEMS

Councilmember Terry requested Item #7 be removed from the Consent Calendar for full discussion.

Upon motion by Councilmember Mantlo, seconded by Councilmember Afman and carried, the following Consent Items 1-6 and 8 were approved:

1. **Approving** the minutes of the Regular Meeting December 20, 1995
2. *** Resolution No. 1-96** - A Resolution of the City of Grand Junction Designating the Location for the Posting of the Notice of Meetings

In 1991, the Open Meetings Law was amended to include a provision that requires that a "local public body" annually designate the location of the public place or places for posting notice of meetings and such designation shall occur at the first regular meeting of each calendar year (24-6-402(2) (c)C.R.S.). This resolution complies with the statutory requirement. The location designated is the glassed-in bulletin board outside the 520 Rood entrance.

3. **Proposed Ordinance** - An Ordinance Amending Chapter 34 of the Code of Ordinances Also Known as the City of Grand Junction City Retail Sales and Use Tax Code

Over the last several years, there have been numerous requests from City licensed taxpayers for the City's filing requirements to be the same as the State's. Additionally, a 50% increase in total licensed accounts since 1990 has resulted in an increase in overtime required each month to process returns.

Under the proposed filing changes, approximately 1,600 accounts would be reclassified to a less frequent filing status with the majority of the accounts moving from monthly to quarterly. The number of returns processed monthly would be decreased by 61% (1,000).

a. First Reading of Proposed Ordinance

4. *** Resolution No. 2-96** - A Resolution Referring a Petition to the City Council for the Annexation of Lands to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, and Setting a Hearing on Such Annexation - Sunset Village Annexation Located at 686 25 1/2 Road [#ANX-95-223]

The property owner, Marc S. Laird, is requesting annexation of his property. The Petition for Annexation is now being referred to City Council. Staff requests that City Council approve by resolution the Referral of Petition for the Sunset Village Annexation.

5. *** Resolution No. 3-96** - A Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of a Revocable Permit for Rock Bottom Restaurants, Inc., for a Sign and Landscaping [CUP-95-197]

Resolution authorizing the issuance of a Revocable Permit to allow encroachment into the 2nd Street right-of-way by an existing sign and landscaping and additional proposed landscaping at the restaurant located at 120 North Avenue.

6. **Proposed Ordinance** - An Ordinance Vacating a Portion of G Road Right-of-Way [VR 94-185]

The residents of the Partee Heights and Ptarmigan Estates neighborhoods are appealing Planning Commission's decision denying their request to vacate portions of the undeveloped G Road right-of-way between Niblic Drive and 27 3/4 Road. The appeal will be heard at second reading of the proposed ordinance.

a. First Reading of Proposed Ordinance

7. **Proposed Ordinance** - An Ordinance Adopting and Implementing Text Amendments to the Zoning and Development Code
REMOVED FOR FULL DISCUSSION
8. **James Park** - Planned Mobile Homes [File #RZP-95-199]

This is a request for a rezone from C-2 to PMH (Planned Mobile Homes), an appeal of the Planning Commission's denial of the request to vacate Gunnison Avenue and an appeal of two conditions of the preliminary plan. The appeals will be heard with the second reading of the proposed ordinances.

- a. **Proposed Ordinance** - An Ordinance Rezoning Land at 28 1/4 Road and North Avenue from C-2 to PMH
 - i. First Reading of Proposed Ordinance
- b. **Proposed Ordinance** - An Ordinance Vacating a Portion of Gunnison Avenue, East of 28 1/4 Road
 - i. First Reading of Proposed Ordinance

* * * END OF CONSENT CALENDAR * * *

* * * ITEMS NEEDING INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION * * *

PROPOSED ORDINANCE - AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING AND IMPLEMENTING TEXT AMENDMENTS TO THE ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE

This ordinance adopts requirements for dedication of sites and land areas for schools and fees in lieu for residential developments. It also adopts an indemnification agreement for collection of such fees with the School District.

Mr. John Groves, General Counsel for Mesa County School District #51, updated Council on the school district request. Mr. David Price, partner in Mr. Groves' law firm, passed out a bound document of material for the Council to review (the School District's current long range plan). Mr. Groves gave an overview of the material. The first document indicates areas in the valley where the District is anticipating locating new schools, etc., including the School District Administration's authorization to approach the municipal and county entities with the request for a site development fee. The second document is a brief showing of demographic material and projections for the Mesa County area. The third document is a study on student generation. What is proposed for the City of Grand Junction is based upon a legal standard and legal authorization contained in the State Statutes that applies to non-Home Rule cities. Also included is the Site Development Fee Methodology giving the generation factors leading to a fee that will be determined based upon the appraisal of the

amount it would cost the school district to acquire school sites. Included is the resolution, followed by the amendment to the County Land Use Code. Mr. Groves plans to present the appraisal information on January 9, 1996, the last step in the stage to invoke the imposition of a site development fee in the County. The County Commissioners are yet to make a determination as to the value of the land.

Mr. Groves presented a proposal and request to Council that Council adopt an ordinance to impose school land dedication requirements for the benefit of the School District upon new subdivision development within the city limits. It would require, in most cases, the payment of a fee fixed in lieu of a land dedication for each new residential dwelling unit before a building permit for such unit could be issued, or a residential development or a residential portion of a mixed development. The fee is based on the acreage required for new school sites on a per student basis and student generation rates of the new development. It provides for credits to developers opting to donate other school lands to the district in lieu of paying fees that would otherwise be due. It allows the developers to prepay the fees at any time the subdivision is approved and the plat is filed, or defer the payment, with the consent of the School District and the City until making application for a building permit. It exempts housing for senior citizens, nursing and group homes, residential development on unsubdivided land, non-residential developments, and most alterations and additions to existing homes. It provides that the site fees are collected, in trust, for the School District, and can be used only for purchase of real property for school sites. It allows the City Council to determine the amount of the fee, after a hearing, and establish a mechanism for review and modification of the fee structure and methodology on a periodic basis, based on changes of the average cost per acre of suitable school lands or other grounds. It establishes by resolution, and is subject to intergovernmental agreements that would establish a site fee trust fund that is separate from other City funds and would set up procedures for governing, managing and disbursing of the fees deposited in the fund to the School District. The District proposes that a single trust fund be established for all school sites collected by the City, the County and other municipal governments. Mr. Groves felt it makes more sense for the trust to be managed by the County, although it could be managed by the School District, a separate trustee, or managed separately by each entity. Finally, the site fee would be refunded to the person or entity that paid it if the money is not used by the School District within five years from the date of collection, subject to certain exceptions.

Mr. Groves stated the School District Administration feels it is time to do as other Colorado school districts and municipal and governmental entities have done, and that is to treat the School District and the schools of the district as a piece of the infrastructure of the community.

Councilmember Mantlo asked how soon the first building could be constructed after the trust fund is established. Mr. Lou Grasso responded they are not proposing that any of these funds be used for construction of new schools, only for site acquisition. The district would immediately begin purchasing sites, as prices tend to escalate.

Councilmember Afman asked if the School District will be prioritizing areas or will it be first come, first serve. Mr. Grasso stated the plan identifies the needs for three elementary school sites, one in the north area, one in the eastern part of the valley, and one in the Orchard Mesa area. Twenty acres have been purchased on F Road behind Central High School. It could be used either for a new middle school or the expansion of Central High School. The plan identifies all the areas being considered.

Councilmember Afman asked if the Homebuilders Association has reviewed the proposal or participated in drafting it. Mr. Grasso stated he has met with the Association over the past two years, and the formula is based on their suggestion.

Councilmember Afman asked if there was a mechanism to identify who would receive the refund on unused fees. Mr. David Price responded that the refund is tied to the collection, so whoever collects the funds will have to track who paid it and tie it to a specific piece of property. Records will need to be kept because the funds are going to roll over. The five-year period to use the money is going to start running from the time it is paid and that period is going to run from the time each fee is paid. The refund will go back to the owner that paid the fee.

Councilmember Baughman asked if refunded funds will be paid with accrued interest. He also asked for clarification of the one time five-year extension at the request of the School District. The interest rate is 5% and will be paid back on refunded fees. Mr. Price stated the ordinance gives a five-year time limit. If it is to be continued, the School District will ask City Council to renew it. The grounds on which the School District can extend the five-year period is if the School District has entered into an option to purchase within the five-year period and needs the

additional time to consummate the purchase transaction that has been entered into within the initial five-year period. It is not a blanket type of extension.

Mr. Groves responded to questions of Councilmember Terry by stating any large developments will be worked out in a joint arrangement.

Mr. Groves stated the City will be the determining party regarding suitable school sites in cases where the developer desires to donate land in lieu of fees. Mr. Grasso identified some basic qualifications for "suitable" lands as they need to be in the 201 sewer area, have sufficient transportation and have utilities available.

Councilmember Terry asked why unsubdivided residential land is exempt. City Attorney Wilson stated the City wants to be consistent with the County's system regarding Statutory authority.

Councilmember Graham suggested Council read a position paper from the Colorado Association of Homebuilders, dated January, 1995, which reveals some of the true costs and negative impacts of this type of new use tax. It was drafted for the Homebuilders Association dispute in Douglas County. It is an indication of what is at stake in terms of negative considerations. He recommended it be read by January 17, 1996. Mr. Groves stated he will comment on the paper at the scheduled hearing.

Upon motion by Councilmember Mantlo, seconded by Councilmember Afman and carried with Councilmembers **BAUGHMAN** and **GRAHAM** voting **NO**, the proposed ordinance was passed on first reading and ordered published.

VARIANCE REQUEST - A REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE TO SECTION 5-4-6 OF THE ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE: REQUIREMENT OF OPEN SPACE FEES FOR A MINOR SUBDIVISION [FILE #MS-95-177]

The applicant, Mr. Tom Gilmor, is requesting a variance to Section 5-4-6 of the Zoning and Development Code which requires payment of open space fees for minor subdivision. The Grand Junction Planning Commission approved the Gilmor Minor Subdivision located on the southeast corner of 25 Road and Blichman Avenue at its November 7, 1995 meeting. The Code requires that open space fees be paid for the undeveloped lot in the amount of five percent of the fair market value of the land.

A hearing was held after proper notice. Kristin Ashbeck,

Community Development Department, reviewed this item. The applicant is proposing to subdivide a parcel of land into two lots within Foresight Park located on the southeast corner of 25 Road and Blichman Avenue. A requirement of the minor subdivision process is that parks and open space fees be paid for any new undeveloped parcel. The petitioner is requesting a variance to that requirement due to the amount of fees he has already paid during the review process for construction of the building which exists on Lot 1. The Grand Junction Planning Commission approved the subdivision at its November 7, 1995, hearing, and recommended denial of the open space fee variance. The primary reasons for denial were that they felt the request did not meet the criteria outlined in Section 10-1-1 of the Zoning & Development Code. They felt if credit was given for other development fees that were already paid, those other fees were not open space fees, there would be no fees from this project in the parks and open space fund. The developer paid a half-street improvement fee for 25 Road in the approximate amount of \$27,000 and a drainage fee in the amount of approximately \$3500. The fees were paid approximately one and one-half years ago.

Mr. Harry Mavrakis, 522 Otto Court, Grand Junction, was present to speak for Mr. Gilmor who was unable to attend this meeting. He stated Mr. Gilmor requested a building permit in February, 1994. At that time a half-street improvement was a requirement of City Code in the amount of \$27,840. At that time the Council was in the process of revising their fees, etc. The new requirement was passed in July, 1994. The building was completed in September, 1994. Mr. Gilmor was required to post a bond rather than make payment in February of 1994 of the \$27,840, which he did. Once he completed the building and asked for a C.O., he asked for a waiver of that because the regulations had changed. The request was denied. As a result, he posted \$27,840 to the City of Grand Junction for the half-street improvements. He is now splitting that lot into two parts of equal portions of one acre each. When the requirement came up for the 5% open space fee, Mr. Gilmor felt because he paid an excess of \$24,000 more under the old regulations versus what it would have been when the building was completed, he is asking for that waiver of the open space fee in the split of the existing piece of property. Mr. Mavrakis could not determine the amount of the open space fee as the property has not been appraised. Councilmember Theobold said it would be difficult for the City Council to waive an open space fee of which the amount is unknown. Mr. Mavrakis stated existing properties in Foresight Circle are quite variable in valuation, and Mr. Gilmor's open space fee could vary from \$4,000 to \$5,000.

Councilmember Graham asked Mr. Mavrakis if he felt Mr. Gilmore would suffer an undue hardship if this fee is not waived. Mr. Mavrakis said it is not a situation of an undue financial hardship because Mr. Gilmore is not indigent. It is more the idea of fairness in that he paid \$24,000 more for improvements on a piece of property that fronts 25 Road which the City has no plans in its current Master Plan of improving in the near future. Councilmember Graham also asked Mr. Mavrakis if he could see any general benefit to the neighborhood or community if the variance is granted. Mr. Mavrakis said the only benefit would be to Mr. Gilmore. Councilmember Graham asked City Attorney Wilson if there was a provision in the Code to refund the half-street improvement fees that have been paid previously. City Attorney Wilson said no.

Mr. Mavrakis responded to a question of Councilmember Terry by stating the bond that was posted by Mr. Gilmore was not an action of the Council. It was an administrative requirement.

Councilmember Theobald asked what event triggered the half-street improvement requirement. Ms. Ashbeck answered the building permit triggered it. The permit was pulled in February, 1994 versus July, 1994 when the ordinance was in effect. Mr. Mavrakis stated Mr. Gilmore was aware the City was in the process of approving the new TCP fee.

City Attorney Wilson stated he has had 4-5 developers who were in the process during the spring of 1994, asking what the rule was. He told them if they wait until the ordinance is in place, they will be under the new system.

There were no other public comments.

Public Works Director Jim Shanks stated the City currently has a ten-year capital improvement plan for all its capital improvements, including road improvements. 25 Road and 25 1/2 Road south of Patterson are both scheduled in the ten-year plan. There is no current plan for the next ten-years for the section of 25 Road north of Patterson Road, although it will be built eventually. Ten-year plans do change and if traffic demands increase, he envisions 25 Road north of Patterson, from Patterson to G Road, being a road that is going to require major widening.

Councilmember Baughman asked where the street improvement funds are held. City Manager Mark Achen said there is a specific street improvement fund where the monies are tracked and accounted to be sure they are used for street improvements, not for other govern-

mental purposes. They are segregated funds.

The hearing was closed.

Councilmember Graham said the conditions for the grant of a variance are not met in the following:

1. The requirement under (b) regarding an undue hardship applicable only to the property involved, is not met;
2. (d) the applicant and the owner of the property cannot derive a reasonable use of the property without a variance, is not met;
3. (e) is not met because it cannot be demonstrated that a variance would be of a general benefit to the neighborhood and the community.

As a Council, Councilmember Graham felt Council is obligated to uphold the law. Under the circumstances, he felt Council's hands are tied.

Councilmember Terry offered some information regarding a proposal being pursued by the Parks Department. The proposal refers to the current ordinance and the current Code. It talks about the \$225 per residential lot and a 5% assessment for commercial. It states, according to the City's legal staff, the City's current method of establishing, collecting and utilizing the open space fees might not be defensible if challenged within the judicial system. The basis for determining this amount has not been documented and the method of its establishment is unclear.

Councilmember Graham asked if the City is currently in a quasi judicial posture, and if so would it be appropriate for Council to consider issues of policy and whether the Code needs to be amended, or is Council charged with applying the Code. City Attorney Wilson answered the City is in a quasi judicial posture, and stated Council has a specific duty to grant the variance if the criteria has been met or deny it if the criteria has not been met. City Attorney Wilson said there is nothing in the Code that can be done for the petitioner regarding fairness. City Manager Achen said attempting to find the balance in equity and fairness has been dealt with by Councils in the past.

Councilmember Afman reminded Council Mr. Gilmor was aware of the options and made the choice knowing what the costs were. She was disappointed in having someone who is so actively involved with

the young people and soccer not wanting to contribute to a fund that will help promote this.

Councilmember Terry stated this is a separate fee, a separate issue, and she thought 5% was excessive.

Councilmember Theobold stated Mr. Gilmore's basis for the argument is not that he does not want to pay an open space fee or that the open space fee is too high. It's because he already paid the previous fee. Councilmember Theobold gave three clear reasons why he thinks Council must deny the request:

1. The Code lists criteria, and the request does not meet that criteria.
2. The open space fee is to put money into parks. Waiving this will not put any money into the parks. None of the previously paid fee went into parks or open-space fees. It went to streets.
3. Mr. Gilmore knew and proceeded with full knowledge that if he would wait a few months, he could save himself \$23,000. He proceeded anyway.

Councilmember Mantlo was concerned that approval of this request will open the door for everyone to complain that the fee is too high.

Upon motion by Councilmember Afman, seconded by Councilmember Theobold and carried by roll call vote with Councilmember **TERRY** voting **NO**, Council followed the Planning Commission's recommendation, that being the request for variance be denied.

PUBLIC HEARING - ORDINANCE NO. 2884 REQUIRING THE REMOVAL AND PROPER DISPOSAL OF DOG EXCREMENT

This ordinance would require dog owners to be responsible for solid dog waste in public parks, including the Downtown Shopping Park. It would require dog owners or possessors or persons in charge of any dog within the City be reasonably required to remove any solid dog waste and to properly dispose of same. The ordinance would also require owners, keepers or harborers of dogs be required to possess suitable equipment for the riddance of such waste.

A hearing was held after proper notice. Police Chief Sloan was present to answer questions.

Councilmember Graham asked if the Municipal Judge will have the discretion to impose fines above and beyond the schedule. City Attorney Wilson answer yes, up to \$1,000. It is a generic default provision in the City Code. The \$1,000 maximum was set by the State Legislature for statutory municipalities. When the City Code was adopted, it was discussed with Council at that time. The Court will rarely, if ever impose it, but it is useful that the Court have the ability to use it. There are a few repeat offenders and sometimes lower fines do not modify behavior, so for the exceptional person, Staff recommended Council adopt the \$1,000 limit.

Councilmember Afman asked Police Chief Darold Sloan if this is the type of ordinance he has seen in other communities. Chief Sloan stated at least half the Colorado communities have this ordinance in some variation. Assistant City Attorney John Shaver said this ordinance was modeled after Boulder, Loveland, Longmont, Ft. Collins, and the City of Denver ordinances. All were very similar.

There were no public comments. The hearing was closed.

Councilmember Terry asked Councilmember Baughman to discuss the results of the Riverfront issue when brought before the Riverfront Commission. Councilmember Baughman stated the issue was brought before the Riverfront Commission at the December meeting for approval. A vote of the Commission resulted in 7-2 on both issues. They approve of the ordinance and approve of the adoption of this ordinance to include the riverfront trail system.

It was moved by Councilmember Terry and seconded by Councilmember Theobald that Ordinance No. 2884 be adopted on final reading with the amendment to sub-section (i) that states at the end "and those portions of the riverfront trail and other trail sections or links as designated by the resolution of the City Council, so long as such trails, sections, or links are within the City limits, and the trail users are given notice by the use of appropriate signs", and ordered published.

Councilmember Baughman stated he is still uncomfortable with the proposed ordinance, particularly sub-section (e) which can convict a person for no other reason than for failing to possess a shovel, gloves, and bucket. He feels the ordinance is unenforceable.

Councilmember Mantlo felt it's a great idea, but does not feel it will work.

Mayor Maupin stated he has received numerous positive comments on this ordinance. The parks are so small for the number of citizens that use them. The riverfront trail is heavily used. He feels enforcement will be from the users of the parks and trails.

Councilmember Baughman felt the solution to the problem is to ban dogs from the City Parks system. Mayor Maupin felt people have to have an area to exercise their animals.

Roll was called on the motion with the following result:

AYE: GRAHAM, MANTLO, TERRY, THEOBOLD, AFMAN, MAUPIN.
NO: BAUGHMAN.

PUBLIC HEARING - ORDINANCE NO. 2885 ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO - B 1/2 ROAD ENCLAVE ANNEXATION LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF B 1/2 ROAD AND 27 ROAD AND CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 8.06 ACRES [FILE #ANX-95-195]

The B 1/2 Road Enclave consists of 8.06 acres of land located at the northeast corner of B 1/2 Road and 27 Road. This area is totally surrounded by City limits and is eligible for annexation under Colorado State Statutes.

A hearing was held after proper notice. This item was reviewed by Dave Thornton, Community Development Department. Mr. Thornton stated this is an enclave, and the City is exercising the three-year limit at this point. The three-year period is effective on February 7, 1996. There are five parcels. All the property owners were mailed letters regarding the process. The City has received two responses by phone. One was glad to be annexed, the other was neutral.

Councilmember Graham asked if the creation of the enclave in the first instance was a deliberate act or incidental. Councilmember Theobold stated the enclave was created by Western Hills Mobile Home Park to the south.

There were no public comments. The hearing was closed.

Upon motion by Councilmember Mantlo, seconded by Councilmember Afman and carried by roll call vote, Ordinance No. 2885 was adopted on final reading and ordered published.

NON-SCHEDULED CITIZENS & VISITORS

Mr. Ron Weller, 3221 Howard Court, Clifton, referred to the December 20, 1995, City Council meeting regarding the Eastern Commercial/Fruitwood Subdivision annexation. He wished to correct his statement at that meeting by having the record show Councilmember Mantlo did attend the meeting in Clifton called by "Taxpayers Against Annexation". He also received a phone call from Councilmember Terry. He requested the record reflect he received response from both councilmembers. He did not appreciate Councilmember Mantlo's comment via the media that "If people don't like the way the government is running, they can move." He felt it was uncalled for, and his right to live here is being violated. He still thinks he should have had a vote on the annexation.

Councilmember Mantlo apologized to Mr. Weller if his comment via the media offended Mr. Weller. The vote was taken, and the vote was defeated.

Mr. Weller stated he is the founder and organizer of the Mesa County Taxpayers United. There is a movement within the City to recall certain members of the Council. He does not condone recalling anyone unless it is the will of the people. His organization is set up to unite the people and also the elected officials. He wanted to state for the record there is no movement within the organization to recall any of the Council members. As the founder, he will be no part of any movement to recall. There has already been something filed against the City on the annexation that took place. Mayor Maupin acknowledged the City has been filed a motion for reconsideration. Mr. Weller stated the filing is not endorsed by his organization. He came tonight to apologize for his mistake about Councilmembers Mantlo and Terry.

Mr. James Braden, 2420 N. 1st Street, stated the City's budget was adopted but he has not been contacted regarding what the City has planned for North 1st Street. Mayor Maupin stated the budget has been adopted, although the Council has not decided what to do with 1st Street. Council plans to discuss the item again at the February 5, 1996, workshop at Two Rivers Convention Center, 7:00 p.m. Mr. Braden said he attended the meeting at West Junior High School to discuss 1st Street widening. He made two suggestions. One suggestion was to continue Orchard toward 25 1/2 Road and 25 Road. A second suggestion was, at that point, there was no need for a bike path and sidewalk on both sides of the street. There would be plenty of room and the widening would not take away any of the shrubs or the tree down if the sidewalk and bike path were eliminated on one side.

Mr. Braden also inquired about the skateboard park site. Mayor Maupin stated City Council chose Westlake as the site for the skatepark at the December 20, 1995 meeting. The land at Sherwood Park is to be sold under sealed bid. City Manager Mark Achen stated both the skate board advocates and the Parks Board will be working on developing a time table and funding schedule on what is going to be done.

Mr. Braden said he interviewed over 250 students from the various local high schools. They were concerned that there is a lack of sport facilities in Grand Junction. They also felt the swimming pool at Lincoln Park was a kiddie pool. They felt a lake or beach would provide a place for them to congregate up until 2:00 a.m., with a canteen and campfires. Noise, drugs and alcohol would definitely be controlled in the area. One area considered was the property north of the new fire station on Patterson Road.

Mr. Braden suggested the City consider a number of skateboard parks. Teams could be formed and competitions conducted during the summer months to bring tourists and visitors to the area. It would be a boost to the local economy.

The Council thanked Mr. Braden for his suggestions.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion by Councilmember Theobold, seconded by Councilmember Terry and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 9:12 p.m.

Stephanie Nye, CMC/AAE
City Clerk