

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

August 16, 2000

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, convened into regular session the 16th day of August, 2000, at 7:27 p.m. at Two Rivers Convention Center. Those present were Cindy Enos-Martinez, Earl Payne, Jack Scott, Janet Terry, and President of the Council Gene Kinsey. Jim Spehar and Reford Theobald were absent. Also present Interim City Manager David Varley, City Attorney Dan Wilson, and City Clerk Stephanie Nye.

Council President Kinsey called the meeting to order and Councilmember Enos-Martinez led in the Pledge of Allegiance. The audience remained standing during the invocation by Scott Hogue, First Baptist Church.

APPOINTMENT TO THE RIVERFRONT COMMISSION

Upon motion by Councilmember Terry, seconded by Councilmember Payne and carried, Gabe DeGabrielle was appointed to a 3-year term on the Riverfront Commission.

CONSENT ITEMS

Upon motion by Councilmember Payne, seconded by Councilmember Enos-Martinez and carried by roll call vote, the following Consent Items #1 through #9 were approved with Item #9 being amended by adding to the action "if not with Shaw then with FCI Constructors":

1. **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

Action: Approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 2, 2000

2. **Setting a Hearing on the Improvements Connected with Alley Improvement District 1999, Phase B**

Reconstruction of the alley, 22nd to 23rd Street, Grand Avenue and Ouray, has been completed in accordance with Resolution No. 47-99 creating Alley Improvement District 1999, Phase B.

Resolution No. 78-00 – A Resolution Approving and Accepting the Improvements Connected with Alley Improvement District No. ST-99, Phase B, and Giving Notice of a Hearing

Action: Adopt Resolution No. 78-00 and Set a Hearing for September 20, 2000

3. **Setting a Hearing on the Improvements Connected with Alley Improvement District 2000, Phase A**

Reconstruction of the following alleys has been completed in accordance with Resolution No. 129-99 creating Alley Improvement District 2000, Phase A:

2nd to 3rd Street, Chipeta to Gunnison Avenue
10th to 11th Street, Rood to White Avenue
11th to 12th Street, Main Street to Colorado Avenue
16th to 17th Street, Grand to Ouray Avenue
18th to 19th Street, Grand to Ouray Avenue

Resolution No. 79-00 – A Resolution Approving and Accepting the Improvements Connected with Alley Improvement District No. ST-00, Phase A, and Giving Notice of a Hearing

Action: Adopt Resolution No. 79-00 and Set a Hearing for September 20, 2000

4. **Signal Communications Design Contract, Phase 1A**

The design contract is the first step toward the signal communications system. Construction will begin in 2001.

The recommendations of last year's feasibility study resulted in programming funds over the next ten years to implement installation of fiber optic line to connect the traffic signals. This contract will result in a design package for the first construction project which will tie together two identified groups of signals in the feasibility study. Group 2 consists of signals around the mall on F Road and the Business Loop and Group 6 consists of signals on Broadway and First Street from Grand Avenue south.

Action: Award Contract for Signal Communications Design, Phase 1A, to Kimley-Horn Associates, Inc. in the Amount of \$45,000

5. **Change Order No. 2 for Additional Work on 24 and F Roads for the 24 Road and Bridge Widening Project**

Additional work was added to the 24 Road and Bridge Widening Contract awarded to United Companies on April 5, 2000. The revised contract total with the addition of Change Order No. 2 is \$1,368,036.11.

Action: Approve Change Order No. 2 for Additional Work on 24 and F Roads for the 24 Road and Bridge Widening Project with United Companies in the Amount of \$132,891.61

6. **Amend Engineering Contract with ICON Engineering, Inc. for Leech Creek and Horizon Drive Drainage Plans**

The original contract with ICON Engineering was for the investigation of alternatives and the preparation of a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) for the Horizon Drive Channel (Ranchman's Ditch). The amended Engineering contract is for development of additional hydrology and flood plain delineation in the Leech Creek and Horizon Drive Channel basins as well as development of floodplain and detention basins locations in the West Leech Creek basin; and preparation of Conditional LOMR for these basins.

Action: Approve an Addendum to the Existing Base Contract with ICON Engineering, Inc. for an Amount of \$75,000

7. **Setting a Hearing on Rezoning the Kollao Property from RSF-R to RSF-2, Located at 2570 G Road** [File #GPA-2000-109]

Request to rezone the Kollao Property from Residential Single Family Rural, RSF-R, to Residential Single Family-2, RSF-2. A request for a Growth Plan Amendment will be heard at second reading.

Proposed Ordinance Rezoning the Kollao Property to Residential Single Family-2 (RSF-2), Located at 2570 G Road

Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for September 6, 2000

8. **Setting a Hearing on Rezoning Reimer Minor Subdivision/Spanish Trails from PD to RSF-4, Located at 719 24 1/2 Road** [File #RZP-2000-107]

A request to rezone a .34 acre parcel from PD (Planned Development) to RSF-4 (Residential Single Family, not to exceed 4 units per acre).

Proposed Ordinance Rezoning Property at 719 24 1/2 Road from PD to RSF-4 (Reimer Minor Subdivision/Spanish Trails)

Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for September 6, 2000

9. **Construction Management Services for the Two Rivers Convention Center Remodel**

Request for Qualifications were received and opened July 20, 2000 for providing professional Construction Management and General Construction Services for the remodel of the Two Rivers Convention Center. Four (4) firms were asked to participate in an oral interview process where the evaluation committee rated the prospective contractors according to predetermined criteria. The final cost for services will be determined after detailed drawings and specifications are developed during the pre-construction process based on a percentage of guaranteed maximum construction price plus a pre-construction services fee.

Action: Authorization to Enter into Negotiations with Shaw Construction, LLC for the Two Rivers Remodel [added "if not with Shaw then with FCI Constructors"]

***** END OF CONSENT CALENDAR *****

***** ITEMS NEEDING INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION *****

Mayor Kinsey announced the appellant of White Willows has requested this item be continued for two weeks. There were no objections.

Upon motion by Councilmember Terry, seconded by Councilmember Scott and carried, the White Willows item was continued to September 6, 2000.

PUBLIC HEARING - AMENDMENTS TO THE 1995 ORCHARD MESA NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN [File #PLN-2000-111]

Adoption of amendments to the 1995 Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan. The maps and text amendments are as follows:

1. Update future land use map:
 - a. Revisions to the future land use map to reflect current use and zoning in the Unawep Business Area and other inconsistencies between the recently adopted City Zoning Map and the Future Land Use Map
 - b. An addition of two land use classifications (RMF-12 and Commercial/Industrial) to reestablish previous zoning that was not reflected in the 1995 plan.

- c. Revisions of the future land use designations to match the City of Grand Junction Growth Plan and the Countywide Land Use Plan
 - d. Revisions of the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan future land use map to designate the "Area under Study" as Rural and to extend the Open Land Overlay District
2. Replace the existing mineral resource map with a revised mineral resource map.
 3. Add an addendum to the end of the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan that shows the accomplishments of the plan.

The hearing was opened at 7:40 p.m.

Principal Planner Dave Thornton reviewed the history of the Orchard Mesa Plan. He noted two open houses were conducted with the residents in the area, two notices were mailed (approximately 4300 notices). Two newsletters were also mailed giving residents an update on the procedures over the past five years regarding the Orchard Mesa Plan.

Amendment #1 – Future Land Use Map – An attempt has been made to bring the Orchard Mesa Plan into conformance with the Growth Plan regarding various categories of use. There were two categories that were not included in the original 1995 Plan. One was density greater than 8 units/acre, and a commercial/industrial land use category.

There was an oversight in the 1995 plan, particularly the UnawEEP business area at 27 Road and UnawEEP. Under the new zoning map, the City reestablished a commercial/business zoning for that area. Under the 1995 plan it was shown as residential 8 units/acre. It was strictly an oversight on the map. It was never an objective to change that area from commercial to residential. Another area was the 5th Street hill, the area on the west side of 5th Street was designated as open space. Under the new zoning map it has been reestablished as a commercial land use category. An area that had some multi-family densities was also reestablished as part of the zoning hearings (includes Southgate Commons) at 16 units/acre. The zonings have been reestablished and they now conform with the Future Land Use Map and the Orchard Mesa Plan.

There was an area on the original map that was south of E½ Road and designated as 4 units/acre. It included the Valle Vista Subdivision. The majority of the public input is that it should remain all rural, and the 4 units/acre should be reduced to rural which would be a 5-acre lot size. Mesa County has an overlay district in place for much of Orchard Mesa in this area. It allows for doubling the density and is called the Orchard

Mesa Open Land Overlay District. If the landowner chooses to dedicate 50% of their land into permanent open space they get twice as many units.

Amendment #2 – Mineral Resource Map – Dave Thornton distributed copies of the original text with changes. Michael Warren, Mesa County Long Range Planning Division, then detailed the process for gathering data for the resource map. They met with the gravel industry and prepared a map of all the existing gravel pits in the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Planning area. He said a model was provided to give direction for the decision-makers. It is not a definitive answer on what should or should not be mined. They went through absolute constraints and relative constraints. Schools, city property, parks and small parcels are absolute constraints. Both constraints were added and came up with an intermediate or composite map called “absolute restraints.” They did the same with relative constraints such as County, BLM, floodplain properties. Those properties will allow gravel extraction with some degree of regulation. Those were combined to form an intermediate map composite of relative constraints. This resulted in the final resource map.

Dave Thornton noted the text amendments under “Implementation Strategy Short Term”: Item (1) Place a period after gravel deposits and eliminate the rest of the sentence. Under Item (3) change to “Encourage gravel extraction as shown on the Orchard Mesa Mineral Resource Map.”

Amendment #3 – Regarding Attachment 8 in the Council packet. It is a report showing Staff’s goal to go back into the neighborhood and determine what had been accomplished. It will be an addendum to the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan. It is strictly informational and does not change anything.

Tom Logue, Western Colorado Contractors Association, spoke in support of the amendment to the Mineral Resource Map component and the Master Plan. He encouraged Council to accept the amended resource map.

There were no other comments. The hearing was closed at 8:05 p.m.

Councilmember Terry assumed the 201 boundary discussion needs to be finalized. She suggested this item be placed on the agenda for the annual meeting that is yet to be scheduled. Councilmember Payne agreed.

Resolution No. 80–00 – A Resolution Adopting Amendments to the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan

Upon motion by Councilmember Payne, seconded by Councilmember Terry and carried by roll call vote, Resolution No. 80-00 was adopted.

PUBLIC HEARING - ANNEXING G ROAD NORTH ENCLAVE, LOCATED AT 25 1/2 ROAD AND 26 1/2 ROAD , NORTH OF G ROAD AND SOUTH OF H ROAD

[FILE #ANX-2000-114]

The 274-acre G Road North Enclave Annexation area consists of 73 parcels of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction city limits. State law allows a municipality to annex enclave areas after they have been enclaved for a period of three years. The 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County requires the City to annex enclave areas within 5 years.

The hearing opened at 8:06 p.m.

This item was reviewed by Dave Thornton, Community Development Department. He clarified the boundaries of this enclave. Staff met with the Mesa View Retirement Center residents on May 25, 2000. Notices were also mailed to the neighborhood residents. Staff recommends annexation of this enclave.

Councilmember Scott asked if H Road goes to 1st Street. Mr. Thornton said everything west of 1st Street at H Road is out of the city limits.

Councilmember Terry asked for clarification on the area to the west. Mr. Thornton said a strip of right-of-way on I-70 is the boundary (10-20 feet). The property west of Wilson Ranch is not within the enclave and is not being annexed.

John Stevens, 2631 Cottonwood Drive, said he moved to the Grand Junction area approximately ten years ago and has enjoyed living here. About four years ago, he was notified there was a possibility he was going to be annexed at that time. He called City Manager Mark Achen and discussed the pros and cons of being within the City. They discussed the increased taxes and the fact that they would be able to hook up to the sewer. The City Manager told him they would have an opportunity, if they were within 400 yards of the main sewerline, to hook up to the line. Mr. Stevens asked if the City would bring the line down Cottonwood Drive and charge him a tap fee to hook up. The City Manager told him no, that with the Agreement that was in place, the City would engineer for an improvement district and estimate the costs to run the line to Cottonwood Drive. The estimated cost came to \$175,000. There are seven residents on Cottonwood, with five being retired and on a fixed income. Based on the agreement at that time, they were told the City would finance the costs at 10% interest over a ten-year period. With 73 new dwellings in this area, Mr. Stevens asked what his increased valuation might be as a result of this annexation, and if Council would consider lowering taxes because of this large annexation. He was opposed to the annexation and asked Council to deny the petition for annexation.

Councilmember Payne clarified that the distance required is 400 feet rather than 400 yards from the sewerline. He asked Mr. Stevens how large is the area on Cottonwood Drive, as he questioned the estimated \$175,000 cost of improvements. Mr. Stevens said the street distance is approximately one-quarter mile from the sewerline. Assistant City Attorney John Shaver said the cost may come down if additional development takes place in the area.

Mayor Kinsey explained to Mr. Stevens the reasons for annexing enclaves.

Councilmember Terry said the City and Mesa County recognizes that failed septic systems can occur and could become a public health hazard. Sewer funds have been pledged to replace failed systems. She knew forced annexation does not feel good, but it is a prudent use of tax money. The cost of leaving enclaves in the County is not justified. She urged the annexation of enclaved areas.

There were no other comments. The hearing was closed at 8:32 p.m.

Ordinance No. 3282 - An Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, the G Road North Enclave Annexation, Located Generally between 25½ Road and 26½ Road, North of G Road and South of H Road but including one property north of H Road, and including but not limited to all or a portion of the following Rights-of-way: 25 1/2 Road, 26 Road, G Road 26½ Road, G½ Road, Elvira Drive, Partridge Court, Kelly Drive, Clarkdell Court, Cottonwood Drive, Lujan Circle and Interstate 70, Consisting of Approximately 274 Acres

Councilmember Scott asked Mr. Stevens to come to Council if he has problems after annexation. Mr. Scott said he has found it is great to be in the City.

Upon motion by Councilmember Terry, seconded by Councilmember Enos-Martinez and carried by roll call vote, Ordinance No. 3282 was adopted on second reading and ordered published.

PUBLIC HEARING - ZONING THE G ROAD NORTH ENCLAVE TO RSF-R, LOCATED AT 25 1/2 ROAD AND 26 1/2 ROAD, NORTH OF G ROAD AND SOUTH OF H ROAD
[FILE #ANX-2000-114]

The 274-acre G Road North Enclave Annexation area consists of 73 parcels of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction city limits. State law requires the City to zone newly annexed areas within 90 days of the annexation. Area property owners have requested that proposed City zoning be identical with existing Mesa County zoning for enclaves.

The hearing was opened at 8:35 p.m.

Dave Thornton, Principal Planner, reviewed this item. The proposed zones are RSF-R, RSF-2 and PD. He stated there are no changes in zone districts.

There were no public comments. The hearing was closed at 8:38 p.m.

Ordinance No. 3283 - An Ordinance Zoning the G Road North Enclave Annexation to RSF-R, RSF-2 and PD, Located Generally between 25 1/2 Road and 26 1/2 Road, North of G Road and South of H Road but including one property north of H Road

Upon motion by Councilmember Payne, seconded by Councilmember Scott and carried by roll call vote, Ordinance No. 3283 was adopted on second reading and ordered published.

PUBLIC HEARING - ANNEXING THE CHAMBLEE/BOYSTUN ENCLAVE, LOCATED AT 714 AND 720 24 1/2 ROAD [FILE #ANX-2000-115]

The 9.60-acre Chamblee/Boydston Enclave Annexation area consists of 2 parcels of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction city limits. State law allows a municipality to annex enclave areas after they have been enclaved for a period of three years. The 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County requires the City to annex enclave areas within five years.

A hearing opened at 8:38 p.m.

This item was reviewed by Dave Thornton, Community Development Department. The enclave is a square parcel surrounded by the City.

Carl Boydston, owner of the 7.6-acre parcel. Mr. Chamblee owns the 2-acre parcel north of Mr. Boydston. The new Vineyard Church is located just north of Mr. Chamblee's property. He thought the church was allowed by the City to use a septic system because the sewer had not been extended down 24 1/2 Road. Senior Planner Bill Nebeker said he understood the church is hooked up to sewer. He said a conditional use permit and site plan review was done on the Vineyard Church. The Fellowship Church is also on septic.

Mr. Boydston could see no benefit to being annexed. He was opposed to the annexation of this enclave area.

Mayor Kinsey advised Mr. Boydston that annexation will have no affect on the way he lives his life or how he uses his property.

Mr. Boydston was concerned with the assessed valuation and increased taxes, also zoning changes to his property without his request.

Mayor Kinsey assured Mr. Boydston there will be no zoning changes to his property without his request.

Mr. Thornton said the Growth Plan will support the higher density so Mr. Boydston could subdivide his property. Councilmember Terry told Mr. Boydston what he is allowed to do with his property when annexed will not change.

There were no other comments. The hearing was closed at 8:43 p.m.

Ordinance No. 3284 - An Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado - Chamblee/Boydston Enclave Annexation, Located at 714 and 720 24 ½ Road, Consisting of Approximately 9.60 Acres

Upon motion by Councilmember Enos-Martinez, seconded by Councilmember Terry and carried by roll call vote, Ordinance No. 3284 was adopted on second reading and ordered published.

PUBLIC HEARING - ZONING THE CHAMBLEE/BOYSTUN ENCLAVE TO RSF-R, LOCATED AT 714 AND 720 24 1/2 ROAD [FILE #ANX-2000-115]

The 9.60-acre Chamblee/Boydston Enclave Annexation area consists of 2 parcels of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction city limits. State law requires the City to zone newly annexed areas within 90 days of the annexation. Area property owners have requested that proposed City zoning be identical with existing Mesa County zoning for these enclaves.

The hearing was opened at 8:49 p.m.

Dave Thornton, Principal Planner, reviewed this item. The proposed zoning is identical to the Mesa County zoning which is RSF-R. Mr. Boydston's property is 7 acres. The Chamblee property is less. The Growth Plan does support a higher density for this area.

Mr. Boydston asked if there will be any changes in subdivision procedure if this property is rezoned from County to City RSF-R. He would like to subdivide the property in future years. City Attorney Dan Wilson said yes. He invited Mr. Boydston to come to City Hall and visit with him regarding the City's subdivision procedure.

Councilmember Terry said this Council strives to allow development that is in keeping with the zoning of the Master Plan. That would be another option for Mr. Boydston.

Mr. Boydston said it was nice growing up in the area with the wide open spaces. When the houses started moving in, it was difficult to accept all the development.

Mayor Kinsey said it is not City government that has caused the development; it is all the people moving into the area. He noted the development of surrounding subdivisions will enhance the value of Mr. Boydston's property.

There were no other comments. The hearing closed at 8:32 p.m.

Ordinance No. 3285 – An Ordinance Zoning the Chamblee/Boydston Enclave Annexation to RSF-R, Located at 714 and 720 24 ½ Road

Upon motion by Councilmember Scott, seconded by Councilmember Payne and carried by roll call vote, Ordinance No. 3285 was adopted on second reading and ordered published.

PUBLIC HEARING – GROWTH PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONING THE KNOLLS FILINGS 4-7 TO PD, LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF 27 1/2 ROAD AND CORTLAND ROAD [FILE #GPA-2000-103]

The previously approved preliminary plan for the Knolls has expired and the new plan requires a Growth Plan Amendment and Rezone. A Growth Plan Amendment from Residential Medium (4 to 8 du/ac) to Residential Medium Low (2 to 4 du/ac) is requested, as well as a rezone from PD (Planned Development) with a density of 2.7 dwellings per acre to PD with a density of 2.5 dwellings per acre. A mixed-use development with 16 patio homes and 64 single-family homes is proposed.

The public hearing opened at 8:53 p.m.

David Chase, Banner Associates, 2777 Crossroads Boulevard, representing the developer, spoke on this item. He identified the location of the project. The Knolls Subdivision began in 1996. The original preliminary plan was approved in April, 1997, which included the area they are requesting the rezone on. The first three filings are complete with homesites almost built out. Filing 1 is a straight zone of RSF-4; Filings 2 and 3 are zoned and part of the current PR-2.7. The rezone and Growth Plan Amendment are being requested as part of the new preliminary plan. Some changes have taken place since the original preliminary plan with the hopes the traffic flow will make a better development plan. An additional parcel of land has been acquired (Davis

parcel, 2.5 acres) and has helped combine with the Knolls Subdivision to make a better development for the entire area.

Senior Planner Bill Nebeker said Mr. Chase has explained the proposal quite well. The Growth Plan map goes back five years when they were assigning densities to areas. This area might have been an area where they made broad density assignments, not having all the detailed background. The Residential Medium Low in this area is because of the airport critical zone. Lines were cut through existing subdivisions with different densities. Spring Valley was zoned RSF-5 because it allows more flexibility in the setback requirements, not because of the density. When the Growth Plan density was applied, they put it in the 4-8 units/acre when it was actually much lower than that. The Knolls Subdivision is similar to Spring Valley, but a bit lower density. When The Knolls first came in, they were rezoned to a planned development of 2.7 dwellings/acre. Mr. Nebeker thought it might have been a mistake on Staff's part, not realizing the property was split half and half, half at 3-4 units/acre and the other half 4-8 units/acre. Since the plan has expired and the applicant had to come back in, Staff determined the Growth Plan map should be changed to indicate the actual density. He felt a Growth Plan Amendment could be done for all of Spring Valley at the 2-4 units/acre density. Staff recommends approval of the Growth Plan Amendment as it meets the criteria in Section 2.5(c) of the Zoning & Development Code.

There were no other comments. The hearing was closed at 9:02 p.m.

a. Growth Plan Amendment

b. Zoning Ordinance

Ordinance No. 3286 - An Ordinance Zoning the Knolls Filings 4-7, Located South of the SE Corner of 27 1/2 and Cortland Roads Including 640 and 652 27 1/2 Road, to City PD

Upon motion by Councilmember Terry, seconded by Councilmember Scott and carried by roll call vote, the Growth Plan Amendment was approved and Ordinance No. 3286 was adopted on second reading and ordered published.

PUBLIC HEARING – APPEAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL OF PRELIMINARY PLAN AND ZONING THE WHITE WILLOWS ANNEXATION, LOCATED AT 2856 C 1/2 ROAD AND 2851 AND 2863 D ROAD [FILE #PP-2000-106] - CONTINUED TO SEPTEMBER 6, 2000 MEETING

An adjacent property owner has appealed the Planning Commission's recommendation to approve the requested RSF-4 zoning for the White Willows Annexation. The property has been annexed for several months but has not been given City zoning.

County zoning is RSF-R (formerly AFT). An appeal has also been filed on the Planning Commission's decision to approve the White Willows Subdivision, a 122-lot subdivision on 39.56 acres. The appellant cites increased traffic on D Road as the major reason for the appeal. A revised traffic study submitted by the applicant shows a minimal traffic impact on the D Road and 9th Street and 30 Road intersections from this subdivision.

a. Appeal

b. Zoning Ordinance

Ordinance No. ___ - An Ordinance Zoning the White Willows Annexation Located at 2856 C 1/2 Road, 2851 and 2863 D Road, from County AFT to City RSF-4

Mayor Kinsey announced the appellant has requested this item be continued for two weeks.

Upon motion by Councilmember Terry, seconded by Councilmember Scott and carried, this item was continued to September 6, 2000.

NON-SCHEDULED CITIZENS & VISITORS

Benefits of Annexation

Bill Nebeker, 2289 Olive Court, said when he bought his home five years ago it was in the County. By the time they closed on their home, they were inside the City of Grand Junction through forced annexation via a Power of Attorney for sewer. He said he and his family are happy with their reduced pool fees. Their road was recently chip-sealed and they appreciate that. They love the City Fire and Police services, and those agencies have had occasion to visit their cul-de-sac. They saw great benefits in annexation.

OTHER BUSINESS

Move to New City Auditorium

Councilmember Earl Payne noted this is the last meeting to take place at Two Rivers Convention Center. Council will move to the auditorium at the new City Hall building for the September 6, 2000 meeting. Interim City Manager David Varley noted Staff training on the audio/video equipment in the new auditorium is scheduled for Wednesday, August 23, 2000.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Stephanie Nye, CMC
City Clerk

Attach 2