

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
WORKSHOP AGENDA**

**MONDAY, JULY 31, 2000, 7:00 P.M.
TWO RIVERS CONVENTION CENTER, 159 MAIN STREET**

7:00 MAYOR'S INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

7:05 COUNCILMEMBER REPORTS AND COMMENTS

7:15 REVIEW WEDNESDAY COUNCIL AGENDA

WRITTEN REPORTS

SEVENTH STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS

[Attach W-1](#)

DESIGN OF 25 ROAD

[Attach W-2](#)

**POLICY ON USE OF HEARING ROOM AND AUDITORIUM IN NEW CITY
HALL**

[Attach W-3](#)

PRESENTATIONS

7:30 24 ROAD CONSULTANT WITH PLANNING COMMISSION: The Steering Committee, Planning Commission and the City Council will review and discuss the draft design standards and guidelines with in the context of Draft Subarea Plan and Proposed Zoning Approach for the 24 Road corridor.

[Attach W-4](#)

9:30 ADJOURNMENT

Attach W-1

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 25, 2000
To: City Council
Cc: David Varley, Mark Relph, Martyn Currie, Joe Stevens
From: Tim Moore

RE: 7th Street Historic District

The purpose of this report is to summarize the meeting which staff conducted with the residents of the 7th St. Historic District on March 31st. It is also a recap of several years of effort by the City and District residents to improve the 7th Street corridor. This report is for information and discussion and does not require City Council action.

March 31st Neighborhood Meeting

The focus of this meeting was to respond to a neighborhood request to reduce the number of travel lanes through the Historic District from two lanes in each direction to one lane each way. There were nineteen residents in attendance and six City representatives including Jim Spehar. Working with the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to project future traffic volumes, staff used a computer model to demonstrate the result of the lane reduction to the group. The computer model and supporting information indicated significant delays, traffic congestion, impacts to adjacent corridors, and the resulting negative impacts to the Historic District neighborhood. As a result of this analysis, the lane reduction request could not be supported by Public Works. Residents along the corridor recognized the impacts and readily accepted the recommendation.

The discussion then focused on truck traffic, school zones, and speeding. Ken Simms of the MPO addressed the group regarding a truck route study the RTPO/MPO has undertaken which will evaluate truck routes valley-wide and include the needs of all users on a system-wide basis. One of the first steps will be to obtain addresses from one of the local delivery truck firms and plot the thirty-day deliveries on a map. This will visually show where trucks drive on a regular basis; we anticipate schools, restaurants, and other small businesses will be seen on the map. From that point, it can be determined where truck routes ought to be placed, rather than a reactive prohibition street-by-street. As you are aware, the first open house to solicit public input was June 8th. Ultimately, the proposed truck route will be presented to the County Commissioners and City Planning Commission for adoption.

The neighborhood group discussed the potential need for school zone flashing lights on 7th Street to accommodate pedestrian traffic from Columbine Elementary. Staff indicated the lights would be considered as part of the establishment of policies for installation of school traffic control devices and the update to the waking route map now planned for next year.

Speeding issues were discussed and the group expressed a desire to have the speed limit lowered from the posted 30 mph to 25 mph. Currently, the 85-percentile speed is 34 mph. Staff shared with the residents some of the difficulties when attempting to

lower a posted speed without statistical data to support the change. Lieutenant Benoint explained the GJPD currently provides periodic traffic enforcement to the corridor. They frequently provide additional enforcement, as requested, through the presence of marked units. This is simply accomplished by altering the routes of police officers. GJPD has committed to formally placing the Historic District onto the speed enforcement maintenance list which will help insure visibility and speed maintenance efforts on an ongoing basis. The PD will continue to respond to any specific complaints, including taking into consideration information provided about specific companies with speeding drivers who frequently use the corridor.

Several of the residents at this recent meeting asked about landscaping. When we talked to the neighborhood prior to the construction of the crosswalks and bulbouts last year, we also discussed the possibility of additional landscaping in the medians. This would have served as a visual cue to drivers to slow down. Subsequent to this particular meeting, the Parks Department has planned some improvements to the median that are intended to enhance the corridor while keeping in mind the Historic District decor. The improvements generally consist of adding flowering trees and replacing the current flower beds with a combination of annual and perennial flowers, border plants and shrubs. These improvements are planned for this coming Fall. Additionally, where the opportunity exists to add street trees in the area between the existing sidewalks and the curb & gutter, Parks plans to contact each homeowner and offer to provide the trees and labor for installation.

Jon Schler with CU-Denver Colorado Center for Community Development was also in attendance at the request of the neighbors, and we talked with him about pursuing studies and possibly grants for defining and potentially fixing foundations of the houses. One of the complaints from the residents is that the traffic makes their walls and foundations rattle. Jon also advised the residents that in some cities, Historic Districts have undertaken “de-marketing” efforts with their communities in an attempt to reduce traffic. He has been researching other historic neighborhoods throughout the country and may be able to provide our residents with some good ideas.

Some general discussion regarding the extensive modeling and forecasts provided by the RTPO, indicate that traffic volume growth on 7th Street will be less than that in other parts of the city, particularly when our long-range projects, such as the Riverside Bypass, are complete.

Accomplishments to date:

1975 – The City and residents installed the decorative lighting in the median through what is now the Historic District.

1984 - The City of Grand Junction recognized the significance of the District by adopting a Planned Residential (PR) zoning for the majority of the area (Hill to Grand Avenues). The zoning ordinance included policies to support maintaining the existing uses in the area, preservation and restoration of existing structures, new construction to be consistent with the historic character of the area, and uses north of Grand Avenue to remain residential. To date, this zoning has been effective in its land use intent and the Planned Development (PD) zoning is being carried forward with the recently-adopted zoning map.

1986 - The City completely replaced the medians. This included concrete curbing, upgraded electrical service for the historic lighting, new planting beds, new (automated) irrigation system and re-seeded grass.

1996 – The residents formed a traffic calming committee which determined speeding & trucks were top concern; proposed lighted entry gate to historic district

1997 - Constructed entry gates; circulated petition for construction of concrete crosswalks at 7th & Gunnison, Grand, north entry; neighborhood education efforts were homemade signs, radar trailers, speedwatch letters

1998 - Council workshop presentation requesting traffic calming funds for crosswalk and bulbout construction; new signal reconstruction at 7th & Gunnison; truck letters sent to trucking firms recorded using 7th Street; project bids 50% over budget, project scheduled for 1999

1999 - Construction of crosswalks/bulbouts contract \$114,000 (all budgeted traffic calming funds for 3 years expended in this project)

2000 – Measured speeds have been reduced to 34 mph (85-percentile)
The MPO truck route study is underway.

The Grand Junction Parks Department maintains the center islands which include annual plants of several varieties, flowers, and grass.

Recommendations:

Most of the elements for a great street are already incorporated in 7th Street through the Historic District, and we are approaching the bottom of our "toolbox". As staff, we will continue to seek out and evaluate opportunities for preserving the quality of life on 7th Street while still maintaining traffic control. Additionally, staff will complete the following:

1. Once the landscape improvements are completed in the median areas, PW staff will periodically monitor speeds to determine the impacts to traffic.
2. The Parks Department will add street trees, where the opportunity exists between the walk and curb, to further enhance the corridor and provide an additional buffer.
3. Continue a formalized traffic enforcement program through the corridor.
4. Because the average speed is currently 4 mph above the speed limit, PW staff is not recommending the installation of more aggressive traffic calming approaches such as speed tables at this time. City staff will, however, continue to look for new and innovative ways to calm traffic through the District.

Attach W-2

MEMORANDUM

To: Grand Junction City Council

From: Mike McDill, City Engineer

CC: Tim Moore, Manager of Public Works
Mark Relph, Director of Public Works and Utilities
David Varley, City Manager
Kristin Winn, Communications Coordinator

Date: July 25, 2000

RE: 25 Road Design

The purpose of this report is to update the City Council on the status of this project. This report is for information only and does not require Council action.

This project was funded for design this year (2000) in the amount of \$181,196 and construction in 2001 for \$1,225,000. It is proposed to be an Urban Collector cross-section consisting of 3 traffic lanes on 44 feet of pavement within 60 feet of right-of-way. The project also includes about a quarter of a mile of 48-inch storm drain from Patterson Road to Weslo Avenue.

The design process started last November with a property owner survey to learn how the local businesses operate and a neighborhood meeting in December to hear specific concerns and make the owners aware of our plans. This input resulted in plans which are nearly complete except for a couple of issues relating to the Ranchman's Ditch and final design of the road base section. Our plans include installing a storm drain early in 2001, placing concrete curb gutter and walk during April and May and paving the new roadway in June. We expect to bid this work right after the first of the new year.

PSCO has completed their project to lower a 10-inch high-pressure gas. They have also re-established the original 24-foot wide rural pavement section in the area of their work. This pavement will remain in place until our roadwork begins next year. U.S. West is now installing a new duct system to replace multiple lines throughout the length of the project. Ute Water will be replacing their main along the west edge of the road in September and October. U. S. West and Ute Water will both patch the 24-foot pavement wherever they encroach on it. Although these utility projects have kept the road in a continual state of construction since May, the road has always remained open to through traffic. The utility companies have also been making a good effort to keep access open to the adjacent businesses.

For work in 2001, our specifications will require the contractor to phase his work to provide continual daytime access to all businesses. The plan is to break the project into short enough sections that each portion can be excavated to sub-grade and filled back up to the bottom of the proposed asphalt within a single night of work. Each section, as it is scheduled for work, will be closed at about 6:00 P.M. in the evening.

Contractor crews will work through the night to excavate the roadbed to the design sub-grade elevation (sometimes resulting in cuts of up to four feet) and compact the new base material up to finished grade. Each morning at least one access will be smoothly graded to each property and a dust control surface will be provided as needed. The new compacted gravel surface will be available for business by about 7:30 the next morning.

Once the base material is correctly shaped and compacted, the new curb gutter and sidewalk will be placed by machine along each side of the street. During this operation one section of concrete work will be left out for temporary access to every property (some might be joint accesses at property lines). Once the primary drive section is placed and cured enough to handle traffic, the leave-outs will be poured to complete the concrete work. Again, there will always be some access to each property.

The only time properties might be isolated for a short time (about one hour) will be when the asphalt paving is being placed directly in front of their access. This interference will be minimal and avoided whenever possible.

We understand that it will be important to keep all of the property owners informed of the plans and progress of this project. Our office will be arranging another presentation and neighborhood meeting this coming November to identify any specific issues, which can be included in the bid documents before advertising. We will continue to update the neighborhood and the community through newsletters as the utility work progresses. We will expect the contractor to arrange meetings with the affected parties, either as a whole or by section, in advance of any work. During the project the contractor will publish and deliver newsletters to update the neighborhood on his progress and immediate plans for future work.

Although the project cannot be constructed without some disturbance to the adjoining properties, we will make every reasonable effort to keep that interference to a minimum. By scheduling the most disruptive work outside of business hours, preserving access whenever possible during all remaining work, and keeping the property owners informed before and throughout the work, our impact on the neighboring business community should be as small as possible.

Attach W-3
Memorandum

To: Mayor Kinsey and Members of the City Council

From: Stephanie Nye, City Clerk

Date: December 16, 2011

Subject: Use of New Auditorium and Hearing Room

Based on discussions with previous users of the auditorium, I would like to propose the following policy for the use of the *new* auditorium and hearing room.

The auditorium and hearing room should be restricted to in-house users (with a few exceptions) due to the significant investment in and the technical complexity of the audio-visual equipment. Other reasons are competition (we shouldn't take away business from Two Rivers and the lodging facilities with meeting rooms) and the already high use of the auditorium and hearing rooms. In the short term, the City should attempt to accommodate some of our previous users until the County Courthouse and the Two Rivers remodeling have been completed. I do not believe it would be feasible or practical to rent out either meeting room for use by the multitude of organizations that we accommodated in the old City Hall (see list below). Not only will the highly technical and delicate equipment in both facilities be expensive to repair, we could have quite a few regular internal users that would make availability infrequent.

Before I can schedule any of the external users listed on the exception list below, I need to know if the City Council intends to extend an invitation to the rest of our volunteer boards/commissions/authorities asking them to hold their meetings in our auditorium and be broadcast if that is the Council's wish. Any broadcasting of their meetings would require additional funding for camera operators/ technicians. The current charge for City Council and Planning Commission meetings, which is paid through the Administration and Community Development department budgets, is around \$300 per meeting.

Once I know which of our other boards want to use the City Hall facility, I can then determine the availability of the rooms for the other few groups to be accommodated. These groups are:

- ◆ The County Commissioners and the Mesa County Planning Commission whenever possible for any special circumstances.
- ◆ Special/quasi political groups - Such as the League of Women Voters hosting/broadcasting a candidates or issues forum, current legislators hosting "Town Meetings"
- ◆ The Bankruptcy Court in the hearing room - temporary only until accommodations can be arranged in the new courthouse
- ◆ The Health Dept. Food Service Classes in the auditorium - temporary only until Mesa County can provide accommodations or the Two Rivers remodel is complete

Regardless of the user, the costs in using the facilities need to be passed along, as does the responsibility for the equipment. I suggest a standard contract be prepared whereby **any** external user would be responsible for paying for extra staff time required to open and close the building, clean the facility and for any repairs on equipment or furniture. The City should also require that they only use our trained staff to operate the broadcasting equipment. Legal staff may also want the users to provide indemnification to the City for liability purposes.

If we can accommodate those temporary external users (like the Bankruptcy Court and the Health Dept.), we will make it clear that it is only until the other facilities are complete and they can be relocated there.

For your information in making your decision I am providing the following information:

Existing Uses of the Hearing Room

In-house Users

Municipal Court - every Tuesday, all day, Thursday morning, half day
Traffic School - two Monday evenings per month
Liquor and Beer Hearing - two Wednesday mornings per month
Board of Appeals - one Wednesday afternoon per month
Bid Openings - as available and needed

External Users

Bankruptcy Court - one Friday per month, all day

Existing Uses in the Auditorium

In-house Users

City Council -workshops and regular meetings - four evenings per month
Special meetings as scheduled
Planning Commission - one or two evenings per month

External Users

Mesa County Health Dept. - one day per month, all day
Mesa County Commissioners/Planning Commission - as needed for special meetings that can't be accommodated by their facilities

Occasional Internal Users

Personnel - all employee meetings, benefits meetings
Recreation - coaches meetings, organizational meetings
Public Works - water rights, pre-bid meetings
Housing Authority - Home Buyers Class

Possible Other Internal Users

Forestry Board - one morning per month
DDA - two mornings per month
VCB - one afternoon per month

Urban Trails Committee - one evening per month
Airport Authority - one evening per month
Riverfront Commission - one evening per month
Parks & Recreation Advisory Board - one afternoon per month
Housing Authority - one afternoon per month
Arts Commission - one afternoon per month
Historic Preservation Board - one evening per month

Existing Policy

Current policy prohibits denominational religious services at all times and musical presentations during business hours. No food is allowed in the auditorium. Groups are charged a fee if the event is outside of regular business hours, if an admission is charged or if the group is a for-profit entity (up to \$250).

In the last two years (when we were at old City Hall) we scheduled the groups in following list in the auditorium. Any similar requests in the future should probably be directed to Two Rivers or motel facilities rather than schedule in the auditorium.

Division of Wildlife
Community Forum - "Use of Public Newspaper"
Cable TV Advisory Board
Mesa County Foster Parent Association
Grand Valley Public Radio
Mesa County Human Services
F.A.C.T. (Teen Pregnancy)
Blue Ribbon Coalition
U.S. Forest Service
Enstrom Candies - employee meeting
Colorado Bow Hunter Association
Civil Rights Commission
Colorado Sportsman Wildlife Fund
Domestic Violence Awareness
Colorado Archaeological Society
Colorado Vocational Rehab

I hope this provides you with the information you need. Since we will be back in City Hall shortly and the auditorium and hearing rooms will be completed in the next few weeks, I invite comments and suggestions on the proposed policy as quickly as possible. I will be happy to answer any questions on this proposal at the next workshop or feel free to call me direct at 244-1511. Thank you.

cc: David Varley, Interim City Manager
Ron Lappi, Administrative Services Director
Dan Wilson, City Attorney
Department Directors
Jodi Romero, Customer Service Manager

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>		
Subject:	24 Road Area Design Standards/Guidelines	
Meeting Date:	July 31, 2000	
Date Prepared:	July 25, 2000	
Author:	Kathy Portner	Planning Manager
Presenter Name:	Kathy Portner	Planning Manager
X	Workshop	Formal Agenda

Subject: Proposed 24 Road Corridor Design Standards and Guidelines

Summary: The 24 Road Steering Committee, staff and consultants will present to the City Council and Planning Commission the Proposed 24 Road Corridor Design Standards and Guidelines

Background Information: In 1999, the City of Grand Junction, with the assistance of BRW, a land use, transportation and engineering consultant, began a study of the 24 Road area to develop general land use alternatives for the City Council’s consideration. To assist in the effort and to ensure a broad yet balanced level of public input, the City established a steering committee to advise BRW in developing alternatives. The plan area is generally bounded by 23 Road, 24 ½ Road, Patterson Road and Interstate 70.

Phase I of the study included reconnaissance and development of a preferred plan. After several meetings involving the steering committee, staff, BRW and the 24 Road area land owners, a final draft of the 24 Road Corridor Subarea Plan was formulated. The preferred plan developed by the committee included residential uses along 24 ½ Road, industrial uses along 23 Road and commercial uses along the F Road/HWY 6 & 50 corridors. The remainder of the area long the 24 Road corridor, north of F ½ Road was proposed for mixed use, to include the possibility for employment, residential and limited commercial. The draft plan recommended that design standards and guidelines be developed for much of the 24 Road corridor.

In March of 2000, City Council requested that staff and the steering committee, with the assistance of the consultant, move forward with Phase II of the study, to create a zone district and design standards and guidelines for the study area. The steering committee has had several meetings to discuss and formulate the draft standards/guidelines, including a meeting with property owners to gather input.

Proposed Zoning

For the area designated as “Mixed Use” on the Preferred Plan we are proposing a new zone district called “Mixed Use”. The zoning standards and uses are similar to the I-O

(Industrial-Office), with some multi-family uses and standards incorporated. This zone district would offer the flexibility in land uses in the area proposed by the Steering Committee.

The 24 Road Corridor Design Standards and Guidelines would be implemented as an overlay zone. The standards and guidelines would be applied in addition to the requirements of the underlying zone district. There are some options as to where the overlay would be applied.

- The standards and guidelines could be applied to the entire 24 Road study area, which would include everything shown on the preferred plan.
- The standards and guidelines could be applied to only the mixed use area.
- The standards and guidelines could be applied to the 24 Road corridor, ¼ mile on either side, which would include everything in that band from F Road to I-70, or could extend north of I-70.

Design Standards and Guidelines

The 24 Road Corridor Design Standards and Guidelines are intended to provide guidance and criteria for the planning, design and implementation of public and private improvements in the 24 Road Corridor. If properly administered and adhered to, they should result in public and private development and improvements that achieve, as a minimum, a common level of quality in terms of site design, architectural design, landscaping, and other site improvements.

The general purposes of the Standards and Guidelines are:

- To establish a practical, interconnected system of streets, parks, and parkways that allows easy orientation and convenient access for all modes of transportation.
- To utilize natural open spaces, such as creeks, and developed public spaces, streets, parks and parkways, to organize and coordinate development.
- To accommodate a broad mix of development types that encourage alternative transportation, especially walking, and transit use.
- To provide common usable open space that is of mutual benefit to surrounding property owners, businesses, and residents.
- To construct the early phases of development in a manner that establishes a pattern and character for the long-term evolution of the Corridor.

Budget: N/A

Action Requested/Recommendation: Council discussion of the proposed standards and guidelines and guidance on an adoption schedule.

Citizen Presentation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	If Yes,
Name:	Consultant and Steering Committee				
Purpose:	Presentation and input				

Report results back to Council:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	When:	
---------------------------------	--------------------------	----	-------------------------------------	-----	-------	--

Placement on Agenda:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Indiv. Consideration	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Workshop
----------------------	--------------------------	---------	--------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------------	----------