

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL  
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 250 NORTH 5<sup>TH</sup> STREET  
AGENDA**

**WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 2001, 7:30 P.M.**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Pledge of Allegiance

Invocation - Scott Hogue, First Baptist Church

**PRESENTATION OF THREE AWARDS FROM THE HOSPITALITY SALES AND  
MARKETING ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONAL TO THE GRAND JUNCTION  
VISITORS AND CONVENTION BUREAU**

**PRESENTATION OF CERTIFICATES OF APPOINTMENT TO NEWLY APPOINTED  
MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON ARTS AND CULTURE**

**CITIZEN COMMENTS**

**\*\*\* CONSENT CALENDAR \*\*\***

1. **Minutes of Previous Meetings**

[Attach 1](#)

*Action: Approve the Summary of the March 5, 2001 Workshop and the Minutes of the Regular Meeting March 7, 2001*

2. **Purchase of Six 2001 Police Vehicles**

[Attach 2](#)

The following bids were received:

Western Slope Auto	Grand Junction, CO	\$129,456
Hellman Motor Company	Delta, CO	\$130,062

*Action: Approve Purchase of Six New 2001 Ford Crown Victoria Police Interceptor Vehicles from Western Slope Auto in the Amount of \$129,456*

Staff presentation: Ron Watkins, Purchasing Manager  
Chuck Leyden, Fleet Manager

3. **Purchase of Four 2001 ½-Ton 4 x 2 Pickups**

[Attach 3](#)

The following bids were received:

Western Slope Auto	Grand Junction, CO	\$53,096
Hellman Motor Company	Delta, CO	\$56,665
Western Slope Chrysler	Grand Junction, CO	\$53,330
Fuoco Motor Company	Grand Junction, CO	\$57,921

*Action: Approve Purchase of Four 2001 ½-Ton 4 x 2 Pickups from Western Slope Auto in the Amount of \$53,096*

Staff presentation: Ron Watkins, Purchasing Manager  
Chuck Leyden, Fleet Manager

4. **Construction of Canyon View Baseball Field Restrooms** [Attach 4](#)

The restroom is needed to accommodate those persons participating in sports activities in the north east area of Canyon View Park. The building is approximately 1,700 square feet built with 8" concrete block walls. The Park Improvement Advisory Board (PIAB) has identified restrooms for the east side of Canyon View Park as a high priority.

The following responsive bids were received for the project:

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>Bid Amount</u>
Tusca II Inc.	Grand Junction	\$191,900
Vostatek Const.	Clifton	\$203,583
John Dyer Const.	Grand Junction	\$208,269
K & G Enterprises, Inc.	Grand Junction	\$234,510
Quality Const.	Grand Junction	\$248,275
R. W. Jones Inc.	Fruita	\$265,000

*Action: Award Construction Contract for Canyon View Baseball Field Restrooms to Tusca II Inc. in the Amount of \$191,900*

Staff presentation: Shawn Cooper, Park Planner  
Rex Sellers, Senior Buyer

5. **Sole Source Purchase of a Wide Area Mower for the Division of Parks Operations** [Attach 5](#)

City Council authorization for the sole source purchase from L.L. Johnson, Inc. of Denver, one Toro wide area mower for \$35,890; the same price as was bid in March, 2000. This mower will be used throughout the parks system.

*Action: Approve Sole Source Purchase of a Toro Wide Area Mower from L.L. Johnson, Inc. in the Amount of \$35,890*

Staff presentation: Don Hobbs, Assistant Director, Parks and Recreation

6. **24½ Road Sidewalk Improvement Project** [Attach 6](#)

The following bids were received on March 6, 2001:

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>Bid Amount</u>
United Companies	Grand Junction	\$68,290.00
Precision Paving	Grand Junction	\$63,674.03
BPS Concrete	Grand Junction	\$61,374.72
G & G Paving	Grand Junction	\$61,000.00
Vista Paving, L.L.C.	Grand Junction	\$58,996.54
Engineer's Estimate		\$75,360.00

*Action: Award Contract for 24½ Road Sidewalk Improvement Project to Vista Paving, L.L.C., in the Amount of \$58,996.54*

Staff presentation: Tim Moore, Public Works Manager

7. **Asphaltic Road Material (Road Oil) for 2001 City Chip Seal Projects** [Attach 7](#)

The City of Grand Junction requests utilizing prices from the State of Colorado Department of Transportation bid prices to purchase approximately 162,000 gallons of road oil for 2001.

*Action: Approve Purchase of 162,000 Gallons of Asphaltic Road Material from Koch Performance Asphalt in an Approximate Amount of \$142,000*

Staff presentation: Mark Relph, Public Works & Utilities Director

8. **Amendment to the FY 2001-2006 MPO Transportation Improvement Program** [Attach 8](#)

The Grand Junction/Mesa County MPO is applying for \$400,000 in Section 5309 grant funding for the restoration of the existing historic train station. The resolution and amendment are necessary to apply for the grant.

Resolution No. 24-01 – A Joint Resolution of the County of Mesa and the City of Grand Junction Concerning Adoption of Administrative Amendment to the 2001-2006 Transportation Improvement Program

*\*Action: Adopt Resolution No. 24-01*

Staff presentation: Mark Relph, Public Works & Utilities Director

9. **Designating the Richard Warren Motor Company Building (749 Main Street) in the City Register of Historic Sites, Structures and Districts**  
[File #HBD-2001-02.01] [Attach 9](#)

Integrated Partners, LLC, as the owner of the Richard Warren Motor Company Building located at 749 Main Street, is requesting the building be designated as historic in the City Register of Historic Sites, Structures and Districts

Resolution No. 25-01 – A Resolution Designating the Richard Warren Motor Company Building at 749 Main Street in the City Register of Historic Sites, Structures and Districts

*\*Action: Adopt Resolution No. 25-01*

Staff presentation: Kristen Ashbeck, Senior Planner

10. **Acquisition of Lots 11 and 12, Block 122, City of Grand Junction (159 Colorado Avenue)** [Attach 10](#)

The proposed resolution will authorize the City to initiate condemnation proceedings to acquire Lots 11 and 12, inclusive, Block 122, of the City of Grand Junction, also known as 159 Colorado Avenue

Resolution No. 26-01 – A Resolution Determining the Necessity of and Authorizing the Acquisition of Certain Property, by Either Negotiation or Condemnation, for Municipal Public Facilities

*\*Action: Adopt Resolution No. 26-01*

Staff presentation: Tim Woodmansee, Real Estate Manager

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

---

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

11. **Public Hearing - Traver Annexation No. 1 and Traver Annexation No. 2, Located at 2980 Rood Avenue and 2986 D Road** [File #ANX-2001-011] [Attach 11](#)

The 31.98-acre Traver Annexation consists of two parcels of land located at 2980 Rood Avenue and 2986 D Road, including a portion of the D Road right-of-way.

- a. **Resolution Accepting Petition**

Resolution No. 27-01 – A Resolution Accepting a Petition for Annexation, Making Certain Findings, Determining that Property Known as Traver Annexation No. 1 and Traver Annexation No. 2, A Serial Annexation Located at 2980 Rood Avenue and 2986 D Road, and Including a Portion of the D Road Right-of-Way, is Eligible for Annexation

*\*Action:* Adopt Resolution No. 27-01

**b. Annexation Ordinances**

- (1) Ordinance No. 3332 – An Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Traver Annexation No. 1, Approximately 0.54 Acres, Located at 2986 D Road, and Including a Portion of the D Road Right-of-Way
- (2) Ordinance No. 3333 – An Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Traver Annexation No. 2, Approximately 31.44 Acres, Located at 2986 D Road and 2980 Rood Avenue, Including a Portion of the D Road Right-of-Way

*\*Action:* Adopt Ordinances No. 3332 and No. 3333 on Second Reading  
Staff presentation: Kristen Ashbeck, Senior Planner

12. **Public Hearing - Zoning Traver Annexation to RSF-4, Located at 2980 Rood Avenue/2986 D Road** [File #ANX-2001-011] [Attach 12](#)

The 31.98-acre Traver Annexation located at 2980 Rood Avenue/2986 D Road consists of two parcels of land. State law requires the City to zone newly annexed areas within 90 days of the annexation. The proposed City zoning conforms to the Growth Plan's Future Land Use map and recommendation for residential land uses between 4 and 7.9 units per acre for this area.

Ordinance No. 3334 – An Ordinance Zoning the Traver Annexation to Residential Single Family with a Maximum Density of 4 Units per Acre (RSF-4) Located at 2980 Rood Avenue and 2986 D Road

*\*Action:* Adopt Ordinance No. 3334 on Second Reading

Staff presentation: Kristen Ashbeck, Senior Planner

13. **Public Hearing - Amending Chapter 36 of the City Code of Ordinances Regarding Unsafe Backing** [Attach 13](#)

On December 6, 2000, the 1995 Model Traffic Code was adopted, which included a provision referring to backing a car in such a manner so as not to be unsafe. The current reading of this section refers only to backing when it occurs on public

or private parking lots, the shoulder of any road, or a controlled-access highway. This amendment removes the “controlled-access” portion of the ordinance, making this section of the Code one that can be charged throughout the City, protecting all citizens, no matter where they may be travelling.

Ordinance No. 3335 – An Ordinance Amending Chapter 36, Section 36-38(b) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado Regarding Unsafe Backing

*Action: Adopt Ordinance No. 3335 on Second Reading*

Staff presentation: Stephanie Rubinstein, Staff City Attorney

14. **NON-SCHEDULED CITIZENS & VISITORS**
15. **OTHER BUSINESS**
16. **ADJOURNMENT**

## Attach 1

### GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP

March 5, 2001

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, met on Wednesday, March 5, 2001 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Auditorium to discuss workshop items. Those present were Cindy Enos-Martinez, Earl Payne, Jack Scott, Jim Spehar, Janet Terry, Reford Theobald, and President of the Council Gene Kinsey. Janet Terry left early at 7:55 p.m. after item #1.

#### Summaries and action on the following topics:

1. **SPRING CLEAN-UP:** Staff presented options for the City's annual Spring Clean-up program.

Tim Moore, Public Works Manager, stated that the plan is to split the City in half and complete the program in two weeks. However, due to the increase in volume, the City's resources are overtaxed. In recent years, the City has had to contract out some of the work. The department is also looking at dealing with the green waste differently and providing free passes to the dump.

**Action Summary:** The Council wanted to continue the program as run previously, contracting out as necessary, with a possible expansion of organic waste being collected in the fall. Councilmember Terry cautioned staff to make sure to use quality contractors. Council felt this to be an important program that can be addressed more closely during the budget process.

2. **STORM WATER REGULATIONS AND FUTURE MANAGEMENT:** An update on storm water management issues including floodplain, pending federal and state water quality regulations and infrastructure needs.

Trent Prall, Utilities Engineer, reviewed storm water management, including maintenance and regulations, with Council. He proposed three ways of getting organized: a new service provider, expand existing operations and develop intergovernmental agreements. He then suggested some funding opportunities.

**Action Summary:** Council appreciated seeing the presentation and complimented the staff.

3. **SEPTIC SYSTEM ELIMINATION PROGRAM:** The SSEP has generated a lot of interest. Staff will present funding alternatives for the possible expansion of the program.

Mark Relph, Public Works Director, introduced the presentation. Trent Prall, Utilities Engineer then reviewed the popularity of the program and suggested ways to fund an expansion of the program. Mr. Prall asked for Council's approval to begin neighborhood meetings with a funding option of bonded indebtedness. The County has already given its go-ahead.

**Action Summary:** Council favored investigating bonding alternatives for this program and authorized Staff to begin neighborhood meetings.

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

**March 7, 2001**

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, convened into regular session the 7th day of March, 2001, at 7:32 p.m. at the City Hall Auditorium, 250 N. 5<sup>th</sup> Street. Those present were Earl Payne, Jack Scott, Jim Spehar, Janet Terry, Reford Theobold and President of the Council Gene Kinsey. Also present were City Manager Kelly Arnold, City Attorney Dan Wilson, and City Clerk Stephanie Nye. Councilmember Cindy Enos-Martinez was absent.

Council President Kinsey called the meeting to order and Councilmember Theobold led in the Pledge of Allegiance. The audience remained standing during the invocation by retired Minister Eldon Coffey.

**PROCLAMATION DECLARING MARCH, 2001 AS "PURCHASING MONTH" IN THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

**APPOINTMENTS TO THE COMMISSION ON ARTS AND CULTURE**

Upon motion by Councilmember Theobold, seconded by Councilmember Scott and carried, Seth Brown and Bill Whaley were reappointed to three-year terms on the Commission on Arts and Culture, and Joan Meyers was appointed to a three-year term on the Commission on Arts and Culture.

**REPORT TO COUNCIL ON INITIATIVE PETITIONS RECEIVED CONCERNING THE SALE OF A PORTION OF LILAC PARK**

City Clerk Stephanie Nye reported that 86 petition sections were received on the deadline of February 21, 2001. The petition included 1051 signatures with 781 valid signatures. The required number needed in order to place this measure on the April 3, 2001 ballot as an initiative was 746. It will be printed on the ballot and labeled Initiative 200. It is for the Lilac Park question which is regarding the sale of a portion of Lilac Park (1.56 acres), with the proceeds to be used for parks development and/or acquisition. The Election Code determines the order of placement on the ballot (candidates, referendums, initiatives) and the numbering system for the ballot.

**CONSENT ITEMS**

Upon motion by Councilmember Spehar, seconded by Councilmember Payne and carried by roll call vote, Item #9 was removed from the Consent Agenda and the scheduling of a Special Meeting for March 19, 2001 to make a decision on the Ten Commandments issue was added, and the Consent Agenda was then approved.

1. **Minutes of Previous Meetings**

*Action: Approve the Summary of the February 21, 2001 Workshop and the Minutes of the Regular Meeting February 21, 2001*

2. **Commission on Arts and Culture Funding for Cultural Events/Projects/Programs**

On February 27 and 28, 2001 the Commission reviewed 24 requests and presentations from organizations and agencies for financial support, per Commission goals, criteria and guidelines. The requests total \$52,680, and the various projects expect to leverage an additional \$75,377 in private donations. The Commission recommends funding support for the following 18 local art and cultural event and projects:

Celtic Society - Celtic Festival & Highland Games	\$2000
David Taylor Dance Theatre (from Denver) - "Rainforest" performances	\$2000
Friends for Native American Communities - Rocky Mountain Indian Festival	\$2000
Italian Cultural Society - Festival Italiano concerts & film festival	\$2000
KRMJ-TV (PBS) "Western Bounty" segments featuring local arts and artists	\$2000
Performing Arts Conservatory musical production "Ruthless"	\$2000
Saturday Cinema at the Avalon Independent Film Series	\$2000
GJ Jaycees "Return to Camelot" Renaissance Festival	\$1500
Latin Anglo Alliance Cinco de Mayo Fiesta (downtown)	\$1500
Mesa Co. Community Concert Assoc. school concert of Andean folk music	\$1300
Brush & Palette Club Regional Exhibition & Workshop	\$1250
Western Colorado Watercolor Society National Watercolor Exhibition	\$1250
VSA Arts-GJ Arts Festival for Adults & Children with developmental disabilities	\$1200
Mesa State College Dance Festival (collaboration of area dance groups/studios)	\$1000
Mesa County Public Library LIVE! at the Library poetry reading	\$ 525
Advocates for Children's Enrichment children's theatre production	\$ 500
Schumann Singers Winter Choral Concert	\$ 500
GJ Music Teachers Assoc. Sonatina Music Festival for piano students	\$ 475
	Total \$25,000

*Action: Approve the Commission on Arts and Cultural Recommendations for Funding Cultural Programs in an Amount of \$25,000*

3. **2001 Alley Improvement District, Phase A**

The following bids were received on February 27, 2001:

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>Bid Amount</u>
Reyes Construction, Inc.	Grand Junction	\$397,406.15
Mays Concrete, Inc.	Grand Junction	\$418,240.00
Engineer's Estimate		\$451,845.00

*Action: Award Contract for 2001 Alley Improvement District, Phase A, to Reyes Construction, Inc., in the Amount of \$397,406.15*

4. **Setting a Hearing on Berthod Annexation Located at 2982 Gunnison Avenue** [File #ANX-2001-033]

The 0.712-acre Berthod Annexation consists of one parcel of land located at 2982 Gunnison Avenue. The property owner would like to build a 100' Telecommunication Tower with equipment shelters, which, under the 1998 Persigo Intergovernmental Agreement, requires development in this area to be annexed.

**a. Referral of Petition for Annexation, Setting a Hearing and Exercising Land Use Control and Jurisdiction**

Resolution No. 20-01 – A Resolution Referring a Petition to the City Council for the Annexation of Lands to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Setting a Hearing on Such Annexation and Exercising Land Use Control – Berthod Annexation Located at 2982 Gunnison Avenue

*Action: Adopt Resolution No. 20-01 and Set a Hearing for April 18, 2001*

**b. Set a Hearing on Annexation Ordinance**

Proposed Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Berthod Annexation, Approximately 0.712 Acres, Located at 2982 Gunnison Avenue

*Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for April 18, 2001*

5. **Setting a Hearing on Cantrell Annexations No. 1 and No. 2, Located at 2930 North Avenue** [File #ANX-2001-052]

The 3.09-acre Cantrell Annexation area consists of one parcel of land, approximately 2.71 acres in size, located at 2930 North Avenue. The remaining acreage is comprised of approximately 703 feet of right-of-way along North Avenue. There are no existing structures on the site. The owner of the property has signed a petition for annexation.

**a. Referral of Petition for Annexation, Setting a Hearing and Exercising Land Use Control and Jurisdiction**

Resolution No. 21–01 – A Resolution Referring a Petition to the City Council for the Annexation of Lands to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Setting a Hearing on Such Annexation and Exercising Land Use Control – Cantrell Annexation, a Serial Annexation Comprising Cantrell Annexation No. 1 and Cantrell Annexation No. 2, Located at 2930 North Avenue and Including a Portion of the North Avenue Right-of-Way

*Action: Adopt Resolution No. 21–01 and Set a Hearing for April 18, 2001*

**b. Set a Hearing on Annexation Ordinances**

(1) Proposed Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Cantrell Annexation No. 1, Approximately 0.38 Acres, Located at 2930 North Avenue and Including a Portion of the North Avenue Right-of-Way

(2) Proposed Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Cantrell Annexation No. 2, Approximately 2.71 Acres, Located at 2930 North Avenue and Including a Portion of the North Avenue Right-of-Way

*Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinances on First Reading and Set a Hearing for April 18, 2001*

**6. Setting a Hearing on Zoning Traver Annexation to RSF-4, Located at 2980 Rood Avenue/2986 D Road [File #ANX-2001-011]**

The 31.98-acre Traver Annexation located at 2980 Rood Avenue/2986 D Road consists of two parcels of land. State law requires the City to zone newly annexed areas within 90 days of the annexation. The proposed City zoning conforms to the Growth Plan's Future Land Use map and recommendation for residential land uses between 4 and 7.9 units per acre for this area.

Proposed Ordinance Zoning the Traver Annexation to Residential Single Family with a Maximum Density of 4 Units per Acre (RSF-4) Located at 2980 Rood Avenue and 2986 D Road

*Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for March 21, 2001*

**7. Modified Street Section for Grand Mesa Center Frontage Road Located at 2464 Highway 6 & 50 [File #PP-2000-234]**

The developer of the Grand Mesa Center requests a waiver from the City's standard street section drawings to allow for a modified street section for the frontage road. There is no standard for a frontage road in the City's standard drawings. Council action is required to permit a 24-foot asphalt mat in a 35-foot right-of-way for the frontage road.

*Action: Approval of Modified Street Section Request*

8. **Setting a Hearing on Amending Chapter 36 of the City Code of Ordinances Regarding Unsafe Backing**

On December 6, 2000, the 1995 Model Traffic Code was adopted, which included a provision referring to backing a car in such a manner so as not to be unsafe. The current reading of this section refers only to backing when it occurs on public or private parking lots, the shoulder of any road, or a controlled-access highway. This amendment removes the "controlled-access" portion of the ordinance, making this section of the Code one that can be charged throughout the City, protecting all citizens, no matter where they may be travelling.

Proposed Ordinance Amending Chapter 36, Section 36-38(b) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado Regarding Unsafe Backing

*Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for March 21, 2001*

9. **Schedule Special City Council Meeting for March 19, 2001 to Make a Decision on the Ten Commandments**

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

---

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

**PUBLIC HEARING – MOORE ANNEXATION LOCATED AT 457 31 ROAD**

[FILE #ANX-2001-012]

This 4.87-acre annexation consists of one parcel of land located at 457 31 Road and including portions of the E Road and 31 Road rights-of-way.

Mayor Kinsey opened the public hearing at 7:43 p.m.

Dave Thornton, Principal Planner, Community Development Department, reviewed this item. The petitioner had nothing to add.

There were no public comments. The public hearing closed at 7:44 p.m.

**a. Resolution Accepting Petition**

Resolution No. 22-01 – A Resolution Accepting Petitions for Annexation, Making Certain Findings, Determining that Property Known as Moore Annexation is Eligible for Annexation, Located at 457 31 Road and Including a Portion of the 31 Road and E Road Rights-of-Way

**b. Annexation Ordinance**

Ordinance No. 3329 – An Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Moore Annexation, Approximately 4.87 Acres, Located at 457 31 Road and Including a Portion of the 31 Road and E Road Rights-of-Way

Upon motion by Councilmember Terry, seconded by Councilmember Scott and carried by roll call vote, Resolution No. 22-01 was adopted and Ordinance No. 3329 was adopted on second reading and ordered published.

**PUBLIC HEARING - ZONING MOORE ANNEXATION RMF-5, LOCATED AT 457 31 ROAD**

The 4.87-acre Moore Annexation area located at 457 31 Road consists of one parcel of land. State law requires the City to zone newly annexed areas within 90 days of the annexation. The proposed City zoning conforms to the Growth Plan's Future Land Use map and recommendation for residential land uses between 4 and 7.9 units per acre for this area.

Mayor Kinsey opened the public hearing at 7:44 p.m.

Dave Thornton, Community Development Department, reviewed this item.

There were no public comments. The public hearing closed at 7:45 p.m.

Ordinance No. 3330 - An Ordinance Zoning the Moore Annexation to Residential Multi-family with a Maximum Density of 5 Units per Acre (RMF-5), Located at 457 31 Road.

Upon motion by Councilmember Payne, seconded by Councilmember Theobald and carried by roll call vote, Ordinance No. 3330 was adopted on second reading and ordered published.

Councilmember Cindy Enos-Martinez entered the meeting.

**PUBLIC HEARING - AMENDING THE ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE  
ADDING A SECTION ON INSTITUTIONAL AND CIVIC FACILITY MASTER PLANS  
AND ESTABLISHING A REVIEW FEE [FILE #TAC-2001-01.01]**

The proposed amendment would add a section 2-20 to the Zoning and Development

Code to define a facilities master plan and a process for its implementation. The resolution establishes a review fee.

Mayor Kinsey opened the public hearing at 7:46 p.m.

Kathy Portner, Acting Community Development Director, reviewed the item. This amendment was first considered as a result of the St. Mary's Master Plan. The proposal was sent to other institutions such as the School District, the Library, Community Hospital and Mesa State College. She then distributed a letter from the School District addressing the proposal.

Councilmember Terry asked Ms. Portner to elaborate on what type of studies the institution would have to prepare in order to meet the requirements of the new code. Ms. Portner replied that it would depend on the project. The studies needed would be required for the plan anyway, at a later step in the review process. If there is no major impact, additional studies would not be required.

Councilmember Spehar asked Ms. Portner if, relative to the letter from the School District and the attached except from the statute, she anticipates the facility's master plan being the same as the sub-development plan referenced in the statute, and would it be treated the same? Ms. Portner responded that she believed so.

City Attorney Wilson stated this point has always been made and understood by all parties.

There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed at 7:55 p.m.

Councilmember Spehar stated he felt this change to the Code was appropriate for larger projects.

Ordinance No. 3331 – An Ordinance Amending the Zoning and Development Code, Institutional and Civic Facility Master Plans

Resolution No. 23–01 – A Resolution Amending Development Application Fee Schedule

Upon motion by Councilmember Spehar, seconded by Councilmember Scott and carried by roll call vote, Ordinance No. 3331 was adopted on second reading and ordered published, and Resolution No. 23-01 was adopted.

### **DISCUSSION OF VALLE VISTA ALTERNATIVES FOR 201 SEWER SERVICE BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS**

On December 13, 2000 the City Council instructed staff to develop alternatives that might allow homeowners on Orchard Mesa, adjacent to the Valle Vista Sewer Interceptor, to connect to the line if they have failed septic systems. Staff from Utilities and the City Attorney's office has developed a number of alternatives to that end. Staff

would like input from Council as to the alternatives so that Council's preferred alternatives can be discussed with Mesa County prior to the April 2, 2001 public hearing.

Greg Trainor, Utilities Manager, introduced this item and stated he would respond to questions. A public hearing is scheduled with Mesa County on April 2, 2001. At the September, 2000 meeting, no agreement had been made between the City and County. At that time, the City Attorney and the Utility Manager were directed to come up with other alternatives. Staff has developed some alternatives but are uncertain if they are ones that both entities can agree on. Once an area is sewered, growth will more than likely occur. Mr. Trainor stated he would like to narrow the list down to a couple of alternatives for the April 2, 2001 meeting.

City Manager Arnold stated there may possibly be more alternatives after talking with the County.

City Attorney Wilson said the County had also allowed for additional taps the City had not granted. There were nine granted during the lawsuit and before the Persigo Agreement was signed. Mr. Trainor said that five have been constructed and there are four outstanding granted taps.

Councilmember Theobold asked City Attorney Wilson to clarify the authority of granting taps. City Attorney Wilson stated Council has the authority to grant the

taps. The Orchard Mesa taps were traded for easements by the Orchard Mesa Sanitation District. However, the Orchard Mesa taps are no good without a Persigo tap granted by the City.

Staff then presented the different alternatives with the use of maps. First, the most restrictive and present alternate, showing four existing taps that do not comply with the agreement. The next was an alternative that allowed for those homes which leads to a lot of "bleed out", i.e. that others perhaps closer to the line would have a good argument as to why they would not be allowed to hook-up when they were closer to the sewer line than their neighbor. The third alternative would open up the whole area, expanding the definition. Lastly, include the whole area and have no build dates restrictions.

Mayor Kinsey suggested that Council compromise incrementally until a point of agreement can be reached with the County.

Councilmember Theobold said the goal of the Persigo Agreement is a mutual agreement. With no mutual agreement, then there are no agreements.

Councilmember Terry agreed overall, except for the area where some room had been left open for discussion on the Persigo boundary. A decision has been promised. She asked Kathy Portner to clarify the reaffirmation of the Orchard Mesa Plan that the area in question was to remain agricultural.

Councilmember Spehar asked Ms. Portner for any technical advice, given the reconfirmation of the plan and the issues and extensions, is it possible those two could work together or would there be direct conflict. Ms. Portner responded that once services are available, the pressure for development increases.

Councilmember Spehar stated he was having a difficult time, given the history, initial discussions and recent reconfirmation of the plan, getting to a place where Council cannot uphold the plan.

Councilmember Terry asked how Council could not uphold the plan and how could Council render it invalid. She stated that if they extend the sewer in any way, Council negates it.

Councilmember Spehar suggested that one alternative would be not to allow any more taps.

Councilmember Theobald stated Council doesn't have the political will to take anyone off the sewer line, so that's the compromise, let those connections remain. It is preferable to have development occur from the center out and avoid hopscotch development, which has occurred during the last forty years.

Councilmember Spehar clarified with City Attorney Wilson regarding the taps that have been granted but not yet hooked up, could Council say no to them being connected. City Attorney Wilson said that was correct.

Mr. Trainor commented that the four taps outstanding have no particular location but are tied to certain parcels.

Councilmember Theobald suggested making specific exceptions for the existing four taps and existing structures, which would otherwise be required to be disconnected, but not to open it up to different build dates, different parcels, etc.

City Attorney Wilson stated Council could draft an agreement of a practical exception to the agreement.

Councilmember Terry asked if this would set a precedent if an amendment is written that deals with this situation. City Attorney Wilson responded that it would be better to include these circumstances and how they occurred in the Persigo Agreement and acknowledge it as an error.

Councilmember Spehar stated that was as far as he was willing to go. He is willing to correct the error but not willing to allow this error to be passed on.

Councilmember Terry stated her dilemma regarding the untapped taps is with the individual that had that agreement and Council now saying this is null and void.

City Attorney Wilson stated Council could address existing tap agreements in the language of the amendment.

Councilmember Theobold clarified that this would be for just existing taps.

Mayor Kinsey stated this would be to clarify specific parcels, and not as part of a general plan.

City Attorney Wilson cautioned Council not to make a decision tonight but to leave the door open for the meeting with the Commissioners and after public testimony.

Councilmember Scott was still concerned about considering the additional four taps agreements.

City Attorney Wilson stated those specific agreements need to be reviewed to see which parcels they are, and acknowledge Council was not aware of the agreement of exchanging taps for easements.

Councilmember Terry commented that these issues should have been brought before the Council during the negotiations with the sanitation districts.

Mayor Kinsey stated there are questions about physical connections that happened after they should have, and there are questions of unconstructed taps. Council wants to retain the integrity of the Orchard Mesa Plan and the Persigo Agreement, but will address these five or nine taps as a separate issue.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **29 Road Construction**

Connie Cass, 266 27½ Road, addressed Council. She lives on Orchard Mesa and asked Council to consider the impact of the 29 Road construction to the area. She feels this would add more development pressure along that corridor. Many are counting on the aforementioned agreement, i.e., the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan.

### **Ten Commandments Discussion**

Marija Vader, Daily Sentinel reporter, asked Council to continue to keep discussions on the Ten Commandments in public session.

City Attorney Wilson stated of course Council would, because of statute requirements. But any attorney advice to clients will be done in private session, such as risks, costs, etc.

Councilmember Terry said Council had no intention of making a decision on the Ten Commandments that would be unlawful and the attorney would address the litigation

issues.

City Attorney Wilson stated the potential for the suit to be filed is crystal clear to him based on his conversation today with two ACLU attorneys. He said there could be some options that the ACLU attorneys would be willing to discuss, however.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Council adjourned into executive session at 8:55 p.m. to discuss pending litigation.

Stephanie Nye, CMC  
City Clerk

Attach 2

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA  
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<b>CITY COUNCIL</b>			
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Purchase 6 each 2001 Police Interceptors</b>		
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	<b>March 21, 2001</b>		
<b>Date Prepared:</b>	<b>March 13, 2001</b>		
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Ron Watkins</b>	<b>Title: Purchasing Manager</b>	
<b>Presenter Name:</b>	<b>Ron Watkins Chuck Leyden</b>	<b>Title: Purchasing Manager Title: Fleet Manager</b>	
<b>Workshop</b>		<b>X</b>	<b>Formal Agenda</b>

**Subject:** Purchase six (6) 2001 Ford Crown Victoria Police Interceptors as per the terms and conditions of Bid #09B-01-RW.

**Summary:** This purchase is to replace six police interceptor units. The old units will be taken out of service and sold after the new units are equipped with the necessary special equipment, ready for use.

**Background Information:** Ford Motor Company is currently the only manufacturer of specialty produced Police pursuit vehicles. Six bids were solicited with two bids received:

Western Slope Auto, Grand Junction, CO	\$129,456 with selected options
Hellman Motor Company, Delta, CO	\$130,062 with selected options

**Budget:** Sufficient 2001 funds have been budgeted for this purchase in the vehicle replacement account 402-61421-80370-30-F15000.

**Action Requested/Recommendation:** Authorize the City Purchasing Manager to purchase six (6) new 2001 Ford Crown Victoria Police Interceptor vehicles for the amount of \$129,456.

<b>Citizen Presentation:</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>No</b>		<b>Yes    If Yes,</b>
<b>Name:</b>	N/A			
<b>Purpose:</b>	N/A			

<b>Report results back to Council:</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>No</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>When:</b>	
--	----------	-----------	--	------------	--------------	--

<b>Placement on Agenda:</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Consent</b>		<b>Indiv. Consideration</b>		<b>Workshop</b>
-----------------------------	----------	----------------	--	-----------------------------	--	-----------------

**Attach 3**

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA  
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i><b>CITY COUNCIL</b></i>			
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Purchase 4 each 2001 ½ ton Pickups</b>		
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	<b>March 21, 2001</b>		
<b>Date Prepared:</b>	<b>March 13, 2001</b>		
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Ron Watkins</b>	<b>Title: Purchasing Manager</b>	
<b>Presenter Name:</b>	<b>Ron Watkins Chuck Leyden</b>	<b>Title: Purchasing Manager Title: Fleet Manager</b>	
	<b>Workshop</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Formal Agenda</b>

**Subject:** Purchase four (4) 2001 new ½ ton 4X2 pickups as per the terms and conditions of Bid #14B-01-RW.

**Summary:** This purchase is to replace three pickups (one each for Solid Waste, Traffic Signs, Construction Engineering) and to add one pickup for Traffic Engineering. The replacement units are being traded to the successful bidder based on the trade option conditions in the bid.

**Background Information:** Thirteen bids were solicited, with four bids received. The individual bids are shown net, less the trade-in values offered. They are as follows:

Western Slope Auto, Grand Junction, CO	\$53,096.00
Hellman Motor Company, Delta, CO	\$56,665.00
Western Slope Chrysler, Grand Junction, CO	\$53,330.00
Fuoco Motor Company, Grand Junction, CO	\$57,921.00

**Budget:** Sufficient 2001 funds have been budgeted for these purchases in the vehicle replacement account 402-61421-80370-30-F15000 \$37,172.00 and the CIP account 100-616521-80370-30-F48000-15924 \$15,924.

**Action Requested/Recommendation:** Authorize the City Purchasing Manager to purchase four (4) new 2001 Ford ½ ton 4X2 pickups for the net amount of \$53,096 from the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, Western Slope Auto Company, Grand Junction, Colorado.

<b>Citizen Presentation:</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>If Yes,</b>
<b>Name:</b>	<b>N/A</b>			
<b>Purpose:</b>	<b>N/A</b>			

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

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

**Attach 4**

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA  
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<b>CITY COUNCIL</b>		
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Restroom Facility at Canyon View Park Baseball Field</b>	
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	<b>March 21, 2001</b>	
<b>Date Prepared:</b>	<b>March 13, 2001</b>	
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Rex Sellers</b>	<b>Senior Buyer</b>
<b>Presenter Name:</b>	<b>Shawn Cooper Rex Sellers</b>	<b>Park Planner Senior Buyer</b>
	<b>Workshop</b>	<b>X      Formal Agenda</b>

**Subject:** Construction of a new restroom facility at Canyon View Park next to the baseball field.

**Summary:** The restroom is needed to accommodate those persons participating in sports activities in the north east area of Canyon View Park. The building is approximately 1,700 square feet built with 8" concrete block walls. The Park Improvement Advisory Board (PIAB) has identified restrooms for the east side of Canyon View Park as a high priority.

**Background Information:** Temporary portable toilets are currently being used at this location. In order to accommodate the users of the park it was determined that a new restroom facility is necessary and was a requirement of the Community Development Department in approval of the construction of the Baseball Field. The facility has been a high priority of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board as well as PIAB. This solicitation was advertised on February 18 and 21, 2001. Twelve solicitation packages were mailed to interested contractors on February 23, 2001. There were six contractors that submitted responsive bids on March 13, 2001. Work on this project is anticipated to start by March 26, 2001 and be completed by June 29, 2001.

The following responsive bids were received for the project:

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>Bid Amount</u>
(1) Tusca II Inc.	Grand Junction	\$191,900.00
(2) Vostatek Const.	Clifton	\$203,583.00
(3) John Dyer Const.	Grand Junction	\$208,269.00
(4) K & G Enterprises, Inc.	Grand Junction	\$234,510.00
(5) Quality Const.	Grand Junction	\$248,275.00
(6) R. W. Jones Inc.	Fruita	\$265,000.00



**Attach 5**

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA  
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<b>CITY COUNCIL</b>		
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Authorization to purchase, through a sole source, a wide area mower for the division of Parks Operations</b>	
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	<b>March 21, 2001</b>	
<b>Date Prepared:</b>	<b>March 8, 2001</b>	
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Don Hobbs</b>	<b>Assistant Director, Parks &amp; Recreation</b>
<b>Presenter Name:</b>	<b>Don Hobbs</b>	<b>Assistant Director, Parks &amp; Recreation</b>
	<b>Workshop</b>	<b>X      Formal Agenda</b>

**Subject:**

Authorization to purchase through a sole source a wide area mower for the division of Parks Operations

**Summary:**

City Council authorization for the sole source purchase from L.L. Johnson, Inc. of Denver, CO, one Toro wide area mower for \$35,890; the same price as was bid in March 2000. This mower will be used throughout the parks system.

**Background Information:**

A wide area mower for the division of Parks Operations is budgeted for purchase this year and City Council authorization of a sole source purchase of the Toro from L.L. Johnson, Inc. is requested.

We are requesting a sole source purchase of the Toro for several reasons but safety is primary. Placement of the mower decks on a golf course mower, as these mowers are primarily designed for, is not a huge concern but in a public park setting it is a real safety issue. Only Toro meets the specification that all three decks must be totally visible while the operator is looking forward. Because there are so many children, pets, trees, tables, benches, unseen rocks and bottles in a public park, it is essential that the operator have full visibility of the mowing units and what those units are about to travel over. The Toro decks are all in front of the operator and thus can be observed from the driver's seat without having to turn sideways or look behind. No other mower, currently on the market, has this design feature.

On some days the mower is loaded and unloaded from the trailer as many as six times and it is not uncommon for children to come over to watch. This makes clear visibility an even greater issue. It is essential for the operator to be able to see both the rear wheels of the mower and the deck of the trailer during this process. This is not possible on side-wing mounted mower decks.

To accommodate the increased mower loading width of a side-wing mower an existing trailer would have to have extensive modifications which, when loaded with the mower, would put it over the stamped gross vehicle weight (GVW) for the trailer. A new trailer could be purchased specifically for the mower at an estimated cost of over \$2,300, making the total cost higher than that of the Toro.

Other non-safety related issues supporting the sole source purchase are the ability to stock a common inventory of repair parts such as spare tires, drive belts, blades and oil and gas filters.

**Budget:**

\$34,000 has been budgeted for the purchase of the mower, the balance of \$1,890 will be transferred from operating funds.

**Action Requested/Recommendation:**

City Council Authorization of a sole source purchase of the Toro wide area mower from L.L. Johnson, Inc.

<b>Citizen Presentation:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>If Yes,</b>
<b>Name:</b>						
<b>Purpose:</b>						

<b>Report results back to Council:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>When:</b>	
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------	--------------	--

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

**Attach 6**

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA  
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<b>CITY COUNCIL</b>		
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>24 1/2 Road Sidewalk Improvements</b>	
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	<b>Wednesday, March 21, 2001</b>	
<b>Date Prepared:</b>	<b>March 6, 2001</b>	
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Mike Best</b>	<b>Project Engineer</b>
<b>Presenter Name:</b>	<b>Tim Moore</b>	<b>Public Works Manager</b>
	<b>Workshop</b>	<b>X      Formal Agenda Discussion Item</b>

**Subject:** Award the Construction contract for the 24 1/2 Road Sidewalk Improvements to Vista Paving L.L.C. in the amount of \$58,996.54.

**Summary:** Bids were received and opened on March 6, 2001, for the 24 1/2 Road Sidewalk Improvements. The low bid was submitted by Vista Paving L.L.C. in amount of \$58,996.54.

**Background Information:** This project will complete the sidewalk along the west side of 24 1/2 Road from the Weststar Bank (under construction) to the Sooper Credit Union. The project includes the construction of new storm drain inlets, new sidewalk, and three driveways. This section of 24 1/2 Road presently has four driveways, we will be eliminating one driveway between CAPPs Furniture and the Mesa Express Lube and constructing a shared driveway to service Mesa Express Lube and the Mesa Car Wash. No right-of-way or construction easements were needed for this project.

This project will begin on April 2, 2001 and continue for 4 weeks with anticipated completion date of April 27, 2001.

The following bids were received for this project:

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>Bid Amount</u>
United Companies	Grand Junction	\$68,290.00
Precision Paving	Grand Junction	\$63,674.03
BPS Concrete	Grand Junction	\$61,374.72
G & G Paving	Grand Junction	\$61,000.00
Vista Paving	Grand Junction	\$58,996.54
Engineer's Estimate		\$75,360.00



Attach 7

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA  
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<b>CITY COUNCIL</b>			
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>ASPHALTIC ROAD MATERIAL (ROAD OIL)</b>		
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	<b>March 21, 2001</b>		
<b>Date Prepared:</b>	<b>March 5, 2001</b>		
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Rex Sellers</b>	<b>Senior Buyer</b>	
<b>Presenter Name:</b>	<b>Mark Relph</b>	<b>Public Works &amp; Utilities Dir</b>	
	<b>Workshop</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Formal Agenda</b>

**Subject:** Asphaltic Road Material (Road Oil or Emulsions) that will be required for the City chip seal projects for 2001.

**Summary:** The City of Grand Junction requests utilizing prices from the State of Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) bid solicitation HAA 01-057-TW dated December 13, 2000 to purchase Road Oil for 2001.

**Background Information:** The City of Grand Junction has scheduled several chip seals projects from for 2001. Based on several previous years use it has been determined that the City will need an estimated 162,000 gallons of Road Oil or Emulsions type product to complete these projects. Koch Performance Asphalt of Grand Junction is the CDOT low bidder for zone 15 (Grand Junction Area).

**Budget:** The amount of purchase is within the budget for this item.

**Action Requested/Recommendation:** Authorization for the City Manager to approve the purchase of an estimated 162,000 gallons of asphaltic road material on an as needed bases from Koch Performance Asphalt for an estimated total dollar amount of \$142,000.00.

<b>Citizen Presentation:</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>
------------------------------	----------	-----------	------------

<b>Report results back to Council:</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>When:</b>	
--	----------	-----------	------------	--------------	--

<b>Placement on Agenda:</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Consent</b>	<b>Indiv. Consideration</b>	<b>Workshop</b>
-----------------------------	----------	----------------	-----------------------------	-----------------

**Attach 8**

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA  
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment</b>		
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	<b>March 21, 2001</b>		
<b>Date Prepared:</b>	<b>February 23, 2001</b>		
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Cliff Davidson</b>	<b>RTPO Director</b>	
<b>Presenter Name:</b>	<b>Mark Relph</b>	<b>PW&amp;U Director</b>	
	<b>Workshop</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Formal Agenda</b>

**Subject:** Adoption of a joint resolution to amend the Grand Junction/Mesa County Metropolitan Planning Organization FY 2001-2006 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to include application for \$400,000 grant funding.

**Summary:** Mesa County is applying for \$400,000 in Section 5309 grant funding for the restoration of the existing historic train station. The City of Grand Junction, Mesa County and CDOT Region 3 staff have reviewed and concur with the proposed amendment. The resolution and TIP amendment are necessary to apply for the grant.

**Background Information:** This FY 2001-2006 TIP amendment is required to reflect a request to obtain an earmark in the FY 2002 Department of Transportation (DOT) Appropriations Act for a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) capital assistance grant under U.S.C. 49, Section 5309, through the Colorado Transit Coalition (CTC). The CTC is an organization comprised of public transit providers located throughout the State of Colorado.

As a CTC member, Mesa County is requesting \$400,000 in Section 5309 funding for the restoration of the existing historic train station.

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a six-year capital improvement program for the urbanized area of Grand Junction and Mesa County. It is based on the adopted 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. The TIP's purpose is to carry out continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative transportation planning and is developed cooperatively by the Grand Junction/Mesa County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Mesa County, Grand Junction, and the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT). Annual adjustments of funds are made as required with input from the City, County, and CDOT.

**Budget:** This item does not affect the City's current budget. The \$100,000 local match requirement for this Administrative Amendment will come directly from the property developer, Jim Leany.

**Action Requested/Recommendation:** Approve and sign the joint resolution endorsing the proposed amendment in the attached report to the Grand Junction/Mesa County Metropolitan Planning Organization FY 2001-2006 Transportation Improvement Program.

<b>Citizen Presentation:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>If Yes,</b>
<b>Name:</b>					
<b>Purpose:</b>					

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

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

**RESOLUTION**

**A JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY OF MESA AND THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION CONCERNING ADOPTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENT TO THE FISCAL YEAR 2001-2006 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

WHEREAS, The City and County have been designated by the Governor as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Grand Junction/Mesa County Urbanized Area; and

WHEREAS, Part 2 of Article 1 of Title 29, Colorado Revised Statutes authorizes the parties to contract with one another to make the most efficient and effective use of their powers and responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, The City and County realize the importance of both short and long range planning in the development of an efficient transportation system, and are both aware that it is the responsibility of the Metropolitan Planning Organization to perform those planning functions; and

WHEREAS, The City and County, in their performance of those planning functions for the Urbanized Area, wish to use Federal Highway Administration transportation planning funds in coordination with the Colorado Department of Transportation;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT JOINTLY RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF THE COUNTY OF MESA, COLORADO AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO:

That the Administrative Amendment to the Fiscal Year 2001-2006 Transportation Improvement Plan, hereunto attached, is adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of the County of Mesa, Colorado on \_\_\_\_\_, and by the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado on \_\_\_\_\_.

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

COUNTY OF MESA

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor  
Grand Junction City Council

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair of the Board  
Mesa County Board of Commissioners

\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2000

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk

\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2000

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
County Clerk

**Attach 9**

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA  
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<b>CITY COUNCIL</b>			
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Designation of Historic Structure</b>		
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	<b>March 21, 2001</b>		
<b>Date Prepared:</b>	<b>March 12, 2000</b>		
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Kristen Ashbeck</b>	<b>Senior Planner</b>	
<b>Presenter Name:</b>	<b>Same</b>		
	<b>Workshop</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Formal Agenda</b>

**Subject:** HBD-2001- 02.01 – Historic Designation of the Richard Warren Motor Company Building at 749 Main Street

**Summary:** Integrated Partners, LLC, as the owner of the Richard Warren Motor Company Building located at 749 Main Street , is requesting that the building be designated as historic in the City Register of Historic Sites, Structures and Districts.

**Background Information:** City Council adopted section 7.4, Historic Preservation, in the Zoning and Development Code in 1994 which established a City Register of Historic Sites, Structures and Districts, to which eligible historic resources may be designated. The criteria by which the Historic Preservation Board and Council shall review a proposed designation are specified in the ordinance.

The following pages describe the characteristics of the Richard Warren Motor Company building that justify its designation and detail the particular features of the building that should be preserved. Given this description, the Historic Preservation Board finds that the building meets the following designation criteria outlined in section 7.4.F.1.a. of the Zoning and Development Code:

- Structure is at least 50 years old
- Exemplifies specific elements of an architectural style or period;
- Is an established and familiar visual feature of the community; and
- Enhances the sense of identity of the City.

**Budget:** N/A

**Action Requested/Recommendation:** It is recommended that City Council approve the resolution designating the Richard Warren Motor Company Building at 749 Main Street as historic in the City Register of Historic Sites, Structures and Districts.

<b>Citizen Presentation:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>If Yes,</b>
<b>Name:</b>					
<b>Purpose:</b>					

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

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

- Attachments:
- a) Proposed Resolution
  - b) Location Map
  - c) Letter from Property Owner
  - d) Current Photographs of Building
  - e) Building History - Information Provided by Applicant

**CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

**Resolution No. \_\_-01**

**DESIGNATING THE RICHARD WARREN MOTOR COMPANY BUILDING  
AT 749 MAIN STREET  
IN THE CITY REGISTER OF HISTORIC SITES, STRUCTURES, AND DISTRICTS**

WHEREAS, the City Council has established by Ordinance 2765 a City Register of Historic Sites, Structures and Districts in order to officially recognize historic resources of local significance; and

WHEREAS, the property owner of the Richard Warren Motor Company building at 749 Main Street is aware of and consents to the designation of this property as a local historic resource; and

WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Board has reviewed the Richard Warren Motor Company building for conformance to the adopted criteria for designating historic resources and finds that the building meets the following criteria: structure is at least 50 years old; exemplifies specific elements of an architectural style or period; is an established and familiar visual feature of the community; and enhances the sense of identity of the City.

WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Board recommended approval of the designation of the Richard Warren Motor Company building at its March 6, 2001 meeting.

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

That the Richard Warren Motor Company building located at 749 Main Street is hereby designated a historic building in the City Register of Historic Sites, Structures and Districts.

PASSED and APPROVED this 21st day of March, 2001.

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
President of the Council

COLORADO CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY  
**Architectural Inventory Form**

**IDENTIFICATION**

Resource number: 5ME 7175

County: Mesa

City: Grand Junction

Historic Building Name: Richard Warren Motor Company Building

Current Building Name: Western Colorado Plumbing and Heating

Building Address: 749 Main Street

Owner Name and Address: Integrated Partners, LLC 801 Grand Avenue Grand  
Junction, CO 81501

**GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

P.M. Ute Township: 1S Range: 1W SE  $\frac{1}{4}$  of SW  $\frac{1}{4}$  of section 14

USGS quad name: Grand Junction Year: 1962 Map scale: 7.5': X 15'

Lot(s): 18-19 Block: 115

Addition: City Year of Addition: 1881

**Architectural Description**

Building Plan: Rectangle

Dimensions in Feet: Length 125' x Width 50'

Number of Stories: 1

Primary External Wall Material: Brick

Roof Configuration: Flat

Special Features: Three arched storefront windows, arched parapet

Architectural Style/Building Type: Plateau Country / Commercial

General Architectural Description: One story commercial brick building with three large display windows with arched clerestories of glass tiles and metal kickplates. Centered

entry with a metal and glass commercial door. Simple brick detail on upper level highlight the window as well as complement the symmetry of the roofline. East side of building has two identical display windows with clerestory. A metal garage door is in the center of the wall. Four windows with three small hinged windows above are on the east wall and a single recessed entry is at the rear of the wall. The building has a concrete floor, brick frame, with interior made up of recently remodeled showroom and office space. The brick is showing signs of aging with cracking in the front and sides as well as deterioration under the windows. The original coloring of the brick has some staining and paint needing removal. The glass windows show poor energy efficiency and should be replaced with more effective double pane glass without changing the look of the building from the exterior. The original brick and color should be preserved along with the glass. Also anticipated for future restoration is exterior period lighting. The complete restoration of brick and glass and lighting will make this property a beautiful addition to downtown Grand Junction. Additional consideration of restoring the front door will be made based on input from historic and architectural professionals.

### **ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY**

Date of Construction: Estimate: 1927-1930 Actual: 1929 Source of Information: Mesa Co. Assessor

Architect: Unknown Builder/Contractor: Unknown

Original Owner: Richard and Pearl Warren Source of information: Mesa County Assessor

Construction History: New display windows, date unknown.

Original location  X  Moved  \_\_\_  Date of move(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Original Use(s): Commercial – Auto display and sales

Intermediate Use(s): Storage, plumbing supply

Current use(s): Vacant – to be used as office furniture display and sales (Office Outfitters)

Historical Background: This structure is located within the original platted area of Grand Junction and is representative of the 1920s town building. Denver investors Calvin and Alice Eastwood appear as early owners of these lots, which remained bare through

about 1929. Pearl Warren, wife of auto dealer Richard Warren, was the new owner, and a fairly imposing structure to house the dealership soon arose. Warren had previously housed his auto sales in the Lilja Building in the 600 block of Main Street. Ed Eisenhauer apparently took over Warren's operation about 1951. Sanborn Maps at the time list the structure as a garage, with the capacity to house 25 cars. Later in the 1950s the uranium boom impacted the building; it was occupied by Climax Uranium Company for a period of time.

Sources of information: Mesa County Assessor; Polk City Directories

### **SIGNIFICANCE**

Applicable National Register Criteria:

- A. Associated with significant events;
- B. Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
- C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction
- D. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

Level of significance: National  State  Local

Statement of Significance: Contributing to potential local district; altered but compatible.

This structure is located within the original town plat of Grand Junction and is representative of the 1920s town building and commercial brick structures on Main Street.

### **RECORDING INFORMATION**

Photograph numbers: 6835-10; 6835-12

Negatives Filed At: City of Grand Junction Community Development

Date(s): July 1994; Updated March 2001 By: Marty Alexandroff

Organization: Winter & Company

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA  
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<b>CITY COUNCIL</b>			
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Resolution determining the necessity of and authorizing the acquisition of real estate by condemnation for the Two Rivers Convention Center Renovation Project.</b>		
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	<b>March 21, 2001</b>		
<b>Date Prepared:</b>	<b>March 6, 2001</b>		
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Tim Woodmansee</b>	<b>Real Estate Manager</b>	
<b>Presenter Name:</b>	<b>Tim Woodmansee</b>	<b>Real Estate Manager</b>	
	<b>Workshop</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Formal Agenda</b>

**Subject:** Resolution determining the necessity of and authorizing the acquisition of real estate by condemnation for the Two Rivers Convention Center Renovation Project.

**Summary:** The proposed resolution will authorize the City to initiate condemnation proceedings to acquire Lots 11 & 12, inclusive, Block 122 of the City of Grand Junction, also known as 159 Colorado Avenue.

**Background Information:** The City Council has adopted details, plans, schedules and funds for the construction of parking lot improvements necessary to accommodate the renovation of Two Rivers Convention Center. Acquisition of the property at 159 Colorado Avenue is required to complete the designed parking lot construction.

City staff have formally offered to purchase the required property for the sum of \$170,000. This amount is the estimated fair market value of the subject property as provided in a complete, self contained appraisal report prepared by Mr. John W. Nisley, MAI, of Nisley & Associates. The owner of the subject property has rejected the City's offer to purchase the subject property for the appraised value.

To facilitate the construction schedule for TRCC parking lot improvements, 159 Colorado Avenue must be available for demolition on July 1, 2001. As a result, Council direction on the issue will be required on March 21<sup>st</sup>, allowing the statutory time necessary to secure a court date.

Condemnation proceedings may be necessary to acquire the subject property.

**Action Requested/Recommendation:** Pass and adopt proposed resolution.

<b>Citizen Presentation:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>If Yes,</b>	
<b>Name:</b>						
<b>Purpose:</b>						
<b>Report results back to Council:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>When:</b>	
<b>Placement on Agenda:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Consent</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Indiv. Consideration</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Workshop</b>

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

**A RESOLUTION DETERMINING THE NECESSITY OF  
AND AUTHORIZING THE ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY,  
BY EITHER NEGOTIATION OR CONDEMNATION,  
FOR MUNICIPAL PUBLIC FACILITIES**

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

Section 1. It is hereby determined that it is necessary to the public health, safety and welfare that certain property be acquired for public street, sidewalk, parking, utility and drainage purposes. The necessary property as hereafter described in Section 3, is to be acquired by negotiation and purchase if possible; provided, however, the condemnation of said property is hereby specifically approved and authorized. The property sought to be acquired is to be used for municipal public purposes associated with the renovation of Two Rivers Convention Center.

Section 2. The City Attorney is hereby specifically authorized and directed to take all necessary legal measures, including condemnation, to acquire the property which is legally described and set forth in the following section, which is hereby determined to be necessary to be acquired to be used for public street, sidewalk, parking, utility and drainage purposes. The City Attorney is further authorized to request immediate possession of the parcels hereinafter set forth.

Section 3. Interest to be acquired: Fee simple absolute.

Owner of record: ROBERT C. MILLER

Legal Description: Lots 11 and 12, inclusive, Block 122 of the Original Plat of the City of Grand Junction, Mesa County Colorado.

The interest to be acquired shall include all buildings attached to the property as realty in accordance with Colorado law.

Section 4. The City Engineer is hereby authorized to amend the legal description(s) of the parcels to be acquired and the nature of the interests to be acquired, if necessary in the course of construction.

Section 5. The City Council hereby finds and resolves, in the event that acquisition by condemnation of the parcels described in this resolution is commenced, that immediate possession is necessary for the public health, safety and welfare, due to design, bidding and construction deadlines.

Section 6. The Charter authorizes this resolution and the actions described. The resolution shall be effective upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the City Council considering it.

DONE this 7th day of March 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gene Kinsey, Mayor

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Stephanie L. Nye, City Clerk

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA  
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>		
<b>Subject:</b>	Traver Annexation	
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	February 7, 2001	
<b>Date Prepared:</b>	January 31, 2001	
<b>Author:</b>	Kristen Ashbeck	Senior Planner
<b>Presenter Name:</b>	Kristen Ashbeck	Senior Planner
<b>Workshop</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Formal Agenda</b>

**Subject:** Annexation of the Traver Annexation - ANX-2001-011

**Summary:** Resolution for Referral of Petition to Annex/First Reading of the annexation ordinance/Exercising land use jurisdiction immediately for the Traver Annexation located at 2980 Rood Avenue/2986 D Road (ANX-2001-011) including a portion of the D Road right-of-way. This 31.98-acre annexation consists of two parcels of land.

**Background Information:** See Attached

**Budget:** N/A

**Action Requested/Recommendation:** It is recommended that City Council approve the Referral of Petition to Annex/First Reading of the annexation ordinance/Exercising land use jurisdiction immediately for the Traver Annexation and set a hearing for March 21, 2001.

<b>Citizen Presentation:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b>		<b>Yes    If Yes,</b>
<b>Name:</b>				
<b>Purpose:</b>				

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

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

<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</b>			
<b>Location:</b>		<b>2980 Rood Avenue / 2986 D Road</b>	
<b>Applicants:</b>		<b>Richard and Marianne Traver</b>	
<b>Existing Land Use:</b>		<b>Vacant</b>	
<b>Proposed Land Use:</b>		<b>Single Family Residential</b>	
<b>Surrounding Land Use:</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>Large Lot Single Family Residential</b>	
	<b>South</b>	<b>Large Lot Single Family Residential</b>	
	<b>East</b>	<b>Large Lot Single Family Residential</b>	
	<b>West</b>	<b>Large Lot Single Family Residential</b>	
<b>Existing Zoning:</b>		<b>RSF-R (AFT) in County</b>	
<b>Proposed Zoning:</b>		<b>RSF-4</b>	
<b>Surrounding Zoning:</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>RSF-R (Mesa County)</b>	
	<b>South</b>	<b>RSF-R (Mesa County)</b>	
	<b>East</b>	<b>RSF-R (Mesa County) and PD (City)</b>	
	<b>West</b>	<b>RSF-R (Mesa County)</b>	
<b>Growth Plan Designation:</b>		<b>Residential with 4 to 8 units per acre</b>	
<b>Zoning within density range?</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>

**Staff Analysis:**

**ANNEXATION:**

This annexation area consists of annexing 31.98 acres of land including portions of the D Road right-of-way. The property owners have requested annexation into the City as the result of proposing to rezone and subdivide the properties into single family residential lots. Under the 1998 Persigo Agreement all such types of development require annexation and processing in the City.

It is staff's professional opinion, based on review of the petition and knowledge of applicable state law, including the Municipal Annexation Act Pursuant to C.R.S. 31-12-104, that the Traver Annexation is eligible to be annexed because of compliance with the following:

- a) A proper petition has been signed by more than 50% of the owners and more than 50% of the property described;
- b) Not less than one-sixth of the perimeter of the area to be annexed is contiguous with the existing City limits;
- c) A community of interest exists between the area to be annexed and the City. This is so in part because the Central Grand Valley is essentially a single demographic and economic unit and occupants of the area can be expected to, and regularly do, use City streets, parks and other urban facilities;

- d) The area is or will be urbanized in the near future;
- e) The area is capable of being integrated with the City;
- f) No land held in identical ownership is being divided by the proposed annexation;
- g) No land held in identical ownership comprising 20 contiguous acres or more with an assessed valuation of \$200,000 or more for tax purposes is included without the owners consent.

The following annexation and zoning schedule is being proposed.

<b><i>ANNEXATION SCHEDULE</i></b>	
<b>Feb 7<sup>th</sup></b>	Referral of Petition (30 Day Notice), First Reading, Exercising Land Use
<b>Feb 13<sup>th</sup></b>	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
<b>March 7<sup>th</sup></b>	First Reading on Zoning by City Council
<b>March 21<sup>st</sup></b>	Acceptance of Petition and Public hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council
<b>Apr 22<sup>nd</sup></b>	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

**Action Requested/Recommendation:** It is recommended that City Council approve the Traver Annexation.

Attachments:

1. Traver Annexation Summary
2. Resolution of Referral of Petition
3. Annexation Ordinances
4. Annexation Maps

<b>TRAVER ANNEXATION SUMMARY</b>		
<b>File Number:</b>		<b>ANX-2001-011</b>
<b>Location:</b>		<b>2980 Rood Avenue / 2986 D Road</b>
<b>Tax ID Numbers:</b>		<b>2945-174-00-130 &amp; 2945-174-14-005</b>
<b>Parcels:</b>		<b>2</b>
<b>Estimated Population:</b>		<b>0 (222 with proposed development)</b>
<b># of Parcels (owner occupied):</b>		<b>0</b>
<b># of Dwelling Units:</b>		<b>0 (96 with proposed development)</b>
<b>Acres land annexed:</b>		<b>31.98</b>
<b>Developable Acres Remaining:</b>		<b>31.98</b>
<b>Right-of-way in Annexation:</b>		<b>D Road: 165 ft of north half of D Road, See Map</b>
<b>Previous County Zoning:</b>		<b>RSF-R (County)</b>
<b>Proposed City Zoning:</b>		<b>Residential Single Family with a maximum density of 4 units per acre (RSF-4)</b>
<b>Current Land Use:</b>		<b>Vacant</b>
<b>Future Land Use:</b>		<b>Detached Single Family Residential</b>
<b>Values:</b>	<b>Assessed:</b>	<b>= \$ 32,010</b>
	<b>Actual:</b>	<b>= \$ 110,400</b>
<b>Census Tract:</b>		<b>8</b>
<b>Address Ranges:</b>		<b>Even Addresses - 2974 to 2994 D Road</b>
<b>Special Districts:</b>	<b>Water:</b>	<b>Ute Water</b>
	<b>Sewer:</b>	<b>Central Grand Valley</b>
	<b>Fire:</b>	<b>Grand Junction Rural</b>
	<b>Drainage:</b>	<b>Grand Junction Drainage District</b>
	<b>School:</b>	<b>District 51</b>
	<b>Pest:</b>	<b>N/A</b>

**CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

**RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_**

**A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING A PETITION FOR ANNEXATION, MAKING CERTAIN FINDINGS, DETERMINING THAT PROPERTY KNOWN AS**

**TRAVER ANNEXATION No. 1  
and TRAVER ANNEXATION No. 2**

**IS ELIGIBLE FOR ANNEXATION**

**A Serial Annexation  
LOCATED at 2980 Rood Avenue / 2986 D Road  
Including a portion of the D Road Right-of-Way**

**WHEREAS**, on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2001, 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:

**TRAVER ANNEXATION NO.1**

A parcel of land situate in the SW 1/4 SW 1/4 of Section 16, the SE 1/4 SE 1/4 of Section 17, the NE 1/4 NE 1/4 of Section 20 and in the NW 1/4 NW 1/4 of Section 21 all in Township 1 South, Range 1 East of the Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the SE corner of said Section 17; thence S 89°59'45" E along the south line of the SW 1/4 SW 1/4 of said Section 16 a distance of 60.00 feet to a point; thence leaving said south line S 00°01'05" W a distance of 5.00 feet to a point; thence N 89°59'45" W along a line 5.00 feet south of and parallel with the north line of the NW 1/4 NW 1/4 of said Section 21 a distance of 60.00 feet to a point on the east line of the NE 1/4 NE 1/4 of said Section 20; thence S 89°57'32" W along a line 5.00 feet south of and parallel with the north line of said NE 1/4 NE 1/4 a distance of 337.49 feet to a point; thence N 00°01'40" W a distance of 5.00 feet to a point on the south line of the SE 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 17; thence N 00°01'40" W a distance of 1049.98 feet to a point; thence along a line 10.00 south of and parallel with the approximate southerly right of way line for the Grand Valley Irrigation Company Canal the following 3 courses:

- 1) N 84°09'52" W a distance of 56.91 feet to a point;
  - 2) S 78°48'05" W a distance of 251.29 feet to a point;
  - 3) S 79°21'59" W a distance of 138.83 feet to a point;
- thence N 11°21'09" W a distance of 10.00 feet to a point on the approximate southerly right of way line for said Grand Valley Irrigation Company Canal; thence along said approximate southerly right of way line the following 3 courses:
- 1) N 79°21'59" E a distance of 138.86 feet to a point;

- 2) N 78°48'05" E a distance of 252.79 feet to a point;
- 3) S 84°09'52" E a distance of 67.43 feet to the northwest corner of Lot 5 of Wilkinson Subdivision;

thence S 00°01'40" E along the east line of the west 990.00 feet of the SE 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 17 a distance of 795.00 feet to the southwest corner of Lot 1 of said Wilkinson Subdivision; thence continuing along the east line of the west 990.00 feet of the SE 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 17 S 00°01'40" E a distance of 223.00 feet to a point on the north right of way line for D Road; thence N 89°57'32" E along said north right of way line a distance of 162.49 feet to a point; thence leaving said north right of way line S 00°01'40" E a distance of 41.00 feet to a point on the south line of the SE 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 17; thence N 89°57'32" E along the south line of said SE 1/4 SE 1/4 a distance of 165.00 feet to the point of beginning.

## **TRAVER ANNEXATION NO.2**

A parcel of land situate in the SE 1/4 SE 1/4 and in the NE 1/4 SE 1/4 of Section 17, Township 1 South, Range 1 East of the Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the SE 1/16 corner of said Section 17; thence N 00°01'40" W along the west line of the NE 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 17 a distance of 848.96 feet to the northwest corner of Lot 2 of Brown's Minor Subdivision II; thence N 90°00'00" E along the north line of said Lot 2 a distance of 329.82 feet to the northeast corner of said Lot 2; thence S 00°01'17" E along the east line of said Lot 2 a distance of 848.86 feet to a point on the north line of the SE 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 17; thence continuing along the east line of said Lot 2 S 00°03'36" E a distance of 342.98 feet to the southeast corner of said Lot 2; thence S 00°03'36" E a distance of 20.22 feet to a point on the approximate southerly right of way line for the Grand Valley Irrigation Company Canal; thence along the approximate southerly right of way line for said Grand Valley Irrigation Company Canal the following 3 courses:

- 1) N 83°35'49" E a distance of 64.97 feet to a point;
- 2) N 81°10'14" E a distance of 57.58 feet to a point;
- 3) N 77°55'42" E a distance of 89.00 feet to a point;

thence leaving said approximate southerly right of way line S 11°21'09" E a distance of 10.00 feet to a point; thence along a line 10.00 feet south of and parallel with the approximate southerly right of way line for said Grand Valley Irrigation Company Canal the following 3 courses:

- 1) N 79°21'59" E a distance of 138.83 feet to a point;
- 2) N 78°48'05" E a distance of 251.29 feet to a point;
- 3) S 84°09'52" E a distance of 56.91 feet to a point;

thence S 00°01'40" E along a line 10.00 feet west of and parallel with the east line of the west 990.00 feet of the SE 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 17 a distance of 1049.98 feet to a point on the south line of said SE 1/4 SE 1/4; thence S 89°57'32" W along the south line of said SE 1/4 SE 1/4 a distance of 980.00 feet to the E 1/16 corner on the south line of said Section 17; thence N 00°01'40" W along the west line of the SE 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 17 a distance of 1002.31 feet to the southwest corner of Lot 2 of said Brown's

Minor Subdivision II; thence continuing along the west line of said SE 1/4 SE 1/4 N 00°01'40" W a distance of 317.95 feet to the point of beginning.

**WHEREAS**, a hearing on the petition was duly held after proper notice on the 21<sup>st</sup> day of March, 2001; and

**WHEREAS**, the Council has found and determined and does hereby find and determine that said petition is in substantial compliance with statutory requirements therefor; that one-sixth of the perimeter of the area proposed to be annexed is contiguous with the City; that a community of interest exists between the territory and the City; that the territory proposed to be annexed is urban or will be urbanized in the near future; that the said territory is integrated or is capable of being integrated with said City; that no land held in identical ownership has been divided without the consent of the landowner; that no 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; and that no election is required under the Municipal Annexation Act of 1965.

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

The said territory is eligible for annexation to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, and should be so annexed by ordinance.

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
President of the Council

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk

**CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO  
ORDINANCE NO.**

**AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE  
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

**TRAVER ANNEXATION No. 1**

**APPROXIMATELY 0.54 ACRES**

**LOCATED 2986 D Road and  
Including a Portion of the D Road Right-of-way**

**WHEREAS**, on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2001, the City Council of the City of Grand Junction considered a petition for the annexation of the following described territory to the City of Grand Junction; and

**WHEREAS**, a hearing on the petition was duly held after proper notice on the 21<sup>st</sup> day of March, 2001; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council determined that said territory was eligible for annexation and that no election was necessary to determine whether such territory should be annexed.

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

That the property situate in Mesa County, Colorado, and described to wit:

**TRAVER ANNEXATION NO.1**

A parcel of land situate in the SW 1/4 SW 1/4 of Section 16, the SE 1/4 SE 1/4 of Section 17, the NE 1/4 NE 1/4 of Section 20 and in the NW 1/4 NW 1/4 of Section 21 all in Township 1 South, Range 1 East of the Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the SE corner of said Section 17; thence S 89°59'45" E along the south line of the SW 1/4 SW 1/4 of said Section 16 a distance of 60.00 feet to a point; thence leaving said south line S 00°01'05" W a distance of 5.00 feet to a point; thence N 89°59'45" W along a line 5.00 feet south of and parallel with the north line of the NW 1/4 NW 1/4 of said Section 21 a distance of 60.00 feet to a point on the east line of the NE 1/4 NE 1/4 of said Section 20; thence S 89°57'32" W along a line 5.00 feet south of and parallel with the north line of said NE 1/4 NE 1/4 a distance of 337.49 feet to a point;

thence N 00°01'40" W a distance of 5.00 feet to a point on the south line of the SE 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 17; thence N 00°01'40" W a distance of 1049.98 feet to a point; thence along a line 10.00 south of and parallel with the approximate southerly right of way line for the Grand Valley Irrigation Company Canal the following 3 courses:

- 1) N 84°09'52" W a distance of 56.91 feet to a point;
- 2) S 78°48'05" W a distance of 251.29 feet to a point;
- 3) S 79°21'59" W a distance of 138.83 feet to a point;

thence N 11°21'09" W a distance of 10.00 feet to a point on the approximate southerly right of way line for said Grand Valley Irrigation Company Canal; thence along said approximate southerly right of way line the following 3 courses:

- 1) N 79°21'59" E a distance of 138.86 feet to a point;
- 2) N 78°48'05" E a distance of 252.79 feet to a point;
- 3) S 84°09'52" E a distance of 67.43 feet to the northwest corner of Lot 5 of Wilkinson Subdivision;

thence S 00°01'40" E along the east line of the west 990.00 feet of the SE 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 17 a distance of 795.00 feet to the southwest corner of Lot 1 of said Wilkinson Subdivision; thence continuing along the east line of the west 990.00 feet of the SE 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 17 S 00°01'40" E a distance of 223.00 feet to a point on the north right of way line for D Road; thence N 89°57'32" E along said north right of way line a distance of 162.49 feet to a point; thence leaving said north right of way line S 00°01'40" E a distance of 41.00 feet to a point on the south line of the SE 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 17; thence N 89°57'32" E along the south line of said SE 1/4 SE 1/4 a distance of 165.00 feet to the point of beginning.

be and is hereby annexed to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado.

**INTRODUCED** on first reading on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2001.

**ADOPTED** and ordered published this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2001.

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
President of the Council

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk

**CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO  
ORDINANCE NO.**

**AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE  
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

**TRAVER ANNEXATION No. 2**

**APPROXIMATELY 31.44 ACRES**

**LOCATED 2986 D Road and 2980 ROOD AVENUE  
Including a portion of the D Road Right-of-way**

**WHEREAS**, on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2001, the City Council of the City of Grand Junction considered a petition for the annexation of the following described territory to the City of Grand Junction; and

**WHEREAS**, a hearing on the petition was duly held after proper notice on the 21<sup>st</sup> day of March, 2001; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council determined that said territory was eligible for annexation and that no election was necessary to determine whether such territory should be annexed.

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

That the property situate in Mesa County, Colorado, and described to wit:

**TRAVER ANNEXATION NO.2**

A parcel of land situate in the SE 1/4 SE 1/4 and in the NE 1/4 SE 1/4 of Section 17, Township 1 South, Range 1 East of the Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the SE 1/16 corner of said Section 17; thence N 00°01'40" W along the west line of the NE 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 17 a distance of 848.96 feet to the northwest corner of Lot 2 of Brown's Minor Subdivision II; thence N 90°00'00" E along the north line of said Lot 2 a distance of 329.82 feet to the northeast corner of said Lot 2; thence S 00°01'17" E along the east line of said Lot 2 a distance of 848.86 feet to a point on the north line of the SE 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 17; thence continuing along the east line of said Lot 2 S 00°03'36" E a distance of 342.98 feet to the southeast corner of said Lot 2; thence S 00°03'36" E a distance of 20.22 feet to a point on the approximate southerly right of way line for the Grand Valley Irrigation Company Canal;

thence along the approximate southerly right of way line for said Grand Valley Irrigation Company Canal the following 3 courses:

- 1) N 83°35'49" E a distance of 64.97 feet to a point;
- 2) N 81°10'14" E a distance of 57.58 feet to a point;
- 3) N 77°55'42" E a distance of 89.00 feet to a point;

thence leaving said approximate southerly right of way line S 11°21'09" E a distance of 10.00 feet to a point; thence along a line 10.00 feet south of and parallel with the approximate southerly right of way line for said Grand Valley Irrigation Company Canal the following 3 courses:

- 1) N 79°21'59" E a distance of 138.83 feet to a point;
- 2) N 78°48'05" E a distance of 251.29 feet to a point;
- 3) S 84°09'52" E a distance of 56.91 feet to a point;

thence S 00°01'40" E along a line 10.00 feet west of and parallel with the east line of the west 990.00 feet of the SE 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 17 a distance of 1049.98 feet to a point on the south line of said SE 1/4 SE 1/4; thence S 89°57'32" W along the south line of said SE 1/4 SE 1/4 a distance of 980.00 feet to the E 1/16 corner on the south line of said Section 17; thence N 00°01'40" W along the west line of the SE 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 17 a distance of 1002.31 feet to the southwest corner of Lot 2 of said Brown's Minor Subdivision II; thence continuing along the west line of said SE 1/4 SE 1/4 N 00°01'40" W a distance of 317.95 feet to the point of beginning.

be and is hereby annexed to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado.

**INTRODUCED** on first reading on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2001.

**ADOPTED** and ordered published this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2001.

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
President of the Council

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA  
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

CITY COUNCIL			
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Traver Annexation</b>		
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	<b>March 21, 2001</b>		
<b>Date Prepared:</b>	<b>March 13, 2001</b>		
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Kristen Ashbeck</b>	<b>Senior Planner</b>	
<b>Presenter Name:</b>	<b>Same</b>		
	<b>Workshop</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Formal Agenda</b>

**Subject:** ANX-2001-011 Consideration of the zone of annexation to Residential Single Family with a maximum density of four units per acre (RSF-4) for the Traver Annexation.

**Summary:** The 31.98-acre Traver Annexation located at 2980 Rood Avenue/2986 D Road consists of 2 parcels of land. State law requires the City to zone newly annexed areas within 90 days of the annexation. The proposed City zoning conforms to the Growth Plan's Future Land Use map and recommendation for residential land uses between 4 and 7.9 units per acre for this area.

**Background Information:** See Attached

**Budget:** N/A

**Action Requested/Recommendation:** Planning Commission recommended approval of the RSF-4 zone district for the Traver Annexation. It is recommended that City Council approve the zoning ordinance for the Traver Annexation.

<b>Citizen Presentation:</b>		No	<b>X</b>	Yes If Yes,
<b>Name:</b>	<b>Richard Traver</b>			
<b>Purpose:</b>	<b>Owner/Developer</b>			

<b>Report results back to Council:</b>	<b>X</b>	No	Yes	<b>When:</b>	
--	----------	----	-----	--------------	--

<b>Placement on Agenda:</b>	Consent	<b>X</b>	Indiv. Consideration	Workshop
-----------------------------	---------	----------	----------------------	----------

BACKGROUND INFORMATION			
<b>Location:</b>		<b>2980 Rood Avenue /2986 D Road</b>	
<b>Applicants:</b>		<b>Richard and Marianne Traver</b>	
<b>Existing Land Use:</b>		<b>Vacant</b>	
<b>Proposed Land Use:</b>		<b>96 Single Family Residential Lots</b>	
<b>Surrounding Land Use:</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>Large Lot Single Family Residential</b>	
	<b>South</b>	<b>Large Lot Single Family Residential</b>	
	<b>East</b>	<b>Large Lot Single Family Residential</b>	
	<b>West</b>	<b>Large Lot Single Family Residential</b>	
<b>Existing Zoning:</b>		<b>RSF-R (AFT) in County</b>	
<b>Proposed Zoning:</b>		<b>RSF-4</b>	
<b>Surrounding Zoning:</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>RSF-R (Mesa County)</b>	
	<b>South</b>	<b>RSF-4 (Mesa County)</b>	
	<b>East</b>	<b>RSF-4 (Mesa County)</b>	
	<b>West</b>	<b>RSF-4 (Mesa County)</b>	
<b>Growth Plan Designation:</b>		<b>Residential with 4 – 8 units per acre</b>	
<b>Zoning within density range?</b>		<b>X</b>	<b>Yes</b>
			<b>No</b>

## STAFF ANALYSIS

**Zone of Annexation:** Under the 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County, the City is allowed to zone newly annexed areas with a zone that conforms to the City’s Growth Plan’s Future Land Use Map. This property is currently zoned RSF-R in Mesa County and is proposed as RSF-4 in the City.

The existing County RSF-R which requires 5 acres per lot does not conform to the recommended densities found on the Future Land Use Map of the Growth Plan which designates this area as Residential Medium with a density range of 4 to 7.9 units per acre. The proposed zoning of RSF-4 does conform to the Future Land Use Map.

The applicant has submitted a Preliminary Plan concurrent with the request for annexation. However, the applicant is still working on several outstanding planning and engineering issues. Once a response to comments is received the plan will be brought to Planning Commission for consideration.

**Zoning and Development Code Criteria:** Section 2.14.F. of the Zoning and Development Code states: “Land annexed to the City shall be zoned in accordance with Section 2.6 to a district that is consistent with the adopted Growth Plan or consistent with existing County zoning.” In order to maintain internal consistency between the Code and

the zoning maps, map amendments must only occur if the criteria of Section 2.6 are met. The pertinent criteria are as listed below.

**Change of Character in Neighborhood.** Due to the character of existing and proposed development, the City and County recently adopted a change to the Land Use Plan of the Growth Plan from Residential 2-4 units per acre to Residential 4-8 units per acre. The proposed zoning is consistent with the new Land Use Plan designation.

**Proposed Rezone is Compatible with Neighborhood.** The proposed rezone is compatible with other recent redevelopment/infill projects such as Scottish Range just west of the north end of the property. It is expected that other large parcels in the vicinity will eventually redevelop with similar densities.

**Proposal Conforms with Growth Plan.** The proposed RSF-4 zoning conforms with the Growth Plan Land Use Plan residential density range of 4 to 8 units per acre.

**Adequate Public Services.** Since this an infill site, adequate public facilities and services are available to the site.

**Community Benefit.** The community will benefit from the proposal by realizing the goals and policies of the Growth Plan that promote such infill development and densities that are supported by existing infrastructure.

<b><u>ANNEXATION SCHEDULE</u></b>	
<b>Feb 7<sup>th</sup></b>	Referral of Petition (30 Day Notice), First Reading, Exercising Land Use
<b>Feb 20<sup>th</sup></b>	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
<b>March 7<sup>th</sup></b>	First Reading on Zoning by City Council
<b>Mar 21<sup>st</sup></b>	Acceptance of Petition and Public hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council
<b>Apr 22<sup>nd</sup></b>	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

**Planning Commission Action (2/20/01 – 4-0):** Planning Commission found that the annexation and rezone are consistent with the Growth Plan and the criteria of Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code have been met and recommended approval of the zone of annexation of the Traver Annexation to RSF-4.

Attachments:           a) Zoning Ordinance  
                              b) Map

**CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

**ORDINANCE No. \_\_\_\_\_**

**ZONING THE TRAVER ANNEXATION TO RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY  
WITH A MAXIMUM DENSITY OF 4 UNITS PER ACRE (RSF-4)  
LOCATED AT 2980 ROOD AVENUE AND 2986 D ROAD**

Recitals.

After public notice and public hearing as required by the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, the Grand Junction Planning Commission recommended approval of applying an RSF-4 zone district to this annexation.

After public notice and public hearing before the Grand Junction City Council, City Council finds that the RSF-4 zone district be established for the following reasons:

- This zone district meets the criteria of Section 2.14.F of the Zoning and Development Code by conforming to the adopted Growth Plan Future Land Use Map.
- This zone district meets the criteria found in Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION THAT THE FOLLOWING PROPERTIES SHALL BE ZONED THE RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY 4 UNITS PER ACRE (RSF-4) ZONE DISTRICT:

Tax Parcel 2945-174-00-130 (2986 D Road)

The W 990' of that part of the SE1/4SE1/4 lying S of the ROW of the Grand Valley Irrigation Co canal in Sec 17, T1S, R1E of the UM, Mesa Co. CO

Tax Parcel 2945-174-14-005 (2980 Rood Avenue)

Lot 2 of the Brown's Minor Sub II as recd in Bk 2376, Pg 153 of the Recds of the Clerk and Recorder, Mesa Co, CO.

Introduced on first reading this 7th day of March 2001.

PASSED and ADOPTED on second reading this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_  
President of the Council

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA  
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Unsafe Backing Ordinance</b>		
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	<b>March 21, 2001</b>		
<b>Date Prepared:</b>	<b>February 26, 2001</b>		
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Stephanie Rubinstein</b>	<b>Staff City Attorney</b>	
<b>Presenter Name:</b>	<b>Stephanie Rubinstein</b>	<b>Staff City Attorney</b>	
	<b>Workshop</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Formal Agenda</b>

**Subject:** Unsafe Backing

**Summary and Background Information:** On December 6, 2000, the 1995 Model Traffic Code was adopted, which included a provision referring to backing a car in such a manner so as not to be unsafe. The current reading of this section refers only to backing when it occurs on public or private parking lots, the shoulder of any road, or a controlled-access highway. These areas do not include other public roadways where an unsafe backing maneuver might occur. If such a maneuver did occur, at present, the driver could not be charged with a violation of this section, although his or her actions may be no less unsafe than if the accident occurred in one of the areas which are covered by the current ordinance. This amendment removes the “controlled-access” portion of the ordinance, making this section of the Code one that can be charged throughout the City, protecting all citizens, no matter where they may be travelling.

**Budget:** None

**Action Requested/Recommendation:** Approval of Ordinance on Second Reading.

<b>Citizen Presentation:</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>No</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>If Yes,</b>
<b>Name:</b>					
<b>Purpose:</b>					

<b>Report results back to Council:</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>No</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>When:</b>
--	----------	-----------	--	------------	--------------

<b>Placement on Agenda:</b>		<b>Consent</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Indiv. Consideration</b>		<b>Workshop</b>
-----------------------------	--	----------------	----------	-----------------------------	--	-----------------

**ORDINANCE NO.**

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 36, SECTION 36-38(b) OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, REGARDING UNSAFE BACKING**

RECITALS: On December 6, 2000, the 1995 Model Traffic Code was adopted, which included a provision referring to backing a car in such a manner so as not to be unsafe. The current reading of this section refers only to backing when it occurs on public or private parking lots, the shoulder of any road, or a controlled-access highway. These areas do not include other public roadways where an unsafe backing maneuver might occur. If such a maneuver did occur, at present, the driver could not be charged with a violation of this section, although his or her actions may be no less unsafe than if the accident occurred in one of the areas which are covered by the current ordinance. This amendment removes the "controlled-access" portion of the ordinance, making this section of the Code one that can be charged throughout the City, protecting all citizens, no matter where they may be travelling.

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION THAT:**

Chapter 36 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Grand Junction, be amended as follows:

That Section 36-38 (b) be amended to read:

The driver of a vehicle shall not back the same upon any shoulder or roadway unless such movement can be made with safety and without interfering with other traffic.

Introduced this 7<sup>th</sup> day of March 2001.

Passed and adopted this \_\_\_\_\_ day of March 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_  
President of the Council

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk