

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
WORKSHOP AND SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA**

**MONDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2003, 7:00 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 250 N. 5TH STREET**

MAYOR'S INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

7:00 COUNCILMEMBER REPORTS

7:10 CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Scheduled meetings with consultants and users regarding Stadium Complex Master Plan

7:15 REVIEW FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS

Request from Colorado West Mental Health

[Attach W-1](#)

7:25 REVIEW WEDNESDAY COUNCIL AGENDA

7:30 TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE: Public Works staff is asking for City Council direction on updating the Transportation Capacity Payment to align the TCP with the proposed valley-wide Transportation Impact Fee (TIF).

[Attach W-2](#)

8:10 STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE

[Attach W-3](#)

8:25 CONVENE INTO SPECIAL SESSION

EXECUTIVE SESSION FOR DISCUSSION OF PERSONNEL MATTERS UNDER C.R.S. 24-6-402(4)(f)(I) RELATIVE TO CITY COUNCIL EMPLOYEES

8:30 ADJOURN TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

This agenda is intended as a guideline for the City Council. Items on the agenda are subject to change as is the order of the agenda.

Attach W-1

Future Workshop Agenda

CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP AGENDAS

~~* **DECEMBER 15, MONDAY 11:30 AM**--Canceled for Christmas Break~~
~~**DECEMBER 15, MONDAY 7:00PM**-- Canceled for Christmas Break~~

** **January 5, MONDAY 11:30 AM***

11:30 UPDATE ON (franchise) DISCUSSIONS WITH BRESNAN

JANUARY 5, MONDAY 7:00PM

7:00 COUNCIL REPORTS, REVIEW WEDNESDAY AGENDA AND REVIEW FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS

7:25 CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

7:30 AFFORDABLE HOUSING ISSUES UPDATE & DISCUSSION (or discuss at lunch meeting?)

8:10 STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE

** **JANUARY 19, MONDAY 11:30 AM***

11:30 LUNCH AT UTEC w/KERRY YOUNGBLOOD

JANUARY 19, MONDAY 7:00PM

7:00 COUNCIL REPORTS, REVIEW WEDNESDAY AGENDA AND REVIEW FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS

7:25 CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

7:30 CHIPETA AVENUE TRAFFIC CALMING

8:05 UPCOMING APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

** **FEBRUARY 2, MONDAY 11:30 AM***

11:30 OPEN

FEBRUARY 2, MONDAY 7:00PM

7:00 COUNCIL REPORTS, REVIEW WEDNESDAY AGENDA AND REVIEW FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS

7:25 CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

7:30 STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE

** **FEBRUARY 16, MONDAY 11:30 AM***

11:30 OPEN

FEBRUARY 16, MONDAY 7:00PM

7:00 COUNCIL REPORTS, REVIEW WEDNESDAY AGENDA AND REVIEW FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS

7:25 CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

7:30 UPCOMING APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

**BIN LIST FROM CITY COUNCIL RETREAT (June 2003)
(and other reminders)**

1. Revisit the “Friendly Native” program: schedule for January 2004
2. Update on Temporary Modification to Persigo Discharge Permit (1st quarter of 2004)
3. Transient update (January 5?)
4. Utilities in right-of-way ordinance: bring back in late February



Colorado West Mental Health

858 Grand Avenue
Grand Junction, CO 81501

November 19, 2003

David Varley
Assistant City Manager
City of Grand Junction
250 North 5th Street
Grand Junction, CO 81501

RE: Request to present substance abuse and detoxification funding issues

Dear David:

This is to followup our conversation this morning regarding our desire to work with the City of Grand Junction related to the problem of substance abuse and detoxification programs. As you know, Colorado West Regional Mental Health, along with its partners, the Department of Human Services, Hilltop Resources, and St. Mary's Hospital, has been working to solve the problem of substance abuse and psychiatric services for citizens of Mesa County and the City of Grand Junction.

Recently, Colorado West Regional Mental Health has assumed responsibility for the detoxification program here in the city. As you know, I have attempted to design this facility in such way that the local police officers will have immediate and timely access should they encounter an individual with a substance abuse problem. Because of the increasing demand for the detoxification service and given that there are no adolescent detoxification beds on the Western Slope, we are seeking to expand our program by constructing of a new building on North Avenue. As you know, we will be approaching the city requesting a conditional use permit for this building, as well as our mental health center, on a nicely manicured campus.

I would specifically like to present the issue of funding for the detoxification program during a Monday night work session with the City Council. As I stated to you by phone, we have some 20 towns, cities and counties throughout Colorado West who are assisting with the funding of our other detox programs located throughout our 10 county region. I would, therefore, like to discuss with the City of Grand Junction opportunities to assist us in providing more comprehensive services to the citizens of the city of Grand Junction.

Thank you very much for your attention to this matter and I look forward to meeting City Council during a work session.

Sincerely,

Thomas F. Updike, Ph.D.
Deputy Executive Director

/pb

970 • 263 • 4918
FAX • 263 • 9535
www.cwrnhc.org

**Attach W-2
Transportation Impact Fee**

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA						
Subject		Transportation Capacity Payment				
Meeting Date		December 1, 2003				
Date Prepared		November 24, 2003			File #	
Author		Tim Moore		Public Works Manager		
Presenter Name		Mark Relph		Public Works & Utility Director		
Report results back to Council		<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	When
Citizen Presentation		<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	Name
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Workshop	<input type="checkbox"/>	Formal Agenda		<input type="checkbox"/>	Consent
						<input type="checkbox"/>
						Individual Consideration

Summary:

City Council direction to pursue updating the Transportation Capacity Payment as suggested by the Grand Valley Regional Transportation Committee (GVRTC).

Budget: Could increase revenues depending on Council action. Current revenues average approximately \$450,000 per year.

Action Requested: Provide direction regarding Council's desire to modify the current Transportation Capacity Payment (TCP) as it relates to the proposal from the GVRTC and previous Council discussions regarding the City's 1/2 Street Improvement policy.

Attachments:

1. Grand Valley Regional Transportation Committee Report & Resolution
2. 10-year Financial Plan for the TCP (Fund 207)

Background Information:

The Transportation Capacity Payment (TCP) was established in June of 1994 by Ordinance No. 2750. This ordinance established a formula for calculating the TCP, based on the cost to construct one lane-mile of street. The payment as calculated in 1994 was \$500.00 per single family home and that payment has not been amend since it was adopted. Based upon 2003 construction costs, the payment could be increased to approximately \$1,900 per single family home.

The TCP adopted by Council in 1994, justified the process as a way to more evenly spread to cost of major street construction across all of the property development within

the City. It also provided that the cost per lane-mile would be calculated and adjusted “from time to time” by a resolution presented by the Director of Public Works. In 1994 the TCP was changed from \$0 to \$500 for a single family home. All of the other rates (e.g. commercial, industrial multi family, etc.) were based on their traffic generation relative to a single family home.

The Grand Valley Regional Transportation Committee (GVRTC) has developed a resolution (attachment #1) that outlines their goals related to a valley wide transportation impact fee which includes adopting a target fee of approximately \$1,500 per single family home for each of the valleys governmental entities.

Also part of attachment #1 is a summary of a meeting held on November 20 by the GVRTC and a group of affected interests. In general, there appears to be common interest in pursuing the goals of the GVRTC, but there are many details to work through including the economic affects on businesses and the correlation with half street improvements.

In recent years it has become a concern that the artificially low value of the TCP has placed the City in the position of subsidizing new development which pays this fee instead of constructing adjacent major street improvements. TCPs only delivered to the City a fraction of the cost to provide the associated traffic carrying capacity. These circumstances have generally put the City in a position to require the construction of adjacent major street improvements whenever possible, rather than simply collecting the TCP. If the TCP is adjusted upwards, then there are more options for the Council to consider in how they might approach the issue of half street improvements

Council provided staff direction at the October 13th Workshop regarding the policy of ½ street improvements. In general, the direction was to develop a policy that would collect the TCP and not require the development to construct perimeter improvements, unless there are safety issues to address. The City would then collect the fees and construct the improvements. The current proposal staff is pursuing is to use the fees collected for construction in three (3) approaches:

1. Hold in reserve a portion of the fee to be used where the City could cost share improvements where there are existing deficiencies and have an immediate impact to the transportation system.
2. Accumulate funds over time to provide a more systematic approach to improving a specific corridor. (e.g. G Road).
3. Use a portion of the fee for “regional projects” as proposed in the Regional Transportation Impact Fee.

Proposed Schedule and Staff Recommendation:

Staff is seeking Council direction to continue the work to update the TCP as suggested by the GVRTC. Assuming we continue to participate in that effort, staff would suggest that we tie the ½ street policy to the issue since the latter is more of an implementation of the TCP once we collect the fees.

Staff would propose that if the Council wishes to proceed, that we work with the GVRTC and the other affected interests to bring back to Council a proposal to increase the TCP

and an implementation policy (i.e. ½ street improvement requirements) within the 1st quarter of 2004.



Mesa County
Regional Transportation Planning Office

750 Main Street, 1st Floor, Grand Junction, CO 81501
P O Box 20,000-5093, Grand Junction, CO 81502-5093
Tele: 970 255-7188 Fax: 970 244-1769



Memorandum

To: Grand Valley Regional Transportation Committee
From: Tom Fisher, Director, Regional Transportation Planning Office
Date: December 16, 2011
Subject: Messages and recommendations from the RTIF Proposal Sub-committee

The RTIF Proposal Sub-committee was brought together at the suggestion of the GVRTC in order to get broader based input into how a regional transportation impact fee should be implemented in our community. This group has met several times over the past three months to discuss and come to some consensus on some of the issues related to implementing impact fees. The group that has been meeting includes:

- Larry Rasmussen – Associated Members for Growth and Development (AMGD)
- Jana Gerow – AMGD
- Don Pettygrove – AMGD
- Ted Munkres – AMGD
- Diane Schwenke – Grand Junction Area Chamber of Commerce
- Gabe DeGabriele – Habitat for Humanity
- Ed Lenhart – AMGD
- Rebekah Wilmarth – AMGD
- Mark Relph – City of Grand Junction
- Tommy Collins – Town of Palisade
- Pete Baier – Mesa County
- Kurt Larsen – Mesa County
- Tom Fisher – RTPO
- Dave Montoya – District 51

One of the many questions that evolved from the sub-committee during the meetings was the commitment of the local governments in pursuing a Regional Impact Fee. This surfaced because of inconsistent participation from the City of Grand Junction and little participation from the City of Fruita. After staff and Manager/Administrator meetings on the subject of commitment and how to proceed, it was discovered that the appetite for a regional impact fee was overshadowed by the need to update and put in place a local transportation impact fee in each community. There were also issues related to return on investment in a regional fund populated by a regional impact fee. We further found out that the communities did want to pursue a consistent local impact fee that would strive to be applied in the same manner throughout the Grand Valley Airshed.

To this end, the GVRTC directed RTPO staff to draft a resolution that would make a recommendation to the member entities to adopt a common level local transportation impact fee with language in each regulation that allows portions of the local fee to be used in

conjunction with fees from other communities for projects that have mutual agreement to pursue.

The GVRTC also felt it was important that their recommendation to the entities include the advice and counsel they received from the Proposal Development Sub-Committee. The Proposal Development Sub-committee met last on November 20, 2003 where they wanted the following points to be included in any action taken on impact fees:

1. Especially in regards to the application and calculation of commercial/industrial transportation impact fees:
 - a. The economic value to the community of the commercial/industrial development should be taken into account as fees are calculated. The simple calculation by number of trips generated by 1000 square feet and type of use should not be the final word.
 - b. Because of the different impacts generated by commercial and industrial uses, they should be treated differently in calculating fees.
2. Fees should be calculated at development application, but collected at Certificate of Occupancy. This would help with the economic burden of the fees.
3. If the City of Grand Junction's Commercial/Industrial schedule is used in all communities, revisions to it and it's application must be made to accommodate the concerns mentioned in Point 1.
4. The sub-committee would like to see more work done on how we define the most proper split of what burden for public infrastructure should be the responsibility of the development and what should be the responsibility of the overall community.
5. Any project in the develop application process before the fees are in place should be exempt from the fees.
6. Allocation and use of fees on projects should follow the "letter of the law".
7. As much as possible, there should be consistency in the way that fees are calculated for like developments.
8. The sub-committee recognizes the community value that a Regional Impact Fee could have. If we aren't going to reach that goal now, we should continue to pursue this concept in the future.
9. It should be noted that this group is very enthusiastic about using this kind of forum to explore policy issues that have an impact on the development and growth of our community. Staff has thoroughly enjoyed and quite frankly needs this kind of spirited input in order to present better information to the elected officials.

Draft
Resolution # 2003-10

A RESOLUTION OF THE GRAND VALLEY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDING TO ITS MEMBER ENTITIES THEIR ADOPTION OF A COORDINATED AND CONSISTENT LOCAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE AND RECOMMENDING GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR SUCH A FEE

WHEREAS, under the authority given in section 104.5: Impact Fees, in Article 20 of Title 29, Colorado Revised Statutes, “pursuant to the authority granted in section 29-20-104 (1) (g) and as a condition of issuance of a development permit, a local government may impose an impact fee or other similar development charge to fund expenditures by such local government on capital facilities needed to serve new development”; and

WHEREAS, the Grand Valley Regional Transportation Committee was established to provide policy guidance to its member entities in pursuing regional solutions to regional transportation issues; and

WHEREAS, the Grand Valley Regional Transportation Committee completed the *Transportation Impact Fee Study* in 2002 in order to understand the need for a transportation impact fee and to establish a legally defensible method of calculating a fee; and

WHEREAS, Adopting transportation impact fees commonly among our communities would provide a more equitable distribution of the infrastructure development burden by making sure that all development pays a share of their contributing impact to the transportation system; and

WHEREAS, elected officials in Mesa County have received clear messages from their constituents that growth should pay its own way, thereby requiring development impact fees to be part of each entities revenue base in order to provide needed infrastructure improvements as development occurs; and

WHEREAS, the Grand Valley Regional Transportation Committee formed a Proposal Development Sub-committee of member entity staff and private business interests to help develop a transportation impact fee proposal that reflects the values of the community and attempts to minimize any negative side effects; and

WHEREAS, the Proposal Development Sub-committee recommends the following principles in its discussion of impact fee implementation:

- Any implemented transportation impact fee should be reasonable in cost and not cause an undue hardship on the development of property;
- Through the administration of a transportation impact fee, the public should be confident that the fees are being accounted for properly and used appropriately;
- There is great value to having a consistent transportation impact fee and related commercial schedule of fees throughout the Grand Valley Airshed in order to make the process of developing consistent; and
- An implemented fee should be indexed on an annual schedule to account for increases in construction costs.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved on the _____ day of December, 2003, that the Grand Valley Regional Transportation Committee does hereby adopt this resolution and forward the following recommendations to its member entities for further action:

1. Update each entity's current transportation impact fee regulation or establish a common local transportation impact fee regulation that establishes a target fee of \$1500.00 for each residential dwelling unit; and
2. As part of the ordinance change adopt the City of Grand Junction's commercial/industrial cost schedule for each entity; and
3. Propose and process the transportation impact fee regulation on a common schedule with major coordination between entities in January/February of 2004 and with adoption of the common fee by June 1, 2004; and
4. Provide within each entity's regulation an annual indexing mechanism based on the movement of Colorado Department of Transportation's Construction Cost Index, to be initiated by the Grand Valley Regional Transportation Committee and presented to the individual entities in enough time that they can adopt any changes by the end of January of each year. The first year that an indexing change to the impact fee will be considered is 2006; and
5. Provide within each entity's regulation, language that speaks to the commitment of using a to-be-determined portion of the transportation impact fee on regional projects that are planned and programmed through the Grand Valley Regional Transportation Committee; and
6. Use the *Transportation Impact Fee Study*, completed by Duncan and Associates, as the legally supportable calculation method, if necessary.

Grand Valley Regional Transportation Committee

Dennis M. Kirtland, Chair
Grand Junction Representative

Doralyn Genova
Mesa County Representative

David Karisny
Fruita Representative

Doug Edwards
Palisade Representative

Attest:

Recorder to the Committee

FUND 207 Long Range Financial Projection

	Actual 1998	Actual 1999	Actual 2000	Actual 2001	Actual 2002	Revised 2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
FUND TOTAL																
BEG. FUNDS AVAILABLE	\$ 1,341,983	\$ 1,239,865	\$ 1,239,865	\$ 814,325	\$ 688,214	\$ 849,424	\$ 360,424	\$ 268,737	\$ 145,201	\$ 137,136	\$ 148,401	\$ 130,771	\$ 133,640	\$ 108,908	\$ 106,104	\$ 77,274
TOTAL SOURCES																
Fees & Charges	\$ 227,144	\$ 318,914	\$ 315,461	\$ 451,278	\$ 626,685	\$ 430,000	\$ 447,500	\$ 465,715	\$ 484,674	\$ 504,409	\$ 524,950	\$ 546,330	\$ 566,586	\$ 591,751	\$ 615,865	\$ 640,965
Pooled Interest Income	114,922	111,968	110,889	82,611	63,963	31,000	10,813	10,749	7,260	6,857	7,420	6,539	6,662	5,445	5,305	3,864
Transfers-In	50,000	52,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	382,066	482,882	426,360	533,889	690,548	461,000	458,313	476,464	491,934	511,265	532,370	552,869	575,268	597,197	621,170	644,828
USES																
Project Expense	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,900	\$ -	\$ 46,338	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 650,000	\$ 650,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 700,000
Transfers-Out	\$ 615,568	\$ 585,000	\$ 850,000	\$ 650,000	\$ 493,000	\$ 950,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 650,000	\$ 650,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 700,000
Other	\$ 615,568	\$ 585,000	\$ 851,900	\$ 650,000	\$ 539,338	\$ 950,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 650,000	\$ 650,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 700,000
NET SOURCE (USE)	\$ (223,502)	\$ (102,118)	\$ (425,540)	\$ (116,111)	\$ 151,210	\$ (489,000)	\$ (91,687)	\$ (123,536)	\$ (58,066)	\$ (38,735)	\$ (67,630)	\$ (47,131)	\$ (74,732)	\$ (52,803)	\$ (78,830)	\$ (55,172)
Ending Fund Balance	\$ 1,341,983	\$ 1,239,865	\$ 814,325	\$ 688,214	\$ 849,424	\$ 360,424	\$ 268,737	\$ 145,201	\$ 87,136	\$ 98,401	\$ 80,771	\$ 83,640	\$ 58,908	\$ 56,104	\$ 27,274	\$ 22,102
ICP - Fund #2071																
BEG. FUNDS AVAILABLE	\$ 495,947	\$ 522,295	\$ 424,938	\$ 332,254	\$ 216,052	\$ 350,638	\$ 61,638	\$ 79,487	\$ 65,307	\$ 68,518	\$ 89,887	\$ 81,042	\$ 91,222	\$ 72,156	\$ 73,191	\$ 46,176
TOTAL SOURCES																
Fees & Charges	\$ 227,144	\$ 199,280	\$ 257,140	\$ 257,506	\$ 445,640	\$ 400,000	\$ 416,000	\$ 432,640	\$ 449,946	\$ 467,943	\$ 486,661	\$ 506,128	\$ 526,373	\$ 547,428	\$ 569,325	\$ 592,098
Pooled Interest Income	27,044	38,363	34,282	26,293	23,945	11,000	1,849	3,179	3,265	3,426	4,484	4,052	4,561	3,608	3,660	2,308
Transfers-In	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	254,188	237,643	291,422	283,798	469,586	411,000	417,949	435,819	453,211	471,369	491,156	510,180	530,934	551,035	572,984	594,406
USES																
Project Expense	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,900	\$ -	\$ 335,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000
Transfers-Out	\$ 227,840	\$ 335,000	\$ 382,206	\$ 400,000	\$ 335,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000
Other	\$ 227,840	\$ 335,000	\$ 384,106	\$ 400,000	\$ 335,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000
NET SOURCE (USE)	\$ 26,348	\$ (97,357)	\$ (92,684)	\$ (116,202)	\$ 134,586	\$ (289,000)	\$ 17,549	\$ (14,181)	\$ 3,211	\$ 21,369	\$ (8,844)	\$ 10,180	\$ (19,066)	\$ 1,035	\$ (27,016)	\$ (5,594)
Ending Fund Balance	\$ 522,295	\$ 424,938	\$ 332,254	\$ 216,052	\$ 350,638	\$ 61,638	\$ 79,487	\$ 65,307	\$ 68,518	\$ 89,887	\$ 81,042	\$ 91,222	\$ 72,156	\$ 73,191	\$ 46,176	\$ 40,582
OTHER IMPROVEMENTS																
BEG. FUNDS AVAILABLE	\$ 1,069,538	\$ 819,688	\$ 814,927	\$ 482,071	\$ 482,162	\$ 498,786	\$ 298,786	\$ 189,250	\$ 79,895	\$ 68,618	\$ 58,514	\$ 49,729	\$ 42,418	\$ 36,752	\$ 32,913	\$ 31,099
TOTAL SOURCES																
Fees & Charges	\$ -	\$ 119,634	\$ 58,321	\$ 193,772	\$ 180,845	\$ 30,000	\$ 31,500	\$ 33,075	\$ 34,729	\$ 36,485	\$ 38,288	\$ 40,203	\$ 42,213	\$ 44,324	\$ 46,540	\$ 48,867
Pooled Interest Income	87,878	73,605	76,617	56,319	40,017	20,000	8,964	7,570	3,995	3,431	2,926	2,486	2,121	1,838	1,646	1,555
Transfers-In	50,000	52,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	137,878	245,239	134,938	250,091	220,962	50,000	40,464	40,645	38,723	39,896	41,214	42,689	44,334	46,161	48,186	50,422
USES																
Project Expense	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 46,338	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000
Transfers-Out	\$ 387,728	\$ 250,000	\$ 467,794	\$ 250,000	\$ 158,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000
Other	\$ 387,728	\$ 250,000	\$ 467,794	\$ 250,000	\$ 204,338	\$ 250,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
NET SOURCE (USE)	\$ (249,850)	\$ (4,761)	\$ (332,856)	\$ 91	\$ 16,625	\$ (200,000)	\$ (109,536)	\$ (109,355)	\$ (11,277)	\$ (10,104)	\$ (6,786)	\$ (7,311)	\$ (5,666)	\$ (3,639)	\$ (1,814)	\$ 422
Ending Fund Balance	\$ 819,688	\$ 814,927	\$ 482,071	\$ 482,162	\$ 498,786	\$ 298,786	\$ 189,250	\$ 79,895	\$ 68,618	\$ 89,887	\$ 81,042	\$ 91,222	\$ 72,156	\$ 73,191	\$ 46,176	\$ 40,582
TOTAL ENDING BALANCE	\$ 1,341,983	\$ 1,239,865	\$ 814,325	\$ 688,214	\$ 849,424	\$ 360,424	\$ 268,737	\$ 145,201	\$ 137,136	\$ 148,401	\$ 130,771	\$ 133,640	\$ 108,908	\$ 106,104	\$ 77,274	\$ 72,102

Fund 207 / Transfers-Out

	Actual 1998	Actual 1999	Actual 2000	Proposed 2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
TCP	227,840											
F22900		275,000	382,206	400,000	300,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	250,000	250,000	300,000	250,000
F01700		60,000										
F02200, 29 Road												
F04600, Riverside												
F24300, Uts/Pitkin												
F42200, 29 Road Viaduct												
F01700, 27.5 Road		1,900										
TOTAL-TCP	227,840	335,000	384,106	400,000	300,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	250,000	250,000	300,000	250,000
OTHER												
F01300	1,960											
F01700	90,143											
F02100	75,000											
F02200, 29 Road	1,125				50,000							
F02600	19,500											
F02900	200,000											
F03800, 24 Road		90,000	93,428	150,000		190,000	100,000	200,000				
F31700		115,000										
F32200		45,000										
F10400, Bookcliff												
F04600, Riverside												
F24300, Uts / Pitkin												
F42200, 29 Road Viaduct												
F48800, Traffic			374,366									
F01700, 27.5 Road												
TOTAL OTHER	387,728	250,000	467,794	150,000	50,000	190,000	100,000	200,000	-	-	-	-
TOTAL TRANSFERS-OUT	615,568	585,000	851,900	550,000	350,000	390,000	300,000	400,000	250,000	250,000	300,000	250,000

**Attach W-3
Strategic Plan Update**

**M
E
M
O**

To: Mayor and City Council
From: David Varley
CC: Kelly Arnold, City Manager
Date: 21 November 2003
Re: November Strategic Plan Progress Report
(for discussion at Council Workshop on 1 December 2003)



City Council's Strategic Plan has 76 Action Steps. To help us track all these Action Steps and make sure they are completed we provide a written progress report every month. Attached to this memo is the report for the month of November 2003 which will be discussed at the City Council workshop on 1 December 2003.

The progress for each Action Step and any requested Council action is listed immediately under each Action Step.

For this month there is only an update for Action Step 4.B as this is the only Action Step that was scheduled to be completed during the month of November 2003.

GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
STRATEGIC PLAN 2002 – 2012

MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT
September 2003



Solution

A BALANCE OF CHARACTER,
ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT

Action Step 4.B: *Develop a City policy on standardizing City provision of emergency medical services. (November 2003)*

Progress: The City is participating in a county-wide emergency services feasibility study. The first draft of the study is scheduled for review on 4 December 2003. The nature of this study will provide insight on the services delivered by the Grand Junction Fire Department and will include suggested steps for improvement. Additionally, the study will provide suggestions regarding economies of scale and potential partnerships with other emergency services providers. Once the study is finalized, we will see how the recommendations fit in with this Action Step and then act accordingly.