

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
WORKSHOP AGENDA**

**MONDAY, APRIL 4, 2005, 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

7:15 REVIEW FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS [Attach W-1](#)

7:25 REVIEW WEDNESDAY COUNCIL AGENDA

7:30 UPDATE ON RIVERSIDE PARKWAY PROJECT [Attach W-2](#)

8:25 TRAFFIC CALMING POLICY: Staff will review the proposed changes to the policy and the Model Traffic Code and get direction on the proposed changes as well as tying traffic calming into the new neighborhood program. [Attach W-3](#)

8:55 STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE [Attach W-4](#)

ADJOURN

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

*** APRIL 18 , 2005 MONDAY 11:30 AM**

*11:30 DEPARTMENT UPDATE ON GOLF COURSES & UPDATE FROM
SUBCOMMITTEE WORKING ON S PLAN OBJECTIVE 15A;
PRIORITIZING PARKS MASTER PLAN PROJECTS AND INCLUDING
SCHOOL SITES AT BOOKCLIFF AND PEAR PARK*

APRIL 18, 2005 MONDAY 7:00PM

- 7:00 COUNCIL REPORTS, REVIEW WEDNESDAY AGENDA AND REVIEW
FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS
- 7:25 CITY MANAGER'S REPORT
- 7:30 APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS
- 7:35 PRESENTATION OF 2 AWARDS BY JOHN PATTERSON, VICE
PRESIDENT OF THE COLORADO ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF
POLICE
- 7:45 JARVIS PROPERTY MASTER PLAN: DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS
- 8:15 PUBLIC WORKS UPDATES ON F ½ ROAD PROJECT AND WATER
ISSUES

**→MAY 2, 2005 MONDAY 10:00 AM Swearing In Ceremony -New Council
Members**

*** MAY 2, 2005 MONDAY 11:30 AM**

11:30 OPEN

MAY 2, 2005 MONDAY 7:00PM

- 7:00 COUNCIL REPORTS, REVIEW WEDNESDAY AGENDA AND REVIEW
FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS
- 7:25 CITY MANAGER'S REPORT
- 7:30 CITY COUNCIL ASSIGNMENTS
- 7:30 STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE

*** MAY 16, 2005 MONDAY 11:30 AM**

11:30 AMBULANCE PROVIDER RFP

MAY 16, 2005 MONDAY 7:00PM

- 7:00 COUNCIL REPORTS, REVIEW WEDNESDAY AGENDA AND REVIEW
FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS
- 7:25 CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

7:30 APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS
7:35 UPDATE ON STREET BEAUTIFICATION PROJECT FOR DOWNTOWN
(SEVENTH STREET AND MAIN STREET)

~~* MAY 30, 2005 MONDAY 11:30 AM Cancel for Memorial Day Holiday~~

~~MAY 30, 2005 MONDAY 7:00PM Cancel for Memorial Day Holiday~~

~~* JUNE 13, 2005 MONDAY 11:30 AM
11:30 OPEN~~

JUNE 13, 2005 MONDAY 7:00PM

7:00 COUNCIL REPORTS, REVIEW WEDNESDAY AGENDA AND REVIEW
FUTURE WORKSHOP AGENDAS
7:25 CITY MANAGER'S REPORT
7:30 APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS
7:40 OPEN

↗ **BIN LIST** ↖

1. Review/discuss project requests for CDBG funds (lunch meeting: week of May 2, or May 9?)
2. City owned property discussion

2005 Department Presentations to City Council
To Be Decided

**Attach W-2
Riverside Parkway Update**

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA									
Subject		Summary of Design-Build Debriefings and Course of Action to Construct Riverside Parkway							
Meeting Date		April 4, 2005							
Date Prepared		April 1, 2005					File #		
Author		Jim Shanks			Riverside Parkway Program Manager				
Presenter Name		Mark Relph			Public Works & Utilities Director				
Report results back to Council		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	When			
Citizen Presentation		<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	Name			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Workshop	Formal Agenda			Consent		Individual Consideration		

Summary: This presentation will include a general summary of the debriefings with the Design-Build proposers for the Riverside Parkway project by City staff and the City's consulting engineer, Carter & Burgess and will describe a course of action to construct the project on time and within the City's budget.

Action Requested/Recommendation: None

Attachments: None.

Background Information: The City received Price and Technical proposals for the final design and construction of Riverside Parkway from 24 Road to 29 Road on February 28, 2005. Upon review of the price proposals it was determined that all of the proposals were significantly higher than the City's upset price. The City rejected all of the proposals.

Debriefings were held with each of the Design-Build proposers to exchange information concerning the process and to determine as much as possible about the price proposals to allow the City to go forward and construct the project.

**Attach W-3
Traffic Calming**

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA							
Subject		Traffic Calming					
Meeting Date		April 4, 2005					
Date Prepared		March 31, 2005			File #		
Author		Jody Kliska		Transportation Engineer			
Presenter Name		Jody Kliska		Transportation Engineer			
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: Review proposed changes to the adopted traffic calming policy and receive Council direction on the proposed changes and future of the traffic calming program; review a proposed change to the model traffic code.

Budget: With 2004 carry-forward, the budget for 2005 is \$81,614. Funds are expended as projects are approved by City Council. No expenditures are requested at this time.

Action Requested/Recommendation: Council direction on proposed changes to the adopted policy; discussion of proposed change to the model traffic code; other discussion on how traffic calming may tie in with the new neighborhood program.

Attachments: Current adopted policy, policy with proposed changes, history of traffic calming requests and outcomes, list of current traffic calming requests, email from Arvada Traffic Engineer, "At the End of a Dirt Road" by Paul Harvey, memo requesting the change to the Model Traffic Code default speed limit for residential streets from 30 MPH to 25 MPH.

Background Information: In 1997, Public Works staff developed the 10 Step Traffic Calming Procedure. This was presented to City Council along with general information on traffic calming and a presentation by Dan Hartmann, Public Works Director for the City of Golden. Funds were approved for traffic calming in the CIP. The 10 Step Process was used until June 26, 2002, when City Council approved Resolution No. 59-02 approving the current policy. Since this policy's inception in 2002, there have been no formal updates.

Since January, 1998, the Transportation Engineering Division has received 130 requests from neighborhoods for traffic calming. Of those, 78 expired (meaning the requester did not follow up with filling out the application), 29 were denied either on the basis of not meeting the criteria set forth in the adopted policy or by Council, 2 were referred to Mesa County because they were not in the city limits, 14 completed the process, 4 are currently in progress and 2 are pending (application has been sent, not received back). A summary of the 130 projects is attached. Of the 143 completing the process, 4 installed speed humps, 3 resulted in adding striping, 5 had signs installed, 1 alley was closed and 1 added sidewalks, bulbouts and striping.

Each time Transportation Engineer staff is contacted by a resident for traffic calming, the person is first referred to the Police Department Traffic Hotline to request enforcement and establish an enforcement record.

The proposed changes are a culmination of feedback received from Council over the last couple of years plus “lessons learned” by staff and are intended for both clarification and a more restrictive approach to qualification for physical devices. A summary of the proposed changes includes:

- Minimum speed criteria. Local streets must be 6 MPH over the posted speed limit. Currently, there is no minimum speed requirement. Collector streets must have speeds 10 MPH over the posted speed limit. The current policy is 5 MPH over the speed limit.
- Currently, the policy says speed humps may be considered on collector streets that are not identified as an emergency response route. The proposed changes adds the additional conditions – there must be no more than one moving lane of traffic in each direction, traffic volumes must be more than 500 vehicles per day but less than 5000 vehicles per day, the street must have a posted speed limit of no more than 30 MPH.
- A “Provisions” section was added for further clarification of the program. The section includes the requirement to establish a neighborhood committee, identifies the committee’s responsibilities and further defines eligibility for the program.
- The draft policy eliminates the test project. As more data is collected locally and available nationally on the use of various traffic calming devices, staff has a better understanding of the likely effects of the installation of a devices and believes this step can be eliminated.
- The draft policy increases the neighborhood approval for the project from 2/3 (66%) to ¾ (75%). The policy also provides Council with the opportunity to review a specific project and formally approve or deny the permanent installation before the neighborhood vote for acceptance occurs.

By developing minimum criteria that must be met to qualify for the program and further clarify what constitutes an eligible project, fewer projects will likely qualify for this program.

When the current traffic calming policy was adopted, Council asked staff to investigate the possibility of amending the Model Traffic Code so that residential streets that do not

have a posted speed limit would default to 25 MPH, rather than the current 30 MPH. A memo was prepared and circulated in February, 2003, but no action was taken. A copy of the memo is attached.

The goals of the new neighborhood program appear to be able to include traffic calming issues, and it may make some sense to incorporate the traffic calming program under the neighborhood program umbrella. Additionally, the Police Department SALT volunteers appear to be working with neighborhoods on speeding issues and it may make sense to have a "one-stop shopping" approach for neighborhoods, rather than different programs contained within different departments. At an Innovations Group meeting last September, the City of Arvada shared some information about their "Trouble Traffic Task Force" comprised of staff from courts, traffic engineering, police, the City Manager's office and two citizens. Their focus has been on the people side of traffic problems rather than trying to address the problems with physical engineering solutions. A copy of the email from the Arvada traffic engineer is attached.

Current Adopted Policy

City of Grand Junction Neighborhood Traffic Calming Policy

The City of Grand Junction recognizes that quality of life and a sense of community and personal well-being for residents may be affected by intrusive vehicular traffic. Livable streets can be attained in several ways – through good design of new development, through reconstruction of existing streets by Capital Improvement Projects, or by spot improvements initiated by neighborhood requests.

This policy sets the framework for staff and citizens to work together to identify problems in spot locations and work toward implementing solutions that are initiated by neighborhood requests.

Goal:

Address public neighborhood livability concerns resulting from a documented vehicular problem including speeding, cut-through traffic, and hazards. Actively involve the people who live in the project area in the planning and decision-making process.

Objectives:

- Encourage reasonable driver and pedestrian behavior in residential neighborhoods.
- Improve neighborhood livability by encouraging adherence to the speed limit.
- Effectively balance the public safety interests of traffic mitigation and emergency response.
- Encourage citizen involvement and input into the determination of appropriate measures.
- Integrate education, enforcement and engineering.
- Create or maintain quality residential environments.
- Improve safety and convenience for pedestrians, cyclists, the elderly and other vulnerable street users.
- Reduce the number and severity of accidents.
- Discourage the use of inappropriate routes by motor vehicles.
- Improve the visual environment.
- Balance traffic space demands.

Minimum Requirements for Traffic Calming Measures

Public resources need to be managed responsibly to serve all citizens equitably. The following requirements are necessary to balance the city's resources to most effectively address concerns.

↓ Local Streets –

Residential streets that are not classified as a collector or higher on the Grand Valley Circulation Plan are considered local. These streets' primary function is for access to the adjacent properties. Cul-de-sacs and streets shorter in length than 1000' are eligible only for educational activities such as distributing flyers and limited enforcement activity such as the neighborhood speed watch or radar trailers. Installation of traffic control devices will be made as needed in accordance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. No physical measures such as speed humps will be considered. Other local streets where data collection indicates the presence of vehicles exceeding the speed limit or traffic volumes higher than what would normally be generated by the houses served by the street are eligible to participate in the traffic calming process. Vertical displacements such as speed humps and raised intersections may be considered where the grade, topography and roadside drainage will allow safe installation.

↓ Collector Streets –

Streets designated as collectors on the Grand Valley Circulation Plan may participate in the traffic calming process. Streets where the data collection indicates 85th-percentile speeds greater than 5 MPH over the posted speed limit and traffic volumes that fall within the ranges shown for the street cross-sections in the adopted Standard Drawings will be given priority consideration. Vertical displacements such as speed humps and raised intersections may be considered if the street is not identified as an Emergency Response Route.

↓ Arterial Streets –

Streets designated as arterials on the Grand Valley Circulation Plan will likely be identified as Emergency Response Routes and will not be considered for vertical displacements such as speed humps and raised intersections. These streets may be considered for medians and landscaping treatments as well as enforcement activities. Except in unique circumstances, the traffic calming process will not be applicable. Improvements made to arterial streets will be part of a larger Capital Improvement Project.

Projects will be evaluated on a first-come, first-served basis ranked by priority and are subject to availability of funds.

Procedures

All neighborhoods requesting traffic calming must follow the 10-Step Process for Initiating Traffic Calming Projects outlined below. Progressive authority for installation is shown in the list of Potential Traffic Calming Measures.

Process for Initiating Traffic Calming Projects on Existing Streets

Step 1: City receives notification from neighborhood of problem and sends an application package. The applicant has 30 days to complete the application and return it. Once the application is received, the City does basic data collection - volumes, speeds, accidents, geometrics within 30 days. The problem is scored and assigned a priority. Staff reviews appropriate actions and follows the implementation outlined in the Traffic Calming Measures list.

Step 2: Hold neighborhood information session and determine if there is sufficient support in the affected neighborhood to pursue problem identification and solution. The session is scheduled within 30 days of the completion of data collection by city staff. Invite representatives from other city departments who may have an interest such as Police, Fire, Parks, Community Development. Identify, quantify problems. Solicit volunteers for project neighborhood traffic committee.

Step 3: Staff/project neighborhood traffic committee develop plan for traffic calming of the project area. Staff prepares a memo of preliminary findings for City Council and receives council feedback on the traffic calming plan that will include limitations or restrictions imposed by council or the City Manager. Time frame for the preparation of the memo and receipt of feedback is 30 days.

Step 4: Public information meeting held by the neighborhood traffic calming committee to present plan to neighborhood. The meeting will be held within 30 days of receiving council feedback.

Step 5: Circulate neighborhood ballot. Approval of traffic calming plan by 2/3 (66%) of affected area is required to proceed to city council for the council decision. The neighborhood traffic calming committee has 90 days to complete the balloting process. If Step 5 has not been completed in one year from the date the original application is mailed, the application will expire.

Step 6: Ballot results for measures requiring City Council approval will be scheduled for a council workshop within 45 days of completion of the balloting. A Public Works staff report will be prepared for the meeting. Council action on temporary installation of traffic calming in accordance with the plan developed by staff/project traffic committee with council input in Step 3.

Step 7: Installation and monitoring of test project, if the traffic calming can be a test project. It is possible at this step to install permanent measures. City collects appropriate traffic data.

Step 8: Survey neighborhood for acceptance and present results of data collection.

Step 9: Request council action, if necessary, for installation of permanent improvements.

Step 10: Design and construction of permanent improvements.

Potential Traffic Calming Measures

The following traffic calming measures may be implemented with staff review only and most may not require a balloting process:

- Stop signs as warranted by MUTCD
- Speed limit signs with issuance of speed resolution
- No outlet signs
- Other signing in accordance with the MUTCD
- Striping/marking changes or additions
- Radar trailer
- Neighborhood Speed Watch
- Informational flyers
- Delineation and plastic curbing
- Installation of street lights through the petition process.

Measures that require City Council approval:

- Speed humps and raised crosswalks
- Street closures
- Medians and entry islands
- Bulbouts
- Roundabouts
- Traffic diverters
- Lane reductions
- Street re-alignments

Prioritization Worksheet

Traffic Volumes

Greater than 2000 vehicles per day	5 points	_____
1500 to 2000 vehicles per day	4 points	
1000 to 1500 vehicles per day	3 points	
500 to 1000 vehicles per day	2 points	
< 500 vehicles per day	1 point	

Traffic Accident History

More than 5 accidents per mile per year	3 points	_____
2 to 4 accidents per mile per year	2 points	
1 accident per mile per year	1 point	

Traffic Speeds

85 th % speed exceeds speed limit > 10 MPH	5 points	_____
85 th % speed exceeds speed limit by 9 MPH	4 points	
85 th % speed exceeds speed limit by 8 MPH	3 points	
85 th % speed exceeds speed limit by 5-7 MPH	2 points	
85 th % speed exceeds speed limit by < 5 MPH	1 point	

Number of houses facing the street (both sides)

>55 per mile	4 points	_____
40 to 55 per mile	3 points	
25 –40 per mile	2 points	
10 –25 per mile	1 point	

Schools and Public Facilities adjacent to the street

5 points for each school		_____
4 points for each recreation facility (park, pool, etc)		
3 points for each trail crossing		
2 points for other public facilities		

Cut-through traffic pattern

25% or more of traffic cutting through	5 points	_____
15-25% traffic cutting through	2 points	

Residents have expressed a concern

Yes	3 points	_____
No	0 points	

Total Score: _____

City of Grand Junction

Neighborhood Traffic Calming Policy with Proposed Changes

The City of Grand Junction recognizes that quality of life and a sense of community and personal well-being for residents may be affected by intrusive vehicular traffic. Livable streets can be attained in several ways – through good design of new development, through reconstruction of existing streets by Capital Improvement Projects, or by spot improvements initiated by neighborhood requests.

This policy sets the framework for staff and citizens to work together to identify problems in spot locations and work toward implementing solutions that are initiated by neighborhood requests.

Goal:

Address public neighborhood livability concerns resulting from a documented vehicular problem including speeding, cut-through traffic, and hazards. Actively involve the people who live in the project area in the planning and decision-making process.

Objectives:

- Encourage reasonable driver and pedestrian behavior in residential neighborhoods.
- Improve neighborhood livability by encouraging adherence to the speed limit.
- Effectively balance the public safety interests of traffic mitigation and emergency response.
- Encourage citizen involvement and input into the determination of appropriate measures.
- Integrate education, enforcement and engineering.
- Create or maintain quality residential environments.
- Improve safety and convenience for pedestrians, cyclists, the elderly and other vulnerable street users.
- Reduce the number and severity of accidents.
- Discourage the use of inappropriate routes by motor vehicles.
- Improve the visual environment.
- Balance traffic space demands.

Minimum Requirements for Traffic Calming Measures

Public resources need to be managed responsibly to serve all citizens equitably. The following requirements are necessary to balance the city's resources to most effectively address concerns.

↓ **Local Streets** –

Residential streets that are not classified as a collector or higher on the Grand Valley Circulation Plan are considered local. These streets' primary function is for access to the adjacent properties. Cul-de-sacs, unpaved street, streets with volumes of less than 300 vehicles a day, streets with widths less than 20 ft. and streets shorter in length than 1000' are eligible only for educational activities such as distributing flyers and limited enforcement activity such as the neighborhood speed watch or radar trailers. Installation of traffic control devices will be made as needed in accordance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. No physical measures such as speed humps will be considered. Other local Streets where the data collection indicates 85th-percentile speeds greater than 6 MPH over the posted speed limit or if not posted 6 mph over the prima facie speed and an enforcement history through the GJPD showing speeding violations or traffic volumes higher than what would normally be generated by the houses served by the street (where street is not access to a subdivision under development or area under construction) are eligible to participate in the traffic calming process. Vertical displacements such as speed humps and raised intersections may be considered where the grade, topography and roadside drainage will allow safe installation.

↓ **Collector Streets** –

Streets designated as collectors on the Grand Valley Circulation Plan may participate in the traffic calming process where the data collection indicates 85th-percentile speeds greater than 10 MPH over the posted speed limit or if not posted, 10 mph over the prima facie speed for the location and an enforcement history through the GJPD showing speeding violations. Vertical displacements such as speed humps and raised intersections may only be considered with the additional conditions:

- The street is not identified as an Emergency Response Route.
- There must be no more than one moving lane of traffic in each direction.
- Traffic volumes must be more than 500 vehicles per day but less than 5000 vehicles per day.
- The street must have a speed limit of no more than 30 MPH

↓ **Arterial Streets** –

Streets designated as arterials on the Grand Valley Circulation Plan will likely be identified as Emergency Response Routes and will not be considered for vertical

displacements such as speed humps and raised intersections. These streets may be considered for medians and landscaping treatments as well as enforcement activities. Except in unique circumstances, the traffic calming process will not be applicable. Improvements made to arterial streets will be part of a larger Capital Improvement Project.

Provisions

- Projects will be evaluated on a first-come, first-served basis ranked by priority and are subject to availability of funds.
- The street(s) must not be scheduled for resurfacing within the next two years
- A neighborhood committee must be formed with a minimum of 3 residents living within the effected area.
- Alleys are not eligible for traffic calming measures.
- Streets that access subdivisions under development and areas under construction are not eligible for Traffic Calming measures until the development is built out and construction is complete.
- New subdivisions are not eligible for traffic calming for a period of two years from date of final acceptance.
- The neighborhood committee is required to contact every property owner in the subject area. If a resident is against the traffic calming device(s) and does not want to sign the petition, the word "OPPOSED" will be noted on the petition signature space. If the neighborhood committee is unable to contact a property owner, "NO CONTACT" will be noted on the petition signature space with the days and times that contact was attempted. It is required that the petitioners make at least three attempts on separate days to contact a property owner. Absentee property owners will be mailed a flyer and a vote card (provided by the city). If property is rented, tenant also needs to be petitioned. If property owner does not respond, tenants vote will be counted. If neither property owner or tenant do not vote, the property will be removed from the vote. Proxy votes will not be accepted unless official documentation is provided. Areas with high rental properties (over 25%) are not required to obtain the tenants vote but must obtain all property owners signatures.
- Areas that have completed the traffic calming process, successfully or unsuccessfully cannot reapply for traffic calming measures for a period of two years from the completion date of the installation or the date the request was denied.
- Areas that have had traffic calming devices installed through the traffic calming process cannot apply for removal of traffic calming devices for a period of two years from the completion date of the installation.
- Areas that have had traffic calming devices installed through the traffic calming process and also had the same traffic calming devices removed

through the traffic calming process cannot reapply for traffic calming measures for a period of five years from the completion date of the removal.

Procedures

All neighborhoods requesting traffic calming must follow the 10-Step Process for Initiating Traffic Calming Projects outlined below. Progressive authority for installation is shown in the list of Potential Traffic Calming Measures.

Process for Initiating Traffic Calming Projects on Existing Streets

Step 1: City receives notification from neighborhood of problem and sends an application package. The applicant must contact the GJPD Traffic Complaint Hotline to involve the patrol officer assigned to the area and establish an enforcement history.

Step 2: The applicant needs to complete the application and return it within 30 days. Once the application is received, a preliminary determination of eligibility based on the minimum requirements for traffic calming measures will be made in a timely manner. If the basic geometric requirements are met, the City will begin data collection, which will include– enforcement records, volumes, speeds and accidents.

- If the street(s) is determined not to be eligible, the applicant (s) will be notified with the reason(s) of ineligibility.
- If all minimum requirements are met, the request is scored and assigned a priority. The applicant(s) will be notified to schedule a neighborhood information session. Request will continue to step 3 in the process.

Step 3: Hold neighborhood information session and determine if there is sufficient support in the affected neighborhood to pursue problem identification and solution. Representatives from other city departments who may have an interest such as Police, Fire, Parks, Community Development will be invited. The purpose of the meeting is to identify, quantify problems and solicit volunteers for project neighborhood traffic committee (minimum of 3 volunteers required to continue to step 4).

Step 4: Staff/project neighborhood traffic committee develop plan for traffic calming of the project area. Staff prepares a memo of preliminary findings for City Council and City departments. Staff receives council and department feedback on the traffic calming plan that will include limitations or restrictions imposed by council or the City Manager.

Step 5: Staff/project neighborhood traffic committee will meet to review feedback and make appropriate changes to traffic calming plan of the project area.

Step 6: The neighborhood traffic committee will hold a public information meeting to present plan to neighborhood. City will prepare a flyer for distribution and provide copies of data collected and traffic calming statistical information for the meeting. **City staff will not be present at this meeting.**

- Support for the Traffic Calming Proposal should be gathered at this meeting. (to show support from the neighborhood at the Council Workshop)

- Vote to go forward with or discontinue the effort. A simple majority vote of those in attendance is needed to go forward.
- If vote is to go forward with effort, neighborhood traffic committee will prepare a form letter addressed to the Transportation Engineer requesting to present the Traffic Calming Proposal to City Council, Continue to step 7.

Step 7: Traffic Calming Proposal will be scheduled for a City Council Workshop. A Public Works staff report will be prepared for the meeting on installation of traffic calming devices in accordance with the plan developed by staff/project traffic committee with council input in Step 4. Council action for approval of Traffic Calming Devices and neighborhood committee to continue to step 8 (petitioning).

Step 8: Circulate neighborhood ballot. Approval of traffic calming plan by 3/4 (75%) of affected area is required to proceed to Step 9.

- If Step 8 has not been completed in 6 months from the date of the City Council approval, request will expire.
- If petitioners are successful in acquiring 3/4 (75%) approval from the petition area, request will continue to step 9.

Step 9: Design and construction of permanent improvements.

Step 10: Monitoring of improvements. Data collection will be conducted approximately 6 months after installation of traffic calming device(s). Results will be given to neighborhood traffic committee for distribution.

The following traffic calming measures may be implemented with staff review only and most may not require a balloting process:

- Stop signs as warranted by MUTCD
- Speed limit signs with issuance of speed resolution
- No outlet signs
- Other signing in accordance with the MUTCD
- Striping/markings changes or additions
- Radar trailer
- Neighborhood Speed Watch
- Informational flyers
- Delineation and plastic curbing
- Installation of street lights through the petition process.

Measures that require City Council approval:

- Speed humps and raised crosswalks

- Street closures
- Medians and entry islands
- Bulbouts
- Roundabouts
- Traffic diverters
- Lane reductions
- Street re-alignments

Prioritization Worksheet

This worksheet will be used by City staff when competing projects exceed budget

Traffic Volumes

Greater than 2000 vehicles per day	5 points	_____
1500 to 2000 vehicles per day	4 points	
1000 to 1500 vehicles per day	3 points	
500 to 1000 vehicles per day	2 points	
< 500 vehicles per day	1 point	

Traffic Accident History

More than 5 accidents per mile per year	3 points	_____
2 to 4 accidents per mile per year	2 points	
1 accident per mile per year	1 point	

Traffic Speeds

85 th % speed exceeds speed limit > 10 MPH	5 points	_____
85 th % speed exceeds speed limit by 9 MPH	4 points	
85 th % speed exceeds speed limit by 8 MPH	3 points	
85 th % speed exceeds speed limit by 5-7 MPH	2 points	
85 th % speed exceeds speed limit by < 5 MPH	1 point	

Number of houses facing the street (both sides)

>55 per mile	4 points	_____
40 to 55 per mile	3 points	
25 –40 per mile	2 points	
10 –25 per mile	1 point	

Schools and Public Facilities adjacent to the street

5 points for each school		_____
4 points for each recreation facility (park, pool, etc)		
3 points for each trail crossing		
2 points for other public facilities		

Cut-through traffic pattern

25% or more of traffic cutting through	5 points	_____
15-25% traffic cutting through	2 points	

Residents have expressed a concern

Yes	3 points	_____
No	0 points	

Total Score:

TRAFFIC CALMING FLOW CHART

1/30/2004



If Step 8 (Circulate neighborhood ballot) has not been completed in 6 months from the date of the Council Workshop, the application will expire.

Data collection will be conducted approximately 6 months after installation of traffic calming device(s). Results will be given to neighborhood traffic committee for distribution. Process Complete

List of Traffic Calming Requests from 1998 – March 2005

Date	Location of Request	Status	Device
3/2/2005	Marliposa Dr.	Pending	
12/10/2004	B 4/10 Road	Pending	
10/22/2004	Allyce Ave.	Expired	
9/3/2004	Main Street 12th St. to I-70 B	Denied	
9/2/2004	Mariposa Dr.	Denied	
9/1/2004	15th Street; Orchard Ave. to Elm Ave.	Expired	
8/16/2004	Hidden Valley Dr.	Expired	
6/14/2004	Westwood Dr. & 25 1/2	Expired	
5/13/2004	Skyler Street	Denied	
5/10/2004	Northridge Dr.	Expired	
5/5/2004	Walnut Ave. & 6th St.	In Progress	
4/30/2004	Hawthorn Ave.	In Progress	
4/22/2004	Cortland Avenue	Denied	
4/22/2004	Brookwood Drive	Denied	
3/30/2004	Grand Mesa Avenue	In Progress	
3/18/2004	Broken Arrow Dr.	Denied	
3/12/2004	Roundup Drive	Expired	
3/9/2004	Lanai Drive	In Progress	
3/2/2004	F 3/4 Rd. and 20 1/2 Rd.	Denied	
2/9/2004	Grand Vista Dr. (26 1/2 Rd. & I Rd.)	Denied	
1/29/2004	Cheyenne Drive	Expired	
1/28/2004	Jaquette Lane	Denied	
11/19/2003	Grand Mesa Avenue	Expired	
11/14/2003	Micaelas Place	Denied	
11/6/2003	Rim Dr., S. Rim area	Expired	
10/30/2003	Northstar Dr, 2800 block	Denied	
10/24/2003	F 1/4 Rd from 29 Rd West to dead end	Denied	
10/20/2003	Lilac Lane	Denied	
9/29/2003	10th St. & Gunnison Ave.	Expired	
9/25/2003	Brookside Dr. Oxbow to Hudson Bay	Denied	
9/24/2003	Lakeside Drive	Expired	
9/24/2003	Roundup Drive	Denied	
9/22/2003	Lilac Lane	Expired	
9/22/2003	ROW Area (alley) east of 19th St.	Completed	Closure
9/17/2003	18th St. Ouray Ave. to Chipeta Ave.	Expired	
9/9/2003	29 3/8 Rd. Patterson Rd. to Darren Way	Denied	
9/5/2003	13th St. & Main St.	Expired	
8/26/2003	Mesa Ct.	Expired	
7/31/2003	Summit View Ranches	Expired	

7/21/2003	Hopi Drive	Expired	
7/8/2003	Renaissance, Tuscany, Montero	Denied	
7/8/2003	Lanai Drive	Expired	
7/7/2003	Elm Avenue 28 1/2 Rd. to 28 3/4 Rd.	Expired	
7/1/2003	Fall Valley Circle/Silver Oak Drive	Expired	
6/30/2003	24 3/4 Rd. north of G Rd.	Denied	
6/23/2003	South Rim Dr.	Expired	
6/5/2003	Starlight Dr./Faircloud Way/Kia Dr.	Expired	
5/27/2003	Walnut Ave. 7th St. to 9th St.	Denied	
5/12/2003	Horizon Glen Ct.	Denied	
4/24/2003	Mesa Avenue	Expired	
4/2/2003	Piazza Way	Expired	
3/25/2003	Kansas Avenue	Expired	
3/13/2003	Mariposa Drive	Expired	
2/28/2003	Cannell Ave. from North Ave. to Orchard Ave.	Denied	
2/5/2003	19th Street in the vicinity of Chipeta	Expired	
1/28/2003	23 Rd. & South Rim Dr.	Denied	
1/16/2003	Roundup Drive	Expired	
1/14/2003	Martello Dr.	Expired	
12/9/2002	East Parkview Dr.	Expired	
11/27/2002	Ridge Circle Dr.	Completed	Striping
11/22/2002	Walnut Ave	Expired	
11/18/2002	G Road, Horizon Dr. to 12th St.	Expired	
8/20/2002	26 Rd (1st St.) North of Patterson	Expired	
8/5/2002	Northridge Dr.	Expired	
7/31/2002	Lanai Drive	Expired	
7/19/2002	10th St. & Ouray Ave.	Expired	
7/9/2002	28 1/2 Rd. North of Patterson Rd.	Expired	
6/20/2002	Music Lane	Denied	
6/3/2002	F 3/4 Rd. and 20 1/2 Rd.	County	
5/31/2002	Ridgeway Drive	Expired	
5/17/2002	G 3/8 Rd.	Denied	
5/15/2002	Mariposa Dr.	Denied	
5/13/2002	Santa Clara Ave.	Completed	Speed Humps
5/13/2002	6th St. Pinyon Ave. to Cedar Ave.	Completed	Signs
4/11/2002	Ridge Circle Dr.	Expired	
4/5/2002	Broken Spoke & Music Lane	County	
4/1/2002	19th St., Walnut. to Bookcliff Ave.	Completed	Signs
4/1/2002	20th St., Walnut Ave. to Bookcliff Ave.	Completed	Signs

3/14/2002	Spring Valley	Expired	
3/13/2002	Kansas Avenue	Expired	
3/2/2002	S. Redlands Road	Expired	
2/7/2002	Wellington Ave. between 12th St. & 15th St. Fountainhead Blvd. Between	Expired	
7/11/2001	Entrance to Fountaingreen Project.	Denied	
3/1/2001	Standing Rock Dr. Rana Rd Between Saddle Ct. & Ridge	Completed	Speed Humps
11/6/2000	Circle Dr.	Completed	Speed Humps
6/2/1999	Chipeta Avenue 13th to 14 th	Denied	
7/9/2002	28 1/2 Rd. North of Patterson Rd.	Expired	
6/20/2002	Music Lane	Expired	
5/17/2002	G 3/8 Rd.	Expired	
5/15/2002	Austin Ct.	Denied	
5/13/2002	6th St. Orchard Ave. to Bookcliff Ave.	Expired	
4/5/2002	Broken Spoke & Music Lane Alley Between Orchard Ave & Hall Ave.	Denied	
4/1/2002	4th St. & 5th St.	Denied	
4/1/2002	19th St. Orchard Ave. to Bookcliff Ave.	Expired	
3/14/2002	Spring Valley	Expired	
2/7/2002	Wellington Ave. between 12th St. & 15th St.	Expired	
11/15/2001	15th Street Orchard Ave to Texas Ave.	Expired	
11/6/2001	23 Road & South Rim Drive	Expired	
10/15/2001	East Parkview Dr.	Expired	
8/20/2001	5th Street between Grand and North	Completed	Striping & Signs
5/16/2001	17th St. between Main and Grand	Expired	
3/12/2001	Brenna Way	Expired	
3/2/2001	Ridge Circle Dr.	Expired	
2/21/2001	Mantey Heights	Expired	
1/30/2001	Walnut Ave. 8th St. to 10th St.	Expired	
9/30/2000	Hidden Valley Dr.	Expired	
9/26/2000	South Rim Dr.	Completed	Signs
9/26/2000	27 3/8 Rd. by Eagle Rim Park G Road between 27 Road & Horizon	Expired	
8/21/2000	Drive	Expired	
7/27/2000	Independence Ranch Rd. & F 3/4 Rd.	Expired	
7/21/2000	East & West Yucatan	Completed	Signs
7/18/2000	Standing Rock Dr.	Expired	
7/6/2000	Court Road North of Orchard Avenue	Expired	

6/29/2000	Darla Jean Subdivision	Expired	
6/22/2000	Northridge Dr.	Expired	
5/1/2000	Ridgeway Drive	Completed	Striping
10/6/1999	24 3/4 Rd. from G Rd. to end of Road	Expired	
9/21/1999	Teller Ave. at Trailer Park entrance	Expired	
5/24/1999	East Harbor Circle	Expired	
	West Kennedy Ave. and 1st. Street		
5/18/1999	North Ave. to Orchard.	Expired	
			Sidewalks, bulb-outs, striping
3/15/1999	Lanai Drive	Completed	
2/5/1999	Lakeside Drive	Expired	
			Speed Humps
10/7/1998	Canyon View Dr.	Completed	
9/29/1998	East Parkview Dr.	Expired	
7/1/1998	Cannell between North and Orchard	Expired	
5/26/1998	14th Street, Gunnison to Grand	Expired	
5/5/1998	Bahamas Way	Expired	
4/25/1998	Alpine Meadows	Expired	
3/23/1998	Hall Avenue	Expired	
1/23/1998	Elm Avenue between 7th & 8th	Expired	
	Completed		14 11%
	In Progress (<i>have met current policy requirements and are proceeding</i>)		4 3%
	Pending (have sent application)		2 2%
	County		2 2%
	Denied		30 23%
	Expired		78 60%
	Total		130

Current Requests for 2005

Request Date	Location of request	Current Status	Preliminarily Qualifies
3/2/2005	Mariposa Dr.	Pending	?
12/10/2004	B 4/10 Road (Arrowhead Acres)	Pending	?
5/5/2004	Walnut Ave. & 6th St.	In Progress	Yes
4/30/2004	Hawthorn Avenue	In Progress	Yes
3/30/2004	Grand Mesa Avenue	In Progress	Yes
3/9/2004	Lanai Drive between H Rd. & Bahamas Way	In Progress	Yes

E-mail from Arvada Engineer

"Bob Manwaring" BMANWARING@ci.arvada.co.us

11/1/2004 12:05 PM

Hi Jody,

Sorry about the delay in responding.

I'm fortunate in that we have a very responsive and cooperative PD. In fact it wasn't an issue of getting them to work with us but rather the other way around. Commander Kathy Foos proposed the idea of our Trouble Traffic Task force - a committee developed to respond to chronic situations/locations that people call/write about. I was skeptical when she came and talked to me about the idea because I didn't want to "engineer" by committee. As it has turned out the committee has not delved into the engineering side of traffic problems but instead has focused on the "people" side and have been successful. Recently a neighborhood received a community grant to purchase a radar speed sign and we installed it for them. In the month or two it has been operating we have documented a reduction in all speed thresholds on that street - a major collector posted at 35mph.

The committee is composed of various staff; courts, traffic engineering, PD, City Managers's office (Vicky is the contact) and two citizens. Kathy was/is familiar with both as they went through our citizen's police academy. They have both proven to be valuable assets because they have a fresh view on these topics, they have done a lot of research (one of them dug up lots of information on the speed radar signs) and in our interaction with residents they don't come across as staff espousing the "company" line.

I should also tell you that my Council is NOT enthusiastic about the typical traffic calming measures such as speed bumps. In the five years I have been at Arvada (anniversary today!) we have not put in one bump, choker, chicane or other such device. I like speed bumps based on my experience at Lakewood but when I brought it up here it went over like a lead balloon. They had some bad experiences here with them several years ago so no one seems to be willing to go down that road again.

Hope that helps. Let me or Kathy know if you need more information.
Bob

>>> "Jody Kliska" jodyk@ci.grandjct.co.us > 9/28/2004 9:48:34 AM >>

Jody Kliska
Transportation Engineer
City of Grand Junction
970 244-1591

What's mainly wrong with society today is that too many Dirt Roads have been paved. There's not a problem in America today, crime, drugs, education, divorce, delinquency that wouldn't be remedied, if we just had more Dirt Roads, because Dirt Roads give character.

People who live at the end of Dirt Roads learn early on that life is a bumpy ride. That it can jar you right down to your teeth sometimes, but it's worth it, if at the end is home...a loving spouse, happy kids, and a dog.

We wouldn't have near the trouble with our educational system if our kids got their exercise walking a Dirt Road with other kids, from whom they learn how to get along. There was less crime in our streets before they were paved. Criminals didn't walk two dusty miles to rob or rape, if they knew they'd be welcomed by five barking dogs and a double barrel shotgun. And there were no drive-by shootings. Our values were better, when our roads were worse!!

People did not worship their cars more than their kids, and motorists were more courteous, they didn't tailgate by riding the bumper or the guy in front would choke you with dust and bust your windshield with rocks.

Dirt Roads were environmentally friendly, you didn't hop in your car for a quart of milk, you walked to the barn for your milk. For your mail, you walked to the mailbox. What if it rained and the Dirt Road got washed out? That was the best part, then you stayed home and had some family time, roasted marshmallows and popped popcorn and pony rode on Daddy's shoulders, and learned how to make prettier quilts than anybody.

At the end of Dirt Roads, you soon learned that bad words tasted like soap. Most paved roads lead to trouble, Dirt Roads more likely lead to a fishing creek or a swimming hole. At the end of a Dirt Road, the only time we even locked our car was in August, because if we didn't, some neighbor would fill it with too much zucchini. At the end of a Dirt Road, there was always extra springtime income, from when City dudes would get stuck, you'd have to hitch up a team, and pull them out....usually you got a dollar....always you got a new friend....at the end of a Dirt Road.

Paul Harvey

Memo

To: Grand Junction City Council

From: Jody Kliska, Transportation Engineer

CC: Tim Moore, Public Works Manager

Date: February 5, 2003

Re: Residential Speed Limits

Summary

At the November 4, 2002 City Council Workshop discussion ensued about the possibility of modifying the City's "default" residential speed limits from 30 MPH to 25 MPH. This memo discusses a possible change. We would make this change by amending the Model Traffic Code.

Budget

No budget impacts are anticipated.

Action Requested/Recommendations

If the Council agrees to reduce the general residential speed limit, staff will schedule an ordinance be prepared for adoption that modifies Section 1101 (2) (c) of the Model Traffic Code for Colorado Municipalities, revised 1995.

Background Information

The earliest attempts at regulating speed in the United States apparently date back to 1678 when the Colony of Rhode Island adopted a resolution against reckless riding (of either horse, mare or gelding) in reaction to a child being run down in the streets. The fine was 5 shillings, with 2 shillings paid to persons giving information regarding the speeding and the remaining 3 shillings for the use of said town. Boston's Board of Selectman attempted to protect churchgoers in 1757 when it passed an ordinance that no coach, sleigh, chair, chaise or other carriage shall at such times (on the Lord's day) be driven at a greater rate than a foot pace, with the penalty a sum of 10 shillings.

With the advent of the motor vehicle at the beginning of the 20th century, more codes and regulations have come into being for the regulation of vehicle speed. An internet search on the words speed limits yielded 1,670,000 hits on websites, indicating this is indeed a subject of interest worldwide.

The City of Grand Junction adopted the 1995 Model Traffic Code for Colorado Municipalities on December 6, 2000. Section 1101(2) (c) regulates the speed limit on

residential streets to 30 miles per hour, except when a special hazard exists that requires a lower speed. The effect of this regulation is that any residential street that does not have a different speed limit posted is 30 miles per hour.

Because most of the residential streets within the City do not have separate signs posting a different speed limit, the legal speed on most streets is 30 miles per hour. When conducting speed studies, we look at the 85th percentile speed to determine whether there is substantial compliance with the speed limit.

In reviewing traffic calming requests for neighborhood streets where there is no posted speed limit, the data often suggests there is no speeding problem because, following national standards, we define the problem based on the 85% of the traffic that is at or below the 30 miles per hour speed. Thus, according to national standards, there is no problem. This is often a frustrating and perhaps somewhat misleading statistic, especially for residents who feel their children, pets and their own safety and quality of life are threatened by vehicles traveling at speeds at or above the default speed limit. By contrast, on residential streets where there is a posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour there may be similar speed statistics but the comparison to the posted speed limit shows a much greater of percentage of vehicles exceeding the posted speed.

Staff recommends a change to a residential speed limit of 25 miles per hour within the City. For traffic calming issues, this “levels the playing field” when comparing speed data as a basis for approving or denying installation of traffic calming devices. For enforcement, the establishment of a lower speed limit may allow more activity in residential areas where complaints are received, which in turn should increase the perception by residents that their concerns about quality of life issues are being addressed. A recent informal survey by members of the Institute of Transportation Engineers indicates that a number of cities and states throughout the nation use 25 miles per hour as the default speed for residential streets. A survey of the states, conducted by MIT, shows the following breakdown of urban or residential street speed limits:

Speed Limit	# of States
None for Residential	10
25 MPH	18
30 MPH	13
35 MPH	5
20-35 MPH Range	4

In addition, there are legitimate safety concerns from residents about speeding on residential streets. Basic physics tells us that it takes a longer distance to stop a vehicle at 30 miles an hour than at lower speeds. National statistics indicate that 33% of all pedestrian accidents occur on neighborhood streets (this includes local and collector streets) and that a pedestrian has a 95% chance of surviving a crash at 20 miles per hour but only a 65% chance of surviving at 30 miles per hour. According to the Safe Kids Campaign, pedestrian injury is the second leading cause of death among children ages 5-15. The US Department of Transportation statistics indicate that

children in this age group represent 16% of the population but 30% of the injured pedestrians. It is no surprise, then, that our office receives more complaints about speeding on residential streets than any other traffic concern.

Should the Council decide to pursue a modification to the Model Traffic Code, the City Attorney's office would prepare an ordinance.

**Attach W-4
Strategic Plan Update**

TO: Mayor and City Council
FROM: David Varley, ACM
DATE: 30 March 2005
SUBJECT: March 2005 Strategic Plan Progress Report
(For discussion at City Council Workshop on 04 April 2005)

In January City Council adopted the 2005/6 Update of the City's Strategic Plan. This Plan contains 56 Objectives for 2005 and 2006. City staff is tracking the work being done on each of these Objectives and will provide regular progress reports to City Council. This is the progress report for the month of March 2005.

Staff assignments have been made and many of the teams involving the City Council have begun work on their specific goals and objectives.

GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN 2005/6 UPDATE

PROGRESS REPORT MARCH 2005



Solution

A BALANCE OF CHARACTER ECONOMY & ENVIRONMENT

2-Goal: Emphasize neighborhood and area citizen-based planning. Adhere to plans once adopted and emphasize high quality development.

OBJECTIVE 2A: Evaluate zoning and infrastructure as tools to encourage development along major corridors.

PROGRESS: (Council Members Enos-Martinez, Spehar and Palmer are on team #1 and may wish to add their comments to this report.)

Team #1 met on 08 March 2005 to work on this goal. One of the main points discussed was that opportunities may exist beyond just the TCP fund - and, in fact, if limited to the TCP fund, projects may be limited due to limited funds and upcoming project commitments (i.e. School District projects). Additional opportunities may exist with a reallocation or reassignment of CIP priorities. In addition, it was noted that Public Works has prepared a 5 year plan of anticipated projects making use of TCP funds.

A map of CIP projects and TCP projects will now be prepared. Staff will then review this in light of anticipated near term development or desired development, possible neighborhood projects and likely infill/redevelopment parcel opportunities. This information will be combined to discuss with the team at the next meeting. At this meeting Public Works will also share the TCP 5 year plan, the CIP plan for the next 10 years and the utility undergrounding program.

OBJECTIVE 2B: Explore citizen-based planning.

PROGRESS: (Council Members Enos-Martinez, Spehar and Palmer are on team #1 and may wish to add their comments to this report.)

Team #1 discussed this at their first meeting on 14 February 2005. They decided that rather than focusing on the public participation process during the preparation of area/neighborhood plans or the development review process, this concept refers to 1) honoring citizen input to the preparation of the Growth Plan and area/neighborhood plans and implementing those plans as the vision of the community; and, 2) educating citizens and getting "buy-in" that regulation can be positive for the community. Also, the City Manager's office is already working with Community Development on a public relations program about regulations, programs and staff.

GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN 2005/6 UPDATE

PROGRESS REPORT
MARCH 2005



Solution

OPEN SPACES AND COMMUNITY APPEARANCE

12-Goal: Develop and implement a plan for the beautification of entrances to the City of Grand Junction.

OBJECTIVE 12A: Identify and prioritize the entrances and gateways appropriate for beautification and design a plan that includes common elements for each.

OBJECTIVE 12B: Identify partners and commit funding for implementation.

PROGRESS: (Council Members Hill and Butler are on this committee and may wish to add their comments to this progress report.)

The Beautification Committee has met several times to discuss the landscape design of the 24 Road and I-70 interchange project. At the last meeting on 21 March 2005, the Committee accepted the Carter-Burgess final concept drawings.

Several weeks ago the Horizon Drive BID committee met and accepted the final concept drawings for the Horizon Drive and I-70 interchange project. We are now close to finalizing the conceptual phase of both interchange landscape projects. Once we know the actual construction costs for the 24 Road bridge replacement project we will know how much of the City's funds will be available for landscaping enhancements.

CDOT attended the latest Committee meeting and informed the group that the bidding of the 24 Road project has been delayed. The bid date is now June and the project will most likely be completed next spring. Once CDOT bids the project and we have actual construction costs we will be able to discuss the City's budget for landscaping.

16-Goal: Facilitate efforts that sustain the historic character of the community.

OBJECTIVE 16A: By early 2005, complete phase II of the Historic Survey.

PROGRESS:

Staff has received the draft report on this survey. Staff and two Historic Board members will review the report and forward it to the State. The State will then review and accept the report. The consultant is also finalizing the individual survey forms which will follow the same process.

PROGRESS REPORT MARCH 2005



Solution

OPEN SPACES AND COMMUNITY APPEARANCE continued

15-Goal: Re-evaluate the Parks Master Plan.

OBJECTIVE 15A: Evaluate and prioritize projects in the Parks Master Plan.

PROGRESS: (Council Members Enos-Martinez, Butler and McCurry are on this team and may wish to share their comments regarding this update.)

Team #3 is assigned to work on this Objective and they met on 09 March 2005. The team discussed these priorities for the Parks Master Plan/CIP: 1) Do Lincoln Park irrigation plan this year (est. cost \$10,000) and get it in the CIP, perhaps as early as 2006. The plan will give us a good number and the price will probably be considerably higher than the \$750,000-800,000 previously discussed; 2) Support Pear Park including the gymnasium; 3) Support Bookcliff Middle School with emphasis on the 2nd gymnasium; 4) Prepare a conceptual master plan for Bluff's West; 5) Complete Canyon View Park.

Also, the team would like to use minimal park upgrade money to install a soft path trail, trash receptacles and signage at Burkey Park if the park is annexed. And, if annexed, they would like to see incremental improvements beginning in 2006 including picnic tables, benches, shade shelter and a playground. (This could be something similar to the playground equipment program that has been on-going for about 10 years. A possible model is the manner in which Westlake Park was developed.)

The school sites at Bookcliff and Pear Park will be discussed by City Council at their lunch workshop on 18 April 2005. Also, Joe Stevens has written a memo with additional information regarding the possible Pear Park and Bookcliff partnerships with School District #51. Please see his [memo on page 7](#).

PROGRESS REPORT MARCH 2005



Solution

OPEN SPACES AND COMMUNITY APPEARANCE continued

17-Goal: Evaluate and redefine the problem and level of effort required to manage weeds.

OBJECTIVE 17A: Evaluate the problem and complete a report.

PROGRESS: (Council Members Palmer and McCurry are on this team and may wish to share their comments regarding this update.)

Team #4 has met twice to discuss this issue (March 9 & 30) and two other meetings are scheduled for April 13 and 27. Team members include Doug Cline, Bill McCurry, Gregg Palmer, Sheryl Trent, and Ivy Williams. Other participants will be invited to meetings for areas of review (legal on ordinance changes, Sam for public campaign).

The team discussed the weed program operations and possible changes to procedures on private property (first meeting), the Public Works operations on City owned properties and certain rights-of-way and potential ordinance changes. Discussion included a couple of problem areas like sidewalks in City right-of-way, but the adjacent property owners are in the County (Patterson Road, B 1/2 Road, east end of North Ave for example) and decided that the City should keep the sidewalks cleared of weeds.

The team will work with Sam Rainguet on a public education campaign for the 2005 weed season to let the public know more about what the City does to manage weeds and what the ordinance requires of the property owners. We will talk more about the components of the campaign at the next team meeting on April 13th.

Ivy Williams will work with Sheryl Trent to involve the neighborhoods in participating in the educational efforts and in promoting compliance within neighborhoods.

The team set October 1, 2005 as the date for completing a report with recommendations for City Council. The report will include recommended ordinance changes, a summary of what was accomplished over the summer and any recommended changes to operations that would impact the budget.

GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN 2005/6 UPDATE

PROGRESS REPORT
MARCH 2005



Solution

SHELTER AND HOUSING THAT ARE ADEQUATE

22-Goal: Implement results of the Affordable Housing Forum with final adoption by participating partners of a common methodology to address housing issues throughout Mesa County.

OBJECTIVE 22A: Identify and convene policy level working partners, developing and promoting public/private partnerships to address funding opportunities and relationships with existing and potential public agencies, not-for-profits and the private sector.

OBJECTIVE 22B: With professional assistance discuss and adopt a common methodology to address housing issues.

PROGRESS: (Council Members Spehar, Butler and Kirtland are on team #5 and may wish to share their comments regarding this progress report.)

Team #5 is assigned to work on this Solution Area. The team had an interview with consultant Joe Gonzales on 02 March 2005. Present at this meeting were Janet Rowland, Mesa County Commissioner; Keith Fife, Mesa County Planning Department; Bruce Hill; Jim Spehar; Harry Butler; and David Varley. The group determined that Mr. Gonzales was an appropriate choice to facilitate and mediate the policy level working group on affordable housing.

A first meeting has been set up with Mr. Gonzales for 11 April 2005 at 2:00 PM. At that time the steering group (invitees include policy level board members from the County, Grand Junction Housing Authority, Division of Housing, Housing Resources, and the cities of Fruita and Palisade) will meet and try to set some guidelines and goals for the meetings. The defining of a vision and obstacles will be the focus of that first meeting.

→Request Council approval

The Housing Team (#5) would like to reach an agreement with Mr. Gonzales, not to exceed \$25,000, for the facilitation of the policy level working group on affordable housing. The team believes that this process will take approximately eight months to complete, with a final report by December of 2005. This funding would be from the affordable housing budget as already directed by the City Council.

To: Kelly Arnold, City Manager

From: Joe Stevens, Director of Parks and Recreation

Date: March 31, 2005

Subject: Pear Park and Bookcliff Partnerships

As you are aware, School District #51 has completed schematic and design development for Bookcliff Middle and Pear Park Elementary Schools. To meet their bidding and construction schedule, the School District must move immediately to the next step which is construction documents that will be finalized by late April. To implement the revised Pear Park Elementary School Plan, with an expanded gymnasium, etc., the City will have to spend up to \$18,550 for construction documents, bidding and construction management. It is my understanding that the City will need to need to be prepared to commit an estimated \$562,000 for 4,500 +/- sq.ft of gymnasium/multi-use space as designed into the Pear Park elementary school construction document. This project does not provide an opportunity to bid at a later date. It does however have an option, once bids are open, to determine whether or not to the City wants the School District to accept bids for the expanded gym. If the answer is no, the School District will build the smaller gym at Pear Park.

At Bookcliff Middle School, the City is being asked to commit \$33,000 for construction documents. When construction documents are complete, the City will have the opportunity to determine whether or not it wishes to have School District #51 bid the 2nd gymnasium as an add alternate at the Bookcliff Middle School. If Council elects to proceed, bidding and negotiations will cost an estimated \$4,125 and construction management will cost \$16,500. If the City authorizes School District 51 to award a contract, a funding source for Bookcliff construction will need to be identified. The estimated cost to the City is \$1.3 million.

In order to keep pace with the School District and take advantage of this unusual opportunity, the City needs to commit up to \$18,550 for Pear Park and up to \$33,000 for Bookcliff. Funds are available in the CIP park development budget. The Strategic Planning Committee charged with reviewing the current parks master plan has met and identified the top three priorities as being 1) irrigation at Lincoln Park Golf Course, 2) Pear Park gymnasium and park 3) 2nd gymnasium at Bookcliff. The Parks and Recreation Advisory Board were apprised of the committee's tentative recommendations on March 17 by Council member, Cindy Enos-Martinez and Parks Chair, Bernie Goss. The Parks and Recreation Advisory Board recommends that the priority for the master plan be revised as follows: 1) Lincoln Park Golf Course Irrigation, 2) Pear Park gymnasium expansion, 3) 2nd gymnasium at Bookcliff, 4) five acre neighborhood park development at Pear Park, 5) minimal neighborhood park development at Bookcliff Middle School to compliment the 2nd gym and the outdoor school facilities. The Park and Recreation Advisory Board was of the perspective that minimal improvements could be implemented at various neighborhood parks such as Burkey (when annexed), Horizon, and the Bluffs (pending ownership transfer to the City) by utilizing park upgrade funds and some volunteer efforts by respective neighborhoods.

In summary and in order to keep the process moving forward, authorization to spend up to \$51,550 is requested. As you are aware, you, Ron Lappi, Mark Relph and I have identified funding scenarios under which these projects may come to fruition. Please let me know should you need additional information. Thanks,