

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

MEMORANDUM

*Rite*

Reply Requested  
Yes  No

Date  
Dec. 1, 1978

To: (From:) Conni McDonough From: (To:) Ron Rish  
Development Director City Engineer-Public Works

Subject: Proposed "Mesa County Standard Specification for  
Road and Bridge Construction"

As requested at the County Road Standards Committee meeting on November 27, 1978, I have reviewed the proposed specifications and offer the following comments for your consideration:

1. I wish to compliment you and the committee for deciding to recommend adoption of equivalent urban standards for Grand Junction and the urbanizing unincorporated areas of Mesa County. It is my strong opinion that policies such as this will do a great deal towards alleviating future operational and maintenance problems for the City and therefore will result in better city services for the public at lower costs.
2. Adoption of Colorado Division of Highways construction specifications is very good. The City has been operating on this basis for at least 2 years and the resulting quality has been very good. Contractors are very comfortable with these proven specifications and acceptance by all should be very good since now they clearly know what is expected on every public works project no matter whether it is State, County or City work.
3. Calling for pavement section thickness designs based on soils tests is a very responsible policy. Soils vary greatly through the valley so pavement thickness should be based on site conditions to assure an adequate and also economical pavement.
4. Providing the same right of way for rural streets as will be needed for urban streets if and when future urbanization takes place is a very forward thinking, responsible and courageous policy action. Urban street hardware can be added in the future if adequate right of way is provided and private improvements are installed with the knowledge of the street possibly being improved in the future.
5. I feel it is extremely important that both the County Commissioners and City Council adopt Street Development Standards. The fact that they both may be the same is also just great in my opinion. We need adopted standards as an "anchor" to help the staff administer policies more consistently to all. Standards can and probably should be revised periodically based on experiences to make them the best tool possible to best serve the public interests. Modifying the standards from time-to-time and being willing to always consider exceptions to the standards is a lot different from not having adopted standards. Everyone needs to be working

## CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

## MEMORANDUM

Reply Requested

Yes  No 

Date

Dec. 1, 1978To: (From:) Conni McDonough From: (To:) Ron RishProposed "Mesa County Standard Specification for Road and Bridge Construction" (page 2)

with the same hardware "anchor". Also, the flexibility and judgement references in the text of the standards are very important so the staff doesn't become overly rigid in administering standards and/or use the standards or "regulations" to avoid legitimate issues.

6. The following minor review comments result from my detailed study of the documents following our November 27, 1978, Committee meeting:
- a. I recommend you consider revising the title to "Street and Road Development Standards and Construction Specifications for Road and Bridges". The term "specifications" is usually taken to mean the detailed construction instructions to contractors whereas "standard" is a term which better applies to planning and design.
  - b. On page 7, the right of way widths should be revised to fit those decided on at the committee meeting. I also recommend a section for "court" be added to Exhibit B.
  - c. On page 7, the first sentence of section E. Parking seems to conflict with the on-street parking lanes shown on the minor-arterial, urban, on Exhibit A.
  - d. I recommend you consider a fence height limit for the off-street pedestrian and bike ways as you suggested at the committee meeting. Otherwise the resulting fence "tunnels" may be a security and aesthetics nuisance.
  - e. Pages 8 and 9 are reversed.
  - f. References in Sections H and I should include "A Policy on Geometric Design of Rural Highways" as the appropriate reference for rural arterials.
  - g. On page 14, Section D.3c, I recommend inclusion of those construction tests and frequency of testing to be required. Enclosed for your use as an example is a copy of the City specifications requirements which we have found to be adequate and accepted by all. I suggest this matter be discussed with Bill Benson.

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

MEMORANDUM

Reply Requested

Yes  No

Date

Dec. 1, 1978

To: (From:) Conni McDonough From: (To:) Ron Rish

Proposed "Mesa County Standard Specification for Road and Bridge Construction" (page 3)

- h. I assume the revisions to Exhibits A and B discussed at the committee meeting will be made. I also suggest you consider 5 foot sidewalks on the Urban Collector to make it consistent with proposed City Standards.
- i. I have discussed the water meter location question with several city staff people including Duane Jensen and we feel the meters belong outside the sidewalks but not necessarily on public right of way.
- j. As discussed at the committee meeting, I recommend the "Private Roadways" section shown on Exhibit B be deleted and no reference be made in the "Standards" to private roadways.
- k. The references in the General Notes on Exhibit C to the "City" and "City Engineer" should probably be revised to "County" and "County Engineer".

Conni, I really appreciate the position you have taken on our community's street standards and am willing to help explain any details or reasoning to anyone. If I can help you in any way in presenting the proposed policies to the Commissioners, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Enclosure

cc - Del Beaver  
Bill Benson  
Jim Patterson  
Jim Wysocki