

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO  
MEMORANDUM

Reply Requested  
Yes  No

Date

May 21, 1982

To: (From:) Jim Patterson

From: (To:) Ron Rish

Subject: Mesa County Policy Statement Proposed by Eric Kelly

As requested, I have reviewed the above and have the following comments:

1. Shouldn't the paragraph concerning availability of drinking water (page 1) include Grand Junction in the list of "operators" who serve the County with potable water?
2. In the section on minimum fire flows (page 2) the words "urbanizing area" and "reasonable distance" are used in the context of being parameters to determine whether certain actions will or will not be taken (ie "go-nogo" choices) without attempting to define these terms or who will make said definitions. In my opinion these are tremendous "loop-holes".
3. The section on standards for street widths is interesting. I find it notable that this "policy statement" devotes more words to this single item than any other "policy" issue. I assume the width of the streets is therefore perhaps the single most important planning issue facing Mesa County.

It is my opinion that most of the information in this section does not belong in a "policy statement". The establishment of standards for public infrastructure hardware is not a "policy statement". These matters deserve specialized technical expertise such as Professional Engineering which I doubt if Mr. Kelly possesses.

The document "Residential Streets - Objectives, Principles and Design Considerations" which Mr. Kelly references is a good guideline document and in fact is listed in the bibliography of the City of Grand Junction Street Development Standards which were adopted by the City Council on December 6, 1978. However, the extraction by technically unqualified people of out-of-context details for inclusion in this "policy statement" is an ill-advised practice.

The stated opinion that "City of Grand Junction standards require streets that are unnecessarily wide" has no place in a Mesa County "policy statement". I suggest this be deleted in the interest of objectivity and civility. Incidentally, Mr. Kelly has never spoken to me on any occasion about anything let alone a detail such as the basis of street widths.

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO  
MEMORANDUM

Reply Requested

Yes  No

Date

May 21, 1982

To: (From:) Jim Patterson

From: (To:) Ron Rish

*RRR*

Mesa County Policy Statement Proposed by Eric Kelly (page 2)

It is essential that Arterial and Collector street standards for Mesa County and Grand Junction match. In my opinion, Mesa County's choice of Local street standards is their business. We have valid reasons for what we recommend and I assume they will also.

4. The section on time limits (page 9) states roads must be completed within one year of approval of Final Plat. It seems to me that developer-furnished utilities such as sewers and waterlines are at least as important as roads. Why are these important items not addressed?
5. The section on drainage requirements (page 9) includes the statement that the "natural" approach is less expensive than curb and gutter. This is a categorical statement which is not based on fact. The economics involved depend on the physical circumstances of the site-specific situation including such ramifications as space requirements and land-costs. This kind of unsubstantiated out-of-context opinion does not belong in a "policy statement". Mesa County deserves more depth in this important document.

cc - Jim Bragdon  
John Kenney  
Ralph Sterry  
Jim Wysocki  
File