

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

August 5, 2015

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction convened into regular session on the 5th day of August, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. Those present were Councilmembers Bennett Boeschstein, Martin Chazen, Chris Kennedy, Duncan McArthur, Rick Taggart, and Council President Phyllis Norris. Councilmember Barbara Traylor Smith was absent. Also present were Interim City Manager Tim Moore, City Attorney John Shaver, and City Clerk Stephanie Tuin.

Council President Norris called the meeting to order. The audience stood for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Councilmember Kennedy followed by a moment of silence.

Appointments

Councilmember Chazen made a motion to reappoint Kelly Flenniken, Sam Baldwin, and James Fleming for Three Year Terms Expiring January 2017 and Appoint Tim Moore and Kristi Pollard for Three Year Terms Expiring January 2018 all to the Grand Junction Colorado State Leasing Authority, Inc. Councilmember Boeschstein seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote.

Certificates of Appointment

To the Riverfront Commission

Gale Foster was present to receive her certificate of appointment to the Riverfront Commission for term expiring July 2018. Ms. Foster thanked the City Council for her appointment.

Citizens Comments

Bruce Lohmiller, 337 Colorado Avenue, addressed the City Council about campaign practices and how candidates are affected; he said it would be good for Mesa County to consider some of these issues. He also mentioned someone would be investigating local issues such as due diligence and the stalking law.

Jeanne Carroll, 1240 Cannell Avenue, said this was her first time speaking in front of City Council and addressed them regarding a jurisdictional issue. She said she is a native of Grand Junction (GJ) and has lived at this address for 31 years. Ms. Carroll

was concerned about accurate police reporting for both the Colorado Mesa University (CMU) and City Police Departments and wanted to ensure whichever department had jurisdiction, the process would be handled appropriately. To illustrate her concern, she recalled a May 17th incident of “extreme donuts” being made on the south side of Bunting Avenue. Ms. Carroll had never before reported this type of incident, but felt this was an extreme case. A GJ Police Officer responded and informed her that the area was not within the City’s jurisdiction; it was on CMU’s private property. She then requested a CMU officer to respond; no one from CMU came. At 7:10 a.m. on May 18th she went to CMU to speak to Andrew Rodriguez, Assistant Vice President for Auxiliary Services, to let him know the report would be transferred from the City to CMU and to show him the damage. Mark Sutton, Parking Services Manager, responded, but due to a previously negative encounter with Mr. Sutton while he was a GJ Officer, she told him to leave. Ms. Carroll asked the CMU Police Department three times for a copy of the report, but has not received one. She felt as a result of reporting the May incident, dumpsters have been parked on her property, her picket fence has been damaged, and some of her sprinkler heads have been broken by golf carts that have been driven onto her property. Ms. Carroll talked to the GJ Police Chief twice, the GJ Deputy Chief twice; she was advised to write a letter to Derek Wagner, CMU Vice President for Intergovernmental and Community Affairs, and Mr. Sutton regarding her concerns. She felt her reports have been minimalized by both Police Departments; these issues are extremely concerning to her as a property owner. Ms. Carroll said she has never had problems regarding her private property in the past, but is now seeking assistance and guidance from City Council regarding these jurisdictional issues and asked why she has not been able to obtain copies of a police report.

Interim City Manager Tim Moore said he and Councilmember McArthur met with the Carroll family and the Police Chief, but he had not received a copy of the police reports. He will follow up.

Councilmember McArthur said they would have additional conversations with the Carroll’s and open up a better line of communication.

Ms. Carroll responded to Councilmember McArthur’s comment regarding communication and said she felt like they had been left alone. She asked City Council to look at their history; they haven’t had any incidents like the one on May 17th around their home. She noted when Larry Gavin was the Parking Services Manager he notified the Carroll’s about services that would affect their property, which showed the lines of communication had been open until the May incident.

Council Comments

Councilmember Kennedy said he attended Hilltop's 65th Anniversary celebration and went on a tour of the City's Grand Mesa watershed; he appreciated seeing how the watershed is operated and maintained. He mentioned he is still working on the broadband issue.

Councilmember Chazen went to the July 30th groundbreaking of Pathways Village; this facility will provide low income housing for women and children. On July 22nd he attended a DOLA (Department of Local Authority) meeting where Staff did a good job of presenting a \$600,000 grant request for North Avenue improvements; this would augment a Federal grant. Councilmember Chazen said the search for the Downtown Development Authority Director is continuing; resumes have been reviewed and phone interviews will begin soon.

Councilmember Boeschstein said he attended the Grand Valley Regional Transportation Committee meeting on July 27th where they discussed the I-70 Business Loop; he mentioned the Colorado Department of Transportation is looking closely at this section. He went to the ribbon cutting ceremony for the Alpine Bank Electric Charging Station; the downtown area now has three stations. On July 29th Councilmember Boeschstein met with North Avenue Owners Association Area Captains, Poppy Woody and Kevin Bray, regarding renaming North Avenue and other issues. Other meetings and events he attended were the Pathways Village groundbreaking, the Grand Mesa watershed tour, the Business Incubator meeting, Colorado Riverfront Commission Trail Host meeting, and he helped tutor at the Riverside Education Center.

Councilmember McArthur said he had been in Salt Lake City and took the opportunity to meet with Lloyd Pendleton, a homeless housing consultant, and tour some homeless facilities which provided a type of mixed use housing and allowed tenants to be of different economic levels. He also went to the Club 20 summer meetings in Lake City, Hilltop's Anniversary celebration, and the watershed tour which included presentations by the Department of Natural Resources and the Forest Service.

Council President Norris said she too had attended lots of tours and meetings, but the groundbreaking for Pathways Village stood out since it is such a unique project. The project is a community-wide effort by HomewardBound, the Housing Authority, and Hilltop and will provide needed services to the tenants at the facility. This combination of housing, services, and community collaboration impressed the Governor's office enough that they sent a representative to the groundbreaking.

Consent Agenda

Councilmember McArthur read Consent Calendar items #1 through #4 and then moved to adopt the Consent Calendar. Councilmember Chazen seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote.

1. **Minutes of Previous Meetings**

Action: Approve the Minutes of the June 25, 2015 Joint Persigo Meeting, the Minutes of the April 1, 2015, July 6, 2015, and the July 27, 2015 Special Meetings, the Summaries of the July 6, 2015 and the July 13, 2015 Workshops, and the Minutes of the July 15, 2015 Regular Meeting

2. **Setting a Hearing on OneWest Outline Development Plan, Located Between 23 ¼ and 23 ¾ Roads, from G Road to Highway 6 and 50**

The applicants request approval of an Outline Development Plan (ODP) for OneWest, a Planned Development (PD) zone district with default zones of BP (Business Park Mixed Use) and C-2 (General Commercial) for approximately 177 acres, located between 23 ¼ and 23 ¾ Roads from G Road to Highway 6 and 50.

Proposed Ordinance to Zone the OneWest Development to a PD (Planned Development) Zone, by Approving an Outline Development Plan with Default Zones of BP (Business Park Mixed Use) and C-2 (General Commercial), Located at 2350 Highway 6 and 50, Between 23 ¼ and 23 ¾ Roads, from G Road to Highway 6 and 50.

Action: Introduce a Proposed Ordinance and Set a Public Hearing for August 19, 2015

3. **River Trail Subdivision Filing One Drainage Easement Vacation, Located at D Road and Green River Drive**

A request to vacate a public drainage easement covering Tracts G and H of River Trail Subdivision Filing One, located at D Road and Green River Drive, in order to proceed with the next phase of the subdivision.

Resolution No. 37-15 – A Resolution Vacating a Public Drainage Easement within River Trail Subdivision Filing One, Located at D Road and Green River Drive

Action: Adopt Resolution No. 37-15

4. **Contract for the 2015 Sewer Line Replacement Phase II Project**

This request is to award a construction contract for the Sewer Line Replacement Phase II project at various locations within the 201 Persigo boundaries to

rehabilitate aging sewer or deteriorated sewer lines. The current sewer lines to be rehabilitated are composed of either reinforced concrete or vitrified clay pipe. As a result of the infrastructure's age and damage caused by hydrogen sulfide gas, this maintenance is necessary to prolong the life of the existing sewer system.

Action: Authorize the City Purchasing Division to Enter into a Contract with Insituform Technologies, LLC of Littleton, CO for the 2015 Sewer Line Replacement Phase II Project for the Bid Amount of \$620,875

ITEMS FOR INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION

Public Hearing – Colorado Mesa University (CMU) Rights-of-Way Vacation, Located within the CMU Area

Colorado Mesa University (CMU) requests approval to vacate portions of Cannell, Bunting, Kennedy, Elm, Texas, Hall Avenues, and parts of alleys adjacent to CMU owned properties.

Councilmember Chazen described his relationship with CMU as an instructor at Western Colorado Community College; the connection to this issue is remote but he left it to Council to decide if he should recuse himself.

Councilmember Taggart said he too is a part time instructor at CMU and wanted it made known.

Councilmember McArthur said although it is not legally required for Councilmembers Chazen and Taggart to be recused, due to public perception, he felt both should withdraw.

Councilmember Boeschstein said the test should be whether an independent decision could be made; this vacation request doesn't relate to their jobs. They should be allowed to decide; he has no objection to either participating.

Councilmember Kennedy agreed with Councilmember Boeschstein and would like to leave the decision up to Councilmembers Chazen and Taggart.

Council President Norris said she was concerned about public perception and had recused herself if she felt it would be seen as having any type of influence. She personally felt they should recuse themselves since they have a connection to CMU, but would leave the decision up to them.

Councilmember Chazen asked City Attorney Shaver if he recused himself, would there be a quorum. City Attorney Shaver said if four members voted one way it would be a majority, but if there was a split decision it would not carry; the vote would need unanimity.

Councilmember Chazen said he had recused himself in the past regarding appropriations of cash payments to CMU and decided to recuse himself for both CMU items. He left the room.

Councilmember Taggart chose not to recuse himself.

Scott D. Peterson, Senior Planner, presented this item and described the proposed vacation of rights-of-way adjacent to CMU owned properties.

Mr. Peterson said this application was remanded back to City Staff and CMU for further review at the June 23rd Planning Commission (PC) meeting in order to address various issues raised during the public hearing which were lack of dust control, lack of on-going maintenance, lack of timely cooperation with the Fire Department (FD) regarding turning radius requirements in existing parking lots, and failure to update the PC on CMU's future development plans.

The applicant held a Neighborhood Meeting on March 3, 2015; twenty-eight +/- area residents attended. The applicant provided a presentation which included updates on various activities across campus and information regarding the most recent right-of-way vacation process. After the meeting, when the formal request for vacations were received by the City for review, several area residents submitted letters/emails/phone messages voicing concerns regarding the existing conditions in the area from the previous vacation request and how the newly proposed vacation requests would impact the area. The Staff report contains the correspondence received.

Mr. Peterson reviewed the site location map which showed the proposed areas for vacation. He then showed an aerial view and noted some of CMU's expansion plans. At the July 14, 2015 PC meeting, CMU submitted a proposal to address the concerns of the PC and public; the PC found the request met criteria and recommended conditional approval that stated the City shall retain a utility easement over all of the right-of-way areas and alleys. Staff's assessment is that the proposed vacations would not impede traffic, pedestrian movement, access to private property, or obstruct emergency accesses. Specific improvements CMU agreed to are: to asphalt pave the fire access lanes to a minimum of 20' wide to meet City standards, comply with FD requirements, asphalt pave a new parking lot north of Bunting Avenue, apply mag chloride to unpaved parking lots as needed and asphalt pave the apron areas of the parking lots to help control dust and contain the spread of gravel.

Mr. Peterson said CMU had concerns regarding Paragraph 2 of the Staff report; the FD's requirement for CMU to submit plans in advance of any construction. CMU President Tim Foster will address these concerns in his presentation; Derek Wagner, CMU Vice President for Intergovernmental and Community Affairs and Fire Marshall Chuck Mathis were also present to answer any questions.

Councilmember McArthur noted the PC had some concerns and asked Mr. Peterson to outline those. Mr. Peterson said the PC had two public hearings and there was considerable neighborhood input which included concerns about the condition of the parking lots that were part of previous vacations; lack of dust control and maintenance. In response to the concerns, the PC remanded this request back to Staff and CMU. CMU returned with a proposal to asphalt pave all fire access lanes. Councilmember McArthur noted this request was only for the vacations; the City has no jurisdiction over the site plan review. In his opinion, there is a distinct lack of buffering that has led to neighborhood conflicts. In the case of the Carroll's, there was an alley that provided access to their garage that is now reconstituted asphalt and also provides access to parking lots. He asked if these vacations would produce similar situations.

Mr. Peterson said this request is only areas that are adjacent to CMU owned properties and the public will be able to utilize the fire access lanes. Councilmember McArthur said he understood the City's jurisdiction is limited to the vacation process, but felt a broader line of communication is needed in order to address ongoing citizen concerns.

Councilmember Kennedy asked how it was decided mag chloride would be used for dust control. Mr. Peterson said CMU decided to use recycled asphalt parking lots because they are temporary and they had used mag chloride in the past. Councilmember Kennedy asked if the neighborhoods should be notified prior to its application. Mr. Peterson said the City had no input regarding that.

Councilmember Taggart asked Mr. Peterson to define controlled versus owned as it was used in the Staff report. Mr. Peterson explained there were a few private properties that had not been purchased prior to the submittal of CMU's application; they are in the negotiation process now. Councilmember Taggart asked for clarification regarding who would be able to use the circulation drives; would they be restricted to neighborhood residents and emergency vehicles or would they also be open to public. Mr. Peterson said they would be open to everyone.

Council President Norris noted CMU owns the adjacent properties to the requested vacation areas, and then asked how access to the private properties located beyond those areas would be affected. Mr. Peterson said access would still be available; residents could come directly from 7th Street or use the paved fire access lanes to the east.

Council President Norris asked if Staff was comfortable with the current proposal for fire and rescue access and if CMU would work with the FD and Staff on their future expansion to ensure access. Mr. Peterson said the FD visited the campus weekly and notified CMU if any access is blocked or impaired. As CMU purchases more property, they will return to the City to request additional rights-of-way vacations.

CMU President Tim Foster then addressed some issues and assumptions. He said CMU met twice a year with neighbors to review CMU's plans and take their input, which he felt went above and beyond. He said CMU had a contract with the City for their police force, so if CMU is called, a GJ Officer would respond. President Foster gave a presentation on CMU's exhaustive Master Plan and the properties they had purchased. He said CMU had only purchased properties from willing sellers, which has left a spotty pattern of ownership and no buffer zone in some areas. He noted this had been very expensive area to buy homes; most had asbestos and needed to be demolished. CMU spent over \$16 million buying houses; the City contributed \$4.5 million toward that effort. Without the ability to expand, CMU would not have had the significant growth in enrollment; this continues to be a concern. The lack of student housing has made it necessary to place some students in area hotels; construction of a new residence hall is contingent on this request. President Foster then said CMU has an issue with Paragraph 2 and if it is not removed they will withdraw the application and forgo the new housing that is scheduled to begin in January. Paragraph 2 stated CMU must have their plans reviewed and approved by the FD before any new buildings are constructed; CMU has been building for the last 18 years and he felt the current arrangement works well. Also contingent on this vacation request being approved is a request CMU submitted to the state legislator for new engineering and nursing buildings as well as paving some parking lots. He reviewed CMU's communication efforts and commented it was difficult to talk to some folks when they wouldn't allow CMU to come onto their property. He also explained CMU's difficulty in maintaining parking lots during the school year.

Council President Norris asked Mr. Peterson to read Paragraph 2. Mr. Peterson said Paragraph 2 is under City Fire Department Review of Rights-of-Way Vacation Request and read.

Construction drawings regarding fire apparatus roads and water supplies shall be submitted to the Fire Department for review and acceptance prior to any construction activities to include the demolition of existing street networks or the construction of new university buildings.

Councilmember Boeschstein asked Fire Marshal Mathis to explain.

Chuck Mathis, Fire Marshall, said that comment is typical and is included in almost all documents, including those for City and County buildings; CMU is different in that they wouldn't go through a complete site plan assessment. Questions they seek to address with this are: is there enough water, are there enough hydrants, would the FD have access, and are there any dead ends streets. To CMU's credit they have done a great job across campus; the FD works well with CMU and they work well with the FD. This is a work in progress and while the wording implies full construction drawings, in CMU's case, he would understand it to mean site plan drawings that show connectivity and

ways around the buildings, nothing more specific as long as they continue to adhere to current standards.

Councilmember Boeschstein asked if this meant no construction could begin without the FD having reviewed completed plans.

Fire Marshall Mathis said there were two processes. One is the building construction and the second is a site plan which is similar to what President Foster showed when he pointed out where new buildings would be located. These could also be used to show hydrant locations; it would not take an extensive period of time to review and if the plan was good, it could be fast tracked to take only a couple of days which would allow the FD to make suggestions since they may see something the architect did not.

President Foster said this is the collaborative process that is currently being used and it has worked well; CMU and the FD have the same goal.

Council President Norris asked how a change could be made to move this forward.

City Attorney Shaver said this is within Council's purview and it would also be appropriate for them to address the Findings of Facts/Conclusions and Conditions; #5 under this section gave him pause just as Mr. Foster had an issue with Paragraph #2 under the FD's proposed conditions. Number 5 states, "CMU has agreed to meet all Grand Junction Fire Department requirements as identified within this application". He was unsure how #5 related to #2; this would need to be addressed.

Council President Norris said it needed to be clarified.

City Attorney Shaver said it would be important to clarify and from his perspective, the interplay between #2, the proposed, and #5, the final, which is not clear.

Councilmember McArthur asked if the City could assume any liability if this requirement is waived and there was a fire.

City Attorney Shaver said liability is subject to a lot of other factors that may occur; independent of the language; that potential is always there.

Councilmember Taggart asked why this would be included in a vacation request and if it should be struck rather than modified.

City Attorney Shaver said Mr. Foster believed it should be struck, but Mr. Mathis thought there were reasons for it to be included; if it is unclear, the solution may be to strike it.

Councilmember Kennedy said he agreed with Mr. Foster's interpretation. He then asked what the language was in the previous vacation ordinance. He would prefer to strike it rather than modify it.

Councilmember McArthur said this vacation appeared to modify the fire protection access to the area; therefore making new accommodations should be part of the plan.

Councilmember Boeschstein noted Mr. Mathis said he would accept sketch drawings; maybe the language should reflect that instead.

Council President Norris asked Mr. Foster if he had a preference.

Councilmember McArthur said this vacation modified fire protection access and that is why Mr. Mathis thought it necessary to include this comment.

Mr. Mathis explained the FD typically looks at access when a building is being constructed and this comment was typical language; it would pertain to this vacation because the approval may lead to construction.

Councilmember McArthur asked if the existing houses would still have fire protection access. Mr. Mathis said those houses would not be affected at this time.

Council President Norris said according to Mr. Foster the plan was to build, but this is a long term project and that could change. She asked if each new building plan would be reviewed at the time of construction.

Mr. Foster said each new building would be subject to the International Fire Codes and the Fire Marshal would review the plans and inspect the building as part of the process. In answer to Councilmember McArthur question, the fire protection access had already been addressed and was reflected in the drawings that were shown. He said in terms of language, Paragraph 4 captured what historically had been done and done successfully.

Councilmember McArthur asked if the Fire Marshal was comfortable striking Paragraph 2 and relying on Paragraph 4 or if he felt Paragraph 2 should be modified.

Mr. Mathis said he would prefer if Paragraph 2 were modified; access could change for a variety of reasons. He suggested "lightening" the language by removing "stopping construction".

Councilmember Boeschstein asked what Mr. Mathis would like it to say.

Councilmember Kennedy commented since this is not a building plan or construction document he was not in favor of modifying Paragraph #2.

Mr. Mathis said he was concerned that fire lanes would be affected if a building were demolished.

Councilmember Taggart asked if Paragraph #4 could be modified by adding "demolish".

City Attorney Shaver said he felt the real question was whether this was applicable to construction activities; generally speaking if Paragraph #2 was deleted there could be an argument that it is redundant based upon Paragraph #4 under Final Conditions.

Dan Robinson, CMU Trustee, said the written language is important; he felt it would be better to delete Paragraph #2 because it does nothing to improve the relationship that had been demonstrated over time. CMU has done everything it can to address fire access and lanes. Paragraphs 1, 3, and 4 addressed everything needed; he urged Council to exclude Paragraph #2 and rely on Paragraphs 1, 3, and 4. He thanked Council for their support.

Council President Norris asked Mr. Mathis if his concern regarding demolitions would be addressed if the language was changed in Paragraph #4.

Mr. Mathis had no objection.

The public hearing was opened at 8:36 p.m.

Ken Harris, 1707 Cannell Avenue, lives next door to the next proposed dorm building. According to the drawing, the proposed alignment would necessitate Texas and Elm Avenues to be vacated in order to finish the complex, which he is in favor of. He felt everyone would be satisfied if the vacations were limited to those two streets and their adjacent alleys. He noted several businesses use Cannell and Mesa Avenues for access; about fifty cars a day access the Little Lambs Day Care and he uses Cannell Avenue for work and errands. He suggested putting in a temporary cul-de-sac at Elm and Texas Avenues to allow a turnaround for emergency vehicles. He felt the request should be resubmitted; this is a big area and he would like to see Garfield Hall finished.

Andy Ford, 860 Kennedy Avenue, said each of the Planning Commissioners were opposed to granting approval to CMU without conditions. He said the spirit of the meeting was that the Commissioners had made a mistake before by approving a vacation to CMU carte blanche and they did not want to make the same mistake. The result, to Staff's credit, was to have CMU pave a fire access lane on Cannell Avenue. However, what he heard tonight from CMU President Foster was that there has been a successful collaborative relationship between CMU, the City, the FD, and the neighborhood; this was not the unanimous view of the PC. He also said, contrary to President Foster, CMU has a great abundance of parking lots; they are everywhere and largely empty. If CMU needed to make a change in their paving schedule, he felt it could be done; it would just not be CMU preference. He then said the alley behind his house is narrow, and the custom of the homeowners has been to place their fences about a foot in from their alley property line to allow trash and maintenance trucks access; he then asked why CMU placed "jersey bumpers" (used to define the parking lot perimeters) on the property line. He said if they would move the bumpers in like the individual property owners did with their fences, it would allow better traffic movement in the alleys.

Clark Carroll, 1240 Cannell Avenue, agreed with President Foster in that he does not want to lose sight of CMU being an asset to the community and young people. With guarded optimism that the City and CMU will succeed in managing the impacts well, he is in favor of the vacation and hoped citizen concerns would be reviewed and situations monitored. He also hoped complaints brought forward to the authorities would be accurately and thoroughly documented and managed. He also commented that about eight years ago the Clean Air Division suggested the use of mag chloride as a dust suppressant, but he would also like to see a 5 m.p.h. limit imposed in the parking lots and have air quality monitoring devices installed; the new technology is better and not very expensive. He felt the City should take an active role, but felt the problems are real fixable. He suggested having a citizen's advocacy committee formed with CMU so CMU could be informed of issues in order to resolve them sooner.

There were no other public comments.

The public hearing was closed at 8:46 p.m.

Councilmember McArthur appreciated the public comments and President Foster's presentation. He said it was apparent there is still some conflict with the area residents that need to be addressed, but also understood the difficulty if those concerned didn't communicate or attend meetings. However, this request is for a vacation and he will limit his vote to that issue.

Councilmember Boeschstein agreed with Councilmember McArthur and felt a lot of the neighborhood issues could easily be solved by CMU. He noted CMU is part of the Economic Development Plan and the community would be short changed if it didn't have CMU, although it is difficult for those in the neighborhoods where CMU is expanding. He will vote in favor of this request if Paragraph #2 is removed.

Councilmember Kennedy agreed with Councilmember Boeschstein; he will vote in favor also if Paragraph #2 is removed and the verbiage regarding demolishing is added.

Council President Norris commented that the City has contributed a lot of money to CMU and that they have been working together for 20 years. She is glad to see the expansion happening and she will support the vacation with the changes noted by Councilmember Kennedy.

Councilmember McArthur said the benefits CMU provides to the community are obvious, but it does not make the property rights of the residents expendable; they have every right to enjoy the privileges of what is possibly the largest investment of their lives and those rights need to be maintained in cooperation with CMU.

Council President Norris said she did not feel anyone was questioning the neighbors' property rights, but this request is to vacate streets adjacent to CMU owned properties.

Ordinance No. 4673 – An Ordinance Vacating Portions of the Cannell, Bunting, Kennedy, Elm, Texas, Hall Avenues, and Associated Alley Rights-of-Way and Retaining a Utility Easement, Located in the Colorado Mesa University Area

Councilmember Boeschstein moved to adopt Ordinance No. 4673 on final passage and ordered it published in pamphlet form with the deletion of Paragraph 2 and the addition of demolition wording to Paragraph 4. Councilmember Kennedy seconded the motion. City Attorney Shaver suggested also changing the text of the ordinance in Paragraph 4 and incorporating the noted changes into the ordinance. Councilmember Boeschstein accepted the amendment. Councilmember Kennedy seconded the amendment. Motion carried by roll call vote on the amended ordinance.

Council President Norris called for a break at 8:53 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 9:02 p.m.

Public Hearing – 2015 Third Supplemental Appropriation Ordinance – Colorado Mesa University

This request is to appropriate certain sums of money to defray the necessary expenses and liabilities of the accounting funds of the City of Grand Junction based on the 2015 budget amendment for contribution to the Colorado Mesa University (CMU) Campus Expansion Project.

Jodi Romero, Financial Operations Director, presented two supplemental appropriations and described the budget amendments.

Councilmember McArthur asked where these appropriations fit into the budget.

Ms. Romero said the funds were savings carried forward from the 2014 Budget. Councilmember McArthur asked how much was carried forward. Ms. Romero said over a \$1 million.

Councilmember McArthur asked from where the additional funds for Horizon Drive would come. Ms. Romero said that would be discussed during the 2016 Capital Planning.

Council President Norris clarified that during the 2015 Budget process it was decided to hold off on paying this item and the next item and to review them mid-year; it was decided in July there was enough money to pay for both of these.

Councilmember Boeschstein echoed Council President Norris and noted sales tax had increased making things like this possible. Ms. Romero confirmed sales tax was

above last year's and the use tax is also strong, but these funds were a carryforward from 2014.

Councilmember Kennedy said he recognized that the expansion of CMU was community development and a part of the ED plan; it is a good use of City money and he will continue to support these projects.

The public hearing was opened at 9:07 p.m.

Lena Elliot spoke on behalf of CMU and thanked City Council for the support they have given in the past and she hoped the future. She said CMU was always knocking at Council's door and the truth is CMU depends on the City; they would not be here without their help. She asked to be forgiven for being so passionate and not slowing down; she hoped their support would continue.

Duke Wortman, Chair of the Hilltop Board, said he has supported CMU and appreciated all the years of support from Council. The institution has grown in his heart and it is a great place which made it easy to recommend to others.

There were no other public comments.

The public hearing was closed at 9:12 p.m.

Ordinance No. 4674 – An Ordinance Making Supplemental Appropriations to the 2015 Budget of the City of Grand Junction

Councilmember Kennedy moved to adopt Ordinance No. 4674 on final passage and ordered it published in pamphlet form. Councilmember Boeschenstein seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote.

Public Hearing – 2015 Second Supplemental Appropriation Ordinance

This request is to appropriate certain sums of money to defray the necessary expenses and liabilities of the accounting funds of the City of Grand Junction based on the 2015 budget amendment for the implementation of wage adjustments in accordance with the City's Class and Compensation Market Study.

Councilmember Chazen returned to the meeting.

Jodi Romero, Financial Operations Director, presented this item and described the budget amendments for the wage adjustments in accordance with the City's Class and Compensation Market Study. During last year's budget preparation, it was decided to bring this item forward mid-year for consideration. She then explained the market survey compensation plan.

Councilmember Chazen asked what the total market adjustment was. Ms. Romero said it was just over a million dollars. Councilmember Chazen then asked if it included wages and benefits to which Ms. Romero answered affirmatively. He then asked her to describe what the wage adjustment was for. Ms. Romero explained a wage evaluation was conducted; 513 positions were under market and required an adjustment ranging from 1.25% to 7.5% and the average pay increase was 3.1%. This request would be for 366 positions that remained under market after the first adjustment and would require a wage adjustment ranging from 1.25 to 3.75%.

Council President Norris commented that when she started with Council, public safety was understaffed; one reason being wages were not at market. This will help keep the City stable and the ordinance needs to be adopted; it is not an across the board increase, it is only for those that are not at a competitive rate.

Councilmember Boeschstein agreed with Council President Norris' comments. City employees are extremely loyal and hardworking and deserve fair pay; this is based on a fair compensation study.

The public hearing was opened at 9:15 p.m.

There were no public comments.

The public hearing was closed at 9:17 p.m.

Ordinance No. 4675 – An Ordinance Making Supplemental Appropriations to the 2015 Budget of the City of Grand Junction

Councilmember Taggart moved to adopt Ordinance No. 4674 on final passage and ordered it published in pamphlet form. Councilmember Boeschstein seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote.

Contract for Storage Area Network System Arrays

The Information Technology Division would like to enter into a contract with Sanity Solutions, Inc. for the purchase of three storage array systems, professional installation services, and related support and maintenance agreements for an amount of \$99,766. The new systems will replace two NexSan Storage arrays that have reached end of life with three new storage arrays with the specialized configurations needed to support three different computing environments.

Jim Finlayson, Information Technology (IT) Director, presented this item. Mr. Finlayson explained network storage is a critical component of the City's computer infrastructure. The two existing storage arrays to be replaced through this procurement were purchased in 2009 and 2010 and have reached the end of their reliable and supported life cycles. The IT Fund accrues funds for replacement systems; the necessary funds

have been accrued and a formal procurement process was completed. He felt the best solution and value for the City would be from Sanity Solutions, Inc. This replacement system would have three storage arrays and provide 95 Terabyte's (TB) worth of data storage with expansion capabilities of up to 200 TB; their life expectancy is five to six years.

Councilmember Chazen noted this is a tremendous amount of data and asked if backup provisions have been made. Mr. Finlayson said the current backup systems will accommodate the additional data; those systems are also on scheduled replacement programs; they will be replaced with accrued IT funds when needed.

Councilmember Kennedy asked if any local vendors were approached or was the type of storage needed not available locally. Mr. Finlayson said they did not specifically look for local vendors but it was a fully competitive bid and bids were welcomed from any and all vendors. However, this type of storage is not something that would typically be purchased locally; if so, they would probably be a reseller for a larger company.

Councilmember Kennedy asked if Sanity Solutions, Inc. would configure the system to meet the City's specific needs or would they manufacture the systems. Mr. Finlayson said Sanity Solutions, Inc. would configure and help install the systems manufactured by NexScan, an industrywide known storage provider. Councilmember Kennedy asked if he felt the 95 TB storage would be enough to carry the City forward for five years. Mr. Finlayson said based on the rate of growth, he did not think so, but the systems are expandable and can be ramped up as needed. Councilmember Kennedy asked what the life cycle of the system is. Mr. Finlayson said Sanity Solutions, Inc. estimated five to six years which is pretty typical.

Councilmember McArthur asked if the request was for hardware and software. Mr. Finlayson said this would primarily be for hardware but there was a software operating system associated with it. Councilmember McArthur asked how big the system would be. Mr. Finlayson said, even though there would be a lot of storage, it would fit on a 2' by 3' rack. Councilmember McArthur asked if it would fit in the current storage area. Mr. Finlayson said although it would fit in the current storage area, IT was in the process of relocating the center because it was almost out of space and the weight of the equipment was now greater than the second floor capacity.

Councilmember Chazen made a motion to authorize the Purchasing Division to enter into a contract with Sanity Solutions, Inc. for the purchase of storage arrays in the amount of \$99,766. Councilmember Kennedy seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote.

Non-Scheduled Citizens & Visitors

There were none.

Other Business

There was none.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:27 p.m.

Stephanie Tuin, MMC
City Clerk