



# DRAWING STANDARDS CHECKLIST

## ROADWAY PLAN & PROFILE

| ITEM         | GRAPHIC STANDARDS | OK   | NA |  |
|--------------|-------------------|--|----|--|
| SECTION VIII | A                 | Scale: 1" = 20', 30', 40', or 50' H: 1" = 2', 3', 4', or 5' V  |    |  |
|              | B                 | Sheet size: 24" x 36"  |    |  |
|              | C                 | Primary features consist only of lighting and traffic features   |    |  |
|              | D                 | Notation: All non-construction text, and also construction notation for all primary features               |    |  |
|              | E                 | Line weights of existing and proposed (secondary and primary) features per City standards                  |    |  |
|              | F                 | Location: All primary facilities are fully located horizontally and vertically                             |    |  |
|              | G                 | Horizontal control: Subdivisions and all public utilities (final drawings) tied to Section aliquot corners |    |  |
|              | H                 | Vertical control: Existing and proposed benchmarks on U.S.G.S. datum                                       |    |  |
|              | I                 | Orientation and north arrow  |    |  |
|              | J                 | Stamped and sealed drawings by registered professional competent in the work                               |    |  |
|              | K                 | Title block with names, titles, preparation and revision dates   |    |  |
|              | L                 | Reference to City Standard Drawings and Specifications   |    |  |
|              | M                 | Legend of symbols used   |    |  |
|              | N                 | List of abbreviations used   |    |  |
|              | P                 | Multiple sheets provided with overall graphical key and match lines  |    |  |
|              | Q                 | Contouring interval and extent   |    |  |
|              | R                 | Neatness and legibility  |    |  |

| ITEM | FEATURES   | Plan | Profile | OK | NA |
|------|--|------|---------|----|----|
| 1    | Use the Composite or Site Plan as a base map or otherwise provide similar information  | X    |         |    |    |
| 2    | Segmentize plan view as required to provide profiles below plan views  | X    |         |    |    |
| 3    | Show all existing and proposed profiles at $C_L$ and right and left Fls. Provide slopes with "+" or "-"  |      | X       |    |    |
| 4    | Show existing and proposed profiles at edge of pavement if there is no gutter  |      | X       |    |    |
| 5    | Note adjustment of all MH rims and valve covers for final grade  | X    |         |    |    |
| 6    | Elevation of $F_L$ at fillet/valley pan interface  | X    |         |    |    |
| 7    | Station & elevation of $F_L$ at BCRs, ECRs, and handicap ramps   | X    |         |    |    |
| 8    | Station & elevation of pavement $C_L$ and $F_L$ at endpoints, BCRs, ECRs, PCs, PTs, PRCs, and PCCs   |      | X       |    |    |
| 9    | Station & elevation at all grade changes and $C_L$ and $F_L$ VPIs, VPCs, VPTs and high & low points.   |      | X       |    |    |
| 10   | Station & elevation at all grade changes and $C_L$ pavement warp at valley pans  |      | X       |    |    |
| 11   | Provide pavement, base, and subgrade specifications  |      |         |    |    |
| 12   | Barricades, turn-arounds, tapers, delineators, driveways   | X    |         |    |    |
| 13   | Street lights, signals, signing, and other traffic controls  | X    |         |    |    |
| 14   | Show future road extension alignment to support current design, where applicable   | X    | X       |    |    |
| 15   | Provide all necessary details or reference detail and/or cross-section sheets  |      |         |    |    |
| 16   | Show proposed permanent benchmark (for new subdivisions) and all proposed horizontal control survey markers and street intersections, offset if required | X    |         |    |    |
| 17   | Space for approval signature by City Engineering with date and title.  |      |         |    |    |
|      |  |      |         |    |    |
|      |  |      |         |    |    |

### COMMENTS

1. For a definition of abbreviations used above, see page VIII-4.



December 13, 1995

KATHY  
FYI  
SENT TO  
COUNTY  
12-13-95  
P. HANLON

**REVIEW COMMENTS FOR:** Systems Inc. MCPC File C96-95  
**TYPE OF REVIEW:** Site Plan - Street, Sewer Improvements  
**REVIEWED BY:** Jody Kliska, City Development Engineer

The driveway accesses to this site need to be constructed in accordance with the City of Grand Junction standards. This means a curb cut rather than radii. The curb cuts may be widened at the street to accommodate the truck traffic evidently anticipated by the proposed design. The standard curb cut includes a transition section which negates the need for handicap ramps at the drives.

Sidewalk on Falcon Way needs to be constructed along the frontage from H Road to the curb cut on Falcon Way.

Sewer Plans - Manhole number 4 needs to include an invert in elevation for the 5' stub out.

An improvements agreement is needed for the sewer and street work. A permit from the City Engineer's office will be required prior to construction in the right of way.

The City requires four sets of street and construction plans submitted for signature prior to construction of improvements. Please do not include all of the building plans.

All comments by the County Development Engineer must also be addressed.



City of Grand Junction, Colorado  
250 North Fifth Street  
81501-2668  
FAX: (970)244-1599

January 8, 1996

Mr. Roy "Andy" Anderson  
Chamberlin Architects  
437 Main Street  
Grand Junction, Colorado 81501

RE: Systems, Inc.

Dear Andy:

We have received an improvements agreement, a check for \$122,205.00, and four sets of construction plans for the sewer and H Road improvements. Prior to signing the improvements agreement and the construction plans I need you to acknowledge and resolve the following items:

1. The drainage pipe across Falcon Way which discharges under the proposed sidewalk is not shown on the plans. This should have been addressed in the final drainage report (which was not submitted to this office) as inflow characteristics from upstream (SSID Report Checklist X-12, Section II Existing Drainage Conditions). As a condition of the approval of the roadway improvement plans, the existing pipe and any discharge from it must be dealt with. If it is determined the existing pipe is not needed, a letter from the upstream owner allowing the pipe to be plugged or removed is required.
2. Comments from the County Development Engineer have evidently not been addressed. The pertinent comments from the review dated 12-11-95 which affect the City's approval of plans include Comment 1(g)-detail the outlet in the existing roadside ditch, Comment 3(b)-pavement design shall be supported by a professional engineer, Comment 3(d)-show the transitions from the proposed road sections to the existing roads, and Comment 3(e)-provide cross-sections at H Road design. I have included with this letter copies of the City's drawing standards from the SSID Manual which highlight our requirements for plans for work in the public right of way.
3. The improvements agreement Exhibit B did not include a guarantee for the following items: City inspection fees, estimated to be about \$500 (we bill for the actual hours after acceptance of the improvements), required quality control testing, and the cost of providing as-built drawings. These items are required to be guaranteed prior to signing of the improvements agreement and issuance of any permit for work in the right-of-way.

The City Code of Ordinances Section 38-173 addresses Construction

Standards and Responsibility for all Public Improvements as follows: "The permittee under this article shall be fully responsible for the cost and actual performance of all work in the public way. The permittee shall do all work in conformance with the engineering regulations, construction specifications, and design standards adopted by the City. These standards shall apply to all work in the public way."

If you have any questions on the above, please call me. If I can provide any additional information, let me know. The contractor for the installation of the sewer line has made an application for work in the city right of way and his permit will be issued once the above items have been addressed.

Sincerely,



Jody Kliska, P.E.  
City Development Engineer

cc: Stan Kiser, Francis Constructors  
Kathy Portner, City Community Development  
Matt Osborn, County Planning  
Fred Sultan, County Development Engineer  
Walt Hoyt, City Construction Inspector



March 8, 1996

Mr. Daniel Gartner  
Chamberlin Architects  
437 Main Street  
Grand Junction, CO 81501

City of Grand Junction, Colorado  
250 North Fifth Street  
81501-2668  
FAX: (970)244-1599

RE: 3D Systems Drainage

Dear Mr. Gartner:

This letter serves as approval of the plans as submitted on March 4, 1996 for the storm sewer extension and grading of the ditch along the north side of H Road to the west. This is also a response to the letter from Bob Horrell which you hand delivered to me on March 4, 1996.

First, I want to clarify the development review process for this project is through Mesa County, not the City of Grand Junction. Our concern in this project has been the street improvements to H Road and the extension of the sewer system.

As I noted in my letter to Andy Anderson of your office on January 8, 1996, I have never received a copy of the final drainage report for this project and have not been involved in its review. Also as noted in that letter, the drainage pipe across Falcon Way should have been addressed in the drainage report as inflow characteristics from upstream as required in the City's Submittal Standards for Improvements and Developments Report Standards. Mesa County has a similar requirement in its Storm Drainage Criteria Manual, Section 302.1, which requires identification of the major drainage basins and sub-basins and off-site drainage flow pattern and impact on development.

I have contacted the City's Streets Department to unplug the existing culvert and that task should be accomplished immediately, thereby relieving your client of the cost to unplug the culvert. However, in accordance with City requirements, extension of the storm sewer is the responsibility of the developer. Because the on-site detention pond is discharging into public facilities, it is also the responsibility of the developer to make improvements as necessary to the existing facilities in order to use them. The grading of the roadside ditch is therefore also a responsibility of the development.

As noted in my January 8, 1996 letter, City Code of Ordinances Section 38-173 addresses Construction Standards and Responsibility for all Public Improvements as follows: "The permittee under this article shall be fully responsible for the cost and actual performance of all work in the public way. The permittee shall do all work in conformance with the engineering regulations, construction specifications, and design standards adopted by the City. These standards shall apply to all work in the public way."

Please notify the City Engineering Office prior to construction of the storm sewer work. A permit has been issued for construction of the sanitary sewer, but one for the storm sewer work may be required for the storm sewer, particularly if a different contractor will be doing the work.

Sincerely,



Jody Kliska, P.E.  
City Development Engineer

cc: ✓ Kathy Portner, City Community Development  
Mark Relph, Public Works Manager  
Matt Osborn, County Planning  
Fred Sultan, County Development Engineer  
Walt Hoyt, City Construction Inspector  
Doug Cline, City Streets Superintendent



To: Kathy Porter  
3D SYSTEMS

Rec'd @ CD  
6-28-96

3

Council  
DEPT HEADS  
JTKA 6/28/96  
6/28/96  
KAC  
CR

June 25, 1996

J.J. Johnston, CED  
President & Executive Director  
Mesa County Economic Development Council  
2828 Walker Field Drive, Third Floor  
Grand Junction, Colorado 81506

Dear J.J.,

This letter is to express my complete satisfaction with the fine job you and your staff have done in helping us establish a manufacturing facility in Grand Junction. You, personally, and your organization have played a very key role in the success of our project.

As I reflect on the past year it reaffirms our decision to locate our expansion facility in Grand Junction. It was in May of 1995 that we first visited Grand Junction as a prospect for relocation. In eleven months we made a decision on Grand Junction; selected a site, an architect, and a contractor; planned a 180,000 square foot facility; and completed the first of three phases - a 66,000 square foot manufacturing building. The project took tremendous coordination and I can't imagine this happening that fast in any other city regardless of its size. The cooperation we received from your organization, and the community at large, made it all possible.

As you know, we searched cities throughout the Southwest United States for a suitable location and visited both large and small potential sites. From the very beginning, Grand Junction stood out from the rest for three primary reasons. First, you and your team were the most supportive and informative of any of the Economic Development Councils, providing honest, accurate, and complete answers to our many questions. Second, Grand Junction provides a business climate equivalent of a much larger city without the negatives that most often come with a "big city" environment. Third, and certainly not least, the quality of life evident in Grand Junction will provide our employees with something not found in other cities that otherwise may be suited to our business needs.

There are two things that I find remarkable about the MCEDC in particular. About halfway through the project, your organization changed Chairpersons without missing a single step. To a "client" that was deeply involved in a major project and very dependant upon the MCEDC's support, the effects were transparent. The outgoing Chairperson, Sam Suplizio, was a key figure in demonstrating what the community has to offer from both a business and personal perspective. When Betty Bechtel stepped into the position, she continued this support culminating in the well orchestrated orientation visit that meant so much to all of our relocating employees. I suspect that such a smooth transition is not the norm in most cities, and it further demonstrates the kind of cooperation that exists in your community.

26081 Avenue Hall, Valencia, CA 91355  
Tel: (805) 295-5600 / Fax: (805) 257-1200

The second thing I find so remarkable is the continued support your organization provides well after the client is "sold". We were fortunate enough to be a company sought after by many cities. All those we contacted and visited were very eager for us to choose them for our expansion. Of course, many promises were made regarding current and future help from their organizations. I know that these promises are not always delivered. You and your organization have not only met your promises but exceeded them in all cases. It is a real pleasure to work with people with so much commitment and dedication.

We look forward to a long and prosperous relationship with you and the community. I know I speak for everyone at 3D Systems when I say, "Thank you for all you have done".

Sincerely,



Bob Horrell  
VP Operations

cc: Mark Achen; City Manager, Grand Junction  
Betty Bechtel; MCEDC  
Sam Suplizio; MCEDC

To: Kathy Portner  
Cc: Jody Kliska  
From: Trenton Prall  
Subject: 3D Systems Inc.  
Date: 7/2/96 Time: 5:21PM

All sewer facilities were constructed in accordance with City Standards and have been inspected and found to be acceptable. As-builts, inspection logs, and testing results have all been submitted and also are acceptable.

The only outstanding issue regarding the project is the payment of City inspection fees for the project. The outstanding balance in activity X09517 is \$1,108.93.

Please let me know when these fees are collected or deducted from the improvements agreement so that I can have GregT sign off on the improvements agreement release.

Thanks. TCP

acc. 10662 43312



Grand Junction Community Development Department  
Planning • Zoning • Code Enforcement  
250 North Fifth Street  
Grand Junction, Colorado 81501-2668  
(970) 244-1430 FAX (970) 244-1599

July 3, 1996

Ed Ferrier  
3D Systems, Inc.  
26081 Avenue Hall  
Valencia, CA 91355

Dear Mr. Ferrier:

City Engineering has done a final inspection of the required utility, street and drainage improvements for the 3D Systems facility at 805 Falcon Way in Grand Junction, Colorado. All improvements were constructed in accordance with the approved plans and were found to be acceptable.

Enclosed is a check for the amount you deposited with the City to guarantee the improvements, less the inspection fees of \$1,108.93 owed to the City. Thank you for your cooperation through this process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Katherine M. Portner".

Katherine M. Portner  
Planning Supervisor

MEMORANDUM

TO: Randy Booth  
FROM: Kathy Portner *KP*  
DATE: July 3, 1996  
RE: 3D Systems Release

All required improvements for 3D Systems, 805 Falcon Way have been satisfactorily completed. Please release the funds 3D Systems deposited with us as a guarantee for those improvements less the inspection fees of \$1,108.93 owed to the City.

|                       |              |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| Total Deposited       | \$122,205.00 |
| Inspection Fees       | 1,108.93     |
| Amount to be released | \$121,096.07 |

The revenue account for inspection fees is 10662-43312

July 5, 1996



David Chase  
Banner Associates, Inc  
2777 Crossroads Boulevard  
Grand Junction, CO 81506  
243-2242

City of Grand Junction, Colorado  
250 North Fifth Street  
81501-2668  
FAX: (970)244-1599

Project: 3D Systems Inc Sewer Extension

---

Subject: Final Acceptance

Dear Mr. Chase:

A final inspection of the sanitary sewer system constructed for 3D Systems Inc was conducted on March 19, 1996. As a result of this inspection, all construction pertaining to sanitary sewer was found to be satisfactorily completed.

"As Built" record drawings and required test results for the sanitary sewer facilities were received on March 27, 1996. These have been reviewed and found to be acceptable.

In light of the above, the sanitary sewer lines and appurtenances are eligible to be accepted for future maintenance by the City of Grand Junction one year after the date of substantial completion. The date of substantial completion is March 19, 1996

Your warranty obligation for all materials and workmanship, including trench settlement and any related damages, for a period of one year beginning with the date of substantial completion will expire upon acceptance by the City. If you are required to replace or correct any defects which are apparent during the period of the warranty, a new acceptance date (and extended warranty period) will be established by the City.

At the time of acceptance if any of the facilities for which you have made a warranty and for which you desire acceptance is located anywhere, other than a previously existing City right of way, you must also provide proof of good title (to be transferred to the City at the time of acceptance) as well as proof that the "New" right of way or easement is free from hazardous, toxic or other regulated materials and substances.

Thank you for your cooperation in the completion of the work on this project.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Trent Prall", is written over a horizontal line.

Trent Prall  
Utility Engineer

cc: Walt Hoyt, Senior Inspection Supervisor  
Jerry O'Brien, Persigo Treatment Facility Supervisor  
Jodi Romero, Customer Service Supervisor  
✓ Kathy Portner, Senior Planner, Community Development