

**FRUITA CITY COUNCIL  
REGULAR MEETING  
DECEMBER 1, 2015**

**1. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Invocation was given and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

**2. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Council members present were Bruce Bonar, Mel Mulder, Kyle Harvey, Stacey Mascarenas, Joel Kincaid and Bob Fuller. Mayor Buck called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Mayor Buck asked if there were any corrections or additions to the agenda. City Manager Mike Bennett stated that there were not.

**3. AGENDA – ADOPT/AMEND**

- **COUNCILOR BONAR MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED. COUNCILOR MULDER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION PASSED WITH SIX YES VOTES.**

**4. PROCLAMATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**

There were no Proclamations or Presentations on the agenda.

**5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Jr. Vice Commander of the American Legion and Fruita resident Lou Brackett stated that December 7, 2015 is officially “Remember Pearl Harbor Day” and the Legion Post has planned to hold a candlelight vigil at the Veteran’s Memorial Park at the Fruita Civic Center beginning at 7:00 p.m. The public is invited.

**6. CONSENT AGENDA**

- A. ORDINANCE 2015-16 – SECOND READING – A REQUEST TO APPROVE AN ORDINANCE REPEALING AND REENACTING SECTION 9.01.034 OF THE FRUITA MUNICIPAL CODE CONCERNING PEDDLING AND SOLICITATION AND REPEALING SECTION 9.01.037 OF THE FRUITA MUNICIPAL CODE CONCERNING LOITERING**
- B. ORDINANCE 2015-17– SECOND READING – A REQUEST TO APPROVE AN ORDINANCE REPEALING SECTION 2.19.030 OF THE FRUITA MUNICIPAL CODE CONCERNING CANDIDATE NOMINATION PROCEDURES FOR MAIL BALLOT ELECTIONS**

Mayor Buck opened the Consent Agenda for public comments, of which there were none.

Mayor Buck brought the Consent Agenda back to the Council for any comments or questions.

- **COUNCILOR KINCAID MOVED TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA AS PRESENTED. COUNCILOR FULLER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION PASSED WITH SIX YES VOTES.**

## **7. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **A. CITY CLERK/FINANCE DIRECTOR MARGARET SELL – ADOPTION OF THE 2016 ANNUAL BUDGET FOR THE CITY OF FRUITA**

#### **1) RESOLUTION 2015-29 – A REQUEST TO APPROVE A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING FEES AND CHARGES FOR THE 2016 BUDGET YEAR**

Mrs. Sell stated that the first Resolution on the agenda was for the adoption of the fees and charges for the 2016 Budget. Highlights on the fee changes include a decrease of \$0.30 per month for trash service, an increase of \$0.30 per month for sewer charges, an annual increase of \$10 for irrigation charges, the implementation of a new convenience fee for credit card and other payments made online of \$2.95 per transaction, updating the use tax tables that building materials use tax is calculated on, and a drainage increase from \$17,041 to \$17,058 based on the Consumer Price Index for 2014.

Councilor Bonar referred to Exhibit A, Page 3, VI. Licensing Fees where a “Sound Amplication Permit” was listed. He noted that this needed to be corrected to “Sound Amplification Permit” and Mrs. Sell said that she would get the spelling error corrected.

Councilor Bonar referred to Page 4, VIII. Maps where the first line item listed was “Map from Arcview.” He noted that the name of that software had been changed quite a few years ago, so it might be better to change that to “Maps from GIS” so that the City doesn’t have to keep up with the changes in software names. Mrs. Sell responded that this was a good idea and she would also make that change.

There were no further comments from the Council, so Mayor Buck opened the public hearing on Resolution 2015-29. Hearing no comments, she referred back to the Council.

- **COUNCILOR BONAR MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 2015-29 – ESTABLISHING THE FEES AND CHARGES FOR THE 2016 BUDGET YEAR. COUNCILOR MULDER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION PASSED WITH SIX YES VOTES.**

#### **2) RESOLUTION 2015-30 – A REQUEST TO APPROVE A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE 2016 BUDGET**

Mrs. Sell noted that this Resolution adopts the 2016 Budget after the public hearing that was continued from the November 17, 2015 Council meeting. She said that staff and the Council have had the chance to go over all the different sections of the Budget and that if there were any questions or comments, she would be happy to take them. Otherwise, staff recommended adoption of the 2016 Budget.

Mayor Buck opened the public hearing on Resolution 2015-30. Hearing no comments, she referred back to the Council.

- **COUNCILOR BONAR MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 2015-30 – ADOPTING THE 2016 ANNUAL BUDGET. COUNCILOR MULDER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION PASSED WITH SIX YES VOTES.**

**3) RESOLUTION 2015-31 – A REQUEST TO APPROVE A RESOLUTION APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR THE 2016 BUDGET**

Mrs. Sell explained that Resolution 2015-31 appropriates funds so that the City can spend the money in the Budget that was just adopted. She said it appropriates \$16.4 million including transfers and \$14.7 million excluding the transfers for the 2016 Budget year.

Mayor Buck opened the public hearing on Resolution 2015-31. Hearing no comments, she referred back to the Council.

- **COUNCILOR BONAR MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 2015-31 – APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR THE 2016 FISCAL YEAR IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ADOPTED 2016 ANNUAL BUDGET. COUNCILOR MULDER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION PASSED WITH SIX YES VOTES.**

**4) RESOLUTION 2015-32 – A REQUEST TO APPROVE A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING THE MILL LEVY FOR THE 2016 BUDGET**

Mrs. Sell stated that Resolution 2015-32 establishes the property tax and noted that the Council and Mayor were sent an e-mail with the updated figures from the Mesa County Assessor's Office. The assessed value increased about \$40,000 in the revenue from that assessment, which resulted in City revenues of about \$400, so staff just adjusted another revenue line item to offset that amount so it doesn't change the overall budget. Mrs. Sell explained that the Resolution establishes the mill levy at 10.146 mills, which is the same that it has been for a number of years now, so there is no increase or decrease.

Councilor Mascarenas said it was nice to see that the values have increased by \$3 million.

Mayor Buck opened the public hearing on Resolution 2015-32. Hearing no comments, she referred back to the Council.

- **COUNCILOR BONAR MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 2015-32 – ESTABLISHING THE MILL LEVY ASSESSED ON PROPERTY IN FRUITA FOR THE 2016 BUDGET YEAR AT 10.146 MILLS FOR GENERAL OPERATIONS AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY CLERK TO CERTIFY THE MILL LEVY TO THE MESA COUNTY COMMISSIONERS. COUNCILOR MULDER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION PASSED WITH SIX YES VOTES.**

Mrs. Sell noted that now that the budget had been adopted, she would put the finishing touches on the budget document, provide the updated document to the Mayor and Council and post the 2016 Budget document on the City's website. She said staff's aim is to have that done by the first of the year.

## **8. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

### **A. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR DAHNA RAUGH**

- 1) **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – A REQUEST TO APPROVE A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW ONE HORSE ON APPROXIMATELY 1.19 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED IN A COMMUNITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE AND LOCATED AT 985 E. OTTLEY AVENUE**

Mayor Buck noted that Planning technician Henry Hemphill and Code Enforcement Officer Mark Angelo would be making staff's presentation on behalf of Community Development Director Dahna Raugh.

Mr. Hemphill stated that the staff report and coversheet highlights the history of the property and shows that the property owners are more than capable of having a horse at the property, however, there has been no evidence shown that they are ready to have the horse on the property.

Mr. Hemphill continued that in the recent month since the Planning Commission meeting, the applicant has shown significant willingness to improve her situation at the property. He said that Code Enforcement Officer Mark Angelo has been working with the community outreach program to help residents who are financially, physically or otherwise unable to do cleanup work on properties and are willing to accept his help.

Mr. Hemphill stated that at first, the applicant wanted to do the work herself, but has since shown that she wants some help and is getting the help from Mr. Angelo.

Mr. Hemphill showed some photographs of the property to illustrate the progress that has been made on the cleanup. There was also a photo of the horse and Mr. Hemphill said that the Community Development Department was able to determine from discussions with staff (who have experience with the care of horses) that the horse on the subject property is a healthy horse.

Mr. Hemphill noted that in the past, staff had seen the horse in worse condition after initially receiving complaints from neighbors about code violations on the property. Since then, the applicant has made improvements to take better care of the horse, who now appears healthy.

Mr. Hemphill stated that staff feels that the applicant may not be in a situation right now to have the horse, but she has been making the improvements, so staff feels the decision would be up to the City Council.

Councilor Mascarenas asked if staff's recommendation was still denial of the request for the Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. Hemphill said it was.

Councilor Mascarenas asked if the applicant had made payment yet for the Conditional Use Permit and Mr. Hemphill confirmed that the City has not yet received any payment from her. He added that staff had anticipated payment by the hearing date at the Planning Commission meeting, but it had not been received. The hearing was noticed to the public and Mr. Hemphill said this is the reason that the application was before the Council.

Councilor Bonar said that regarding the specific criteria for approval, number one is that "The proposed use is consistent with the provisions and purposes of this Title (Section 17.13.040, Conditional Uses of the Fruita Land Use Code), with the purposes of the zone in which it is located, and with the City's Master Plan." He continued that the staff report states that "This criteria could be met if the animals are kept so as to not to create a public nuisance, however, because of previous nuisances and new continuing nuisances combined with the lack of fee payment, staff has no confidence that the horse will be kept without a continued nuisance problem."

Councilor Bonar asked if staff's opinion was still that the animal constitutes a nuisance.

Mr. Hemphill responded that yes, staff stands by the staff report that did go in front of the Planning Commission. He added that as he said earlier, the applicant, however, is making improvements and progress.

Councilor Bonar noted that the second approval criterion for a Conditional Use Permit is that "The purpose use is compatible with existing and allowed uses surrounding or affected by the proposed use, pursuant to the criteria in Section 17.07.080." He continued that staff's opinion was that "keeping one horse at this location cannot be considered compatible with existing and allowed uses due to the ongoing nuisance issues."

Councilor Bonar then pointed out that the third approval criterion says that "The proposed use will not materially endanger the public health or safety." He noted that staff's comments were that if the animals are property confined and taken care of, the keeping of the one horse at this location should not materially endanger the public health and safety and that this criterion has not been met.

Councilor Bonar asked if he was interpreting correctly that staff was saying that the horse was not property taken care of and that was why the third criterion was not met. He asked if this was still staff's opinion.

Mr. Hemphill said it was.

Councilor Bonar noted that the applicant met the fourth approval criterion for a Conditional Use Permit. He asked Mr. Hemphill if he believes that the applicant could correct the deficiencies or is showing a willingness to do so, which was not the case at the time the hearing went to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Mark Angelo approached the Council and said that a couple of the questions that Mr. Hemphill answered yes to needed some further clarification.

Mr. Angelo said he thought it was a policy decision for the Council because his understanding of a Conditional Use Permit is that there are certain requirements that have to be met in order for the Council to approve the permit, which includes payment of fees. He continued that if the City starts making exceptions for individuals, what they do for one, they may have to do for another and it gets into a policy decision of where to draw the line.

Mr. Angelo continued that the initial complaints were sustained in regards to what he and the neighbors felt, which was whether the horse was adequately being taken care of and based on what he and the neighbors could see, there was a question as to whether the conditions could be better. He agreed with Mr. Hemphill that the conditions have improved considerably, as has his understanding of what are normal conditions for a horse.

Mr. Angelo said he learned from people that have and maintain horses, that there are certain things to look for to determine the condition of a horse. In the photo of the horse, he pointed out a section of the hind quarters of the horse where a crease appears (meaning the horse is not underfed) and the horse also has a winter coat, which is healthy and normal.

Mr. Angelo said that once he was able to get on the property, he could then confirm that the applicant had brand new hay bales stacked up and a water trough for the horse. He said that he has been working with her to help make sure that she can articulate to the City Council that she is doing much better on showing that she is taking care of the horse appropriately.

Mr. Angelo said that he also learned that the small stall that the horse is sometimes confined in is pretty standard (12' x 10' or 12' x 12') for most horse stalls. He added that the horse has plenty of room to roam on the property.

Mr. Angelo said that tremendous strides have been made to improve the conditions of the property.

In regards to the criterion of the property being compatible with surrounding uses, Mr. Angelo stated that right across the street, there is a woman who has two horses and a llama on her property, so he believes it is compatible. He further explained that there are mostly agricultural uses to the east of the subject property including a corn field and two large sections of agricultural land, but

there is an area right next door that is more urban, so it isn't really compatible with that. Mr. Angelo said it was important to balance and be reasonable when considering what is standard for urban living and what is the standard for agricultural living and sometimes it is an educational process for both parties that are close together. He said it is hard sometimes to make people understand that when they build an urban type house next door to an agricultural use, they really should have known or should have educated themselves about the environment that they are moving into.

Mr. Angelo said that the complainant was not present in the audience and that he/she is in a dilemma about whether to oppose the Conditional Use Permit or be in favor of it. He said that the complainant might not have a full understanding of what it takes to care for a horse.

Mr. Angelo concluded that he feels the property use is compatible with the surrounding uses. He said he does not feel like there is a public safety issue and that he feels the horse is being taken care of properly. He added that in the beginning, staff wasn't getting a lot of cooperation from the applicant and that she did miss the Planning Commission public hearing.

Mr. Angelo noted that a lot of things have happened since that Planning Commission meeting and he feels it is only fair that the Council have all the up-to-date information so that they could make a decision as to whether to approve the Conditional Use Permit or not.

Councilor Bonar asked if Mr. Angelo's opinion (as the Code Enforcement Officer) was that the property meets the four criteria for approving a Conditional Use Permit; was it consistent with the provisions and purposes of the Title (the staff report stated that the animal constituted a public nuisance), was it compatible with existing and allowed surrounding uses (staff's opinion was it was not considered compatible because of ongoing nuisance issues), was it materially endangering the public health or safety (staff said the condition had not been met) and lastly, were public services there (staff said this criterion had been met).

Councilor Bonar said that it would seem that the material situation on the ground is currently different than what it was when the staff report was written, so he asked Mr. Angelo if he believes that the application currently meets the four criteria and if not, did he believe that the applicant could meet the four criteria?

Mr. Angelo responded that he believes the property currently meets the first, second, third and fourth criteria. He asked that the Council consider some kind of monitoring of the property if the application were to be approved because it needs to be clear that the property needs to continue to improve. He said there are things that need to be taken care of such as trash, tires, and rubbish, but the applicant did make some good faith effort before going in front of the City Council. Mr. Angelo continued that the corrals need to be maintained because there are lots of tree branches and wire and things that the horse could get tangled up in.

Councilor Bonar asked if the City could put conditions on the Conditional Use Permit as far as review periods or a probationary period.

City Clerk Margaret Sell stated that the intent of the Conditional Use Permit is to put those conditions into place and if they are not met at any time, then the permit can be revoked.

Councilor Bonar asked if a sequence of review periods could be established to verify that the conditions have improved and that the improvements are being maintained.

Councilor Bonar also asked that if the Conditional Use Permit were to be denied, was there a waiting period before the applicant could re-apply for a Conditional Use Permit? He said he knows that with a denied Planned Unit Development, an application cannot be re-submitted for one year.

Mr. Bennett said he thought it was also a year waiting period as well for a Conditional Use Permit, but he would have to check on that.

Councilor Bonar suggested continuing the decision on the application until the first meeting in January rather than making a decision now to allow time for the applicant to complete the improvements to the property and for Code Enforcement to verify that the conditions have been met and to have the fee paid.

Mayor Buck said that sounded very reasonable.

Councilor Mulder said that initially, the applicant didn't want help from the Code Enforcement Office, but then she did. He asked if the applicant indicated she wanted help after the Planning Commission public hearing. Mr. Angelo said she did.

Councilor Mulder asked Mr. Angelo how much work he and his crew had done on the property. Mr. Angelo responded that he spent two days working on the property and had taken close to six truckloads of weeds and tree branches off the property. There were also three televisions that he took to Best Buy for the applicant.

Mr. Angelo said that when working with people, you start to learn a little bit about them and their conditions. He said the applicant does have financial issues; she is struggling even to pay her City of Fruita utility bill. He asked that the Council take this into account.

Mr. Angelo said that the community outreach program has not only helped the applicant with the horse, but also to bring the whole property into compliance so that it is not a nuisance to the neighboring houses. He added that the applicant is now willing to allow the City to help, but that every family is different (that he has worked with in the past) regarding at what point they decide they want to work with the City to resolve issues and that some take a little bit longer than others. Mr. Angelo said the applicant needed time to understand and interpret what the City was trying to accomplish with them.

Councilor Mulder asked Mr. Angelo if he was going to continue to help the applicant regardless of what the Council decided to do. Mr. Angelo said he was.

Councilor Mulder stated that he was not present at the Planning Commission meeting, but in reading the minutes, the Board didn't seem to be totally aware that the fee for the Conditional Use



Permit had not been paid. He continued that the Planning Commission had the option of denying or continuing the application, but they chose to deny it and send it on the City Council. He added that the Planning Commission never should have heard the application because the fee had not been paid. Councilor Mulder said that in the legal process, the application had already “jumped a ditch” and as Mr. Hemphill indicated, the decisions that the Council make do have ramifications.

Councilor Mulder continued that it seemed to him that the best thing that the Council could do right now would be to continue the application for 30 days and then get another statement from the Community Development Department that the fee has been paid, that the property has been into compliance and that the horse is perfectly okay and the corrals have been fixed.

Councilor Mulder stated that the Conditional Use Permit is about the horse and Code Enforcement is about the whole property. He asked if Mr. Angelo was taking on the horse situation as well as the whole property.

Mr. Angelo responded that he would have to say yes; that it is the living conditions of not just the horse, but the family as well and making sure the property is reasonably compatible with the surrounding areas taking into consideration that everyone has different standards. Mr. Angelo added that in regards to the horse, it also depends on what direction the Council gives him.

Councilor Mulder stated that the Code violations were between Code Enforcement and the applicant. He said this was a different issue and that the Council wasn’t dealing with that; they were dealing with the horse.

Councilor Mulder asked Mr. Angelo if he thought the applicant was going to be able to pay \$200 in 30 days. Mr. Angelo suggested that Councilor Mulder ask the applicant that question.

Councilor Mulder asked if the Council were to continue the application, were they stepping out on a limb?

Applicant Shereen Sheets stated that she had already done her son’s Christmas shopping and she is currently working. She said she had some issues when she wasn’t working and had a family emergency that prevented her from attending the Planning Commission meeting. She apologized for missing the meeting.

Ms. Sheets continued that she is a single mom that works 25 hours per week and will do everything she possibly can in 30 days to have the \$200 Conditional Use Permit fee. She said she would have a whole paycheck on December 22<sup>nd</sup> and she would be able to pay the fee then.

Councilor Mulder said he couldn’t help but notice that there was a boat in one of the pictures of the property shown by Mr. Hemphill. Ms. Sheets responded that she would have taken it to the junkyard by now if she had a truck.

Councilor Mulder said he thought the boat should be worth \$200. Ms. Sheets responded that she doesn’t have anybody to sell the boat to.

Councilor Mulder asked if the Council could legally continue the application for the Conditional Use Permit. Mayor Buck said yes, she was certain that the Council could do that and that the Council should move on. She thanked Mr. Angelo for stepping up and doing all the things he has done and that she had no doubt that he would continue to work with Ms. Sheets.

Ms. Sheets stated that she didn't accept the offer for help at first because she was overwhelmed.

Mayor Buck said it was within the Council's rights to give Ms. Sheets another month and asked for a motion to continue the matter until then.

Councilor Mulder asked if the applicant should be given 30 days, 60 days or leave it open ended.

Mayor Buck asked Mr. Angelo if a month was enough time. Mr. Angelo responded that he thought with the weather conditions that would be coming up, a timeframe of more than 30 days would certainly be appreciated by both the applicant and himself.

- **COUNCILOR BONAR MOVED THAT CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION 2015-11 BE CONTINUED UNTIL THE FIRST CITY COUNCIL MEETING IN FEBRUARY OF 2016 TO ALLOW THE APPLICANT TIME TO ADDRESS THE ISSUES WITH THE FOUR CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AND TO RESOLVE THE ISSUE OF PAYMENT OF THE APPLICATION FEE AND TO HAVE CODE ENFORCEMENT BE ABLE TO VERIFY THAT THE CONDITIONS HAVE BEEN IMPROVED AND THE IMPROVEMENTS HAVE BEEN MAINTAINED. COUNCILOR MULDER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION PASSED WITH SIX YES VOTES.**

## **9. COUNCIL REPORTS AND ACTIONS**

### COUNCILOR KINCAID

Councilor Kincaid stated that he e-mailed everybody out the logo concept designs and he was waiting on feedback to get back to the students who are designing them. He asked that the other Council members and staff respond via e-mail with their comments so he could give the students some direction in two weeks.

Councilor Fuller said it seems that it would make sense for the Council to provide Councilor Kincaid with feedback and asked him to summarize the comments for the next Council meeting.

City Manager Mike Bennett said that the main item on the next Council meeting agenda is to opt in to the Jump Start Colorado program, which has a deadline soon after that meeting. He added that the state has just been finalizing the language so that cities can opt in to the Jump Start Colorado incentives and Kristi Pollard, Director of the Grand Junction Economic Partnership is planning to have the information in time to get in the packet for the next meeting.

Mayor Buck asked the Council to make it a priority to get their logo design feedback to Councilor Kincaid in the next few days. Councilor Kincaid asked to have the feedback by the end of the week.

#### COUNCILOR MULDER

Councilor Mulder stated that the Grand Valley Drainage District (GVDD) has two open house meetings scheduled for the following day.

Councilor Mulder also said that there will be a meeting at 3:30 p.m. discussing what was determined by the group that was studying the Dinosaur Diamond National Scenic Byway.

#### COUNCILOR BONAR

Councilor Bonar said that the GVDD will have two open house forum presentations at the Drainage District; one at 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. and the other at 5:30 to 7:00 p.m. on December 2, 2015 to answer questions on how the drainage fees will be implemented. He added that the purpose of the forums was not to listen to comments, but to answer questions only because the decisions have been made and will not be changed. There will be a FAQ sheet available at the forums and will hopefully answer most people's questions.

#### MAYOR BUCK

Mayor Buck stated that there would be a meeting on December 3, 2015 at the City of Grand Junction Council Chambers regarding economic development.

Mr. Bennett added that it would be a joint meeting with the City of Grand Junction City Council, the Mesa County Commissioners and the Palisade Board of Trustees and that the Fruita City Council and Mayor were invited to attend. The meeting will be held from 1:30 to 2:30 p.m. and is set up for GJEP, the Business Incubator and the Grand Junction Chamber to discuss some of the recommendations from North Star Consulting Group and to provide suggestions on how those could be funded or how much those things would cost. He said for the City of Fruita, it was more about staying in the loop, so he and the Mayor would be attending.

### **10. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT**

Mr. Bennett reported that at 7:00 a.m. on December 3<sup>rd</sup>, he would be attending a quarterly meeting to discuss local entities' Intergovernmental Agreements with the BLM at their offices.

Mr. Bennett also said that there is also a Housing Needs Assessment Study presentation on December 3<sup>rd</sup> from 11:30 to 1:00 p.m. that everyone was invited to as well, but that Community Development Director Dahna Raugh would be in attendance on behalf of the City of Fruita.

Mr. Bennett stated that regarding Dinosaur Diamond, CDOT hired a consultant to do an assessment study that Mrs. Raugh was participating in over the course of two days where people from the area actually drive to Fruita along the paths from multiple locations on the diamond. There will then be

a session in the afternoon on December 3<sup>rd</sup> to cover the results of the assessments and Mr. Bennett stated that he and Mrs. Raugh would be in attendance for that as well.

Mr. Bennett asked the Council if everyone had provided their RSVPs to Human Resources Odette Brach for the City's Christmas Party. All Council members said they had and Councilor Harvey noted that he would be unable to attend because he had to work.

Mr. Bennett mentioned that the City was successful in getting the Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) grant for the priority based budgeting and that the City's match is already in the 2016 Budget. Staff will be working with the Center for Priority Based Budgeting beginning in January, and working on a timeline before then to establish the dates for webinars for leadership staff and City Council members.

Mr. Bennett stated that the budget numbers won't change, but staff will be doing some updates on the narratives in the budget, which will be completed by the first of the year.

Mr. Bennett noted that the new issue of the City Link had just been mailed to homes and businesses that day. He said there were a number of articles including one covering the City's efforts with the Greenway Business Park and economic development.

Mr. Bennett said that the Town of Palisade had originally suggested January 21<sup>st</sup> or 28<sup>th</sup> for the Municipalities Dinner, but reminded the Council that there was a *Love Where You Live* book chat scheduled on January 21<sup>st</sup> at the Lithic Bookstore and Gallery. He asked if any of the Council members had any calendar conflicts for January 28<sup>th</sup> to attend the Municipalities Dinner. No Council members voiced any conflicts for that date.

Mr. Bennett said that staff received a draft of what the GVDD drainage fee bills for the City may look like. The bills total just under \$20,000. Staff has been going through the bills and corresponding with the GVDD staff via e-mail, and will also be meeting with GVDD staff on December 7, 2015 to go over questions that City staff has.

## **11. ADJOURN**

With no further business before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Woods  
Deputy City Clerk  
City of Fruita