

Grand Junction, Colorado

June 2, 1965

ROLL CALL

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, met in regular session at 7:30 p.m., June 2, 1965. Councilmen present and answering roll call were Charles E. McCormick, R. B. Evans, Charles H. Love, Harry O. Colescott, Dr. Hurst F. Otto, Herbert M. Wright and President Ray A. Meacham. Also present were City Manager J. M. Lacy, City Attorney Gerald J. Ashby and Deputy City Clerk Blanche G. Stringer. City Clerk Helen C. Tomlinson was absent.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given by Rev. Ray J. Hawkins, Pastor, Church of the Nazarene.

MINUTES

It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Evans that the minutes of the regular meeting held May 19, 1965 be approved as written. Motion carried. (7 AYES)

I.D. #60 - PETITION TO INCLUDE FIRST, 15TH AND GRAND

City Manager Lacy presented petitions for street and alley paving, sidewalk, curb and gutter for Council's inspection. Three arterial streets are to be included in this district: 1st Street from North Avenue to include 1st, Lorey Drive, 15th Street from North Avenue to Orchard; Grand Avenue from 19th to 22nd Street. A little later, he said, he would have a map prepared for members of the Council showing the locations of the improvements to be made. Estimated approximate cost of the District will be \$247,000 with the City's cost approximately \$89,000. Paving on North 1st Street will include widening so it will be the same as 12th Street by Lincoln Park which was done last year.

The following Resolution was presented and read:

R E S O L U T I O N

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION:

That, under the authority granted the City Council in Chapter 81 of the 1953 Compiled Ordinances of the City of Grand Junction, there be, and there is hereby ordered to be, included within Improvement District No. 60 the following streets within the City of Grand Junction for the construction or reconstruction of sidewalks, curbs, gutters and paving on or along said streets; to

wit:

1. First Street - from the north line of North Avenue to the South line of Lorey Drive.
2. Grand Avenue - from the east line of 19th Street to the west line of 22nd Street.
3. Fifteenth Street - from the north line of North Avenue to the North line of Orchard Avenue.

Assessment for the cost of such improvements shall be made against the abutting properties in accordance with the procedures as contained in said Chapter and in accordance with the procedures followed in said Improvement District No. 60.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 2nd day of June, 1965.

Ray A. Meacham
President of the City Council

ATTEST:

It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Love that the Resolution be passed and adopted as read. Roll was called on the motion with all members of the Council voting AYE. The President declared the motion carried. (7 AYES)

The following Resolution was presented and read:

R E S O L U T I O N

DECLARING THE INTENTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO TO CREATE-WITHIN SAID CITY A LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT TO BE KNOWN AS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 60 AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY ENGINEER TO PREPARE DETAILS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE SAME.

WHEREAS, there have been presented to the City Council of the City of Grand Junction petitions for and the City Council has, under authority granted it in Chapter 81 of the 1953 Compiled Ordinances of the City, submitted for the construction or reconstruction of sidewalks, curbs, gutters and paving on streets and paving on alleys to serve the following property in said City, to-wit:

1. First Street - from the north line of North Avenue to the south line of Lorey Drive.
2. Grand Avenue - from the east line of 19th Street to the west line of 22nd Street.
3. Fifteenth Street - from the north line of North Avenue to the north line of Orchard Avenue.

4. Walnut Avenue - from the east line of College Place to the west line of 12th Street.
5. Eleventh Street and the connecting alley in Kister Addition to the City of Grand Junction.
6. Sparn Street - South of Orchard Avenue.
7. Balsam Court in Westlake Park.
8. Spruce Court in Westlake Park.
9. Rood Avenue - from the west line of 1st Street to the east line of Spruce Street.
10. Glen Road - from the north line of Teller Avenue to the South line of Gunnison Avenue.
11. Bookcliff Avenue - from the west side of 7th Street east to the City Limits which is the right-of-way line of the Little Bookcliff Railroad.
12. The North-South alley in Block 1 of Mesa Subdivision, except the north 90 feet thereof.
13. The East-West alley in Block 3 of Mesa Subdivision.
14. The East-West Alley in Block 139 of the City of Grand Junction.
15. The East-West alley located between Block 5 of Shaffroth-Rogers Subdivision and Block 12 of Sherwood Addition in the City of Grand Junction.
16. The L-shaped alley in Block 1 of Regent Subdivision.

AND WHEREAS, the Council has found and determined and hereby finds and determines that said petitions were signed and acknowledged by the owners of more than one-third of the property abutting on said streets and alleys to be assessed with the cost of the proposed construction or reconstruction of sidewalks, curbs, gutters and paving, and where inclusion was by action of the City Council, that such was properly done; and

WHEREAS, the City Council deems it advisable to take the necessary preliminary proceedings for the creation of a special improvement district;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO:

1. That the district of lands to be assessed with the cost of the improvements in the district is described as follows:

I.D. 60 - PROPERTY DESCRIPTIONS

First Street Properties

E 130' of Beg at int of N line H/W 6 & 50 with W line First Street in SE4 SE4 SE4 Sec T1S R1W N 100' W 150' S 100' to sd H/W E along H/W 150' to beg.

E 140' of Beg 30' W & 200' N from SE cor Sec 10 T1S R1W N 127.9' W 369.1' S 127.9' to H/W along H/W E 39.8' S 44° 36' E 141.4' E 80.2', thence leaving H/W N 100' E 150' to beg.

E 170' of E 200' of S 97' of N2 S2 SE4 SE4 Sec 10 T1S R1W

E 170' of E 400' of N2 S4 SE4 SE4 Sec 10 T1S R1W exc S 97' of E 200' thereof also exc S 97' of N 133' of E 200' thereof also exc N 90' of W 100' thereof.

E 170' of S 97' of N 133' of E 200' of S2 SE4 SE4 Sec 10 T1S R1W

N 138.65' of E 140' of beg 654.6' N & 30' W of SE cor Sec 10 T1S R1W W 236.1' N 163.65' E 236.1' S to beg.

Lot 6 and E 55' of Lot 5, Block 7, Replat of Blocks 1-5-6-7 Monument Heights Subdivision.

Lots 5 & 6 and E 55' of Lots 4 & 7, Block 1, Replat of Blocks 1-5-6-7 Monument Heights Subdivision.

E 140' of Beg 30' of SE cor NE4 SE4 Sec 10 T1S R1W N 90' W 270' S 90' E to beg exc H/W.

E 170' of Beg 120' N of SE cor NE4 SE4 Sec 10 T1S R1W W 270' N 90' E 270' S to beg.

E 140' of Beg 210' N & 30' W SE cor NE4 SE4 Sec 10 T1S R1W W 631' N 120' E 631' S to beg.

All of Block 1, West Lake Park Annex 2nd Amended.

E 170' of NE4 NE4 SE4 Sec 10 T1S R1W.

E 130' of Beg at SE cor NE4 Sec 10 T1S R1W W 300' N 150' E 300' S to beg exc E 40' & S 30' for Road.

S 96.8' of Beg 150' N 40' W of E4 cor Sec 10 T1S R1W W 100' N 111.8' S 81° 17' E 101.1' S 96.8' to beg.

S 96.8' of E 30' of Beg 150' N 140' W of SE cor NE4 Sec 10 T1S R1W W 160' N to the S R.O.W. line Grand Valley Canal Ely along canal to a point N of beg S to beg exc Road and Street.

S 216.8' of W 140' of beg 30' N & 30' E of W4 cor Sec 11 T1S R1W E 255' N 300.8' W 255.5' S 300' to beg.

Lots 1 & 2 & W 8' of Lot 3, Block 3, Sherwood Addition.
Lots 31 & 32 & W 8' of Lot 30, Block 3, Sherwood Addition.

Lots 1 & 2 of W 8' of Lot 3, Block 4, Sherwood Addition

Lot 31 & 32 & W 8' of Lot 30, Block 4, Sherwood Addition.

Lot 1 & W 65' of Lot 2 Block 6 Sherwood Addition
Lot 23 & W 63' of Lot 22, Block 6, Sherwood Addition.

Lots 1 & 2 & W 5' of Lot 3, Block 7, Sherwood Addition.
Lots 17 & 18 & W 5' of Lot 16, Block 7, Sherwood Addition.

Lots 1 & 2, Block 8, Sherwood Addition.
Lot 3, Block 8, Sherwood Addition exc beg at a point on the S
line of sd Lot 3 10' E of the SW cor thence E to the SE cor,
Thence NEly to the NE cor sd Lot 3, thence W to a point 5' E of
the NW cor sd Lot 3 thence S to beg.

Lots 12 & 13, Block 8, Sherwood Addition.
Lot 11, Block 8, Sherwood Addition, exc beg at a point on the N
lot line of sd Lot 11 10' E of the NW cor thence S to a point on
the S lot line 30' E of SW cor of sd Lot 11, thence E to the SE
cor of sd lot, thence NEly to the NE cor sd Lot 11, thence to the
point of beg.

E 130' of Block 14, Sherwood Addition.

Beg at SW cor Sec 11 T1S R1W E 154' N 40' N 29° 55' W 100' N 10°
08' W 80.5' S 44° 27-1/2' W 28.6' W 70' to W line sd Sec 11 S
186' to beg.

Beg 154' E of SW cor Sec 11 T1S R1W E 186' N 400' W 60' S 44° 27-
1/2' W 271.25' S 10° 08' E 80.5' S 29° 55' E 100' S to beg exc
Beg 170 E of SW cor sd Sec 11 E 170' N 400' W 60' S 44° 27-1/2' W
to a point 170' E of W Sec line of sd Sec 11 thence S to point of
beg.

Grand Avenue Properties

Lots 1 through 10, Block 7, East Main Street Addition.

N 112.5' of W 323.47' of a tract of land in the SE4 Sec 13 T1S
R1W Ute Meridian beg 1429.4' W of NE cor SE4 Sec 13 T1S R1W Ute
Meridian, thence S 431.74' W 520' to E line 21st street N along E
line 21st Street 431.74' E 520' to beg.

The S 112.5' of Lots 15 through 19, Block 1, Parkland
Subdivision.

S 112.5' of Beg 30' N of SW cor Block A Mesa Gardens Subdivision,
N 212' E 100' S 212' W to beg.

S 112.5' of Beg 30' N & 100' E of SW cor of Block A Mesa Gardens Subdivision, N 212' E 150' S 212' W to beg.

S 112.5' of Beg 30' N & 250' E of SW cor Block A Mesa Gardens Subdivision, N 120' E 80' S 120' W to beg.

S 112.5' of Block F Mesa Gardens Subdivision.

15th Street Properties

Lots 11 & 12 & E 20.28' of Lots 10 & 13, Exposition Arcade.

E 100' of Beg 216' S of NE cor Lot 2 Grand View Subdivision, Grand Junction, S 113.08' W 240' N 229.08' E 80' S 116' E 160' to beg exc W 77' of N 51.85' thereof.

E 100' of Beg 145' S of NE cor of Lot 2 Grand View Subdivision, Sec 12 T1S R1W S 71' W 160' N 71' E 160' to beg.

E 100' of Beg 100' S of NE cor Lot 2 Grand View Subdivision Sec 12 T1S R1W S 45' W 160' N 45' E 160' to beg.

E 100' of E 154.95' of N 100' of Lot 2 Grand View Subdivision, Sec 12 T1S R1W exc Road on North.

E 100' of E 145' of S4 Lot 7 Grand View Subdivision, Sec 12 T1S R1W exc Road on South.

E 95' of Beg 319.26' E of SW cor E2 N2 S2 Lot 7 Grand View Subdivision, N 56' W 129' S 56' E to beg.

E 95' of Beg 319.26' E & 56' N of SW cor E2 N2 S2 Lot 7 Grand View Subdivision, W 129' N to S line Kennedy Avenue SEly along sd S line to a point N of beg S to beg.

E 100' of E 231.6' of N2 Lot 7 Grand View Subdivision, exc Kennedy Avenue, also exc 20' alley on W.

E 100' of N 50' of S 130' of E 231.6' of NE4 Lot 7 Grand View Subdivision, exc 20' alley on W.

E 100' of N 50' of S 180' of E 231.6' of NE4 Lot 7 Grand View Subdivision, exc alley on N also exc 20' alley on W.

E 95' of Beg 25' W & 89.6' S of inters of center lines of Elm Avenue & N 15th Street, S 59.25' W 123.37' N 49.25' E 11' N 10' E 112.37' to beg Sec 12 T1S R1W.

E 95' of Beg 10' S & 5' W of NE cor Lot 7 Grand View Subdivision, S 59.6' W 112.37' N 59.6' E to beg.

Lots 5 through 8, Block 3, Prospect Park.

Lots 7 through 9, Block 4, Prospect Park.

E 100' of Lot 12 & 13, O'Neil's Subdivision.

E 90' of Lots 5 & 6, Block 2, Eastholme-In-Grand View Subdivision.

E 90' of Lots 9 through 12, Block 1, Eastholme-In-Grand View Subdivision.

Lot 1 & W 9.8' Lot 2 Block 1 North Sunnyvale Acres.

W 90' of Lots 17 & 18, Block 1, North Sunnyvale Acres.

W 90' of Lots 1 through 4, Block 2, North Sunnyvale Acres.

W 90' of Lots 1 through 4, Avalon Gardens, Sec 12 T1S R1W.

W 90' of Lots 1 & 2, Belaire Subdivision.

Lots 1 & 2 & W 90' of Lot 10, Paulson Subdivision.

W 95' of Lots 1 through 4, Fox Subdivision, Sec 12 T1S R1W.

W 95' of Lots 11 through 20, Block 2, Parkplace Heights.

W 95' of Lots 1 & 2, Block 3, Parkplace Heights.

Lot 10 and W 26.3' of Lot 9, Block 3, Parkplace Heights.

Petitioned Streets

Beg 40' W & 25' N of SE cor NE4 SE4 NE4 Sec 11 T1S R1W N 120' W 160' S 120' E to beg.

S 120' of Beg 145' N & 200' W of SE cor NE4 SE4 NE4 Sec 11 T1S R1W N 20' W 460' S 165' E 460' N to beg exc S & W 25' thereof.

N 120' of NW4 SE4 NE4 Sec 11 T1S R1W, also beg 40' W & 25' S of NE cor sd SE4 SE4 NE4 W 289.9' S 175' E 100' N 100' E 189.9' N 75' to beg.

N 45' of NE4 SE4 SE4 NE4 Sec 11 T1S R1W exc beg 40' W & 25' S of NE cor sd SE4 SE4 NE4 W 289.9' S 175' E 100' N 100' E 189.9' N 75' to beg.

Kister Addition N 100' & E 95' thereof.

W 95' of Beg 220' N & 30 W of E4 cor Sec 11 T1S R1W W 299.92 N 109.64' E 299.92 S to beg exc W 25' thereof.

E 95' of N 190' of beg at a point N 89° 58' W 219.92' from E4 corner Sec 11 T1S R1W N 0° 04' E 220' N 89° 58' W 110' S 0° 04' W

220' to the center line Orchard Avenue along sd center line S 89° 58' E 110' to place of beg.

Lots 1 through 8, Block 1, Parkerson Subdivision, Sec 7 T1S R1E.
Lots 1 through 9, Block 2, Parkerson Subdivision, Sec 7 T1S R1E.

Lots 1 through 8, Block 3, West Lake Park Annex 2nd Amended.
Lots 1 through 8, Block 2, West Lake Park Annex 2nd Amended.

Lot 1, Block 3, Mobleys Subdivision.
Lots 12 & 13, Block 6, Mobleys Subdivision.

Lots 1 through 7, Block 1, Dorris Subdivision.
Lots 8 through 14, Block 2, Dorris Subdivision.

Lots 2 through 18 & S 76.76' of Lot 19 & 20, Block 1, Mesa Subdivision.

Block 3, Mesa Subdivision.

Block 139, City of Grand Junction.

Lots 5 & 6, Block 12, Sherwood Addition.

N 140' of Lots 2 through 4, Block 5, Shaffroth-Rogers Subdivision and also N 130' of beg at SW cor sd Block 5, Sec 11 T1S R1W W 75' N 360' E 75' S to beg exc N 10' of above for alley & N 130' of Lot 1, Block 5, Shaffroth-Rogers Subdivision.

Lots 1 through 9, Block 1, Regent Subdivision.
Lots 11 through 15, Block 1, Regent Subdivision.
Lot 16 & 8, Block 1, Melrose Subdivision.
Lot 9, Block 1, Bailey's Subdivision.

N 150' of Medical Arts Addition

N 150' of W 348' of N4 SW4 NE4 Sec 11 T1S R1W E of center line Seventh Street exc W 450' & E 138.5' thereof also exc Roads.

S 150' of beg N4 cor Sec 11 T1S R1W S 0° 39' E 577' to a square stone marked x on top. Thence S 63° 31' E 225.4', thence S 0° 04' W 292' to the NW cor of tract herein conveyed and the place of beg. Thence S 89° 26' E 951' to a point on the west line of the R/W of the L.B.C. RR. Thence SWly along the line of said R/W to the S line of the NW4 NE4 sd Sec 11, thence W to a point S of beg thence N to the NW cor of sd tract, the place of beg.

2. That the City Engineer be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to have prepared and filed full details, plans and specifications for such sidewalk, curb and gutter construction and paving; and estimate of the total costs thereof, exclusive of the per centum for cost of collection and other incidentals, and of interest to the time the first installment becomes due; and a

map of the district to be assessed, from which the approximate share of said total cost that will be assessed upon each piece of real estate in the district may be readily ascertained, all as required by Ordinance No. 178, as amended, of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado.

Adopted and approved this 2nd day of June, 1965.

Ray A. Meacham
President of the City Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk

It was moved by Councilman Colescott and seconded by Councilman McCormick that the Resolution be passed and adopted as read. Roll was called on the motion with all Councilmen voting AYE. The President declared the motion carried. (7 AYES)

BUILDING PERMIT FEES

The matter of the request of Senior Citizens Foundation for rebate of building permit fee in the amount of \$348.50 paid Sept. 3, 1963 was brought up. City Manager Lacy reported that in 1964, 906 building permits had been issued with an actual cost to the City budget of \$11.72 average per permit. The average revenue was \$9.41. A total of \$901.50 in fees had been waived during 1964 and \$238.50 so far in 1965. This matter had been briefly discussed at the informal meeting and it was agreed some policy should be determined, but the matter of water and other free services for churches were more far reaching and should have more consideration.

Since that time another request for waiver of building permit fee in the amount of \$199.76 has been received from the 1st Baptist Church, 7th and Grand, for an \$89,000 addition to their church.

Councilman Colescott stated he thought the Council should reconsider its policy and either raise the fees to get on a break-even basis or stop granting waivers. In the past only churches and church-sponsored projects have been eligible for waiver of permit fees. Building permit fees are a direct payment for a direct service paid for by those who benefit from the inspections. Other members of the Council agreed that a more equitable way would be for everyone to pay for building permit fees.

DENY REBATE OF \$348.50 TO SENIOR CITIZENS FOUNDATION

It was moved by Councilman McCormick and seconded by Councilman Evans that in view of the fact that in the past permit fees have not been waived for non-profit organizations that the request of

Senior Citizens Foundation for a rebate of building permit fee of \$348.50 be denied. Roll was called on the motion with the following result: Councilmen voting AYE: McCormick, Evans, Love, Otto, Wright and President Meacham. Councilman voting NO: Colescott. A majority of Councilmen voting AYE, the President declared the motion carried.

WAIVE \$199.76 BUILDING PERMIT FOR FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH, 7TH & GRAND

It was moved by Councilman Love and seconded by Councilman Wright that the request of the First Baptist Church, 7th and Grand, for waiver of building permit fee be granted. Motion carried with Councilman Colescott voting NAY. (6 AYES 1 NAY)

ESTABLISH POLICY -NO WAIVER OF BUILDING PERMIT FEES

President Meacham stated he believed it would be incumbent to discuss and establish a policy for future use and abide by that policy. It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman McCormick that the Council adopt a policy in the future of not granting requests for refunds or waiving of building permits by any organization that would normally be required to pay such permit fees. Motion carried. (7 AYES)

3.2 BEER RENEWAL - PAD 307, EARL A. & ROSEMARY A. MACHABY - GRANTED

An application for renewal of 3.2 beer license was presented by Earl A. & Rosemary A. Machaby dba Pad 307, 307 S. 12th Street. A report was read from Chief of Police Johnson citing a number of instances when the Police Department had been called to this establishment. A report from the Mesa County Health Dept. was read approving the establishment and recommending a general clean-up. It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman Otto that the application be approved and license granted when State license has been received. Motion carried. (7 AYES)

BONDS APPROVED

It was moved by Councilman Colescott and seconded by Councilman Love that the following bonds, being on the approved forms, be accepted and filed. Motion carried. (7 AYES)

S.C. Thomas	House Mover	Gen Ins Co of Am	467280	#186
Certified Bldg				
Products Inc.	Gen Contr	Continental Ins Co	S1548733	#187

ORDINANCE NO. 1213 (EMERGENCY) - AMENDING CHAPTER 94, CITY SALES & USE TAX TO AGREE WITH STATE ON 3% BASIS

The following entitled proposed emergency ordinance was

introduced and read: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTIONS OF CHAPTER 94 OF THE 1953 COMPILED ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, THE SAME BEING THE CITY RETAIL SALES AND USE TAX ORDINANCE, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. City Attorney Ashby explained that this ordinance was drawn up solely to make the City's ordinance in accord with the State sales tax statute. It was moved by Councilman McCormick that the ordinance be passed and adopted as an emergency ordinance, numbered 1213 and ordered published.

LIQUOR DEALERS PROTEST OCCUPATIONAL TAX IF SALES TAX IMPOSED ON LIQUOR

Mr. Richard Stranger was present and stated that if the City was going to bring its ordinance in line with the State, Section 13 2. (1) should be changed from 5% to 3 1/3% for collection expense for the retailer as the State has changed its statute. It was explained that the mechanics of this would probably work out all right. Motion was seconded by Councilman Love.

Councilman Wright stated that he had been approached by certain business people who thought this was unfair but he felt it would be impossible to exempt-any one classification from the Ordinance.

Mr. Elmer Nelson of the Bar X Motel & Lounge was present together with a number of other liquor licensees. He said he was speaking for 31 members of the Grand Junction Beverage Dealers Association who were not there to oppose the sales tax as such as they are willing to pay their just share of taxes, but they think there is one thing people don't realize when they go to a liquor store; that on a bottle of 100 proof liquor which people pay approximately \$6 for, there is \$3.22 tax on it. This is both federal and state tax which amounts to 50% of the cost. Now, with the sales tax, another 4% or 24 cents will be added. This is part of the overall cost of operation.

There are 273 persons employed directly in the liquor industry within the City; there are another 42 in related services making a total of 315 families or 1145 people, depending in whole or in part on the industry for a livelihood.

The assessed valuation of inventory, furniture and fixtures is \$94,689, or represents a take of \$14,100 to the City of Grand Junction at the rate of 15 mills. There is over \$1,000,000 assessed valuation in property either owned outright or leased for this type of business. With the advent of the sales tax on the industry, there should be a minimum of \$20,000 taken into the City coffer as well as \$8,515 now collected in occupational tax.

Some years ago, the City imposed this occupational tax on the industry giving as a reason the cost of extra police protection that would be necessary. He felt that basically the industry had outgrown this, but they are still having to pay the tax.

With the adoption of the sales tax, the Grand Junction Beverage Dealers Association asked the Council to do away with the occupational tax because it puts an extra burden on the industry which has to come out of shrinking profits and which will force more people to operate outside the City limits where they collect neither. He requested that they be allowed approximately one-half of \$250 for each business which would be accredited back to them. They feel they should be on the same basis as grocery stores and they are being taxed in the same manner.

Members of the Council felt that the industry was being highly taxed and that their request should be considered when the budget is being considered for next year as there will be some other license fees to be taken up at that time.

Roll was called on the motion with all members of the Council voting AYE. The President declared the motion carried. (7 AYES)

CEMETERIES - CONSOLIDATION OF IOOF, MASONIC AND CALVARY - TO PROCEED WITH LEGAL PROCEEDINGS TO CONSOLIDATE

City Manager Lacy stated that Mr. Traylor, Attorney, speaking on behalf of the I.O.O.F., the Masonic, and the Calvary Cemetery organizations, had contacted his office regarding the possibility of the City taking over all of the cemeteries.

Last summer, a study was made on this matter which was discussed at to proceed with legal the informal Council meeting. It was felt that if the City would take over all of the cemeteries, including all perpetual care funds and lands owned by the various cemeteries at this time, all would be benefitted in at least three ways:

- a. It would be a more efficient operation which should result in a higher level of care for all of the cemeteries.
- b. Rates for burials would be standard within all of the cemeteries whereas now a fee of \$100 is charged in the Masonic, \$85 in IOOF and \$110 in Calvary.
- c. It is to be understood by the Calvary people that there would be no legal restriction on where a person might be buried under total municipal operation.

Mr. Stocker has stated that the proposed consolidation would probably mean two more men during the summer months, but no increase in the present staff during the winter months.

It was mentioned that sometime in the future, Crown Point Cemetery, some seven miles northwest of the City, might also be taken under City auspices.

It was moved by Councilman Wright and seconded by Councilman

Evans that the City Manager and City Attorney be authorized to proceed with legal and other necessary work to bring these into the City system and when they have developed the necessary contract them back to the Council for action. Motion carried. (7 AYES)

SEWER EXPANSION - MESA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT REGARDING URBAN NEEDS - INVESTIGATE MAKING STUDY

The following letter from Dr. Cecil R. Reinstein, Director, Mesa County Department of Public Health was read:

"To the City Council
City Hall
Grand Junction, Colorado

June 2, 1965

Gentlemen:

The problem of the provision of adequate sanitary sewage facilities in the suburban areas surrounding Grand Junction is rapidly approaching a critical stage. This is especially true in areas north of the City as in the vicinity of Horizon Drive and adjacent to the InterState highway complex, and also in other unorganized community areas such as Orchard Mesa which are over populated for their existing facilities and needs.

We are aware of the problems created by urban development or suburban expansion which do not take into consideration future progress and development in relation to our total larger community needs.

Although present needs in these areas could be met by small unit sewage systems, acceptable under our standards, such short sighted solutions to the existing problems would create barriers restricting future development, as well as being less economical and less efficient.

We are also aware that the City of Grand Junction will have to, in the future, improve, expand, enlarge or relocate its present westside sewer plant to meet the increasing needs of its changing and growing population.

I would, therefore, respectfully urge your consideration of an overall survey of the needs of the City of Grand Junction and its suburbs and adjacent rural areas by an unbiased firm of sanitation engineers. Such a study jointly sponsored by the City of Grand Junction and Mesa County would assess the feasibility and costs of providing area wide sanitary sewer services in the most economical and practical manner. In addition to whatever existing monies from City and County sources are available, additional State and Federal funds for such studies could be obtained on a grant or loan basis.

It would seem that the City Council and County Commissioners could accomplish a great deal by jointly sponsoring such a survey and by appointing a Citizen's Committee or delegating to a mutually agreeable committee of its members a group to work with the engineering firm chosen. All existing agencies and planning groups within the community should cooperate with such a positive action program.

Your early consideration of this suggestion would be appreciated and our department would be happy to cooperate in any way possible.

Sincerely,

/s/ Cecil R. Reinstein, M.D.
Director"

City Manager Lacy stated that this matter has been talked about by the Council before, but the time is here when it must be recognized. Piecemeal urban services are expensive as proven by the experience of the Fruitvale and Clifton Sanitation Districts.

Some urban areas are in critical need of sewer service and, are not eligible for annexation, Mr. Lacy had talked to Dr. Reinstein and felt his suggestion is reasonable. It would be well to contact the County Commissioners to get their feeling as they are having problems with zoning and development of areas from lack of sewer facilities. Also, a look should be taken to see about the possibility of what financial help might be available.

A good engineering study should be made to see if outside city sewer service can be provided at a reasonable cost. The Westside sewer plant is operating at capacity now, and it should be determined whether it is wise to spend any more money on it for a grit and grease remover when it does not improve the capacity, and whether it should be enlarged or re-located to handle future needs.

The Council instructed City Manager Lacy to take the-necessary action to see what could be done by contacting the County Commissioners and to see if funds are available for an engineering study.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Councilman McCormick and seconded by Councilman Colescott that the meeting adjourn. Motion carried. (7 AYES)

/s/ Blanche G. Stringer
Deputy City Clerk