

Grand Junction, Colorado

March 17, 1976

ROLL CALL

The City Council of Grand Junction, Colorado, met in regular session at 7:30 p.m. March 17, 1976, in the Council Chambers at City Hall. Members present and answering roll call: Larry Brown, Harry Colescott, Karl Johnson, Jane Quimby, Elvin Tufly, Robert Van Houten, and President of the Council Lawrence Kozisek. Also present: City Manager Harvey Rose, City Attorney Gerald Ashby, and City Clerk Neva Lockhart.

MINUTES

It was moved by Councilman Tufly and seconded by Councilman Johnson that the Minutes of the regular meeting of March 3, 1976, be approved as written. Motion carried.

COUNCIL DECISION REGARDING APPLICATION BY LARRY SHAVER FOR HOTEL-RESTAURANT LIQUOR LICENSE AT TWO RIVERS PLAZA, 2ND AND MAIN

City Attorney Gerald Ashby read the following Decision:

A public hearing having been held on March 3, 1976, on the application by Larry Daniel Shaver for a Hotel and Restaurant Liquor License for Two Rivers Plaza at Second and Main in the City of Grand Junction, and the City Council having considered the evidence adduced at said hearing:

FINDS:

1. That the hearing was held after proper notice under the Liquor Code.
2. That the survey conducted by the City indicated that the needs of the neighborhood were not being met by other outlets within the neighborhood and there was a need for this outlet, in that 96 persons so stated while 28 felt the needs were being met by the other outlets and 8 persons were otherwise opposed to the issuance of the license. Two letters were received opposing the issuance of the license.
3. That two persons appeared at the hearing in opposition to the issuance of the license.
4. That the character of the Applicant, as determined through the check of his fitness by the Police Department and through letters attesting to his good character, is good.

IT IS THEREFORE the decision of the City Council of the City of Grand Junction that a Hotel and Restaurant Liquor License be issued to Larry Daniel Shaver for the Two Rivers Plaza at Second

and Main in Grand Junction.

Dated this 17th day of March, 1976.

President of the Council

Attest:

City Clerk

It was moved by Councilman Johnson and seconded by Councilman Tufly that the decision be approved and the license granted when the State license is received. Motion carried.

APPLICATIONS TO RENEW 3.2% BEER LICENSES

City Market Store #1
433 Grand Avenue

George Pederson
Colescott's 7-11
551 South Avenue

Submitted for consideration was the application by City Market Store No. 1, 433 Grand Avenue, for the renewal of the 3.2% Beer License. A report from the Police Department indicated that during the past licensing period there have been no known violations or complaints filed in connection with the sale of 3.2% fermented malt beverage by this establishment.

It was moved by Councilman Tufly and seconded by Councilman Colescott that the application be approved and the license issued when the State license has been received. Motion carried.

Submitted for consideration was the application by George Pederson, Colescott's Seven-Eleven Store, 551 South Avenue, for the renewal of the 3.2% Beer License. A report from the Police Department indicated that during the past licensing period there have been no known violations or complaints filed in connection with the sale of 3.2% fermented malt beverage by this establishment.

It was moved by Councilman Tufly and seconded by Councilman Brown that the application be approved and the license issued when the State license has been received. Motion carried with Councilman Colescott abstaining.

APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF OWNERSHIP OF 3.2% BEER LICENSE FOR ORCHARD BOWL, INC., 295 - 27 ROAD, (ROBERT J. STACK, PRESENT OWNER)

Submitted for consideration was the application for 3.2% Beer License (Change of Ownership), by Orchard Bowl, Inc., presently owned by Robert Stack. A report from the Police Department advised there was nothing derogatory in the background check of the proposed corporate members. Proposed Corporate Officers are:

Charles M. Camerson, President
Robert G. Wittenberg, Vice President
Patricia L. Wittenberg, Treasurer
Imogene E. Cameron, Secretary

It was moved by Councilman Johnson and seconded by Councilman Tuflly that the application be approved and the license issued when the State license has been received. Motion carried unanimously.

REPORT FROM CITY ANIMAL WARDENS

City Manager Rose submitted a written report to Council providing some background information on Animal Control. However, the Animal Wardens were not prepared to make recommendations at this meeting. Recommendations will be brought to Council at a later date.

HEARING - APPLICATION FOR 3.2% FERMENTED MALT BEVERAGE SPECIAL EVENTS PERMIT, AMERICAN LEGION POST #200, APRIL 3, 1976

Submitted for consideration was the application by American Legion Post #200 for a Special Events Permit to sell fermented malt beverages (3.2% Beer) by the drink at Houston Hall, Mesa College, April 3, 1976, 7:30 p.m. to midnight. American Legion Post #200 is acting as sponsor for the Mesa College Vets Club, who is in charge of the event.

It was moved by Councilman Tuflly and seconded by Councilman Brown that the Special Events Permit be granted. Motion carried unanimously.

HEARING - PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN WITHIN HIGHWAY ORIENTED ZONE - 427 SHERMAN DRIVE

Advertised for hearing this date was the proposed development plan within H.O. Zone, 427 Sherman Drive. The President opened the hearing. Recommended from the Planning Commission was the proposed development plan within Highway Oriented Zone on 427 Sherman Drive, with one condition: that the North and East side be screen fenced. There being no letters received and no one in the audience speaking on this matter, the President closed the hearing.

It was moved by Councilman Colescott and seconded by Councilman Johnson that the proposed development plan be approved with the conditions of the Planning Commission. Motion carried.

HEARING - PROPOSED FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR DENTAL OFFICE IN PD-B ZONING - NE CORNER FIRST AND WALNUT

Advertised for hearing this date was the proposed final development plan for a dental office in PD-B Zoning, the northeast corner of First and Walnut. The President opened the hearing. Conditions made by the Planning Commission were: (1) that the planting be cleared with the Parks Department; (2) that right of way be granted for First Street; (3) improvements required on Walnut (curb, gutter and sidewalks). No letters having been filed and no one in the audience wishing to speak on this matter, the President closed the hearing.

It was moved by Councilman Brown and seconded by Councilwoman Quimby that the final development plan for dental office in PD-B Zoning be approved contingent upon the conditions of the Planning Commission. Motion carried with Councilman Tufly abstaining.

HEARING - FINAL PLAT FOR BARGER MINOR SUBDIVISION

Advertised for hearing this date was the final plat for Barger Minor Subdivision. The President opened the hearing. Senior Planner Don Warner reviewed the plat with Council. Location is 28th and Orchard. The Planning Commission approved this plat with one recommendation: that curb, gutter, and sidewalk be provided along Hall Avenue. No letters having been filed, and no one in the audience indicating a desire to speak on this matter, the President closed the hearing.

It was moved by Councilman Johnson and seconded by Councilman Brown that the final plat for Barger Minor Subdivision be accepted and signed by the President of the Council and the City Manager; that it be approved and filed with the Mesa County Clerk and Recorder and that a copy thereof be placed on file in the offices of the County Assessor and the City Engineer. Motion carried unanimously.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE - PROPOSED REZONING FROM R-1-C AND C-2 TO I-2, GUNNISON AVENUE EAST OF HARRIS ROAD, PETITIONER: CORN CONSTRUCTION

Advertised for hearing this date and recommended by the Planning Commission, was the proposed rezoning from R-1-C and C-2 to I-2, Gunnison Avenue East of Harris Road. Petitioner: Corn Construction. The President opened the hearing.

Senior Planner Don Warner reviewed the proposed rezoning stating that since the time of the original zoning, Mr. Corn has purchased the south ends of the two properties, therefore, the request for rezoning. Mr. Jerry Fossenier stated that the lots are fenced with chain-linked fencing, and the south end is proposed to be fenced also. Mr. Warner stated that one of the requirements was the right of way for Gunnison Avenue, which has been agreed to by the petitioner. No letters having been filed and no one in the audience indicating a desire to speak, the President closed the hearing.

The following entitled proposed ordinance was read: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ZONING MAP, A PART OF CHAPTER 32 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, BY CHANGING THE ZONING OF CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN THE CITY. It was moved by Councilman Tufly and seconded by Councilman Johnson that the proposed ordinance be passed for publication. Motion carried unanimously.

HEARING - PROPOSED CONDITIONAL USE IN C-1 ZONING - 28-3/4 ROAD & NORTH AVENUE

Advertised for hearing this date and recommended by the Planning Commission was the proposed conditional use in C-1 zoning, 28-3/4 Road and North Avenue. The President opened the hearing.

Senior Planner Don Warner indicated that this area is intended to be used for a lumber yard. The Planning Commission asks that there be screen fencing on the 28-3/4 Road side, also that any needed right of way for 28-3/4 be deeded, and deeded right of way for North Avenue.

There was a recommendation by Assistant Parks and Recreation Director Ken Idleman that street trees be spaced so that no sight problems will be presented. No letters having been filed and no one in the audience indicating a desire to speak on this matter, the President closed the hearing.

It was moved by Councilwoman Quimby and seconded by Councilman Johnson that the proposed conditional use be approved with Planning Commission's recommendations. Motion carried unanimously.

ORDINANCE NO. 1616 - OFF-STREET PARKING FACILITIES

The Proof of Publication to the following entitled ordinance was presented: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, PROVIDING FOR FURTHER OFF-STREET PARKING FACILITIES BY MEANS OF THE LEASING OF SUCH OFF-STREET PARKING FACILITIES BY THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION FROM THE GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, PARKING AUTHORITY, A COLORADO NON-PROFIT CORPORATION; APPROVING THE FORM OF LEASEHOLD AGREEMENT WITH OPTION TO PURCHASE BETWEEN THE CITY AND SAID AUTHORITY FOR SAID PURPOSE, AND PROVIDING OTHER MATTERS RELATING THERETO. It was moved by Councilman Tufly and seconded by Councilman Brown that the Proof of Publication be accepted for filing. Motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Councilman Brown and seconded by Councilman Tufly that the proposed ordinance be called up for final passage and read. Motion carried unanimously. The Ordinance was read. There being no comments, it was moved by Councilman Colescott and seconded by Councilman Johnson that the Ordinance be passed, adopted, and numbered 1616, and ordered published. Upon roll call all Council members voted AYE. The President declared the motion carried.

ORDINANCE NO. 1617 - ADOPTION OF SIGN CODE HEARING

The President opened the hearing. Mr. Dick Clark requested a definition for "flashing sign." City Attorney - any sign which contains an intermittent or flashing light source, or which includes the illusion of intermittent or flashing light by means of animation or an externally mounted intermittent light source.

Councilman Tufly stated he cannot accept the Sign Code Ordinance as it is written, feeling that the Council should not have the right to say "you cannot do this or you will not do this" where the Sign Code is concerned. He is not opposed to the fact that Council is trying to regulate signs, but he does not agree with the concept of the Sign Code Ordinance. He does not feel the Council should have the right to tell certain individuals what they will do and what they will not do in this area. He did not feel it is any different than passing an ordinance that states everyone will plant grass in their front yard. He doesn't feel the citizens of Grand Junction would allow that type of an ordinance due to the fact that they are the ones that are being affected. He feels there are other ways in which this problem could be solved. In other areas, if someone wants to do something different, the City charges them for that privilege. He simply feels Council is approaching this ordinance from the wrong way.

Mr. Dieter Sutherland felt that the Sign Code still does not allow sufficient square footage for theatre marquees. Don Warner stated the Code allows one-half square foot for each linear foot of building for projecting signs. The flush wall sign is two square foot for each linear foot of building.

Councilman Brown would like to leave the Sign Code as it is, recognizing Mr. Sutherland's problem. He expects that there will be considerable adjustments made in the Code before it really takes effect. If this Code is causing an undue hardship years from now, a variance could be requested. Councilman Brown would favor a variation to the Code rather than lessening the standards of the Code itself.

Councilman Johnson commented that Denver's five-year moratorium on signs ended last Friday, and they have over 10,000 signs left that are non-conforming, and most of them are projecting signs. Their code prohibited any projecting sign. This is where they are having the problem. They estimate it is going to take two years to notify these sign owners and take action against them.

Mr. Richard Clark stated he has been confronted as Representative of North Avenue Association on several instances concerning blinking signs. He would still prefer to see something involving the intensity, allowing flashing and blinking signs as long as the intensity doesn't go beyond a certain point. This is what he has been trying to say all the time, but cannot see where there has been any change. Mayor Kozisek asked Mr. Clark if he would be comfortable with the idea of being able to work this out with the Appeals Board or Committee recommending changes to Council. Mayor

Kozisek asked that as soon as a Sign Code Board is set up that Mr. Clark approach it with any recommendations.

City Attorney Ashby stated that, in fairness, if a theatre came in tomorrow, it would not be looking at Mr. Sutherland's side, it would be looking at what the Sign Code says. Then eight years from now you would want to give a variance to Mr. Sutherland. Would this be fair to the person who put the sign up originally in conformance with the Sign Code. Mayor Kozisek stated that his would have to become considerations of the Variance Board and their recommendations to Council. The President closed the hearing.

The Proof of Publication to the following entitled ordinance was presented: AN ORDINANCE ENACTING A SIGN CODE FOR THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION CONTROLLING THE SIZE AND LOCATION OF SIGNS WITHIN THE CITY, PROVIDING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN SIGNS, REQUIRING CONFORMANCE OVER A PERIOD OF TIME WITH SIGN CODE REGULATION OF SIGNS NOT MEETING THE CODE, PROVIDING FOR ASSESSMENT AGAINST PROPERTY FOR REMOVAL OR REPAIR OF SIGNS, AND PROVIDING FOR PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF SAID CODE.

It was moved by Councilman Brown and seconded by Councilman Johnson that the Proof of Publication be accepted for filing. Motion carried.

It was moved by Councilman Johnson and seconded by Councilman Brown that the Ordinance be called up for final passage and the reading of the title as copies were made available to the meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

The Ordinance was read. There being no comments, it was moved by Councilman Johnson and seconded by Councilman Brown that the Ordinance be passed, adopted, numbered 1617, and ordered published in pamphlet form. Upon roll call, Councilmembers voting AYE: Jane Quimby, Harry Colescott, Robert Van Houten, Larry Brown, Karl Johnson, Lawrence Kozisek. Council members voting NO: Elvin Tufly. The President declared the motion carried.

Mrs. Virginia Flager, Planning Commission member, commented that the news media statements placed the blame for the contents of the Sign Code on one member of the Planning Commission for most of the controversy in the Code. She stated it simply is not true. The Code was passed by the Planning Commission with majority opinion. There were no close-tie votes on the controversial issues. There were no "no" votes. The Code passed by the Planning Commission was not the work of one man, and Mrs. Flager wished to specifically refute the news media on that particular issue.

Councilman Brown stated that two other members of the Planning with whom he had talked confirmed Mrs. Flager's comment. Councilwoman Quimby stated she had advised Council on March 3 that Mr. Clark's assessment of the situation was not so. She noted her remarks were not in the Council Minutes of March 3.

Mayor Kozisek, on behalf of the City Council, personally expressed his complete appreciation for the work the Sign Code Committee did on the Sign Code. He thanked them for this diligence, dedication, and work. This Committee signified that it could accept the charge and was diligent in carrying it through successfully.

It was moved by Councilman Brown and seconded by Councilman Johnson that the Sign Code Committee be disbanded with the appreciation and thanks of the entire City Council. Motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Councilman Van Houten and seconded by Councilman Johnson that appointments to the Sign Code Board be deferred until the next regularly scheduled meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION - RECONVEY TO WELLINGTON MEDICAL BUILDING, A COLORADO CO-PARTNERSHIP, PROPERTY LOCATED ON SOUTH SIDE OF PATTERSON BETWEEN 7TH & 8TH STREETS

The following Resolution was presented and read:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the property hereinafter described was erroneously conveyed to the City of Grand Junction for easement purposes;

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

That City Manager be authorized on behalf of the City and as the act of the City to reconvey to Wellington Medical Building, A Colorado Co-Partnership, the land situate in Mesa County, Colorado, and described as:

Commencing at the Northeast corner of Lot 2 Wellington Medical Subdivision, Filing No. 1; thence North 79° 28' 00" West 233.49 feet to point of beginning; thence North 23° 06' 09" West 30.46 feet; thence East 16.78 feet; thence South 45° 43' 00" East 40.13 feet to point of beginning; for utility purposes, together with a temporary easement for construction extending 15 feet South of the North property line of Lot 2 Wellington Medical Subdivision Filing No. 1.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 17th day of March, 1976.

President of the Council

Attest:

City Clerk

It was moved by Councilman Johnson and seconded by Councilman Tufly that the Resolution be passed and adopted as read. Roll was called upon the motion with all members of Council voting AYE. The President declared the motion carried and the Resolution duly passed and adopted.

TWO RIVERS PLAZA POLICY STATEMENT

City Manager Rose supplied councilmembers with copies of a proposed Policy Statement with regard to the usage of Two Rivers Plaza. Some problems have arisen since the opening of the Plaza, and this statement is being handed to Council merely as an information item, so that Council may review it, and have on the next meeting's agenda. Members of the Chamber of Commerce will be present to answer questions.

SEWERAGE SYSTEMS OF CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

City Manager Rose stated that in reference to the two sewer tap requests at the last meeting, the two requests would have to be denied, as recommended by staff, since staff, at this time, does not know if the second regional plan will be forthcoming. However, the Valley Wide Sewer Association has met - it has a very active group of people who have been studying the problems. They feel that within two weeks they will be able to move ahead on the funding of the Regional Sewer Plant. Jim Patterson, Utilities Director, pointed out the new developments within the City, totaling approximately 967 units, which would generate approximately one half million gallons of sewage. Another 1.3 million gallons of sewage is expected to be generated from proposed developments within the City, totalling 1.8 million gallons of sewage. Based on the current rate of growth this entire area would be developed by 1985. The City has contracts with the Fruitvale Sanitation District, the Central Grand Valley Sanitation District, and the Orchard Mesa District. Councilman Johnson questioned if there is a commitment as a condition of the grant received that the City would serve a specified area.

City Manager Rose stated that the contracts we have do not set perimeters as to the number of gallons, number of taps, or areas of square miles. They are merely contracts to treat sewage, and can be called to a halt given the certain perimeters of those contracts, and the periods of time, etc. But the board of directors of the various districts have indicated that they are willing to work with us to develop new treatment facilities or to slow down in the development or need for additional treatment out of their districts. So it is a matter of progressing toward the next step in our master plan, and that is the second regional plant. Mr. Patterson stated the City has a contract with Central Grand Valley; therefore, it has a commitment to that area. As each one of the developments goes through the Development Department,

the City signs a site application saying it will be responsible for treating the sewage.

Councilman Van Houten commented that it is readily apparent that if the City and County will continue in the cooperative spirit, which it has previously, that it is well within the possibility that within the next 120 days we can pretty well see some daylight. He believes the approach that has been suggested at this point is quite practical, economical, and can be accomplished with the cooperation of the City and the County. He could think of no way for the City to back off and say "If you live one inch over the boundary line, the City cannot serve you." He thinks the City and the County have an obligation to see to it that the residents of this valley, who are all actually the same people, get the required services they need. If it requires cooperation between the City and the County, he thinks it behooves Council to follow that.

It was moved by Councilman Brown and seconded by Councilman Johnson that the two requests and any others which may be forthcoming, be denied for 90 days or less, and the "or less days" depending on the outcome of the Valley Wide Sewer Service negotiations. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Tufly suggested continued City cooperation with the County. City Manager Rose commented that there are a lot of active people that are involved in the Valley Wide Sewer Association. Mr. Howard Roland was elected Chairman, Ted Ford: Vice Chairman, Jim Patterson: Secretary of the organization. The association will be meeting the morning of March 18, 1976, with a financial consultant who has volunteered his services to make recommendations to the Valley Wide Sewer Association with regard to funding of 25% of a 75%/25% grant for the construction of the facility. After speaking with Senator Shoemaker, it is felt that it is possible to obtain anywhere from three to four million dollars as the 75% match for the construction of the facility by September of 1977. The City's receiving the funding depends on its diligence in obtaining the 25% for its share. Right now the question in which organization will be floating the revenue bonds to come up with the match. It could be either the City government or County government, or it could be a sewer authority (a new separate government entity). Mr. Rose will recommend that the next meeting of the Valley Wide Sewer Association be a joint meeting with the County Commissioners and the City Council so that when a recommendation is made as to how we fund that 25%, it will be possible for actions to take place as rapidly as possible.

Mr. Al Mayo, representing a group of property owners just outside the city limits, approached Council. He wished to emphasize that the 90-day moratorium is, in effect, frustrating the investment of millions in this valley. He stated that it takes at least a year from the time you start thinking about one of these projects to the time you can even begin to merchandise, so he was trying to underscore what the investors feel.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS

Trip to Washington, D.C. Councilwoman Quimby stated that she and President Kozisek plan to have a report ready soon on their trip to Washington, D.C.

Planning Commission She also stated that the Planning Commission is attempting to go back to a nighttime meeting on March 30, 1976, at 7:00 p.m. rather than 8:00 a.m.

Contractors-State Licensing-Colorado Municipal League Councilman Johnson discussed the legislative reports of the Colorado Municipal League Office. One item of interest that is before the legislature, right now is the State licensing of contractors, which, if passed, would take away from the City any right to license or control any contractor doing business in this City. This is a League opposed amendment, and the City's position should be made known to the local legislators.

CENTENNIAL-BICENTENNIAL FILM SHOWING-FRIDAY, MARCH 20, 1976

Councilman Johnson also discussed the Centennial-Bicentennial film that was put together with funds from the City. He felt every council member should make a strong effort to see the film. Film is to be shown Friday, March 20, 1976.

DISCUSSION OF CITY MANAGER'S RESIGNATION DATE

Councilman Tufly stated the Council has a situation in which it has to take some further action. He continued that Mr. Rose announced his intention to resign approximately one month ago, and Council still does not have a date that it will be effective. Councilman Tufly's feeling is not that which was expressed by the news media as being that of the Council. Councilman Tufly does not feel this is a good administrative move, nor does he feel that it is fair to other City employees. He stated that if Mr. Rose were to receive the same form of resignation from a staff member that he would not tolerate it, or Councilman Tufly hoped he would not. He continued that he does not feel there is any means of enforcing any control over this type situation. If the Council does not have a date by which Mr. Rose feels he will be leaving, Councilman Tufly feels the Council has only one other choice and that is to begin recruitment for a new City Manager. Due to the fact that it will probably take several months to find one, and if Mr. Rose hasn't given a date by that time, although Councilman Tufly felt confident that Mr. Rose probably will have, then Council would have to take further action. He felt it rather ironic that last Monday Council was asked to give long-range direction to the Planning Commission, and it doesn't even know where its own administration stands. Councilman Tufly does not feel that he is alone in his opinion due to the number of calls he has received on this matter. He felt he could no longer sit back and let the problem solve itself. He felt Council needs to know exactly where

it is going.

Councilman Johnson responded to Councilman Tufly's comment by stating that he does not feel comfortable over the uncertainty of the future that Council is living with right now. He could see some definite problems that will be faced down the line. When it gets into Budget matters and other things, he would hope that before that time Council would have a City Manager on board that would be oriented and would be familiar with the needs of the City and its operations. He certainly concurred that Council needs something definite to stand on.

Councilwoman Quimby did not feel it is fair to force Mr. Rose to make a decision and felt he should be given time to get his affairs in order and complete the projects and goals he has strived for. She felt that she, personally, owes this to him. She did recognize some of the problems this may entail.

Councilman Johnson had no quarrel with Councilwoman Quimby's comments. He is not criticizing Mr. Rose on what he is doing on a day-to-day basis. He has no objection to his taking time to finish up things. But if he is planning to finish something that will take a year from now, and Council is going to be faced with an indefinite situation, then it isn't one that he can accept.

Councilman Brown did not see any problems. He would consider a couple of months a reasonable time for decision and could see no reason to consider anything for a couple of months. The City has a man it has been training for two years that has been receiving an assistant manager's salary, so that he can step in any time he is needed for as long a period of time as needed. Therefore, he does not feel there is any need for this whatsoever. Councilman Van Houten concurred with Councilman Brown's statements.

MAYOR'S REMARKS ABOUT TRIP TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mayor Kozisek reported on his trip to Washington, D.C. on revenue sharing and some energy related programs.

Revenue Sharing - Our delegates gave the impression they will vote for a revenue sharing program of some type and generally speaking, there will be a revenue sharing bill come out this year.

Energy Related Programs - Synthetic fuels bill, concerning shale development, mineral leasing acts. Of all the congressmen, Congressman Evans was the only one who favored anything dealing with energy development and possible subsidization of private industry in getting something started. The others felt that subsidies were not necessary. At one point he was told by Congressman Johnson that regardless of what happens, we can expect to be a "Rock Springs. There isn't much that can be done to eliminate it." Mayor Kozisek disagreed with the statement - he felt that something can be done about it, particularly, if people, such as Congressman Johnson, will not express his views and will

help us do something to try to eliminate it. Our senators, both Haskell and Hart, are in favor of the synthetic fuels bill which has been proposed. The senate passed that bill last year. It was defeated in the House. The language of the new bill this year is almost identical to what it was last year. The monetary amount is less than 50% of what it was, and President Kozisek does not feel there will be any trouble passing it this year. He feels that the bill will provide Industry with some answers they need to be able to make some decision. More detailed analysis of the trip is available upon request.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Councilman Brown and duly seconded that the meeting be adjourned.

Neva B. Lockhart

Neva B. Lockhart
City Clerk