

Grand Junction, Colorado

March 4, 1981

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, convened in regular session at 7:30 p.m. the 4th day of March, 1981, in Council Chambers at City Hall. Those present were Council members Louis Brach, Frank Dun, Robert Holmes, Dale Hollingsworth, Karl Johnson, Bill O'Dwyer, and Jane Quimby, a quorum. Also present were City Manager Jim Wysocki, City Attorney Gerald Ashby, and City Clerk Neva Lockhart.

Council President Jane Quimby called the meeting to order and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

INVOCATION

Reverend Robert McClung, Northeast Christian Church.

MINUTES

Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilman O'Dwyer and carried, the minutes of the regular meeting February 18, 1981, were approved as written.

AIR QUALITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT

Reverend Conard Pyle was appointed to the Air Quality Advisory Committee.

LIQUOR - RENEWAL OF PANTUSO'S ITALIAN RISTORANTE HOTEL-RESTAURANT LICENSE

Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilman Johnson and carried with Councilman HOLMES voting NO, the application by Pantuso's Italian Ristorante to renew the hotel-restaurant liquor license for 2782 Crossroads Boulevard was approved.

LIQUOR - RETAIL LIQUOR STORE LICENSE GRANTED LESLIE SOMERVILLE DBA FIRST STREET LIQUOR, 817 N. 1ST STREET

Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilman Johnson and carried with Councilman HOLMES voting No, the application by Leslie Lynn Somerville for the retail liquor store license for First Street Liquor, 817 N. 1st Street, was approved.

HEARING - DEVELOPMENT IN PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ZONE, SAFEWAY STORE FINAL PLAN - APPROVED

A hearing was held after due notice on the petition by Safeway Store for development in a planned Development Zone on Orchard Mesa and its final plan. There were no opponents, letters, or counterpetitions. Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilman Johnson and carried, the final development plan by

Safeway Store was approved.

LIQUOR - HOLIDAY INN HOTEL-RESTAURANT LIQUOR LICENSE RENEWAL -
APPROVED - CHANGE IN CORPORATE STRUCTURE APPROVED

"President Quimby" The next item under communications and that's an application by the Holiday Inn of Grand Junction at 755 Horizon Drive to renew a hotel-restaurant liquor license and a change in corporate structure with Henry J. Teters, Jr., as Vice-President, replacing H. Tiffin Teters.

Councilman Hollingsworth: Madam Chairman.

President Quimby: Yes.

Councilman Hollingsworth: I asked that this be removed from the consent agenda so I could comment on it at this meeting if I might now.

President Quimby: All right.

Councilman Hollingsworth: I think that those individuals who hold liquor licenses gain a special privilege from the City residents and from the City Council. I think special privileges usually implies special responsibilities. The owners of license who sell alcoholic beverages are in the public view, and I think they should be.

City Council members are in that same limelight, or public view, and I think that's proper too. I don't think we nor they should abdicate any of our rights or responsibility, but we should choose, I think, with extreme care our personal activities. The owners of licenses who do not operate the businesses assign individuals to represent them as owners. It pinpoints a daily responsibility but I think the license is still the obligation of the owners to continue and/or to lose it. In December I met personally with two of the owners of this applicant from Jefferson City, Missouri, and I pointed out the hazards of the confrontation that I thought was developing communitywide which wasn't to involve them. I cautioned them regarding the petition process, which in my judgement, limits activities to City residents only, not just signing the petitions, but circulating them. I also indicated that urging people to sign petitions is implied for City residents only. They at that time advised me of the death of one of the owners and that's the change to the application this evening. The conflict that developed was fanned by a sense of publicity and that included all City Council members. It actually was the most conflicting single item we've discussed in my two years on this Council. I do not, however, consider it the most important. Far from it. I will attest to the fact that it split badly the City Council, and I will attest further that we have not been reunited as of this day. In renewals of liquor licenses we are to determine if there have been any violations and there have been none. The violations are usually selling to underaged

individuals. However, actions of all types by the owners and the managers are considered and can cause or delay a non-renewal of a license. I think the tragic case for this Council of the licensee in the recent Sherwood Park incident will remind the Council that other than selling to underage individuals can come into view. As a result the Council developed a new method of reviewing violations. Although the City Attorney takes a broader view of the petition process than I do, and I respect his judgement and I always have, it does not seem appropriate for me to be circulating or being active in a recall petition in DeBeque even if I owned or operated a business in DeBeque. And to DeBeque's credit, they settled a far more emotional and complicated issue yesterday by the ballot box, a privilege that was denied our citizens in the visitor convention tourist lodging issue. City petitioners dealing with City Council actions or ordinance are intended if not specifically written to be the prerogative of City residents. I do not believe that was the case in the last two petitions programs. I want to reiterate: liquor licenses deserves special responsibilities by all who are involved. And the special privilege and responsibility go together. It's not my intention to pursue or comment further on this matter, but I want to serve notice to all licensees that they need to review their individual activities carefully. And I, for one, will be watching far more closely than I have in the past. Madam Chairman, with those remarks I would move that the liquor license for Holiday Inn be approved for the twelve-month period beginning April 9, 1981.

Councilman Johnson: I will second the motion.

President Quimby: It has been moved and seconded that the application by the Holiday Inn for a hotel-restaurant liquor license be renewed. Are there any comments?

Councilman Holmes: madam Chairman?

President Quimby: Yes, Bob.

Councilman Holmes: If I may. I find the relevance between the remarks and the association between a petition being circulated relating to a bed tax and the consideration of an application for a renewal of a liquor license to be totally without foundation, and I find it further somewhat of a threat to people in this comment that they will be rather under close surveillance and I fell that this is certainly a sad commentary on the part of this Council this evening.

President Quimby: Are there other comments from members of the Council? If not, it has been moved and seconded the application be approved. All those in favor?

AYES: HOLLINGSWORTH, JOHNSON, DUNN, O'DWYER, BRACH, QUIMBY.

President Quimby: Opposed:

Councilman HOLMES: OPPOSED."

RESOLUTION OF FINDINGS AND DECISION ON APPLICATION BY SAL'S PIZZA, INC. FOR BEER-WINE LICENSE AT 755 NORTH AVENUE - APPROVED

The following Resolution was read:

RESOLUTION

OF DECISION ON APPLICATION FOR BEER-WINE LICENSE FOR SAL'S PIZZA AT 755 NORTH AVENUE, GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO.

A public hearing having been held on March 4, 1981, on the application by Sal's Pizza, Inc. for a Beer-Wine License for Sal's Pizza at 755 North Avenue, 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 219 persons so stated while 102 felt the needs were being met by the other outlets.
3. That no one appeared at the hearing in opposition to the granting of the license and no petitions or letters of disapproval were received by the City Council.
4. That the characters of the Applicants are good as determined by checking done by the Police Department and by letters attesting to their good characters, the applicants being the officers of said corporation making application.
5. The evidence supports the position that the needs of the neighborhood are not being met by other outlets of the same type and the position that the desires of the inhabitants of the neighborhood are that the license issue.

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

That a Beer-Wine License issue to Sal's Pizza, Inc. for Sal's Pizza at 755 North Avenue, Grand Junction, Colorado.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 4th day of March, 1981.

President of the Council

Attest:

City Clerk

Upon motion by Councilman Brach, seconded by Councilman Dunn and carried by roll call vote with Council members HOLMES and O'DWYER voting NO, the Resolution was passed and adopted as read.

HEARING - APPLICATION BY LOMA JAY, INC. DBA HUNGRY MINER, 2424 U.S. HIGHWAY 6 & 50 (MESA MALL SUITE 300) FOR USE IN H.O. ZONE AND HOTEL-RESTAURANT LIQUOR LICENSE - DECISION MARCH 18, 1981

A hearing was held after due notice on the application by Loma Jay, Inc., for use in H.O. Zone and for hotel-restaurant liquor license at the Hungry Miner, Suite 300, Mesa Mall, 2424 U.S. Highway 6 & 50. The following report was read:

On January 29, 1981, an application for a hotel-restaurant liquor license was filed by Loma Jay, Inc. dba Hungry Miner, to be located at 2424 U.S. Highway 6 & 50, Suite 300, in Mesa Mall. Officers and majority stockholders are:

President: Marvin J. Somerville 33-1/3%

Vice Pres: Earl F. Payne 33-1/3%

Sec/Treas: Donald E. Riggle 33-1/3%

The sign giving notice of hearing was posted on the property February 20, 1981, and the display ad giving notice of hearing was published in The Daily Sentinel February 20, 1981.

The area from 23-1/2 Road on the west, F-1/2 Road on the north, 24-1/2 Road on the east, to E-1/2 Road on the south was surveyed. Results:

1. Yes, I am in favor of the issuance of the license as I believe the needs of the neighborhood are not being met by existing outlets. 268

a. Owner of property in neighborhood 25

b. An employee or business lessee of property in the neighborhood 235

c. Inhabitant of neighborhood 27

2. No, I am not in favor of the issuance of the license as I believe the needs of the neighborhood are being met by existing outlets. 26

a. Owner of property in neighborhood 3

b. An employee or business lessee of property in the neighborhood

c. Inhabitant of neighborhood 4

The proposed plans have been reviewed by the Mesa County Health Department and the Grand Junction Fire Department with notations by those agencies that construction comply with Fire and Building Codes. The Police Department reports that nothing of a derogatory nature was revealed during the course of the background investigation of the officers.

Similar type outlets within one mile: none.

The map showing similar type outlets was reviewed.

Earl Payne, Vice President of the corporation, appeared in behalf of the application.

There were no opponents, letters, or counterpetitions.

A Resolution of findings and decision is scheduled on the March 18, 1981, City Council agenda.

BIDS - AWARD OF CONTRACT - PAINTING OF WATER TANK AT WATER PLANT - SPECIAL COATINGS CORPORATION - \$136,400

Bids were received and opened February 23, 1981, for the painting of the inside of the two 4-million gallon treated water storage tanks at the Water Treatment Plant. Bidders were:

Libo Painting Company \$309,944

Major Paint & Sandblasting \$288,000

Special Coatings Systems \$236,000

Skyline Painting \$172,447

Thompson Painting \$169,800

Lamdrecht & Sons \$159,052

Clark Painting Company \$153,900

Special Coating Corporation \$136,400

\$120,000 was included in the 1981 budget for this work. The low bid of \$16,400 in excess of the budgeted amount. The Public Works Department is requesting on separate documents that \$16,400 be transferred from the budget item for purchase of additional water rights to the budget item for painting the tanks.

Special Coatings Corporation satisfactorily completed the painting of the Mantey Heights water tank, therefore, the Public Works

Department recommended award of the contract to Special Coatings Corporation for its low bid of \$136,400.

Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilman Brach and carried, the contract for the painting of the inside of the two 4-million-gallon treated water storage tanks was awarded Special Coatings Corporation for its low bid of \$136,400.

ORDINANCE NO. 1946 - CONCERNING BUILDERS OF HOMES FOR THEIR OWN USE OR FOR RENTAL USE FOR THEIR BENEFIT

Upon motion by Councilman Johnson, seconded by Councilman Holmes and carried, the Proof of Publication to the following entitled proposed ordinance was accepted for filing: AN ORDINANCE CONCERNING BUILDERS OF HOMES FOR THEIR OWN USE OR FOR RENTAL USE FOR THEIR BENEFIT.

Upon motion by Councilman Holmes, seconded by Councilman Hollingsworth and carried, the proposed ordinance was called up for final passage and read.

There were no comments. Upon motion by Councilman Brach, seconded by Councilman Dunn and carried by roll call vote, the Ordinance was passed, adopted, numbered 1946, and ordered published.

ORDINANCE NO. 1947 - RIGHT-OF-WAY VACATION AT 27.75 LINE AND RIDGE DRIVE

Upon motion by Councilman O'Dwyer, seconded by Councilman Holmes and carried, the Proof of Publication to the following entitled proposed ordinance was accepted for filing: AN ORDINANCE VACATING RIGHT OF WAY AND EASEMENT WITHIN THE CITY.

Upon motion by Councilman Holmes, seconded by Councilman Johnson and carried, the proposed ordinance was called up for final passage and read.

There were no comments. Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilman Brach and carried by roll call vote, the Ordinance was passed, adopted, numbered 1947, and ordered published.

ORDINANCE NO. 1948 - ZONING TAMERLANE ANNEXATION PR-11

Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilman O'Dwyer and carried, the Proof of Publication to the following entitled proposed ordinance was accepted for filing: 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.

Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilman O'Dwyer and carried, the proposed ordinance was called up for final passage and read.

There were no comments. Upon motion by Councilman O'Dwyer, seconded by Councilman Johnson and carried by roll call vote, the Ordinance was passed, adopted, numbered 1948, and ordered published.

ORDINANCE NO. 1949 - ANNEXING LANDS TO DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Upon motion by Councilman Johnson, seconded by Councilman Hollingsworth and carried, the Proof of Publication to the following entitled proposed ordinance was accepted for filing: AN ORDINANCE EXPANDING THE BOUNDARIES OF THE GRAND JUNCTION DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY.

Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilman O'Dwyer and carried, the proposed ordinance was called up for final passage and read.

There were no comments. Upon motion by Councilman Dunn, seconded by Councilman Brach and carried by roll call vote, the Ordinance was passed, adopted, numbered 1949, and ordered published.

EMERGENCY ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE OF BONDS FOR LOS LUNEROS PROJECT - FAILED TO PASS ORDINANCE WITHDRAWN

The title only to the following ordinance was read: AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE ISSUANCE AND SALE OF AN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT REVENUE BOND (LOS LUNEROS PROJECT), SERIES 1981, IN THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF \$3,500,000; APPROVING THE FORM OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS RELATING THERETO AND AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION THEREOF; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. It was moved by Councilman Johnson and seconded by Councilman Hollingsworth that the Ordinance be passed and adopted as an emergency ordinance, numbered 1950, and ordered published. Roll was called upon the motion with the following result: AYE: BRACH, HOLLINGSWORTH, JOHNSON, DUNN, O'DWYER, QUIMBY.

NO: HOLMES.

Councilman Holmes stated that prior to the meeting at the conference table upstairs, several of the Council members indicated they did not understand all of this in its entirety and his questions on this on Monday were such that he did not understand it at that time and he still does not and he further does not feel the necessity of an emergency ordinance in dealing with the financing of a project as it relates to this community and the citizens thereof, so therefore his NO vote on this emergency ordinance.

Councilman O'Dwyer stated he, too, continues to have problems with emergency ordinances. He appreciates what the developer is going through financially. His understanding is that if the ordinance is not passed now as an emergency ordinance, it will come back to council as a standard ordinance. In view of that, he cast a YES vote.

Warren Gardner, the developer, advised Council that the problem has been that when they budgeted funds on the construction loan it was budgeted at 15 percent. They are paying to the Denver banks 24 percent as they could not raise the money locally. The only way to put it back into perspective is through an emergency ordinance. His understanding is that a conventional ordinance takes approximately 75 days to become effective and that would be within 15 days of completion and would be bringing the permanent loan ordinance to the Council for consideration within two weeks. The effect to the company with the emergency ordinance would be to reduce the interest rate from the 24 percent paid to the Denver banks back to a nominal 15 percent. This type financing has destroyed their budget and that is why they are asking for the emergency ordinance. According to Mr. Gardner, borrowing \$3,000,000 at 24 percent is costing approximately \$2400 a day and is very prohibitive especially when leases are being signed at a predetermined rental rate. Therefore, the request for the emergency ordinance is to stop an inordinate interest rate.

Councilman Holmes said he could appreciate the circumstances but while he sympathizes with the financial burden, he does not feel that the emergency ordinance is one that is attributed to the community as a whole and he does not feel comfortable in voting on this issue as an emergency.

Mr. Gardner stated that the effect of not having the emergency ordinance adopted is that the issue be dropped and they will come with the permanent ordinance within the next two weeks.

RESOLUTION OF INDUCEMENT FOR INDUSTRIAL REVENUE BONDS FOR SAFEWAY, INC. - DENIED

The following Resolution was read:

RESOLUTION

PROVIDING FOR THE ISSUANCE OF CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, REVENUE BONDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING A RETAIL GROCERY STORE WITHIN THE CITY, AND THE EXECUTION OF A MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT IN CONNECTION THEREWITH BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY AND SAFEWAY STORES, INCORPORATED.

WHEREAS, the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, (the "City") is authorized by the provisions of the County and Municipality Development Revenue Bond Act, Title 29, Article 3, Colorado Revised Statutes 1973, as amended (the "Act"), to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of defraying the costs of financing, refinancing, acquiring, improving and equipping a project, including any land, buildings or other improvements suitable or used for or in connection with commercial and business enterprises; and

WHEREAS, Safeway Stores, Incorporated (the "Company"), a Maryland

corporation, proposes to acquire, construct, improve and/or equip commercial and business facilities consisting of a retail grocery store (the "Project") on land located on the northwest corner of U.S. Highway 50 and 27 Road within the incorporated area of the City, such facility to constitute a "project" within the meaning of the Act; and

WHEREAS, the Company has requested the City to issue its revenue bonds in one or more series pursuant to the provisions of the Act in an aggregate principal amount of approximately \$2,500,000 (the "Bonds") for the purpose of financing the Project and related incidental expenses (including, if desired by the Company and the City, funding a portion of the interest, and any reserves); and

WHEREAS, the City considers that the financing of the Project will promote industry and develop trade or other economic activity by inducing corporations to locate in the City, mitigate the threat of unemployment and secure and maintain a balanced and stable economy; and

WHEREAS, by subsequent ordinance to be adopted before issuance of the Bonds the City will consider and approve the final details of the Bonds and, subject to the conditions of this Resolution, will authorize all acts and the execution of all documents and instruments in connection with the issuance thereof after approval of the form and content of the same; and

WHEREAS, the Income Tax Regulations promulgated by the United States Treasury require that the issuer of such bonds adopt a bond resolution with respect to such bonds or take some other similar official action toward the issuance of such bonds prior to the commencement of construction or acquisition of such facilities; and

WHEREAS, one purpose of this Resolution is to satisfy the requirements of said Income Tax Regulations;

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

Section 1. That the City Council finds, intends and declares the adoption of this Resolution is and constitutes the taking of affirmative official action by the City acting by and through its City Council, toward the issuance of the Bonds within the meaning of Section 1.103-8(a)(5) of the Income tax Regulations with respect to interest on the Bonds to finance certain exempt facilities or facilities to be financed by the issuance of exempt small issue bonds.

Section 2. That in order to insure the completion of the Project and the public benefit which is expected from the operation thereof, the City, subject to the terms and conditions of the Memorandum of Agreement (attached hereto as Exhibit A and by this reference made a part hereof), will issue the Bonds in one or more

series pursuant to the provisions of the Act in an aggregate principal amount of approximately \$2,500,000 which amount is necessary to pay the cost of financing the Project, together with related incidental expenses, including if desired by the Company and the City, funding a portion of the interest, and any reserves.

Section 3. That the Bonds shall bear such interest rate, be in such denominations, bear such date, mature at such date, be in such form, carry such registration privileges, be executed in such manner, be payable at such place and be approved and provided in a subsequent ordinance of the City Council prior to the issuance of the Bonds. Any indenture, financing agreement (as that term is defined in the Act, hereinafter referred to as the "Financing Agreement") and other documents relating to the Project and the Bonds will also be approved and authorized in final form prior to the issuance of the Bonds.

Section 4. That the proceeds of the Bonds will be loaned to the Company in order to finance the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of the Project.

Section 5. That the City will enter into the Financing Agreement with the Company as mutually agreed upon for the financing of the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of, and payment for, the Project, as more fully described in the Memorandum of Agreement.

Section 6. That the Memorandum of Agreement between the City and the Company in the form attached hereto is approved by the City Council, and the Mayor and the City Clerk are hereby authorized and directed to execute such Memorandum of Agreement on behalf of the City.

Section 7. The cost of financing the Project will be paid out of the proceeds from the sale of the Bonds, which shall be special, limited obligations of the City, payable (subject to any mortgage provisions of the Act) solely out of the revenues derived by the City from the Financing Agreement, and the Bonds and the interest thereon shall never constitute the debt or indebtedness of the City within the meaning of any provision or limitation of the Constitution or statutes of the State of Colorado or any home rule charter, nor shall the same give rise to a pecuniary liability of the City or a charge against its general credit or taxing power, and such limitation shall be plainly stated on the face of the Bonds.

EXHIBIT A

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

This Memorandum of Agreement is between the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, State of Colorado (the "City") and Safeway Stores, Incorporation (the "Company").

1. Preliminary Statement. Among the matters of mutual inducement which have resulted in the execution of this Agreement are the following:

(a) The City is a city of the State of Colorado, a body politic and corporate, authorized and empowered by the County and Municipality Development Revenue Bond Act, Title 29, Article 3, Colorado Revised Statutes 1973, as amended (the "Act"), to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of defraying the cost of financing, refinancing, acquiring, improving and equipping commercial and business facilities within the City and to enter into financing agreements with respect to such facilities, upon such terms and conditions mutually agreeable to the Company and the City Council.

(b) In order to provide commercial and business facilities the Company proposes to acquire, construct, improve and/or equip certain commercial and business facilities consisting of a retail grocery store (the "Project") on land located on the northwest corner of U.S. Highway 50 and 27 Road in the incorporated area of the City, which Project will be owned by the Company and financed with proceeds received from the sale of the City's revenue bonds which will be loaned to the Company.

(c) The City has indicated its willingness to proceed with the issuance of its revenue bonds in one or more series as provided by the Act in an aggregate principal amount of approximately \$2,500,000 (the "Bonds") to finance the Project and has advised the Company that subject to due compliance with all requirements of law and the obtaining of all necessary consents and approvals and to the happening of all acts, conditions and things required precedent to such financing, the City, pursuant to the Act, will issue the Bonds in one or more series in an aggregate principal amount of approximately \$2,500,000 which amount shall be sufficient to pay the costs of financing the Project, together with related incidental expenses, including, if desired by the Company and the City, funding a portion of the interest, and any reserves.

(d) The City considers that the financing and acquisition of the Project and the entering into a financing agreement (as that term is defined in the Act, hereinafter referred to as the "Financing Agreement") with the Company with respect to the Project will promote industry and develop trade or other economic activity by inducing corporations to locate in the State of Colorado, mitigate the threat of unemployment and secure and maintain a balanced and stable economy.

2. Undertakings by the City. Subject to Paragraph 4 hereof, the City agrees as follows:

(a) That it will issue or cause to be authorized the issuance of the Bonds pursuant to the terms of the Act in one or more series an aggregate principal amount of approximately \$2,500,000 which amount will be sufficient to pay the cost of financing the

Project, together with related incidental expenses, including, if desired by the Company and the City, funding a portion of the interest, and any reserves.

(b) That it will adopt or cause to be adopted such proceedings and authorize the execution and delivery of such documents as reasonably may be necessary or advisable for the authorization, issuance and sale of the Bonds; the financing of the Company's acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of the Project and the execution of any Financing Agreement with the Company and other documents relating to the Project and the Bonds as shall be authorized by the Act or other law and mutually satisfactory to the City and the Company.

(c) That the aggregate sums to be paid by the Company under the Financing Agreement shall be required to be sufficient to pay the principal of and interest and redemption premium, if any, on the Bonds as and when the same shall become due.

(d) That it will take or cause to be taken such other acts and adopt such further proceedings as reasonably may be required to implement the aforesaid undertakings and as it may deem appropriate in pursuance thereof.

(e) The Bonds shall provide that they shall be payable solely out of the revenues derived from the operation of the Project pursuant to the provisions of the Financing Agreement, that they shall never constitute the debt or indebtedness of the City within the meaning of any provision or limitation of the Constitution or statutes of the State of Colorado or any home rule charter and that they shall not give rise to a pecuniary liability of the City nor a charge against its general credit or taxing powers, and such limitation shall be plainly stated on the face of the Bonds.

(f) In authorizing the issuance of the Bonds pursuant to this Agreement, the City will make no warranty, either expressed or implied, that the proceeds of the Bonds will be sufficient to pay all costs of the Project.

3. Undertakings on the Part of the Company. Subject to Paragraph 4 hereof, the Company agrees as follows:

(a) That the Company will enter into a contract or contracts for the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of the Project.

(b) That prior to the delivery of the Bonds the Company will enter into the Financing Agreement with the City under the terms of which the Company will obligate itself to complete the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of the Project and, to the extent not payable out of proceeds of the Bonds, to pay to the City sums sufficient in the aggregate to pay or reimburse the City for expenses incurred in connection with the authorization, issuance and sale of the Bonds, including a service

charge payable to the City of 1/4 of 1% of the face amount of the bonds issued, and to pay the principal of and interest and premium, if any, of the Bonds as and when the same shall become due and payable, all fees and expenses of any trustee for the benefit of the holders of the Bonds as and when the same shall become due and payable, all fees and expenses of any trustee for the benefit of the holders of the Bonds incurred under any trust indenture, all utility charges, taxes, assessments, casualty and liability insurance premiums, and any other expenses or charges relating to the ownership, use, operation, maintenance, occupancy and upkeep of the Project, such Financing Agreement to contain such other provisions as may be required by law and such other provisions as shall be mutually acceptable to the City and the Company.

(c) That it will take such further action and adopt such further proceedings as may be required to implement its aforesaid undertakings or as it may deem appropriate in pursuance thereof.

4. General Provisions.

(a) All commitments of the City under Paragraph 2 hereof and of the Company under Paragraph 3 hereof are subject to the condition that on or before one year from the date of this Agreement (or other date as shall be mutually satisfactory to the City and the Company) the City and the Company shall have agreed to mutually acceptable terms for the Bonds and of the issuance, sale and delivery thereof, and mutually acceptable terms and conditions of any Financing Agreement and other documents referred to in Paragraph 3 and the proceedings referred to in Paragraphs 2 and 3 hereof.

(b) Prior to the issuance of the Bonds, there shall be a reasonable showing to the City that the Company is capable of carrying out its financial obligations under the Financing Agreement.

(c) If the events set forth in (a) of this Paragraph do not take place within the time set forth or any extension thereof and the Bonds are not issued and sold within such time, the Company agrees that it will reimburse the City for all reasonable and necessary out-of-pocket expenses which the City may incur arising from the execution of this Agreement and the performance of the Company's obligations hereunder and this Agreement shall thereupon terminate.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have entered into this Agreement by their duly authorized officers on this _____ day of _____, 19_____.

(seal)

CITY COUNCIL CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

Mayor

ATTEST:

City Clerk

SAFEWAY STORES, INCORPORATED

By:

President Quimby explained that this application for industrial bonds by Safeway, Inc., was reviewed by the IRB Committee and they recommended denial. Mr. Jones, representing Safeway, Inc., was present. It was moved by Councilman Johnson, seconded by Councilman O'Dwyer that the Resolution be passed and adopted as read. King Clemons, Chairman of the IRB Committee, stated that the Committee by a 6 to 4 vote recommended denial of this request based on the fact that it is for retail use and the Committee feels IRBs should be used for industrial purposes.

Roll call upon the motion resulted in AYES: HOLLINGSWORTH. NO: HOLMES, JOHNSON, DUNN, O'DWYER, BRACH, QUIMBY. The President declared the motion lost and the Resolution denied.

RESOLUTION DENYING THE ZONING APPLICATION OF PDC INVESTMENTS - CEDAR SQUARE OFFICES AT 605 26-1/2 ROAD

The following Resolution was read:

RESOLUTION

DENYING THE ZONING APPLICATION BY PDC INVESTMENTS

WHEREAS, PDC Investments sought a zoning change from R-1-A to PDB (Planned Development - Business) on lands situate in the County of Mesa, State of Colorado, and described as:

Lot 1 and that part of Lots 2 and 3 of Fairmount Heights Subdivision described as follows: Beginning at a point 10 feet South and 14 feet West of the Southeast Corner of said Lot 2, thence East 14 feet, thence North along the East line of said Lots 2 and 3 to the North line of said Lot 2 to the Northwest Corner thereof, thence South along the West line of said Lot 2, 65 feet, thence East 187.8 feet, thence Southeasterly to the point of beginning;

and

WHEREAS, the Grand Junction Planning Commission recommended that the rezoning be denied, and the owners of over twenty percent of the land abutting the tract sought to be rezoned opposed the rezoning; and

WHEREAS, the evidence presented by the applicant did not indicate that the original zoning of the land was in error, nor that there had been any change in the neighborhood to warrant this rezoning; and, further, that the change in zoning did not fit within any plan of development for the area;

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

That the application of PDC Investments for a change in zoning on the within described property from R-1-A to PDB be denied.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 4th day of March, 1981.

President of the Council

Attest:

City Clerk

Upon motion by Councilman O'Dwyer, seconded by Councilman Brach and carried by roll call vote, the Resolution was passed and adopted as read.

CURRIER ANNEXATION-PETITION - RESOLUTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE - NW SIDE OF HORIZON DRIVE, NORTHERN BOUNDARY H ROAD, SOUTHERN BOUNDARY HIGHLINE CANAL

The following petition was accepted for filing:

PETITION

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, do hereby petition the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, State of Colorado, to annex the following described property to the said City:

That part of the SW4NW4 Section 31 T1N, R1E U.M. lying N and W of County Hwy (Horizon Drive) and that part of the E2 of the NE4 Section 36 T1N R1W U.M. lying N and W of County Hwy (Horizon Drive) and N and E of Government Highline Canal.

Also beginning at the point of intersection of the S right of way line of H Road and the W line of the NW4NW4 of Section 31, T1N, R1E of the U.M. from which the NW Corner of said Section 31 bears N 00 deg. 00 min. 00 sec. E 30.00 feet, thence S 89 deg. 48 min.

40 sec. E along said S right of way line of H Road, 200.10 feet, thence S 33 deg. 46 min. 05 sec. E 1468.89 feet to the Northerly right of way line of Horizon Drive, thence S 54 deg. 46 min. 30 sec. W along said Northerly right of way of Horizon Drive, 122.55 feet to the S line of said NW4NW4, thence N 89 deg. 50 min. 20 sec. W along said S line of said NW4NW4 916.46 feet to the SE Corner of said NW4NW4, thence N 00 deg. 00 min. 00 sec. E along said W line of said NW4NW4 1289.87 feet to the point of beginning together with adjacent Horizon Drive right of way and except H Road right of way on N.

As ground therefor, the petitioners respectfully state that annexation to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, is both necessary and desirable and that the said territory is eligible for annexation in that the provisions of the Municipal Annexation Act of 1965, Sections 31-12-104 and 31-13-105 CRS 1973 have been met.

This petition is accompanied by four copies of a map or plat of the said territory, showing its boundary and its relation to established city limit lines and said map is prepared upon a material suitable for filing.

Your petitioners further state that they are the owners of one hundred percent of the area of such territory to be annexed, exclusive of streets and alleys; that the mailing address of each signer and the date of signature are set forth hereafter opposite the name of each signer, and that the legal description of the property owned by each signer of said petition is attached hereto.

WHEREFORE, these petitioners pray that this petition be accepted and that the said annexation be approved and accepted by ordinance.

DATE

2-27-81

SIGNATURE

/s/ Bruce C. Currier

/s/ Wilma M. Currier

ADDRESS

2760 H Road Grand Jct, CO 81501

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

That part of the SW4NW4 Section 31 T1N R1E U.M. lying N and W of County Hwy (Horizon Drive) and that part of the E2 of the NE4 Section 36 T1N R1W U.M. - lying N and W of County Hwy (Horizon Drive) and N and E of Government Highline Canal.

Beginning at the point of intersection of the S right of way line of H Road and the W line of the NW4NW4 of Section 31, T1N, R1E of the U.M. from which the NW corner of said Section 31 bears N 00 deg. 00 min. 00 sec. E 30.00 feet, thence S 89 deg. 48 min. 40 sec. E along said S right of way line of H Road, 200.10 feet, thence S 33 deg. 46 min. 05 sec. E 1468.89 feet to the Northerly right of way line of Horizon Drive, thence S 54 deg. 46 min. 30 sec. W along said Northerly right of way of Horizon Drive 122.55 feet to the S line of said NW4NW4, thence N 89 deg. 50 min. 20 sec. W along said S line of said NW4NW4 916.46 feet to the SW corner of said NW4 NW4, thence N 00 deg. 00 min. 00 sec. E along said W line of said NW4NW4 1289.87 feet to the point of beginning.

STATE OF COLORADO)			
) SSAFFIDAVIT			
COUNTY OF MESA)			

Jack Treece, of lawful age, being first duly sworn, upon oath, deposes and says:

That he is the circulator of the foregoing petition;

That each signature on the said petition is the signature of the person whose name it purports to be.

;sigl;
/s/ Jack Treece

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 2nd day of March, 1981.

Witness my hand and official seal.

;sigl;
/s/ Donald H. Warner, Jr.
Notary public

My Commissioner expires: April 9, 1983

The following Resolution was read:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, on the 4th day of March, 1981, a petition was submitted

to the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, for annexation to said City of the following property situate in Mesa County, Colorado, and described as follows:

That part of the SW Quarter of the NW Quarter of Section 31, T1N, R1E, U.M. lying N and W of County Highway (Horizon Drive) and that part of the E2 of the NE Quarter of Section 36, T1N, R1W, U.M., lying N and W of County Highway (Horizon Drive) and N and E of Government Highline Canal. Also beginning at the point of intersection of the S right of way line of H Road and the W line of the NW Quarter of the NW Quarter of Section 31, T1N, R1E of the U.M. from which the NW Corner of said Section 31 bears N 00 deg. 00 min. 00 sec. E 30.00 feet; thence S 89 deg. 48 min. 40 sec. E along said S right of way line of H Road, 200.10 feet, thence S 33 deg. 46 min. 05 sec. E 1468.89 feet to the Northerly right of way line of Horizon Drive, thence S 54 deg. 46 min. 30 sec. W along said Northerly right of way of Horizon Drive, 122.55 feet to the S line of said NW Quarter of the NW Quarter, thence 89 deg. 50 min. 20 sec. W along said S line of said NW Quarter of the NW Quarter 916.46 feet to the SW Corner of said NW Quarter of the NW Quarter, thence N 00 deg. 00 min. 00 sec. E along said W line of said NW Quarter of the NW Quarter 1289.87 feet to the point of beginning together with adjacent Horizon Drive right of way and except H Road right of way on N.

and

WHEREAS, the Council has found and determined and does hereby find and determine that said petition is in substantial compliance with statutory requirements therefor; that one-sixth of the perimeter of the area proposed to be annexed is contiguous with the City; that a community of interest exists between the territory and the City; that the territory proposed to be annexed is urban or will be urbanized in the near future; that the said territory is integrated or is capable of being integrated with said City, and that no election is required under the Municipal Annexation Act of 1965 as the owner of one hundred percent of the property has petitioned for annexation;

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

That the said territory is eligible for annexation to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, and should be so annexed by Ordinance.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 4th day of March, 1981.

President of the Council

Attest:

City Clerk

Upon motion by Councilman Johnson, seconded by Councilman Brach and carried by roll call vote, the Resolution was passed and adopted as read.

The following entitled proposed ordinance was read: AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO. Upon motion by Councilman O'Dwyer, seconded by Councilman Dunn and carried, the proposed ordinance was passed for publication.

CITY SERVICES CENTER - BLACK & VEATCH REPORT

The final plans and proposal for Phase I of the City Services Center was reviewed by Maurice McMullin of Black & Veatch. Total estimated for the first phase of the project is \$2,606,850. The Consultant recommended advertising for bids on March 22, 1981, open bids on April 16, 1981, and recommended an 18-month construction period. Upon motion by Councilman Brach, seconded by Councilman Johnson and carried, the Consultant and Staff were authorized to proceed.

MADAM CHAIRMAN QUIMBY NOW MAYOR GRANDMOTHER QUIMBY

The City Manager announced that our Madam Chairman Quimby is now Mayor Grandmother Quimby!

CITIZEN COMMENT

Mr. Harlan Davis, 2205 North 15th Street, appeared before Council to report that the error on 15th Street still has not been straightened out. According to Mr. Davis, the letter from the County Surveyor does not explain the situation to his satisfaction.

City Attorney Ashby reported that the County Surveyor has talked to Mr. Davis on a number of occasions and so have other surveyors, and Mr. Davis remains unconvinced that an error was not made. Mr. Ashby said he does not know what more the City Council can do. Mr. Davis does not accept the lines there that the County Surveyor and all the other surveyors indicate are the proper position for the lines. He added that the City Council hasn't the power to change those lines. Those lines exist with definite relationships to other properties out there. All that the Council can do is to get to the best that it can evidence for Mr. David as to what exists out there, which the Council has done.

Mr. Warner of the Planning Department advised that all these lines tie to a survey by Colorado West Surveying who was hired by Mr. Davis. The survey by Colorado West Surveying agrees with the one by the County Surveyor. Mr. Warner suggested that the City so far has done all it can and the only other thing would be that if Mr. Davis gets a surveyor who comes up with some evidence that there

is a discrepancy, then that surveyor would arbitrate with the County Surveyor.

President Quimby advised Mr. Davis that it appears there is nothing more the City Council can do for him. The City has been diligent in examining the situation and conducting an inquiry to assure that an error was not made.

AIRPORT

Councilman Brach reported that the Airport has had a certain area of land released for a hotel-motel use only.

President Quimby wanted to know if the request asked only for this specific use. She stated that the answer one receives depends on what kind of question was asked.

Councilman Brach said it was just for a motel-hotel use only.

Councilman Holmes asked what direction was given to the Airport members. Was there a consensus of the Council members?

President Quimby responded that there was no resolution and no direction given to the Airport Authority members.

Councilman Holmes said this was a rather pointed concern when he was a member of the Airport Authority. He believed that the conversation was that the Authority pursue every effort to obtain something other than a hotel complex at the Airport, if the terminal could "fly" without it, and is the Council still of that opinion and are the Airport Authority members still regarding that wish? President Quimby said there has been no conversation with the Airport Authority members since that meeting. Tonight (The Daily Sentinel article) was the first information there was "at least something in writing" pertaining to the use of that parcel of land.

Councilman Johnson said that in view of what has happened, he thinks it is a foregone conclusion that there will be a hotel in the vicinity of the Airport whether it is on the Airport property or some other property and that there appears to be nothing the City Council can do to forestall it. He understands that the Airport Authority will be meeting all day Friday with some potential investors who are interested in developing a portion of Airport land and that after that meeting there will be more information available to the Council in order to give directions and to make decisions as to what can and cannot be done.

For the record, Councilman Holmes stated he does not think the Airport Authority should be engaged in a hotel enterprise any more than the City should be engaged in a restaurant enterprise at Two Rivers.

Councilman Brach said there is competition in the vicinity of the

Airport for a hotel complex. Carriers are bidding some of the same investors.

Councilman Holmes responded that a hotel entrepreneur is not a charge of the Airport Authority.

Councilman O'Dwyer said that by the same token, there are other lessees of the Airport Authority. So in all probability the Airport Authority would be leasing for a hotel complex.

Mr. Ashby understands that the indication is that all the FAA is going to accept out there at least on their Section 16 land is hotel convention type facilities as being Airport related.

President Quimby said she hates to be in a discussion about a newspaper article, but there were a couple of comments attributed to Mrs. Albers in which she (Mrs. Albers) hoped that all the restrictions would be lifted on that land and she thought that that should be pursued for commercial and industrial development. At this point, President Quimby feels that Council is in a discussion about things that have not been brought to it in report form. She was somewhat uncomfortable discussing a newspaper article regardless of how accurate it was.

Councilman Brach said the FAA letter was very specific that the hotel convention complex was an airport related use in that it accommodates the air traveling public. The letter did not specify the acreage.

President Quimby wanted to know how the question to FAA was phrased. She wants to see the letter that went out and she wants to see the response. She also would like a report as to the status of the financial analysis. She stated that it is very difficult for the City Council if the Airport Authority members has it locked into some decision that the Airport Authority has made without giving the City Council a full briefing of all the alternatives. She stated that the City Council may agree entirely with the decision made by the Airport Authority members, but she would have real problems if the Airport Authority members make the decision and then come to the City Council and say "this is what we have decided," In response to Councilman Brach's question as to how else to do it, she stated that the Airport Authority members are to present the City Council the alternatives and tell it what options the Airport Authority has and at that point the City Council will tell the Airport Authority members which option it expects the Airport Authority members to follow. It may be the one the Airport Authority members want but it also could be an option the Airport Authority members do not want. She emphasized that carrying out the directions of the City Council was how the Airport Authority was set up.

Councilman Hollingsworth suggested to the Chairman that the temper some of the thoughts expressed by considering Item E on the agenda tonight of the annexing of adjacent property and that it will be

rezoned to compatible use. He felt that the basic charge to the Airport Authority members, at this moment at least, is to complete the construction of the terminal. None of these eventualities of leasing lands was involved initially because the members were unaware of the massive inflationary spiraling of costs that caught them as well as the individuals on the City Council as well as all the other citizens. He continued that the members of the Airport Authority are struggling to put together a financial package that will complete the project.

President Quimby recognized that fact but stated the City Council needs to see that financial package.

Councilman Johnson hoped that before any firm agreement was made with a developer for a hotel that the Airport Authority has assurance that there is going to be enough revenue derived from this to do what they want and need to do so that they will not have to come back and say "well we're going to develop some more revenue in some other fashion."

Councilman Hollingsworth asked Councilman Johnson to bear in mind that the Airport Authority does not as yet have the bids. He correlated this matter with the City Services Center where so much money was budgeted and the construction bid is to put out so the City can take advantage of the best possible bid and that the suggestion was to get it in ahead of the Airport. He noted that this doesn't do much for the Airport, but that if the bids come under the budgeted amount there is some feasibility of doing other things. If the bids are over the budgeted amount, it doesn't know quite what the Airport Authority members will do.

Councilman Dunn stated that sometimes the City Council members are hearing things from the media that the Airport Authority members have not reported to the City Council which makes them feel left out.

Councilman O'Dwyer said that it isn't that the Airport Authority members are trying to be secretive about the happenings. Sometimes, he said, they do not know themselves as there are so many "ifs." He stated that he understands as a member of the Authority that the charge by the City Council is that it wants to be informed of the options before a final decision is made. That is right and good.

President Quimby said that ultimately it will be the City Council and the County Commissioners who will be charged with explaining to the citizens how the airport terminal is going to be built and how it is going to be paid for. If those two groups do not have a package to present and if it looks as though sometime in the future these two groups have to come up with some tax dollars at some point in order to make this thing go, why then there is going to be a lot of explaining to do to the citizens. And, she concluded, it is not responsible management.

Councilman O'Dwyer agreed and said that is why the task is so heavy as they are searching for ways to avoid the use of tax dollars.

Councilman Johnson noted that the Airport Authority members know within certain parameters how much money is needed above the money that is now available. If, on Friday, an offer is made that will give the Airport Authority all that will be needed, or fifty percent, or whatever, then it will know whether it is able to fly or whether it is still on the ground. Councilman Johnson's concern was that the Airport Authority may make the decision to accept a bid even though it amounts to only a percentage of what will be needed, with the idea that the rest will be found somewhere else sometime.

Councilman O'Dwyer responded that he does not feel any of the Airport Authority members are in that position other than they do not know what will be offered until it is presented.

President Quimby noted a Monday morning meeting when some information may be presented as a result of the Airport Authority members Friday meeting.

DOWNTOWN

Councilman Brach expressed concern about downtown. He is not very optimistic about it, and he is afraid the City Council is going to be disappointed.

Councilman Johnson responded that he attended a DDA meeting on March 4, and the comment was made that there is a growing feeling among downtown that the City has forgotten downtown and that it hasn't done anything to help them do what needs to be done to revitalize the downtown. Councilman Johnson said he does not know what the specifics are, but those comments are becoming more and more frequent. His response to the statement was that the City Council has not been asked nor has downtown told the City Council what it wants the City to do. He has encouraged them on a number of occasions that if they want to put something together that they have one vehicle they have not used which is the tax increment financing, but before they can use that they have got to put together a project that is specific that they can sell, and they have not done that.

Councilman O'Dwyer said that if they are waiting for the City Staff and the City Council to do that for them they are going to have a long wait. The people who own and do business downtown are the ones who should be so vitally interested in downtown and they should be willing to do the legwork.

President Quimby said that the work plan for downtown has not been put together and she feels that is a hindrance to anything really specific being put together.

Councilman Johnson reported there are some things being done. The downtown financial institutions have agreed to put together a pool of money that would be available at a reduced interest rate on a matching basis by the owners for rehabilitation of some of the downtown properties. There is also some activity being promoted to put together a package of development properties that might then be eligible for some bonding financing.

President Quimby said that if the State Office building comes to this community, it has been requested very specifically that it come to the downtown core area.

VALLEYWIDE SEWER

Jim Patterson, Public Works Director, reported that after last week's noontime meeting, Ron Schyler of the State Water Quality Control Commission met for a couple of hours with him, and he has essentially agreed at this point to accept the design of the basin. The only other major issue to be resolved is the peak factor. He is to meet on Friday in Denver with Mr. Schyler in an effort to resolve the major issue.

RECREATION BOARD

Councilman Dunn reported on the Recreation Board meeting at Lincoln Park Auditorium. He encouraged everyone to visit the Auditorium to view the renovation. President Quimby noted the bill before the State Legislature now attempting to broaden or amend the sports and recreation facilities definition so they could qualify for municipal development bonds.

FIRE DEPARTMENT COMMENDED

Councilman Dunn expressed sympathy to the people on South 7th Street for their recent fire loss. He commended the Fire Department for its efforts. He was sorry there were some injuries.

HANDICAPPED COMMITTEE

Community Representative Tom Lundstrom reported that the Handicapped Committee is trying to arrange beforehand the activities for the month. One of the things they are going to try very hard to work on is during the month of April as a salute to transportation they will provide transportation to the polls for the elderly and disabled so they can vote in the Municipal Election.

DOWNTOWN

Councilman Hollingsworth commented that at times as downtown is equated to the Airport, the hotel, and he feels there is a tendency to overlook the basic economics of the system we operate under that not too much happens until someone has the ability and the capacity and the funds to move into the actual development and

construction stages, and there have to be some economic opportunities or those construction programs usually do not come into fruition. But as one Councilman, he is completely open minded of considering the land the City owns down in the general area, participating in some parking program, or doing whatever it seems necessary to redevelop the downtown area. As he recalls, the downtown study that is not yet complete is being funded by the citizens of this community. He is ready to consider any plan that the downtown group brings to the City Council including funds to do the job. He indicated disappointment that there may be some sort of feeling that the City is not doing its share when he is not quite certain what is expected of the City.

HOUSING AUTHORITY

Councilman Johnson reported that the Housing Authority received notice this week that it has been approved for Section 8 Housing of fifty units on its downtown property. This is half of what was requested, but it has been encouraged to go ahead with this fifty and make application immediately for the next fiscal year for the other fifty.

LEGISLATIVE BILLS

President Quimby reported on some of the legislative bills.

PORNOGRAPHY

Councilman Holmes expressed concern about a business on Orchard Mesa and its display of what he considers blatant, flagrant, pornographic material that is wide open on the checkout stand. He suggested that anything that can be done to prompt these people to respect decency would be in order.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by the President.

Neva B. Lockhart

Neva B. Lockhart, CMC
City Clerk