

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**

February 1, 1995

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, convened into regular session the 1st day of February, 1995, at 7:35 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium at City Hall. Those present were Linda Afman, Jim Baughman, Bill Bessinger, Ron Maupin, Reford Theobald, John Tomlinson and President of the Council R.T. Mantlo. Also present were City Manager Mark Achen, City Attorney Dan Wilson, and City Clerk Stephanie Nye.

Council President Mantlo called the meeting to order and Councilmember Baughman led in the Pledge of Allegiance. The audience remained standing during the invocation by Rev. Andrew Gebbie, Hospice.

PROCLAMATION DECLARING FEBRUARY 1, 1995, AS "LAWRENCE 'FUZZY' AUBERT DAY" IN THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

APPRECIATION AWARDS TO PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYEES DON RODGERS AND GARY ZAVADIL - PRESENTATION BY POLICE CHIEF DAROLD SLOAN AND PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR JIM SHANKS

CONSENT ITEMS

President of the Council Mantlo announced that Item 10 will be removed from the Consent agenda for full discussion. Upon motion by Councilmember Bessinger, seconded by Councilmember Afman and carried with Councilmember **BAUGHMAN** voting **NO** on Item 7, and Item 10 being removed from the Consent Agenda for full discussion, the following Consent Items 1-9 were approved:

1. **Approving** the minutes of the Regular Meeting January 18, 1995
2. **Authorizing** the Purchase of Replacement Personal Computer Systems from Gateway 2000 in the Amount of \$21,420

These represent Personal Computer Systems budgeted as replacements for obsolete systems in various City departments for the 1995 budget year, including 17 basic 486-DX2/66 models at \$1,260 each.

3. **Award of Bid** for Refuse Collection Truck
Recommended Award: Mesa Mack Sales and Service - \$139,969

One bid was received from Mesa Mack for a Mack Model MR688S cab and chassis mounted with a Lodal Model TC-1034-SC front loader body at a net cost of \$139,969. The bid includes a \$5,000 trade allowance for the 1980 Crane Carrier w/Lodal

Packer.

4. *** Resolution No. 9-95** - A Resolution Authorizing a Revocable Permit to Colorado West Improvements, Inc. for Landscaping and Irrigation in Public Right-of-Way for Foresight Circle and Blichmann Avenue [File #207-94]

Resolution authorizing the issuance of a Revocable Permit to allow installation of landscaping and irrigation lines in the right-of-way on the southeast corner of Foresight Circle and Blichmann Avenue in conjunction with the development of the Refrigeration Industries facility.

5. **Proposed Ordinance** - An Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Northwest Enclave Annexation, Approximately 1016 Acres Located between 22-3/4 Road, 25 Road, G-1/2 Road and Patterson Road

The Northwest Enclave is located generally within the area between 22-3/4 Road and 25 Road and G-1/2 Road and Patterson Road/Highway 50. This area is totally surrounded by the City limits and is eligible for annexation under State Statutes.

a. First Reading of Proposed Ordinance

6. *** Resolution No. 10-95** - A Resolution Referring a Petition to the City Council for the Annexation of Lands to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, and Setting a Hearing on Such Annexation - Northridge Addition Annexation Located at 412 Northridge Drive [File #ANX-95-16]

A Power of Attorney for annexation was signed when the home at 412 Northridge Drive was constructed and connection to sewer was requested. A Petition for Annexation is now being referred to City Council. Staff requests that City Council approve by resolution the Referral of Petition for the Northridge Addition Annexation.

7. *** Resolution No. 11-95** - A Resolution Referring a Petition to the City Council for the Annexation of Lands to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, and Setting a Hearing on Such Annexation - Pomona Park Annexation Located at the Northwest, Northeast and Southeast Corners of 24 Road and I-70 Interchange, then Easterly to 24-3/4 Road Including Various Properties East, West and South Including the Kay, Valley Meadows and Moonridge Falls Subdivisions [File #ANX-95-17]

The City desires to annex lands north of the present City limits. Powers of Attorney have been obtained for the County approved Moonridge Falls Subdivision, Valley Meadows Subdivision, and Kay Subdivision, all currently under construction as well as POA's from individual properties that have already connected to sewer and the 151 acre Saccomanno property. These POA's, along with adjoining lands, are being considered as part of the Pomona Park Annexation. Staff requests that City Council approve the resolution accepting the submittal of annexation petitions and scheduling a public hearing on the sufficiency of the petitions.

8. *** Resolution No. 12-95** - A Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Approve An Addendum to the Contract with Freilich, Leitner & Carlisle, and to Transfer Funds in the Amount of \$27,500 from the Contingency Fund for this Purpose

An addendum to the City's contract with FLC, concurrent with Mesa County's addendum to their contract with Design Studios West (DSW), would have the result of a merged City and County plan alternatives analysis and final plan selection process for the City's future annexation area. This revised planning approach requires up to 22 new meetings and up to 10 new person-trips to Grand Junction by FLC.

9. *** Resolution No. 13-95** - A Resolution Authorizing An Exchange of Vacant Land on Purdy Mesa with Mrs. Esther Mash

Mrs. Esther Mash is proposing to exchange equivalent acreage (approximately 18 acres) of land on Purdy Mesa. Under this proposal, the City will gain protection for the Highline Canal and Juniata Canal, and Mrs. Mash will gain a buildable parcel.

10. **Approving** a MCEDC Proposal for Economic Incentive for Project Janie - **REMOVED FOR FULL DISCUSSION**

*** * * END OF CONSENT CALENDAR * * ***

*** * * ITEMS NEEDING INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION * * ***

APPROVING A MCEDC PROPOSAL FOR ECONOMIC INCENTIVE FOR PROJECT JANIE

Councilmember Maupin stated that the City and County jointly

helped fund Walker Field Airport, and questioned why was it necessary for the City to pay the lease fees. Mr. J. J. Johnston, MCEDC Director, stated that it was determined by the Airport Authority and confirmed by the Airport Director, Marcel Theberge, that if the Walker Field Airport Authority were to grant a land lease subsidy, it could place the Authority in violation of FAA grants already in place.

Councilmember Theobold stated that any airport-generated-revenue must be spent for airport improvements, and cannot be spent in other areas.

Councilmember Baughman questioned how this project will benefit the expansion of Walker Field. Mr. Johnston stated that when Project Janie comes on line, it will bring a \$2 million capital investment to the community. This will bring larger aircraft equipment into the market place, and the potential for expanded aircraft and frequency of trips to Denver and other major cities from Grand Junction. The Council views this as an opportunity to do more industry clustering around aviation maintenance, much like West Star and Sundstrand Aviation are already doing. It is a very solid company.

Mr. Sam Suplizio, MCEDC Chairman, stated that four other cities were attempting to get this company to come to their city with many incentives. Grand Junction had the best location for the company.

Mr. Johnston stated the larger aircraft will be flown into the market by the end of February. They will begin renovating an existing hangar facility beginning in March, 1995. A news conference is scheduled for February 8, regarding another development. The president of the company and several of his staff will be in attendance.

Councilmember Theobold asked if the radar situation had any affect on this company. Mr. Johnston responded that the radar was a non-issue because it is not in existence at present. Mr. Johnston's concern about the radar is the FAA's plan to remove the approach control part of it when it gets sited in Grand Junction. If they remove the approach control it will cause delays in the air traffic as demonstrated in other communities.

Mr. Suplizio said he has talked with Secretary of Transportation Frederico Pena who is aware of the City's dilemma, the air conditions and hazardous conditions experienced by Grand Junction versus Denver. The tower is needed here.

Upon motion by Councilmember Maupin, seconded by Councilmember Bessinger and carried, the MCEDC proposal for economic incentive for Project Janie was approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 15-95 ADOPTING PHASE I PROGRAM FOR PARKS DEVELOPMENT

Based on public participation and task force direction over the past few months, the Phase I Program for parks development is ready to be submitted to the City Council.

Parks & Recreation Director Joe Stevens reviewed this item, and recognized the Task Force members for their efforts. He would like to get underway a \$9 million project, known as Phase I, as soon as possible. The total cost for all phases of development is \$36 million. He requested Council's consideration of \$5.5 million, with the City seeking the balance of the \$9 million elsewhere.

The #1 priority is the 24 and G Road site (103 acres). They would also like to devote some attention to 26-1/2 and H Road, to 12th and G Road, to Orchard Mesa, and to Pine Ridge. Some attention needs to be devoted to upgrades of existing parks.

City Manager Mark Achen stated that the item could be placed on the April 4 ballot. City Council is to decide whether it is appropriate to go to an election today, or at some future date partway through the project.

Mr. Sam Suplizio, member of the Parks & Recreation Advisory Committee, stated that the issue of going to an election is one of no increase in taxes. He felt it was very important that the public be aware of that. The ballot question would ask the citizens to approve future indebtedness of revenue streams that are already being received by the City.

Administrative Services Director Ron Lappi stated that the indebtedness would be repaid from a dedicated revenue stream that is already allocated from the 10-year capital improvement program. The amounts are coming out of the 3/4% capital improvement program. To up-front the money, the City has sufficient resources to pay back the debt. Since Amendment #1 passed in 1993, debt cannot be issued without a vote of the people. The voters must give permission to issue that debt to be repaid out of current tax revenues over the next ten years. There will be no impact on any other capital improvement program in the entire 10-year capital improvement program.

Councilmember Afman praised the task force for its efforts. She feels they have done a terrific job. President of the Council Mantlo concurred with Councilmember Afman's comments.

City Manager Achen stated that Council's action tonight does not change the budget, does not allocate \$9 million dollars or authorize any expenditure. A proposed contract for detailed plans and specifications will be brought back to City Council, with or without the election. Those specifications will be used to actually bid a project. Council will at that time make some decision about the appropriate amount to spend, the contract, some options, etc., and only then will monies be spent to actually build anything.

It was suggested that Items #2 and #3 be deleted from the resolution since both refer to the April 4, 1995, election.

Mr. Jamie Hamilton, Task Force member and Parks & Recreation Advisory Board member, stated that \$36 million dollars would cover everything that everybody wanted, with a reality of \$9 million dollars being something that could be given to citizens now, for example moving dirt and planting grass and producing green space. In essence the current park space available could be doubled. His recommendation is that this program be on a fast track. He feels the consultants are on track with the amount of dollars it would cost today.

City Manager Achen stated that the consultant's figures are detailed and on the high side, so he feels comfortable with them. Mr. Hamilton stated that the actual figures represent a 20% contingency fee.

City Manager Achen stated that if Council acts on this program, he intends to immediately instruct the Parks and Recreation Department to begin the process of recruiting and selecting a final design firm. It will begin with the sports complex, then a recommendation will be made to Council as to when to begin the final design on the other sites.

Parks & Recreation Director Joe Stevens clarified that the discussion tonight is Phase I only of the sports complex, approximately 50% of the entire complex.

It was moved by Councilmember Theobald and seconded by Councilmember Bessinger to adopt Resolution No. 15-95 Adopting Phase I of the Parks Development Plan. Councilmember Tomlinson suggested an

amendment to Councilmember Theobold's motion.

Councilmember Theobold withdrew his motion, and Councilmember Bessinger withdrew his second.

Councilmember Tomlinson moved to amend Number 2 of the Resolution by striking "April 4, 1995" and inserting "an election date to be determined", and adopt the amended Resolution No. 15-95. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Bessinger. Upon roll call vote, those voting **AYE** were: **BAUGHMAN, BESSINGER, MAUPIN, THEOBOLD, TOMLINSON, MANTLO.** Those voting **NO**: **AFMAN.** Councilmember Afman stated for the record that she has voted **NO** only because she opposes dropping the April 4, 1995, election date.

RESOLUTION NO. 14-95 - A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING 1995 FEES AND CHARGES POLICY FOR THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION'S GOLF COURSES

Based on input received from 188 persons in attendance at previous focus groups, the desire to balance varied demands (i.e.: affordable fees, high maintenance standards) and a policy decision to operate municipal golf courses on an enterprise basis, 1995 fees for Lincoln Park and Tiara Rado Golf Courses have been developed for City Council approval.

Parks & Recreation Director Joe Stevens reviewed this item.

Mr. John Gormley, Vice Chairman of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, read a statement into the record regarding the 1995 golf fees (copy attached).

Mr. Gormley stated that the interest that the golf course is repaying, along with the principal amount, are fee generated. The PIAB will pay the principal back, but allow the interest coming from those fees to go into the Capital Improvement Fund for the golf courses so they can remain self-sufficient.

Councilmember Theobold stated that PIAB is asking for a subsidy to support the golf program. The golf course fund and its stability is the issue, not the semantics. He felt that the action taken tonight will regard fees only. He felt Council needs to make clear where the City is headed with the golf fund, the 80 acre site, and a subsidy, if there is going to be one, and express Council's intent just to get the issue settled. The issue has not been dealt with - it has been deferred for a year or two. He suggested adopting the fees as presented. Beyond the fees, he suggested that the City buy back from the golf course fund the 80 acres for the following reasons:

1. It solves the cash flow dilemma of the golf fund. It not only eliminates the expenditures coming out of that fund to pay for the 80 acres, but will also repay the down payment for the 80 acres (\$240,000). That amount gets put back into the golf course expansion fund immediately, and eliminates approximately \$30,000 in interest that is being paid per year.
2. It continues the past practice of the City in paying for the land upon which it has golf courses out of the general fund, or other resources, and then expects the golf course to support itself in any capital improvements.
3. It deals with the situation now instead of deferring it to a later time, which could be particularly crucial since the sprinkler system could fail soon. If the golf course capital fund is depleted, there could be problems.
4. It keeps the 80 acres in the City's name and dedicates it for golf course expansion.

Councilmember Afman was concerned about the weather in the past, the decrease in the number of rounds, and the fee differences. She wondered if Council is acting too hastily regarding the acreage on a negative response in a short period of time. She felt Option C, deferring a decision, would give Council the opportunity to digest all the past facts that have caused the current situation.

Administrative Services Director Ron Lappi recommended Option C based upon the past five years, in which he has been with the City of Grand Junction, he is not aware of any operating subsidies to the golf course. Regarding Option B, Mr. Lappi feels it is the best of two choices to buy the land back. Then the City holds the land and can dedicate it to future golf expansion, or to future park expansion or sell the land. If the golf courses cannot support the land, then the City can buy the land and it will belong to the City's general fund. A supplemental appropriation for \$640,000 would be needed, not just the \$400,000 that is owed on the loan, but also to pay back the \$240,000 down payment. It has an immediate \$640,000 impact on the general fund or the CIP Fund of the City. Those resources would probably have to come out of the dedicated stream of resources set up for the parks development plan. He stated that the golf course fund is self-sufficient, but it will not generate enough resources to do a lot

of capital improvements until the later years of the ten-year plan.

City Manager Mark Achen noted the two issues that Council is considering:

1. Settle the golf course fee issue and not have to keep readdressing it. Council did ask the Parks Board to try to solve this problem.
2. Should the City subsidize golf or not? Mr. Achen feels the proposal by Councilmember Theobald is one that attempts to solve the problem now, and not have to revisit, and also does not conflict with the current policy on subsidy. It merely takes the property back.

Mr. Achen feels the number is closer to \$700,000 if the golf course fund is to be made whole, because interest has been paid on the \$400,000. Mr. Lappi clarified that at the end of 1994, an 8% interest only payment in the amount of \$32,000 was made on the \$400,000. Mr. Achen feels the only realistic place to take the monies from would be the \$5.5 million for parks capital improvements. It does solve the golf problem for the near future.

Councilmember Theobald feels that Council is unanimous in not wanting to sell the 80 acres and keeping it for future golf course expansion or some other park use. His proposal solves all the problems in terms of golf course expansion. If Council wishes to sell the 80 acres back to the golf course for expansion, or turn it into something else, or gift it to the golf course as a one-time capital infusion similar to what was done when the City bought Tiara Rado years ago, that decision can be made in the future based on the information at the time. The 80 acres needs to be kept for the future use of the people of this community.

Councilmember Tomlinson questioned why the \$275,000 has to be an initial lump sum payment. He suggested that it be paid over a period of time.

Councilmember Baughman agrees with Option B. He feels the City should take the money from the Parks CIP Fund, which the City generates in various ways, then the golf course is not obligated for the interest payments or the capital cost of the land acquisition. Land improvement yes, but not the land itself.

Councilmember Maupin is tired of the taxpayers subsidizing golf. He lives close to Lincoln Park and the children are squeezed into

one tiny piece of land. There is a huge open space in the middle of Grand Junction that cannot be walked on because it is posted with "no trespassing" signs and 3-story fencing. He feels that buying the 80 acre site back is merely subsidizing the golf course to another \$800,000. If the Golf Fund wants this land in reserve, then they need to pay for it.

Mr. Lappi stated that if the City bought the land back for the general fund, it would need to pay the following to the golf fund:

\$240,000 down payment
\$400,000 forgiving the loan
\$ 32,000 first year of interest payment
\$672,000 Total Cost to the City

Mr. Mark Fenn, a resident of Grand Junction, and long time golfer in the area, stated that the increased fees are not a problem with him, what they pay for is. He feels the golfers are being treated differently than other users of parks and recreation facilities. He requested a little more balance and fairness on the part of the City in dealing with golfers. He requested that Council adopt the proposed golf fees, and change a basic philosophy that golf is a "stand alone" enterprise. He feels golf has at least equal value to some other recreational activities in quality of life in Grand Junction.

Upon motion by Councilmember Theobold, seconded by Councilmember Bessinger and carried by roll call vote, Resolution No. 14-95 was adopted.

It was moved by Councilmember Theobold and seconded by Councilmember Baughman that Staff be directed to prepare a resolution for the repurchase of the 80 acre property by the General Fund from the Golf Course Expansion Fund. Upon roll call vote, Councilmembers **THEOBOLD**, **BAUGHMAN** and **MANTLO** voted **YES**, and Councilmembers **BESSINGER**, **MAUPIN**, **TOMLINSON** and **AFMAN** voted **NO**. The motion failed.

Councilmember Tomlinson stated that his NO vote was simply an expression of frustration. He is not ready to make a decision. He would like more time.

Councilmember Afman stated that she would like more input on the numbers and the impact on the park funds. She needs time to digest Councilmember Theobold's suggestion.

It was moved by Councilmember Tomlinson that Staff be directed to

return in two weeks with further study of cost implications and other options that might be appropriate for consideration.

Councilmember Bessinger amended the motion to include an assessment of the number of golfers, not number of rounds, and the number of people who use the golf courses.

Mr. Jamie Hamilton stated that the Board needs to get on the fast track. They have made their recommendation. He does not know how much more fine tuning can be done to Options A and B.

Councilmember Afman stated that the Board does not need to be involved. She feels Council needs the time to openly discuss this item rather than taking up important agenda time, then come to the next Council meeting with a clear consensus of what is to be done.

President of the Council Mantlo stated that Councilmember Tomlinson's motion was taken as direction without further action.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE - AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 34 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES ALSO KNOWN AS THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION CITY RETAIL SALES AND USE TAX ORDINANCE

In order to encourage manufacturing industry development within the City of Grand Junction, the City proposes to adopt an amendment that will exempt the purchase of machinery and machine tools used directly and exclusively in a manufacturing process. This exemption parallels an exemption provided in the State of Colorado Sales and Use Tax Regulations.

Administrative Services Director Ron Lappi reviewed this item. He explained that the amendment would exempt machinery equipment and machine tools that are used in manufacturing in the City's Sales and Use Tax Ordinance. Previously, the purchase of new machinery for manufacturing was subject to the 2-3/4% Use Tax. The amendment has implications for all manufacturing within the City, in that they can replace their worn out equipment, etc., without having to pay any City Use Tax. It aligns the City's Sales and Use Tax Ordinance with the State of Colorado Sales and Use Tax Ordinance.

It was moved by Councilmember Theobold and seconded by Councilmember Bessinger that the proposed ordinance be amended to include "consumable manufacturing materials" in a single ordinance that reflects both of the exemptions, and be passed for publication as amended.

City Attorney Dan Wilson clarified that there will be two additional exemptions, Subsections 38 and 39.

City Manager Mark Achen stated that Section 39 would be about the purchase of property used and consumed in the manufacturing process, as opposed to machinery and equipment involved in the manufacturing process.

Mr. John Trotter, Director of Operations for Coors Ceramics Co., was concerned that the impact of the current ordinance can put many businesses out of business. The amended ordinance will still cost his business, but it is an improvement.

Sam Suplizio, representing MCEDC, discussed the implications of this ordinance, and thanked Council.

Mr. Elvin Tufly, RICON, thanked Council and staff for considering this proposed ordinance.

City Manager Achen felt this is a matter of considerable significance to Grand Junction and to the City's economic efforts.

If Council feels strongly about this, it may want to encourage MCEDC, the manufacturing community, and the Chamber of Commerce to join together and use the assistance of the City, and, perhaps Mesa County, to encourage the State Legislature to reconsider its treatment of this same issue.

Councilmember Baughman felt it is better to have conditions favorable to locate in the City, which means less government control, less taxes, etc.

A vote was taken on the motion and it passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING - ORDINANCE NO. 2806 - AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, BLUE HERON ENCLAVE ANNEXATION, APPROXIMATELY 112 ACRES LOCATED ON RIVER ROAD BETWEEN 24 ROAD AND 24 3/4 ROAD AND SOUTH TO THE COLORADO RIVER [FILE #206-94]

A hearing was held after proper notice.

John Trotter and Elvin Tufly spoke regarding why it costs more to operate inside the City than outside. Mr. Elvin Tufly added that currently a mill levy and sales tax is paid for sheriff protection. Now, they will receive Grand Junction Police protection instead of through the Sheriff's Department. He feels the sales tax is going to be doubled for the same service.

Upon motion by Councilmember Baughman, seconded by Councilmember Tomlinson and carried by roll call vote, Ordinance No. 2806 was adopted, and ordered published.

RECOGNITION OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS DORALYN GENOVA AND KATHY HALL IN AUDIENCE

President of the Council Mantlo thanked County Commissioners Doralyn Genova and Kathy Hall for attending the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING - ORDINANCE NO. 2807 - AN ORDINANCE REZONING LAND LOCATED BETWEEN RICE AND SPRUCE STREETS AND HIGHWAY 340 AND WEST MAIN STREET FROM I-1 TO PZ [FILE #216-94]

A hearing was held after proper notice. Kathy Portner, Community Development Department, reviewed this item. Mesa County is proposing a rezone for the properties they own adjacent to the existing detention facility on Highway 340 and Rice Street. She reviewed the plats and noted the current zonings for various properties in the area. Mesa County's intent is to move the Motor Vehicle Department and the Elections Department, in the near future, to the existing building on the corner of Rice Street and White Avenue. There is an existing cinder block building that houses some of their facilities now. They would like to move those offices there in 1995. The I-1 zoning does not allow professional offices. It is a Light Industrial Zone and is not meant for office uses. Therefore, they need a rezone on this property. At the same time the County would like to rezone the remainder of their properties that they own for the potential use of those properties in the future for some type of governmental office use. The City staff agrees that the I-1 zoning probably is not appropriate in this area anymore. It is developing differently. The County had originally proposed a C-2 zoning. The City staff suggested they perhaps consider the C-2 zoning or the PZ zoning. However, at this time, City staff recommends that the Public Zone be adopted which is the same as the existing jail facility, and also presents an opportunity for the City to look at this area through the growth plan process to determine whether or not the C-2 (Heavy Commercial) Zone is appropriate here. Staff thinks office uses are appropriate given the way it is developing, and the PZ zoning would serve the purposes of Mesa County at this time. Staff recommends approval of rezoning all of the County owned property to PZ (Public Zone) and Planning Commission also recommended approval.

Roy "Andy" Anderson, Mesa County Project Manager, stated that

originally a C-2 zone was requested. The County has since amended that request. The County is not opposed to the PZ zone, and requested that City Council approve the rezone.

Upon motion by Councilmember Bessinger, seconded by Councilmember Maupin and carried by roll call vote, Ordinance No. 2807 was adopted, and ordered published.

PUBLIC HEARING - ORDINANCE NO. 2808 - AN ORDINANCE VACATING A PORTION OF RICE STREET BETWEEN WHITE AVENUE AND MAIN STREET AND A PORTION OF ROOD AVENUE BETWEEN RICE AND SPRUCE STREETS [FILE #216-94]

A hearing was held after proper notice. Kathy Portner, Community Development Department, reviewed this item. She stated that the County is also requesting the vacation of a portion of Rice Street which is currently undeveloped. There is a portion directly in front of the jail that has some improvements, but the remainder is undeveloped. The portion of Rood Avenue between Spruce and Rice Street, which is also undeveloped, has a structure in a portion of the right-of-way. The vacation of the right-of-way would necessitate the replatting of individual lots into larger parcels to eliminate land-locked lots. It would require the retention of easements for utilities within those rights-of-way. The City is concerned with the amount of traffic at the intersection of Highway 340 and Rice Street, and how that traffic could increase in the future with the potential extension of a frontage road along Highway 6 & 50 to connect into Mulberry and Highway 340. Alleviating traffic congestion at First and Grand is also a primary concern. City Staff feels it needs to consider the possibility of alternate routes to get around that intersection and that the Rice Street/Spruce Avenue area might offer a solution. Without knowing specifically what the County has proposed for their undeveloped parcels in that area, it is difficult to anticipate the amount of traffic that might be generated from that area, and the traffic circulation that might be needed for that. Mesa County is requesting the right-of-way vacation at this time as follow-up to the resolution that was adopted by City Council at the time that the Special Use Permit was approved for the jail facility. From that resolution, the following was included:

1. Regarding Rice Street, south from White Avenue to the north side of Main Street: it is understood that the County will propose the vacation of Rice Street from White Avenue south to the north side of Main Street. In the event vacation is requested and granted, the County shall hold the City

harmless from any claims or damages. The last statement was in regards to a property that the County did not own at that time, but does own now.

2. Regarding improvements on Rice Street, south of White Avenue to the north side of Main Street: said improvements must be made by December 31, 1996, unless Rice Street is vacated as contemplated above, in which case improvements will not be required since the vacated Rice Street will become a portion of the lands to be developed by the County. The County has a couple of years to determine what they will do with this property, and to finalize the vacation of Rice Street before they must make the improvements. They have indicated that it is important to them to get the issue resolved so they will know what the future of their lands will be in that area, and whether or not they should be making a major investment in the existing building for some of their facilities at this time. If there is still the potential that the street will go through, they will be hesitant to make that investment for the relocation of the two offices they are proposing to do in 1995.

Ms. Portner stated that until an analysis is done of traffic impact and the needs in the area, that would include the specifics of the County proposal for development, staff cannot support the vacation of Rice Street or Rood Avenue. The Planning Commission did recommend approval of the vacation.

Councilmember Afman questioned the conditions of the Special Use Permit. Ms. Portner stated that Rice Street must be improved by December 31, 1996 if it has not been vacated by that time. Councilmember Afman questioned if it could be delayed or postponed until development plans are ready.

Public Works and Utilities Director Jim Shanks stated that it was suggested to County Staff that the City preferred, in the absence of a real definitive plan for this area, to see the timeline extended if the County needed another year or two, giving the County time to solidify its plans. He knows the County would like to see it vacated so they can consolidate their lands and plan for it. Yet, once the City lets it go, it is gone. The City wants real definitive plans as to how the traffic is going to be handled. The City received a copy of the County proposed plan three years ago as a part of the jail project. His concern, from recent correspondence, is they don't know exactly what is going to go in there. He felt it would be preferable to give the County some additional time rather than force the issue now. He did not

feel that the use north of White Avenue really dictates resolution on the streets to the south be made at the present time.

City Manager Mark Achen stated two concerns are:

1. The impact of the County development plans: what types of uses and traffic that would be generated. Within certain limits, an estimate could probably be made regarding impacts. Mr. Shanks agreed.
2. The possibility of the intersection of Rice and Grand somehow ending up being a way to circumvent or supplement the congestion at First and Grand. Mr. Shanks stated this was one of his concerns with the plan as it was submitted previously because it also showed the vacation of West Main Street. There is a concern also that people will circumvent the First and Grand Avenue intersection and work their way through Rice Street.

City Manager Achen felt that while the County studies the impact generated from their development, it is a small part of a much larger problem. The issue is does the City see the need for a corridor of significance to be a by-pass? That seems like a policy of capital planning decision on the City's part. The County is in a difficult situation.

Mr. Shanks said that north of Rice Street on Mulberry will eventually connect into a frontage road that will go all the way up to the northwest and be a continuation of that, impacting this entire area. Once this right-of-way is vacated, it is gone. The City has little to say about how the traffic around this area will be developed. He is willing to work closely with the County to come up with a reasonable solution to the traffic. He thinks Rice Street, in the end, will not go through, that there will be some alternative to it. City Market has considered developing between Main and Colorado, which would impact traffic circulation as well.

Councilmember Afman stated that obviously when the Special Use Permit was granted, that particular Council gave some importance to Rice Street. Otherwise they would not have required the improve-ments. City Manager Achen said that the County didn't own all the land at that time, making the plans more difficult. The right-of-way that exists for the section of Rice Street north of White is substantially larger than the right-of-way that is being considered for vacation to the south. In terms of the County planning use of this land, if there's going to be a major corridor of that width through there, not only does the City not want to

vacate this, but the City wants some of the County's existing land. He felt that the County also faces that dilemma.

Mr. Shanks also mentioned the County's dilemma of security for the jail. The County obviously does not want a major street right in front of the jail. They have concerns about a hazardous waste spill or a situation where they would have to vacate prisoners. Mr. Achen recalled discussion about the construction of the jail.

One of the issues was to find a site that was relatively secure and out of the way, off the main traffic routes. Mr. Shanks did not think Rice Street was going to be the major carrier of traffic. He does not object to vacating it per se. His preference is to have some real definitive plans.

As an alternative, if Rice Street is not expected to go through, and Mr. Shanks would not suggest taking a larger right-of-way through the middle of it, what happens if the City vacates, and the County wants to develop some of the property that is in the blue hatched area (see plat). They will have to come to the City for approval which would lead the City to raise issues of traffic flow, requiring them to provide rights-of-way that may not even be dedicated today, in order to satisfy the circulation needs of their proposal. Can they develop without addressing those issues?

If that is a concern of the City, could it be remedied by some kind of commitment from the County that if the City vacated this, they would subject themselves to the entire discussion of how circulation is provided, etc.

Mr. Mike Serra, Mesa County Facilities Manager, stated that he thought that mechanism is already built into the City's process in the PZ Zone. He cannot do anything in a PZ zone without coming back for a site approval. He felt it was important that the street be vacated for the following reasons:

1. They want to protect the integrity of investment to maintain their campus; the ability to build another building there if and when it happens. He feels a decision will be made soon.
2. They do not want to develop Rice Street because it counters the county's first premise. They do not want to have a street in front of the jail.
3. It's very difficult to do long term planning with that right-of-way in existence. For example, when the County first talked to Staff, there was a proposal to take additional right-of-way on Rice Street north of the vacated area. They came in July of 1993 with a proposal to develop. It was

the Planning Commission's request, to put the improvements in the facilities the County currently has on the north side of the street. There was no mention of additional right-of-way at that point in time. He is concerned about what is going to happen in the future. The County would like to get that campus consolidated, protect the integrity of the jail, and give the County the ability to do some long term planning there.

For those reasons, it is very important to Mesa County that those streets be vacated. The City has a mechanism in place for the County to come back. Every site can be reviewed and will show everything that they want to do on that site. Mr. Serra stated that he is more than willing to work with the City on some reasonable accommodations for additional right-of-way. He recognized that there is a severe problem at the intersection of Grand and First Street. He feels it is important that the City and County work together on this issue as was done in the past, with the Conditional Use Permit for the jail. They contributed \$33,000 into the traffic signal at the intersection of Rice and Grand. They contributed approximately \$100,000 into the improvements on Rice Street north of the area they would like to vacate. This was done jointly with the City. They put improvements into Crosby Avenue. They also prepared a traffic study and submitted it to the City, based on a courthouse development there, which is the highest traffic generator he could imagine. They also submitted a master site plan. The County has methodically been moving forward on trying to consolidate its campus and abide by the conditions that the City placed on the Conditional Use Permit. It is very important that those streets get vacated so the County can do its long range planning, protecting the integrity of their investment. Mr. Serra stated that the County is willing to work with the City of Grand Junction any way possible, to accomplish some relief at the corner of First and Grand.

Mr. Serra continued that each time there is an extension of time, other alternatives pop up, both for the City and County. He cited the White Street improvements. The County has an investment there and would like to move on. They are trying to conform with the conditions placed by the City. The County has submitted a plan, and has not deviated from it. The plan proposed is for a public facility.

Ms. Portner stated that a plan was submitted to the City for review after the Special Use Permit was issued for the jail. It shows a conceptual plan for the court facility in that area. This

is not a planned zone with adopted plans. There is no legal plan.

Mr. Serra stated that in the County's mind, there is a plan. Mr. Achen stated that until the County is willing to say that it will submit the plan and legally make it binding, then it is not a plan. Mr. Achen felt the County is saying that if the City is willing to vacate the right-of-way, then later on the County will be willing to give the City reasonable accommodations for future right-of-way. Generally, when a landowner with private development comes to the City and says "Give us that land, and then we'll make reasonable accommodations for you", the City is inclined to hesitate, not wanting to let go of anything owned by the City until the City is satisfied. Mr. Serra believes that the County made the reasonable accommodations when they built the facilities to accommodate the traffic study and the improvements that were requested by the City at that time. Based on the plan that was submitted by the County, it has not changed in the County's mind, and on the conditional use permit for the construction of the jail, the County feels the City may not have a firm plan in that area, and either the City or the County needs to pin it down. The County would like to pin theirs down, so that both can move forward.

Andy Anderson stated that he did get review comments back from the City on the conceptual plan that the County submitted. He received it July 16, 1991. It says "City Staff has done a preliminary review of plans for the new courts facility at Spruce and Main Streets. The City is very concerned with the proposal to vacate Main Street and Spruce and Main Streets, and re-route Crosby Avenue to First Street via Colorado." At that time the County had proposed bringing Crosby down on the south side of the County's two-acre tract on the bottom side, and connecting it into Colorado. The City did not agree with that. There was never a mention of being opposed to Rice Street vacation at the time. The County has two existing buildings that are currently in right-of-ways, one in Rood Street, the other in Rice Street. Mr. Anderson stated that a decision needs to be made very soon. They are getting ready to expend close to a quarter of a million dollars in the other part of that warehouse, and if there are plans to take a portion of Rice Street and cut out their parking lot, it really affects the feasibility of doing that project.

Mr. Achen felt the County is saying they need now a commitment from the City that the City is not going to use Rice or the connection at Rice and Grand; that the City must forego any future possibility of having that as a significant route. That is the heart of the issue. Mr. Anderson stated that Mr. Achen's

interpretation is correct.

Mr. Anderson reaffirmed that the County did present the plan, and assumed it was approved because comments were never received back on it. It also said the County was going to vacate Rice and Rood at the time which was in the plan that was submitted at that time.

The County is trying to follow through with its commitments at the time. President of the Council Mantlo stated that in 1991, Mr. Anderson was talking about the courthouse. The County did not own the Pepsi Cola building at that time, so this portion of Rice was not in that plan. Mr. Anderson responded by saying that the County spent \$77,000 on improvements at the City's request, realigning Rice Street, plus \$30,000 for a total investment of approximately \$100,000.

City Attorney Dan Wilson asked what impact the current court case regarding responsibility for the Court, County or State, has on the issue being discussed.

Mr. Serra responded stating that one of four things could happen:

1. The County can lose, and the County will have the same facilities problems it has today.
2. The County can win, and the County will still have the same facilities issues it has today.
3. The County can win. The courts could take the existing courthouse. In fact, the County has a memorandum on the table from Judge Buss, Chief Judge of the 21st Judicial District, asking just for that. In which case, the County must find a new home for the services and departments that are in that building. The properties by the jail were acquired for public purpose. He anticipated that would be a primary site to be looked at for a new administrative complex or service center.
4. The County can win. The courts could say "This is a terrible building. We'll move out." In which case, Mr. Serra would assume that the County would try to discuss with the courts the possibility of locating within their new facility. It would save the County a significant amount in prisoner transport costs if the court facility was located there. He sees a very immediate need for that property.

City Attorney Wilson stated that another possibility would be the County wins, and the courts move out, and the County has the

courthouse as its property, and would still have this subject property. This fifth alternative would give the County more options than any of the other four above.

City Manager Mark Achen felt the issue here is the future use of the Rice and Grand Avenue intersection, and the County is trying to encourage the City to not consider that as a thoroughfare connection because it adds another major issue to their development, and certainly would require dedication of some of that land, or some kind of right-of-way, whether it's on Rice alignment, or whether its through Spruce and Main, or whether it guides over to Spruce.

Public Works Director Jim Shanks stated that a decision could be made now, but he does not feel there is enough information tonight. He stated that Mr. Anderson talked about a previous traffic study which was primarily centered around the jail. An agreement was not reached on a traffic plan. Mr. Shanks thinks something could be worked out in time, regarding an alignment that could be agreed upon. He is concerned that if Rice is vacated and the portion of Rood is vacated, some sort of geometry changes at the northeast corner of Rice and White, and the southwest corner of White and Spruce will likely have to take place. He thinks that this possible requirement is the County's fear. Once the City gives up its right-of-way, Mr. Shanks is concerned that the City will have trouble getting it. If an agreement can be reached as far as future geometry changes at those intersections to handle traffic and work it out, then he is comfortable with the vacation request.

Mr. Serra stated that the County has a short term need, and a long term dilemma. They would like to move their facilities to the corner of White in the very near future. It is not prudent for the County to make such a investment without knowing what the City's plans for that area. They are not prepared to expend another \$250,000 without having an answer. In the longer term, the County needs to know what the development potential is of the property they acquired.

Mesa County Commissioner Doralyn Genova stated that the County has documentation from the City regarding what is proposed and recommended, and now, as the County moves forward to utilize the facilities the taxpayers have in the subject area, suddenly this Council feels it has a bad corner to deal with. She stated that the County's intentions were to vacate these streets after the overall concept was complete.

City Manager Mark Achen stated that he understood Ms. Genova, but

he also understood that the County was not willing to commit to that plan, and actually adopt that plan and make it legal, so that the issue of "access" remained an uncertainty. It was not resolved even with those problems that were submitted. He didn't know if the Council realized that the County's intent was to have that intersection become a quasi-cul-de-sac, or just a local access for the use of the County property only.

Ms. Genova referred back to Resolution No. 58-90 entitled Granting a Special Use to the County of Mesa for a Detention Facility and Sheriff's Office at Approximately 215 Rice Street. The County's plans never changed from that, in the fact they were going to use those facilities, as far as vacation of streets and those types of things. And that is what the County is holding to. She stated that the County needs to use those facilities to take care of a problem of crowding with the County Clerk and Recorder and its Election Department. It needs to be done as soon as possible.

Mr. Anderson stated that when Crosby was proposed as the alternate route, the County did not know how it was going to get on Highway 340, nor did the City, but he felt the City would come up with a solution. A delay would hurt the County in the amount of \$27,000 over the next six months. He feels it is important for both the City and the County to resolve the issue. The County cannot move forward in a methodical fashion with the development of that property, and solve major facilities problems coming up for Mesa County, without a resolution to the Rice Street and Rood Avenue vacation.

Public Works Director Jim Shanks felt the local traffic circulation in the area could be worked out in approximately 30 days.

Councilmember Tomlinson questioned what would be accomplished in 30 days.

City Attorney Dan Wilson stated that if the roads are vacated, he felt the argument from County legal staff would be: the roads are vacated, there are improved roads already, and the amount of traffic that the courthouse complex would generate can be handled by the existing road system. The real problem is the addition of traffic on top of an existing problem. In terms of having leverage to work out the terms cooperatively, the Rice Street right-of-way is critical to that.

Councilmember Theobald suggested an alternative would be to grant the vacation, but attach to it the condition that a final plan for

the rest of the property must be submitted, and that alternate right-of-way may be required in that process.

City Attorney Dan Wilson stated that in the past, the City has applied conditions to vacating ordinances. Typically, they have been reserving easements for public utilities. The State Statute regarding vacation has no language in it that supports attaching land use conditions or those kinds of conditions to a vacating ordinance. He felt it is risky to assume conditions would be enforceable.

Mesa County Commissioner Kathy Hall requested the cooperation of the City Council any time Mesa County comes before it with a request. She promised the City the same treatment by the County.

Kathy Portner clarified that the PZ Zone would require a special use permit for any uses for the County. Technically, that requires only administrative review. It only gets raised to a hearing level if it is requested to be raised to a hearing level by a Council member or by its staff choosing to deny it.

Councilmember Theobald assumed that if, during this process, there is a problem with some part of it, and the traffic issue has not been resolved, that Council would be made aware, and there would be opportunity for it to then be reviewed. Ms. Portner agreed. Councilmember Theobald was confident that the County understands the issues raised by Council and the frustrations, and he feels a commitment exists to work this out.

Commissioner Genova asked Mr. Shanks if the County is still going to maintain the streets that the City needs open in order to address that corner, that is, the northern part of Rice Street and White Avenue is going to be kept open. Mr. Shanks stated that in order to carry the traffic that's going to be produced in that area, with more vehicles, courts, the jail, or whatever it's going to be, it may be necessary. There may be something needed at both intersections to accommodate the volume of traffic there. Mr. Shanks stated that once the City vacates Rice Street, there will be very little possibility of obtaining additional right-of-way to make those intersection accommodations.

Ms. Genova stated that in five or ten years, the County may not have to use those buildings. But right now, they have to use those buildings in order to accommodate their space needs. They need to do something about their lease agreement at 619 Main Street. It does not mean that the County won't be willing to work with the City in an overall concept for that site. She could see

no reason for not vacating Rice Street now.

Upon motion by Councilmember Theobold, seconded by Councilmember Tomlinson and carried by roll call vote, with Councilmembers **AFMAN** and **BESSINGER** voting **NO**, Ordinance No. 2808 was adopted.

PUBLIC HEARING - ORDINANCE NO. 2809 - AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 5-4-6 A. AND F. OF THE ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE CONCERNING OPEN SPACE FEES [FILE #1-94(Z)]

Parks/open space fees are not justified for some types of minor developments. This code amendment will eliminate the parks/open space fee for change of use or special use permit situations.

A hearing was held after proper notice. Tom Dixon, Community Development Department, reviewed this item. He explained that this is a simple code amendment proposes the elimination of the Parks and Open Space fees for special uses and for any change of uses that would require those types of reviews.

He stated that the current parks and open space fees for platting of minor and major subdivisions for residential are \$225 per lot. It is payable at the time of platting. For all other uses, commercial and industrial reviews is 5% of the fair market value of the unimproved land. The fair market value is determined by an appraisal of the property, and is paid for by the developer.

It was moved by Councilmember Maupin and seconded by Councilmember Bessinger that Ordinance No. 2809 be adopted with the amendment that the residential fee for open space be raised to \$750 and the commercial percentage be raised to 15%.

An analysis of the open space fees structure has been in the working for the past two years, and is not imminent. Mr. Dixon felt the new Parks Planner will be working on this project. He felt it is difficult to make the connection between the parks and open space demands that are generated from commercial and industrial uses. Any analysis is probably going to focus on residential.

With the City Attorney's advice that such a motion may not be a legal course of action, Councilmember Maupin withdrew his motion, and Councilmember Bessinger withdrew his second.

Upon motion by Councilmember Maupin, seconded by Councilmember Theobold and carried by roll call vote, Ordinance No. 2809 was

adopted.

PUBLIC HEARING - PROPOSED ORDINANCE - AN ORDINANCE ASSESSING COSTS OF ALLEY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT 1994, PHASE A

Reconstruction of the following 6 alleys has been completed in accordance with the Resolution Creating Alley Improvement District 1994, Phase A:

Grand to Ouray Avenues between 17th and 18th Street;
8th to 9th Street between Hill and Teller Avenues;
Mesa to Orchard Avenue between 19th and 20th Streets;
Bunting to Elm Avenue between Cannell and Houston Avenues;
3rd to 4th Street between Chipeta and Gunnison Avenues;
11th to 12th Street between Ouray and Chipeta Avenue;

The second and final reading of the proposed ordinance will be held on February 15, 1995.

A hearing was held after proper notice. There were no comments. Upon motion by Councilmember Tomlinson, seconded by Councilmember Baughman and carried by roll call vote, the proposed ordinance was passed on first reading, and ordered published.

PUBLIC HEARING - PROPOSED ORDINANCE - AN ORDINANCE ASSESSING COSTS OF ALLEY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT 1994, PHASE B

Reconstruction of the following 2 alleys has been completed in accordance with the Resolution Creating Alley Improvement District 1994, Phase B:

12th to 13th Street between Main Street and Rood Avenue;
13th to 14th Street between Grand and White Avenues;

The second and final reading of the proposed ordinance will be held on February 15, 1995.

A hearing was held after proper notice. There were no comments. Upon motion by Councilmember Bessinger, seconded by Councilmember Tomlinson and carried by roll call vote, the proposed ordinance was passed on first reading, and ordered published.

TRANSIENTS WITH SIGNS

Councilmember Baughman has received complaints from citizens regarding the number of transients in the area with signs saying

that they will "Work for Food." City Attorney Dan Wilson advised that there is very little that can be done legally about this problem. If traffic is impeded, then they can be asked to step back to a safe location. The sign is irrelevant.

ADJOURNMENT

The President adjourned the meeting at 10:44 p.m.

Stephanie Nye, CMC
City Clerk

TO: City Council
FROM: Parks and Recreation Advisory Board Members
FOR: CITY COUNCIL MEETING ON FEBRUARY 1, 1995
RE: Golf Course Fee Recommendation

I. It is City Council's policy that Grand Junction's two Public golf courses will be operated as an enterprise fund and will be self sufficient.

II. This policy includes payment, through golf fees, of all operation and maintenance costs and payment of all capital improvement projects associated with the golf courses, including the Tiara Rado Clubhouse remodel, the Lincoln Park Clubhouse remodel and lake enhancement, and acquisition costs and future development costs of the 80 acres of land near Tiara Rado Golf Course for an additional 9 hole golf course.

III. One clear message we received from members of City Council was that staff and the Parks Board should take input from all involved and make a recommendation that would allow golf fees to remain stable with nothing more than a cost of living increase annually to try and avoid the need for significant fee increases in the near future. Frankly, given the number of meetings that we have attended and comments we have heard, the Parks Board would prefer not to revisit golf fees in the near future either. The comment heard on a number of occasions was, let's come up with a fee structure that we don't have to revisit year after year, i.e. one that won't just let us get through the next couple of years and see where we are, but a fee structure that would make a conscious effort, based upon the information available to us today, to comply with the policy set by City Council of self sufficiency for the golf courses.

IV. After holding 5 golf course focus group meetings and 3 meetings of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board with the public, we have given City Council a recommendation. This recommendation includes a significant fee increase, which is never popular. However, the Parks Board felt that the fee structure was competitive with other local and regional golf courses and potentially could provide approximately 2 million dollars at the end of ten years for golf course capital improvements or development of the additional 9 holes. The majority of this 2 million dollars accumulates over the final years of the ten year period. It also assumes that there are no major capital improvement expenditures at the golf courses over the next ten years, a weak assumption given the age of the sprinkler systems at

both Lincoln Park and Tiara Rado golf courses. The Parks Board felt that this problem was not adequately addressed by the fee structure.

V. With this in mind, the Parks Board recommendation further included a request that City Council consider a change in its current policy to include dedicating to the golf course capital improvement fund the interest paid to the City general fund by the golf course fund on prior golf course capital improvement projects. The effect of this recommendation would be to front end load the golf course capital Improvement fund with dollars generated through golf course fees (not tax dollars) with the idea that the golf courses would have a better chance of paying for unexpected capital improvement costs (i.e. sprinkler systems) out of the fees generated through play rather than having to make a request to the city general fund in a few years and having to borrow money from the general fund for these expenses. It would also hopefully generate sufficient dollars in the golf course capital fund for the additional 9 holes of golf at Tiara Rado in the next ten years without having to request additional dollars from the general fund in competition with all the other capital improvement projects of the City, including, other parks projects.

VI. The comment we heard on Monday evening was that maybe the City Council should approve the option promoted by Ron Lappi, the City Finance Director, of just adopting the proposed fee structure without dedication of the interest, and waiting a few years to see what happens. I think this suggestion is in direct contravention of the message we were given by members of council to come up with a structure that we didn't need to revisit in the near future.

VII. Obviously there is an inherent subsidy involved in the Parks Board recommendation. However, the subsidy is being paid by the golfers with their fees, not from sales taxes paid by the general public. The "subsidy" from the taxpayers, i.e. the principal loaned by the City to make prior improvements and land acquisitions will be repaid to the general fund under the current recommendation.

VIII. As a Board, we are aware that our recommendation of dedicating the interest to the golf course fund may impact the parks expansion dollars available to the task force. As a Board, we felt that it was more equitable to dedicate dollars generated from golf fees to improvement and development of the golf courses, rather than to ask the golfers to pay for other city capital improvements, including park expansion.

IX. The Parks Board recommendation is an attempt to provide a recognizable funding source for capital improvement projects, to take into account the comments heard from many citizens that the golf courses are important components in what' our city has to offer and to hopefully avoid having to revisit the fee structure for an additional significant fee increase one or two years down the road. The proposal is not perfect but it provides some hope that the courses will remain self sufficient and that the additional 9 holes could be built, using golf course generated dollars, within the next ten year period.