

**LIQUOR AND BEER MEETING
LOCAL LICENSING AUTHORITY
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO
CITY/COUNTY AUDITORIUM, 520 ROOD AVENUE**

MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 5, 1998, 8:00 A.M.

I. **CALL TO ORDER** - The meeting was convened at 8:08 a.m. Those present were Hearing Officer Phil Coebergh, Assistant City Attorney John Shaver and Acting City Clerk Christine English.

II. **APPLICATIONS TO RENEW LIQUOR AND BEER LICENSES**

1. Fishers Liquor Barn Incorporated dba Fishers Liquor Barn, 2448 F Road, Retail Liquor Store

The application was in order and approved.

2. C & F Food Stores Incorporated dba C & F Food Stores, **3 locations**, 3.2% Beer

1. 859 Pitkin
2. 2714 Highway 50
3. 596 25 Road

Kathleen Busking, representing C & F Food Stores Incorporated, was present. The applications were in order and approved.

3. Mill Inn Incorporated dba W.W. Peppers Ltd., 753 Horizon Drive, Hotel-Restaurant

The application was in order and approved.

III. **APPLICATION FOR RENEWAL WITH DECISION ON CAUSE FOR LATE FILING AND APPLICATION FOR MODIFICATION OF PREMISES - Continued from July 15, 1998**

1. Deborah and Charles Campbell dba The Station at 7th and Main, 701 Main Street, Hotel-Restaurant-License expired on June 4, 1998, renewal filed on June 29, 1998

Deborah Campbell was present. The lease is not for the entire licensing period. Darleen McKissen, Mesa County Health Department, requested that the report of their inspection be read into the record (see attached).

Ms. Campbell stated the problem with the ants at the bar was due to a spill of drink mix that was sweet and left on the floor. The big refrigerator was in need of repair so the bar refrigerator was being used. There are plans to remodel.

Mr. Shaver pointed out that a modification of premises was to be part of the hearing process today, but the modification had all ready taken place. Ms. English stated the Health Department had notified the City Clerk's office that a modification of the premises had taken place. The Clerk's office requested the Code Enforcement Division to inspect the premises at that time to see if the existing floor plan matched the diagram which was submitted with the original application. Code Enforcement reported that a substantial amount of rearranging had been done on the inside. The bar area was moved and the premises had been extended to include an area that housed pool tables. The applicant was contacted and requested to file a modification of premises at that time. Ms. Campbell stated when The Station first opened, they only had a small temporary bar and this is what was moved. Mr. Coebergh asked if the area of alcohol service has been expanded. Ms. Campbell replied yes.

Ms. English read into the record the letter of explanation concerning the late renewal (see attached). Mr. Shaver stated C.R.S. 12-47-302(2)(a) specifies that a licensee whose license has not been expired over 90 days, may file a late renewal application upon the payment of the non-refundable late application fee of \$500 each to the State and Local Licensing Authorities. The licensee may continue to operate upon payment of the fees. These fees have been paid. The issue of good cause does not apply to the filing of late renewal on an expired license once the fees have been paid. The next issue is the payment of taxes. The Revenue Department had furnished Mr. Shaver with information that the applicant had not paid sales or use tax, specific ownership tax or occupational tax. He had been in contact with Ms. Campbell and stipulated that these needed to be paid prior to this meeting. This has been paid at this time, but payment was made upon estimated sales not actual sales. Mr. Shaver's recommendation is the application proceed on the matter of the late renewal and the question of the modification of premises and the health department situation be resolved contingent upon the actual reinspection. The issue of modification of premises will be addressed this morning. The fees will need to be paid and the diagram will need to accurately reflect the premises. The last issue is the matter of the lease. Some testimony from the applicant will be needed.

Ms. Campbell stated the lease expires in May and the liquor license expires in June. This is a matter of 30 days. Mr. Shaver stated the applicant has been advised the lease should be for the period of the license (the statutory provision not being perfectly clear) and she would have opportunity to make argument here this morning. If all of the others matters are favorably resolved, Mr. Coebergh might want to consider whether or not the period of eleven (11) months is sufficient on the lease for purposes of renewal.

Mr. Coebergh asked Ms. Campbell to state her position on the lease. Ms. Campbell stated she felt if the license ran until the lease was up, things might change. This will give them 10 months until the lease runs out. All fees have been paid. The lease might be extended but she is not sure at this time if this will happen. There has not been enough time to negotiate this with the owner of the building. Ms. Campbell was not sure if she wanted to extend the lease. Ms. Campbell stated she does need to proceed with the remodel to continue doing business. Some of the equipment needs to be repaired. There were plans for a large remodel, but this has been put off for a little while. At this time, they will do only what needs to be done.

Mr. Coebergh noted Mr. Shaver had left the meeting. Ms. English stated Mr. Shaver was checking on the status of the fees. The initial checks that were submitted were returned from the bank for insufficient funds. Ms. Campbell stated she came in and paid these the day after the notification from the bank. Mr. Coebergh requested to wait until Mr. Shaver's return before proceeding.

Mr. Coebergh requested to go back on the record. Ms. Campbell stated copies of the plan review had been dropped off to Darleen at the Health Department a long time ago. No modification of premises was filed at that time.

Mr. Shaver apologized for leaving the meeting but stated he wanted to confirm payment of the applicable fees. These have been taken care of.

Mr. Coebergh wanted to discuss the possibility of continuing this to the next hearing or the first hearing in September. Mr. Shaver stated he saw no problem in doing this. Under the statute, once the fee has been paid, the licensee may continue to operate under both state and local licenses until the Authority has taken final action to approve or deny the late renewal application. Currently her status is lawful. The other issues may be more appropriately resolved later after she has had an opportunity to address them. There is no restriction on continuing the hearing. Ms. English requested a clarification of what the applicant is being requested to provide.

Mr. Coebergh stated the issues of the modification of premises, the critical health code violations and the lease will need to have more information provided. Mr. Coebergh stated he was inclined to allow the applicant to operate with the current lease based upon his reading of the statute. It would be much easier to consider if the lease did coincide with the licensing period. There is no need for good cause on the late renewal to be found since the fees have been paid. Mr. Shaver stated since the health reinspection is scheduled for August 10th, continuing the hearing until the first meeting in September would be appropriate. Ms. Campbell concurred. She is currently looking into purchasing the building. The first meeting in September would give her time to resolve some of these issues.

Mr. Coebergh continued this matter to the first meeting in September, 1998. He admonished the applicant that there are significant problems and he did not feel the applicant was taking this as seriously as she should. Ms. Campbell stated she is taking this seriously. He encouraged Ms. Campbell to deal with Mr. Shaver, the health department and the City Clerk's office to be sure these matters are addressed well in advance of the September meeting. If there are any changes made after the filing of this modification of premises, Ms. Campbell will have to file again. This needs to be done prior to the modification taking place. This application does reflect the modification as it is at this time.

IV. APPLICATION FOR TRANSFER OF OWNERSHIP

1. La Providencia, L.L.C., dba La Bamba Mexican Dining, 2900 North Avenue, Hotel-Restaurant

Transfer of Ownership from Laurie Chavez dba La Bamba Mexican Dining to La Providencia LLC., dba La Bamba Mexican Dining

Members: Laurie Chavez, 621 Oxbow, Grand Junction, CO
Rudy Chavez, 120 E. Main, Green River, UT
Francisco Cervantes, 10 Moselle Court, Grand Junction, CO

Laurie Chavez and Francisco Cervantes were present. The application was filed after the change to the limited liability company took place. No reports were requested from the Fire and Health Departments as the licensee had just undergone the renewal process for the last hearing on July 15, 1998. This application is for a transfer of ownership from a sole proprietor to a L.L.C. A temporary permit was issued on July 15, 1998. The Code Enforcement Department confirmed the diagram submitted matches the floor plan and the Notice of Hearing was posted in a timely manner.

Mr. Coebergh questioned since this was filed after the fact, it means there was a period of time when there was no license? Ms. English replied they were licensed under Laurie Chavez dba La Bamba Mexican Dining. The L.L.C. was filed through the Secretary of State's office not the City Clerk's office. When Ms. Chavez brought in her application to renew, it was discovered that not only was this a late renewal, but they had changed ownership. At that time, Ms. Chavez was given the paperwork to file for the transfer of ownership. Mr. Coebergh stated there was no license from the point of the change. Mr. Shaver concurred. During the period of time the L.L.C. was managing/owning the restaurant and serving liquor, it was illegal. Mr. Coebergh asked what the period of time was? Mr. Cervantes stated it took place in January, 1998. Mr. Cervantes said he came to the City Clerk's office and was told he did not need to file until the renewal was due. Ms. English stated she spoke to Mr. Cervantes. Mr. Cervantes said he would be holding an event with the Denver Broncos but no discussion took place concerning a transfer of ownership. The law states that any change in the license needs to be filed within 30 days. This is a regulatory provision.

Mr. Coebergh asked Mr. Shaver to address the issue of the temporary permit. Mr. Shaver stated the liquor code's primary concern is compliance. Since the applicant is now in compliance, he will take the matter under advisement and do some further research and investigation. If circumstances warrant, a complaint will be filed against the licensee for the period in which there was no license. The violation occurred when the L.L.C. came into ownership of the restaurant. From that point forward any alcohol service was illegal. The temporary permit should not be a problem. It is authorized under the statute 12-47-303. The permit is valid for 120 days. Mr. Shaver recommended a favorable consideration of the transfer of ownership with the understanding there may be a complaint filed based upon the prior acts.

Mr. Coebergh asked how a temporary permit could be issued if there was a period of time when the licensee did not have a license. Mr. Shaver stated the license was a sole proprietorship. The question is possession of the premises and when the limited liability company actually became the legal entity. The Clerk's office processed what they were presented with. The transfer occurred in conjunction with the issuance of the permit. After the fact, it was found the limited liability company had been formed months earlier. This puts the City in an awkward position relative to processing the temporary permit without doing the research as to when the L.L.C. was formed. This makes for an interesting legal question as to whether or not there truly was a license.

It seems appropriate at this time, given there have been no other problems or complaints relative to the license, and for purposes of this application, to treat the formation of the L.L.C. and the transfer as occurring at the same time.

Mr. Coebergh admonished the applicant to be aware of the law. There is a problem with not having a license for a period of time under the L.L.C. Based upon the recommendation of Mr. Shaver, Mr. Coebergh approved the application for transfer of ownership.

V. APPLICATION FOR SPECIAL EVENTS PERMIT

1. Application by Western Colorado Center for the Arts for a Malt, Vinous and Spirituous Special Events Permit for "Harvest Brewfest" on September 26, 1998 from 6:00 p.m. 12:00 midnight to be located at Western Colorado Center for the Arts, 1803 North Street

to
7th

Applicant: Western Colorado Center for the Arts, 1803 N. 7th Street
President: Gaynell Colaric, 680 Step-A-Side Drive, Grand Junction
Event Mgr: Rich Helm, 2816 Hawthorne Avenue, Grand Junction

Tim Sarmo, volunteer board member and chairman of the special events committee, and Richard Helm were present. Ms. English read into the record the letter addressed to the Local Licensing Authority (see attached).

Mr. Coebergh asked Mr. Sarmo if a special event permit has been issued for this event in the past? Mr. Sarmo stated yes. Mr. Shaver recalled Mr. Helm appearing before the Authority but thought it was for a dinner theater event. He was not aware of a permit being issued for this type of function before.

Mr. Helm stated there may be some confusion with a subcontractor at the Arts Center called the Performing Arts Conservatory. The subcontractor does live theater at the Arts Center but it is under a lease type of arrangement. There was a request for a special events permit recently, but it was withdrawn. A similar event was held previously. Mr. Helm recalled Mr. Coebergh's remarks at that time, as being appreciably understanding about trying to get people into the Arts Center and introducing them to the cultural facility. The statute at that time was in relationship to whether there were other venues available. Mr. Helm stated this was approximately one year ago.

Mr. Shaver stated the Arts Center had previously held a license, and this event could have occurred during that period of time when the facility was licensed.

Mr. Coebergh asked if they were planning to charge by the drink or have a flat fee when the people come in allowing them to drink or not as they choose? Mr. Sarmo said the admission price would be a flat fee.

Mr. Coebergh asked if they were aware of the section of the statute that deals with exemptions for events of this type so that a license is not required? This is section 12-48-108. Mr. Sarmo said yes. He had questioned the City Clerk whether that provision would exempt them from the requirement for the permit. Ms. Nye felt this

matter should be brought before the Local Licensing Authority. Mr. Coebergh wanted them to be aware of this statute but did not know if it would apply at this time for this particular event. Mr. Coebergh stated he was not comfortable with what was being presented. The applicant needs to show that other existing facilities are unavailable or are inadequate. There are many places in Grand Junction which are licensed and it is a question of what inadequacy means. This has previously been addressed based on size factors, not on insurance factors or things of that nature.

Mr. Sarmo stated the statute is fairly open ended in terms of inadequacy and references inadequate needs of the organization. This leaves some room for the applicant to determine the adequacy of the facilities.

Mr. Shaver agreed with Mr. Sarmo concerning the statute. The provision specifically talks about other existing facilities being unavailable or being inadequate. The application gives rise to the question that the Arts Center is the facility required; where it is usually a situation where a facility is required outside of what the applicant has, which is why a special events permit is needed. By stating, "Nothing else is adequate, therefore I have to have it here", turns the statute around. This analysis is backwards. Mr. Shaver went on to say Section 12-48-103 has a conjunctive provision that says the facilities are unavailable or are inadequate **and** that existing licensed facilities are inadequate for the purposes of serving members or guests of the organization, and that additional facilities are necessary by reason of the nature of the special event being scheduled. By The Arts Center saying we have our facility and therefore that is the additional facility, therefore the special event is required, turns the statute around. This is not the traditional special events permit analysis where an organization has a building that they say isn't big enough, we need to go someplace else.

The other question is on the exemption provision, 12-48-108. Mr. Shaver stated he cannot give legal advice in his role as a regulator, but he concurred in all likelihood the event could be structured to provide an exemption. It may be appropriate to have this matter continued this morning and have the opportunity to discuss the exemption question and discuss the issue raised with Mr. Wilson, City Attorney, about the opportunity to restructure the board for purposes of securing a license so this special event issue will not have to be repeated.

Mr. Sarmo asked Mr. Shaver what the process was on an exemption. Mr. Shaver replied a determination is made by the organization that the organization is exempt; understanding that it is subject to potential enforcement if for some reason there is a problem.

Mr. Sarmo asked what constitutes a guest at a private function. Numerous individuals would be invited to be "guests" at this event. Mr. Shaver stated this is an area that has been struggled with in the past. If the event is advertised, is truly a private function? If it is treated as a party with invitations, something not generally available through print or electronic media, it is likely a "private" function even though many invitations may be sent out. As long as it is not directed to the public at large, it is a private function.

Mr. Helm stated the Arts Center has been in the process for over a year now of trying to find suitable locations which are licensed to hold these events. For example, the

Christmas function last year was held at another facility. That facility has now obtained a liquor license and the Christmas function will be held there again this year. This will probably be the last event they will hold in the Arts Center facility. The only reason it was chosen this time is due to having Cristo Exhibit on the premises. This international artist has wide notoriety and will attract additional attendees. If a newspaper ad was run, that generally excludes this from becoming a private function. As a fund-raiser, the target is 400 to 500 people. On this basis, it would preclude doing an invitation list. Mr. Helm's recommendation to The Arts Center's board is to out-source all the fund-raising where liquor and spirits are involved to another location. With only \$700 being taken in when the Arts Center had a liquor license, it had become too expensive to maintain a license. There were also liability issues in carrying the insurance. Based upon the liability of having a license and the expense of changes due to having a board, who have to go through the process of being certified as being applicable, the Arts Center has reduced the number of special events being held. The Country Inn, which now has a liquor license, was contacted. Unfortunately, the facility is too small for the number they need to accommodate for this event. Mr. Helm stated his understanding of the statute is to research additional sites to see if they can accommodate, and no other feasible site is available. This is a paradox for the Arts Center. Having an event at the Arts Center that will attract additional attendees versus a site which is rather sterile. Mr. Helm suggested to Mr. Sarmo that they indicate at this hearing the intent to ultimately hold all fund-raising events that involve serving alcohol at other locations besides the Arts Center. More sites could have been researched, but the appropriateness of those sites becomes an issue for the type of event that is being done. The success of the event is two-fold. If it does not meet with success this year by generating sufficient revenues based upon the time and resources involved to create it, it will be discontinued.

Mr. Coebergh stated he can see that Mr. Helm understands the statutory requirements that need to be dealt with. This issue has come up in the past with the decision of the Arts Center not to have an arts license. Unfortunately, this is not what the Licensing Authority has to look at. The statutory issues are what is relevant as to whether or not to grant a special events permit. Mr. Coebergh stated his view of the exemption statute seems to be fairly broad, whereas Mr. Wilson's and the states interpretation seems to be rather narrow. Some enforcement action would need to be taken if an event is a public function in the state's view as opposed to a private function.

Mr. Shaver stated, to supplement the discussion which is all ready on the record, the question of whether or not the advertising which was suggested earlier would convert a private party to a public party. The notion that an event is private because it is on your property is not controlling. The state, in an effort to maintain the integrity of the special events process and to control this process, has said the exemption is literal, it means a private function. This means it is not publicly advertised, it is not generally available to the public. Mr. Shaver suggested again to continue this matter to give everyone a chance to sit down together and sort through these issues. Mr. Shaver suggested the possibility of advertising the fund-raising event but to also privatize some of the functions, i.e., there will be a private showing or a private reception and to preclude the liquor sales from the public part. This type of solution may be available for purposes of the exemption. Mr. Shaver also said it would not be an unreasonable construction of C.R.S. 12-48-103, where it talks about additional facilities being

necessary by reason of the event, to meaning specialized facilities. This would refer to the need for specialized lighting, ambiance, character, acoustic quality etc. But if, as discussed earlier, additional means space or things above and beyond what a facility all ready has, which is what the plain meaning of the word is, whether or not an injustice was being done by saying the word meanings specialized will need to be left to the Hearing Officer's discretion.

Mr. Coebergh said the state legislature needs to address this issue and give clear guidance in a matter such as this. Mr. Coebergh stated his interpretation of the word additional means beyond that which you would normally be using. This excludes using your own facility.

Mr. Sarmo stated one way of viewing this, since it is in a paragraph referencing "existing licensed facilities are inadequate", one could say additional facilities are any facility beyond existing licensed facilities, not additional to the applicants premises, but additional to existing licensed facilities. If it is read this way, then in fact, the Arts Center is providing a premise in addition to other existing licensed facilities which are unavailable and inadequate as described in the prior paragraph. This may provide some room for the possibility of this interpretation. If some room in the language can be found, the special event license is the preferred method for the event this year. In the future, it could be structured differently, keeping the private issue in mind, it would be worth walking that fine line and placing the burden back on the state licensing authority. Given this year's plan of tabloid and media types of coverage, the additional interpretation of being in addition to existing licensed facilities, which has already been determined that there are none, and the special event permit be approved.

Mr. Coebergh stated from looking at the letter submitted, it is not determined that other existing facilities are not available. It addresses a couple of places that were contacted, but it needs further information on other facilities that would be sufficient for this event. Contacting only two places is not sufficient.

Mr. Helm stated this was addressed one prior time with two other issues that came into play: 1. the affordability; and 2. the control the facility required over the service of alcohol, whether they got the revenue or the Arts Center did. Many of the places that have been contacted in the past wanted either total revenues from the sale of alcohol of any type, or the cost for the facility exceeded what would be taken in total for the event. This narrows down the scope of who can be contacted. These problems have been run into many times in the past. The purpose of the special events are to generate revenue for the Arts Center. This creates a very difficult situation for the Arts Center.

Mr. Shaver asked Mr. Helm if he had a supplement to the letter which was submitted with the application as far as who was contacted and when they were contacted. Mr. Helm replied no, but if this is what is necessary, this can be provided.

Mr. Sarmo stated the inadequacy issue has been documented already based on the nature of the event and the availability of the display at the Arts Center, making another venue inadequate by virtue of the nature of the event. Mr. Sarmo asked if it was a problem for an already licensed establishment to provide liquor brought from off

premises to be consumed at no charge. Mr. Shaver replied this would be a problem as the license only extends to the licensed premises. This would make it unavailable for a different facility, meaning they can not transport their liquor and their license to a different facility and be lawful. Mr. Sarmo asked what if they stayed at their premises. Craft brews are being brought direct from micro-breweries. They are not selling the liquor to the establishment wholesale. It is not available for resale. The liquor being consumed is not being provided by the licensee. Mr. Shaver cited C.R.S. 12-47-415 which pertains to brew pubs. This states, " Brew pub license may be issued to any person operating a brew pub and also selling malt, vinous and spirituous liquors in the place where such liquors are to be consumed." This specifically relates to the brewing activity, the person operating a brew pub. Mr. Shaver questioned Mr. Sarmo if he was asking whether or not the manufacturers license is adequate for purposes of them bringing their manufactured alcohol product to your location and then dispensing it under their license? Mr. Sarmo stated his understanding is no one can bring liquor from one licensed premise onto another licensed premise for consumption. The alcohol for an event being held on a licensed premise must come from the licensed premise. Mr. Coebergh and Mr. Shaver concurred with this. Mr. Shaver stated this can be dealt with by the manufacturer or distributor invoicing the liquor through the licensee.

Mr. Coebergh gave Mr. Sarmo and Mr. Helm the option of a decision today or continuing to the next hearing date of August 19, 1998, thereby giving the applicant time to consider the options which have been discussed. Also, this will give them more time to explore the exemption possibility mentioned and to discuss these issues with Mr. Shaver.

Mr. Shaver asked Mr. Coebergh if the hearing were continued, if he would allow the record to be supplemented for purposes of a final decision. Mr. Coebergh stated yes. At this point the record is open.

Mr. Sarmo and Mr. Helm expressed their appreciation of the suggestions offered and agreed to have the matter continued to the next hearing date. They will provide some additional information for this next hearing.

Mr. Coebergh continued this matter to the next meeting, leaving the record open. He encouraged the applicants to discuss these issues with Mr. Shaver and Mr. Wilson.

VI. ADJOURNMENT - The meeting was adjourned at 9:28 a.m.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING - August 19, 1998

Mesa County Health Department

515 Patterson Rd., Grand junction, CO 81506
PO Box 20000, Grand junction, CO 81502-5033
Administration 248-6900
Environmental Health 248-696
Nursing 248-6950
Animal Control 242-4646
362 28 Rd.

July 31, 1998

City of Grand Junction
Attn.: Chris English, City Clerk's Office
250 North 5th Street
Grand Junction, CO 81501

RE: Renewal of Hotel - Restaurant license for Charles & Deborah Campbell, dba The Station, 701 Main Street, Grand Junction, CO

Dear Chris:

A routine inspection was conducted at The Station by a Darleen McKissen, Environmental Health Specialist III with the Mesa County Health Department on July 30, 1998 in order to provide your office with an up to date inspection for the Liquor licensing hearing scheduled for August 5, 1998 at 8:00 am. Five critical violations were noted during that inspection. A copy of the inspection report is attached for your records. A follow-up inspection is scheduled for August 10th.

A summary of the violations noted are as follows.

Critical Items

- 01 Granita Dolce Melon D'Eau Watermelon liquor (approx. 1/6th bottle) was discarded because it was contaminated with fruit flies.
- 03 One gallon of City Market 1% Low Fat Milk was discarded because it was at a temperature of 47 degrees F. Three open cans of Meadow Gold Whipped Light Cream were discarded.
- 04 Refrigeration unit - GE refrigerator (which contained potentially hazardous foods) were not holding ambient air temperatures of 45°F or below.
- 31 Hand wash sink has been removed.
- 35 Ants present on the counter top at the bar; Ants on floor at front of GE refrigerator.
- 41 First aid supplies, etc. were being stored over food and utensils. Relocated.

The Station - 701 Main Street, Grand Junction, Colorado Page 2

Thirty-four non critical violations were also noted. See inspection form for a complete listing.

The owners have verbally discussed future remodel ideas with this Department but as of today's date, the required written plan review has not been provided. The following notation as added to the last page of the inspection form:

"If a remodel is conducted, a plan review will be required prior to any construction. Health Department review and approval will be required. Also, contact the Mesa County Building Department for clarification of required permits. A two week review period is required."

A follow-up inspection will be conducted at this facility on or about August 10th to verify correction of the critical violations. Item 03- Temperatures; Item 04 -Refrigeration temperatures; and Item 3 5 - ants. The non-critical violations are to be corrected prior to the next routine inspection which will be conducted in approximately 6 months.

The Mesa County Health Department is requesting that this letter and a copy of the attached inspection report be submitted into the official minutes of the August 5th hearing. If additional information is required, please contact Darleen McKissen, Environmental Health Specialist III at 248-6968.

Sincerely,

Kathy Guerrie, Office Coordinator

The Art Center

WESTERN COLORADO CENTER FOR THE ARTS

1803 North Seventh Street Grand Junction, Colorado 81501 (970) 243-7337

July 1, 1998

City of Grand Junction
Licensing Authority
250 North Fifth Street
Grand Junction, CO 81501

To: Licensing Authority

The Western Colorado Center for the Arts, a private not-for-profit organization, requests the approval of a Special Events Permit for a micro-brew tasting fund-raiser to be held at the Art Center, 1803 North Seventh Street, Grand Junction, Colorado, on Saturday, September 26, 1998, from 6:00 P.M. to 12:00 midnight.

The purpose of this event is to attract community members to the Art Center and introduce them to the displays, facilities, on-site services, and staff. In a social setting, participants enjoy a special art exhibit, music, lectures, food, and craft beers from around the region.

The nature of the event requires use of the center as the venue in order to allow the community to see the facilities first hand. Another venue is not suitable due to the practical and insurance limitations associated with transporting the art collection. In spite of these limitations, other venues including the Holiday Inn and Grand Junction Hilton were contacted but are unable to accommodate our event.

The Art Center receives no funding from the City of Grand Junction or Mesa County. Funds raised from this and other similar events support ongoing educational and cultural programs of benefit to our community. The Board and Director of the Western Colorado Center for the Arts respectfully request permission to host this event at our facility and ask to be granted a Special Events Permit.

Thank you for your consideration and support.

Sincerely,

Richard Helm
Executive Director

cc: Dan Wilson, City Attorney