

Mr. Errol Snider
21 September 1978
PAGE 2

annual tax rebate. In my mind, this is the equivalent of having the expenditure covered by non-city residents.

2. The bonding procedure being used for the "downtown" development is confusing to me, but as I understand it, it is a procedure whereby the tax income from the increased base is utilized primarily to purchase property . . . and excludes additional income to other entities which presumably would accrue to the cost for installation of utility lines, etc..

Errol, I recognize that these are two problems to which city government must relate on the basis of specific needs . . . but I submit to you that if that governmental body administering those matters which are going to be arising on a continual basis is representative only of a segment of the citizens, those persons living outside the boundaries of that governmental subdivision can experience discrimination.

Recognizing all the problems that seem to be inherent in its operations, joint administration similar to the Airport Authority board appears to me to be a much more fairly representative approach than to place absolute control in the hands of people elected to represent only a segment of the whole of the taxpayers involved. I think it is pertinent to note that County Commissioners represent all of the residents and taxpayers (including those living within the city limits), while City Council members represent almost exclusively the concerns of citizens and taxpayers living within the city limits.

In my opinion, this fact would indicate to me that a governing board with a majority of its membership from the County Commissioners side would more fairly represent each and all of the areas.

I apologize for the rather laborious dissertation . . . it is something which could have been discussed in a few minutes and I am more than willing to pursue it further with you.

I think the impact of this decision goes far beyond what appears on the surface.

Regards,



John Porter

JMP/so

21 September 1978

H. E.
M.

Mr. Errol Snider
Mesa County Commissioner
Mesa County
P.O. Box 897
Grand Junction, Colorado 81501

SUBJECT: PROPOSED SEWER PLANT

Dear Errol,

I have tried to contact you on several occasions . . . it would have been advantageous to speak to you directly about this matter, but I recognize that your time is very much committed and hence my letter to you today.

A decision as to "who" owns . . . and administers, the new sewer plant is difficult to resolve. However, I feel that if the matter can be placed in proper perspective, it can be turned from a controversial matter into a giant step forward in developing the sort of "city/county" coordination which the valley demands.

I recognize that this goal hasn't been accomplished too successfully elsewhere, but I have always felt that the opportunity exists for government to function with some innovation . . . and this may well be an example. The other side of the coin is the fact that if it doesn't work well, it's going to be a terrible mess!

As the matter presently stands, it appears to me that Mesa County Commissioners are basically less "prejudiced" as far as the matter is concerned. I concur that the sewer should be utilized as a planning coordinating tool - hopefully more wisely than in the Clifton area, which has spawned almost uncontrolled growth. Unfortunately, the City of Grand Junction has demonstrated an extremely parochial attitude in matters of "interrelation", in my estimation. Frankly, I observe their concerns to be almost exclusively limited to the immediate needs of the city and I think they have taken several actions that are of concern when you consider the option of their having total control of a tool such as a sewage system . . . there may well be no more powerful device available to a governmental system. Use rates are not the final determinant in these matters . . . consideration must be given to the alternative taxing methods that are available. I feel there have been abuses on the part of the City of Grand Junction in the past as indicated in the actions described below:

1. Several years ago, the city was faced with the need to obtain additional monies to support essential utilities programs. Rather than "bite the bullet" and increase fees to city taxpayers, they opted to apply an additional 1% sales tax . . . which on the face of it affects all people the same. But they then provided relief for city residents only by means of an

JOHN PORTER / ARCHITECTURE & PLANNING
BOX 806 PHONE 245-2000 GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO