

JANUARY 18, 1968

Pursuant to Resolution No. 1 declaring the intention of the City of Idaho Falls to create Local Improvement District No. 37 and calling for a public hearing on January 18, 1968, the City Council met in special session in the Council Chambers in the City Building for the purpose of hearing and considering all protests and other comments pertaining to the creation of said district. There were present at said meeting: Mayor S. Eddie Pedersen, Councilwomen Lyn Smith, Councilmen Jack Wood, Gordon Nelson, Dale Parish, Jim Freeman, Melvin Erickson. Also present: Roy C. Barnes, City Clerk; Arthur Smith, City Attorney; Donald F. Lloyd, Public Works Director; Joe Laird, City Engineer.

Noting an overflow crowd in the Council Chambers, the Mayor asked the Council their opinion on the advisability of conducting the hearing in the Council Chambers. It was moved by Councilman Erickson, seconded by Councilwomen Smith, that this meeting be recessed, to reconvene in the District Court Room in the Bonneville County Court House. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

Upon reconvening, the Mayor called the meeting to order and in addressing those present, explained that the City Council had passed a resolution of intent to create Local Improvement District #37 because of the requests of various property owners who had experienced flooding conditions due to improper and inadequate storm drainage. He said that an engineering study had been completed at a cost of approximately \$2,000.00 and that as a result, boundaries had been determined and all properties contributing to the problem would be subject to assessment. The Mayor said that, from his findings, he was of the opinion that most affected property owners wanted the district but objected to the cost. He assured those present that the City would do everything possible to keep costs to a minimum. The Mayor then introduced Public Works Director Lloyd and asked him to comment on the proposed district's background and the problems. Be slide, Lloyd pointed out all the low regions of the drainage area and explained the problems which have developed as a result of the overload sanitary sewer. Lloyd noted that, as long ago as August of 1964, an informal preliminary hearing was held, that about sixty were in attendance and, because of the protests at that time, the project was abandoned. The problem continued however, and in 1966 a petition favoring the project was circulated and submitted to the City early in 1967 and, as a result, the Council ordered a study to be made. Lloyd showed the boundaries of the proposed district and verified the fact that the area in question did not have an acceptable surface drainage system. He pointed out that the sewage treatment plant, because of storm water, cannot handle the load in times of storms and, therefore, all sewage then must be channeled directly to the river. It will only be a matter of time, said Lloyd, until the State will no longer permit this practice. Lloyd explained that, as the area was originally developed, and streets and catch basins were constructed, there was no great concern because all raw sewage went into the river anyway. Lloyd then introduced City Engineer Laird who presented the proposed solution. He said the study necessitated a topography study to determine the best drainage routes. He pointed out certain existing drainage tunnels, constructed by W.P.A. many years ago, which would be used to good advantage. Laird said surface cross drainage at intersections was considered and that, in some areas, these would be cheaper but, in others, it would require so much curb and gutter work that underground pipe would be just as economical. Laird then submitted a

very tentative cost estimate as follows: street drainage construction, \$93,000; tunnel renovation, \$11,200; contingencies, legal, advertising, etc., \$10,400; engineering, drafting, etc., \$10,400; total, JANUARY 18, 1968

\$125,000. To provide revenue the following estimates were given: City participation, \$22,700; School District #91, \$2,630; property assessment, \$99,670; total, \$125,000. Laird concluded by noting that within the proposed boundaries are 3,503,305 square feet which, divided into the proposed cost, would result in a square foot assessment of 2.92 cents.

At the request of the Mayor, the City Clerk presented and read aloud the initial petition, as follows:

PETITION FOR IMPROVEMENT

November 1, 1968

Honorable Mayor and City Council
City of Idaho Falls
Idaho Falls, Idaho

We the undersigned property owners petition the Mayor and City Council to create a Local Improvement District for the express purpose of providing adequate surface drainage to prevent property damage and health hazards in the area shown on the attached map, providing the cost of said improvements shall not exceed .02 ½ ¢ per square foot of property owned.

The Mayor then directed the City Clerk to present and read aloud all written protests to the creation of L.I.D. #37, as follows:

January 17, 1968

To the City Council & Mayor

I am writing in protest to the drainage project you are trying to put over —

In the first place, there aren't any of us on (Lot 4, Block 100, Riverside Addition) who need it. Only a few "6 or 7" people want it. "(Let them pay the cost of it)".

There are 73 widows in the fourth ward and all live on this side of G. Street to Elva. I am one who is disabled since July and cannot work by doctor's orders. My 16-year-old son works after school to try and keep us alive. Our income for the year of 1967 was a total of a little less than \$1,400.00 dollars, a little less than the Mayor's \$14,000.00 a year. I think it is a moral sin to try to make poor people dig up money (money they don't have) for a project they will not benefit from in any way.

Sincerely,
s/ Wilba Borrowman
530 Highland Drive

JANUARY 18, 1968

Sharp, Anderson & Bush
January 16, 1968

City of Idaho Falls
Idaho Falls, Idaho

ATTN: Mr. Roy Barnes, City Clerk

Dear Mr. Barnes:

Please be advised that Lulu Burggraf, the owner of Lot 1 and the easterly 47 feet of Lot 2 in Block 3 of the Railroad Addition hereby protest the inclusion of her property in the proposed Local Improvement District No. 37.

Mrs. Burggraf's protest is directed initially to the creation of the district and secondly, to the inclusion of her property within said district.

Mrs. Burggraf respectfully draws to the attention of the City of Idaho Falls the fact that there is presently a storm sewer servicing her property and that the problems which have apparently caused the enactment of the resolution of intention by the Council do not arise from the property south of "G" Street.

In the event the City does proceed with the proposed L.I.D. No. 37, we believe the property of Mrs. Burggraf should be excluded from the district.

Sincerely yours,
s/ Eugene Bush
Attorney

January 16, 1968

I hereby protest the sewer improvement for financial reasons.

s/ Joseph M. Card
195 Whittier

January 16, 1968

Honorable Mayor and City Council
Idaho Falls, Idaho

JANUARY 18, 1968

I wish to protest the Improvement District #37 on the grounds that somewhere someone has to think about public spending, with so many paid people trying to figure ways of spending the taxpayers' money.

I would have to protest this as a matter of principle.

Respectfully yours,
s/ Fontella Cook
280 H. Street

Idaho Falls, Idaho
January 16, 1968

City of Idaho Falls
Office of the City Clerk
P.O. Box 220
Idaho Falls, Idaho

RE: Proposed Local Improvement District No. 37 to the City of Idaho Falls

Gentlemen:

I own my home and lots at 925 Ada Avenue in Idaho Falls and according to the information mailed to me concerning the above proposed improvement district, this property will be assessed to help defray the costs if this plan is carried out.

I hereby notify you that I do protest against establishing said local improvement district referred to above, or the making of said improvement, or any part thereof.

By way of explaining why I protest, I might list the following information concerning myself:

1. I am a widow.
2. I am 81 years old.
3. My sole and only income is my social security check each month in the amount of \$64.50.
4. I find it increasingly difficult to live on this amount and it would be absolutely impossible for me to pay any part of an assessment such as is proposed.

5.

Thanking you kindly for your consideration of this protest, I am,

Yours truly,
s/ Lenora Dees
925 Ada Avenue

JANUARY 18, 1968

Sharp, Anderson & Bush
January 18, 1968

Honorable Mayor and City Council
City of Idaho Falls
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401

RE: Resolution of Intention L.I.D. No. 37

Dear Sirs:

Protest is hereby filed on behalf of Richard J. Flood and Geraldine Flood to the creation of proposed Local Improvement District No. 37 of the City of Idaho Falls. Mr. and Mrs. Flood own the following described property included within the lots and lands proposed to be assessed to cover the costs of the district and the improvements proposed to be made.

Lots 15 and 16 in Block 2 of Dwight's Addition to the City of Idaho Falls, Bonneville County, Idaho, according to the recorded plat thereof, less the following described tract, to-wit: Beginning at the northwest corner of Lot 16, and running thence east along the north property line of said Block 2, 50 feet to the east property line of Lot 15; thence south along the east line of Lot 15, 7.30 feet; thence south $88^{\circ}48'23''$ west 50.01 feet to the west line of Lot 16; thence north along the west line of Lot 16, 8.34 feet to the point of beginning.

Commencing at a point 270 feet east of the southwest corner of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of Section 18 in Township 2 north, Range 38, EBM; in Bonneville County, Idaho and running thence east 60 feet; thence north 16 Rods, thence west 60 feet; thence south 16 Rods to the place of beginning, EXCEPTING: Beginning at a point 270.0 feet east of the Center of Section 18, Township 2 north, Range 38; EBM; and running east along the east-west centerline of Section 18, 60.0 feet; thence north 10.0 feet; thence west 60.0 feet; thence south 10.0 feet to the point of beginning.

Protest is made as follows:

1. Protest is made against the proposed work.

2. That the lands above described are not abutting, adjoining or contiguous or adjacent to any of the proposed work or proposed improvements.
3. That no benefit would result to the above-described lands from the proposed work and the proposed improvement.
4. That the cost proposed to be assessed is out of proportion and excessive as to these lands.

JANUARY 18, 1968

5. That the lands described should not be included within the proposed local improvement district.

That upon this protest it is requested that the proposed Local Improvement District No. 37 not be formed but that if formed, the above-described lands be deleted therefrom.

Sincerely yours,
s/ W. J. Anderson
Attorney

Office of the City Clerk
City of Idaho Falls

In answer to the proposed Local Improvement District to be known as Local Improvement District No. 37, I am writing this letter in protest of the method in which the special assessments levied against the lots is proposed. I own Lot 5, on Block 94, in Riverside Addition, which is a corner lot on Sage and L. Street.

I happen to have no particular sewage problem only in the fact that I possibly contribute to some of my neighbors problems on the lower end of the block. We do not live in this house, but use it for rental property, which we depend upon for income.

My home is valued at about \$6,000. If I am assessed just under 3¢ per square foot, my assessment would probably be somewhere around \$280.00. In the same neighborhood, there are homes which have sewage problems, that are valued at \$18,000 or \$21,000 who have filed suit against the City, and would be evidently willing to pay whatever is necessary to correct this problem. It is possible this \$21,000 home is a rental and would probably be bringing in an income to the owner possibly 3 or 4 times as much as my property brings to me and may involve 3 or 4 families. Yet our assessment, under the present proposal would be the same.

Can you see any fairness in this assessment? It is not worth that much to me to have this project completed, as it is now proposed.

Would you please reconsider the method in which these homes will be assessed; then I may conform, but as of now, I protest the proposal.

s/ Jay Foster
427 E. 13th Street

Hatch Investment Co.
January 16, 1968

JANUARY 18, 1968

City of Idaho Falls
Idaho Falls, Idaho

RE: Proposed Local Improvement District No. 37

Gentlemen:

This letter is written in protest of the above proposed Local Improvement District for the purpose of constructing a sewer drainage system.

We have four pieces of property within this proposed district and would be assessed in the proximity of \$13,000.00 plus interest. We feel that sewage problems are caused by all users within the expanded area and not just the area where the back-up difficulties occur.

Three parcels of the property above mentioned are, as is much of the property in the area, not valued at a figure commensurate to this proposed improvement cost.

For these and other significant reasons we should like to register our vote against the proposed improvement district on each of the properties in our name.

Sincerely,
s/ Hatch Investment Co.
By: L. Deon Sanderson

January 17, 1968

Honorable Mayor:

In regards to Improvement District No. 37 I have lived here at 1396 Mound Avenue for 30 years and have never been flooded.

I will be laid off my job in May, so don't know how I can pay for this improvement. When the petitioners came around for signatures, I was not home. My wife may have signed but I didn't. Therefore I am not in favor of same.

s/ V. J. Holmes
1396 Mound

January 17, 1968

JANUARY 18, 1968

Dear Sirs:

In regard to your notice intending to improve the sewer system, I must protest because I believe the system we now have is quite adequate and also I cannot afford the additional cost.

Thank you,
s/ Mrs. Effie Jensen
160 Whittier Street

Idaho Falls, Idaho
January 15, 1968

Statement of Protest To: The Mayor and City Council of Idaho Falls, Idaho

As property owner of Lot 1, Block 96, Riverside Addition, I am making this written protest against the creation of the proposed local improvement district for my part of the City. I have never had any trouble with flood or sewage water concerning my property. There are only a few homes that have had trouble. Why should I be taxed for these few homes? Some have already solved this problem by installing individual safety valves. I am on retirement income and it is necessary to keep my taxes as small as possible. Therefore I am not in favor of the above mentioned improvement project and I would like my property to be excluded from it.

Sincerely yours,
s/ Raymond W. Miles
588 L. Street

Idaho Falls, Idaho
January 15, 1968

Roy C. Barnes, City Clerk
City of Idaho Falls

Dear Sirs:

I am writing in protest of the City of Idaho Falls intention of establishing a Local Improvement District No. 37 involving my property Lot 9, Block 96, Riverside Addition. I am a widow and know I will not be able to meet the obligation. As recently as Christmas morning I had a heart attack, was hospitalized and have been forced to give up my job due to this illness. I do not have any money coming in except what I was able to earn. The doctors insist I will not be able to work for six months and then just part time in a sedentary job. If I had any money for improvements I certainly would like to use it on my little home which has needed

JANUARY 18, 1968

painting for years and my front walk broken to pieces. Sorry to complain but I definitely protest, something that will just add more worry and strain to what I already have.

Respectfully submitted,
s/ Inez S. Molen
535 Highland Drive

Idaho Falls, Idaho
January 13, 1968

City of Idaho Falls

Dear Mr. Barnes:

We would like to protest against the levy for a storm sewer on the block from I to H along Sage Street. We do not need a storm sewer here as we have no problems. We cannot afford to pay and live as we are too old to get any benefits. We believe in moderation not taxation. Just omit the improvement on this block.

Sincerely,
s/ Mrs. Philip Oswald
595 I Street

s/ Mrs. Mabel Oswald Fife
1176 Sage

Dear Mayor and City Councilmembers:

Gentlemen:

Since receiving the certified letter I have talked to a number of my friends and neighbors, some of whom need the sewer improvement very much others like myself do not need it at all. Since some do need it, I hope something will be done to help, but why should just a few of us who do not need it be assessed to help pay for all of it. Why should the City not be assessed as in road repairing. There is a saying many hands make work light. In the same way many assessed dollars would make this burden light for all.

Sincerely yours,
s/ Myrtle Rogers

Roy C. Barnes, City Clerk

I protest the storm drain system that is proposed for District No. 37 of Idaho Falls.

JANUARY 18, 1968

Thank you,
s/ Margie Schluter
1401 Idaho Avenue

January 11, 1968

Dear Sir:

In regards to your Resolution No. 1, to be known as Local Improvement District No. 37 of the City of Idaho Falls, pertaining to Lot 9, Block 9, South Hillcrest Addition.

I am protesting against this Improvement, on this day January 11, 1968. How am I supposed to pay for these so called improvements? When buying the said property, I assumed the City of Idaho Falls had approved streets, sidewalks and sewers.

In the fall of 1967 I was informed that if I wanted a street to drive on and a sidewalk that I could walk on without falling in a hole, that there would have to be an L.I.D. made up for this district.

Now you inform me you're going to have another L.I.D. and there is to be a special assessment levied upon me. You put it in, you pay for it. I have other obligations to meet. These obligations are also a necessity. To live on my income I can only pay so much. One L.I.D. in the same district is enough for the time being.

s/ D. W. Scott
955 Westchester Ct.

Idaho Falls
945 Ada Avenue
January 16, 1968

City of Idaho Falls
Office of the City Clerk
P.O. Box 220
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Dear Sir:

I want to go on record as protesting against Local Improvement District #37. The reasons are: First, I'm a widow and I am not financially able to take on this added expense. Second, I am paying on one sewer improvement now. Another would be an impossibility as I'm on old age assistance.

JANUARY 18, 1968

s/ Carrie E. Southwick

Gil Telford, Realtor
Idaho Falls, Idaho
January 12, 1968

Honorable Mayor and City Council
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Dear Sirs:

I am in receipt of the brochure proposing Local Improvement District #37.

I wish to protest against this project on the grounds that it will be of no benefit whatever to 98% of the residents of the described area.

Also, that there are areas in Idaho Falls, Idaho, which do really need more sewer capacity. One such is the area south of 9th Street, and east of June Avenue. I happen to own a home in this area, and there is never a flash flood, that didn't flood the basement. Some of the home owners in this area have installed valves in the sewer line so when they are away from home for a trip, they would close it to avoid trouble. I have inquired of several home owners in the above proposed L.I.D. and have yet to find one that could see any need for this project.

Sincerely,
s/ Gil Telford

Idaho Falls, Idaho
January 16, 1968

Mr. Roy Barnes:
Dear Sir:

I am writing this letter in protest of the proposed construction of a drainage sewer. I am living on social security, and cannot pay anything more that I am already doing. I am paying now more than I can afford every month to the City.

Yours recpt.

s/ Mrs. Lillian Tobin
559 Highland Drive

January 17, 1968

JANUARY 18, 1968

I do not know how to tell you, only that I really Don't know of any way I would be able to pay my share of this project. All I have since my husband's death is my social security check and a part time job that buys my groceries and a few clothes I need. At my age I cannot get another job, they just won't hire only young people. I am sorry.

s/ Mrs. May Ruby Webb
167 Whittier Street

Dear Sir:

I sure don't want to pay any sewer taxes on my property at 470 Highland Drive. Have all the taxes I can pay out of my little income without any more, and can't even see where we need the sewer improvement. Thank you.

s/ Mrs. A. B. Whyte

**PROTESTS AGAINST ESTABLISHING OF PROPOSED LOCAL
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT #37 OF THE CITY OF IDAHO FALLS**

TO: THE HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO

The undersigned, individually and jointly, as property owners of real property which is included within the boundaries of the property subject to special assessment under the proposed Local Improvement District #37 of the City of Idaho Falls, submit the following objections to the establishment of said Local Improvement District, the designation of the property owned by said property owners being attached hereto as Exhibit "A", to-wit:

1. The drainage system now in existence serving the properties included within the proposed Local Improvement District is in good repair and condition and adequately serves the purpose for which it is constructed and there is no need for additional drainage sewer improvements to serve said properties.
2. The cost of the proposed assessment for the various lots described on Exhibit "A" would far exceed any direct or indirect benefit to the owners of said lots.

3. The benefits of the proposed district would not balance the undue economical hardship suffered by the owners of the lots described on Exhibit "A" in comparison to any public benefit or other benefit that might come from including the above described property in the proposed Special Improvement District #37.

JANUARY 18, 1968

4. The cost of said drainage sewer should be borne by all of the residents of Idaho Falls and not merely by the owners of the properties presently included in the proposed improvement district.
5. The construction of such drainage sewer would at best benefit only a very small number of the owners of property now included within the proposed improvement district and the persons who would not so benefit from such drainage sewer should not be compelled to pay the cost of same.
6. Other less expensive methods of alleviating any drainage problems are available which could be utilized in lieu of the construction of the proposed drainage sewer as contemplated under Local Improvement District #37.
7. The establishment of said district and the assessments resulting therefrom would be unlawful and contrary to the laws of the State of Idaho.

Violet K. Shaw
Daniel Winder
Paul Cobbley
Lee Miller
Wayne W. Richards
Aileen Wolverton
Doren Knudsen
Harley Kelsey
Mildred Adams
Gary Adams
George W. Thompson
Horace Fell
John Anderson
Von J. Hill
A. L. Wohlschlegel
Eunice V. Simpson
McClain Nelson
John Schwindiman
J.L. Aland
Edith M. Belnap
Leon B. Poorman
Verda Archibald
Arminta E. Cordingley
Orville Storer
Jason Ashworth

Mrs. Garland Demoir
Mrs. Joseph Card
Elick Warnock
May Ruby Webb
S. A. Wolverton
Mrs. Kenneth McClaskey
Mr. & Mrs. Wayne Pulsipher
Kenneth Young
Daniel Williams
Mrs. Elmer Anderson
Ila Thompson
Viola Fell
Mrs. Dale Bybee
J. Donald Bagley
H. Dorsal Haack
Roy Wood
Leona Naef Merrell
Elvin R. Connell
Martha Zitlaw
James Armstrong
LaVenia Van Orden
Eunice C. Smith
John I. Anderson
Alma Hearn
Shirley Ashworth

Kenneth Clabo
Richard Jones
Rhoda H. Hampton
Evelyn R. Rabou
Jean Richards
Mrs. Doren Knudsen
Zelda Gardner
Clarence Young
Ermer Burton
Elmer Anderson
Alvin Allgood
Bernetta Anderson
Wilba Borrowman
John V. Ellis
Joseph Horner
Katheryn Campbell
Arthur C. Berrett
Ralph Landon
George C. Stallings
Minnie Poorman
Lucille Leavitt
Doris Leavitt
Raymond W. Miles
Verlin Searle
Mary Parks

JANUARY 18, 1968

Fred Parks
Richard L. Campbell
Lavon Nichols
R.L. Rasmussen
Ethel Park
Charles Williams
David Smith
Lorraine Strom
Albert F. Hules
Richard L. Rydalch
Chick Bloxham
Dorothy McKelley
Denzle F. Clark
Leon M. Morgan
W. F. Burtenshaw
Kona Hammond
Bruce Burton
Kent Roberts
Ray Stephen Barton
R. S. Stocking
Helen Wilkins
Inez S. Molen
Odessa Haynes
Rex Price
Francis Bybee
Verlyn Croft
A. Fay Jordan
Elizabeth J. Fell
Sharon Barber
Leona Blackburn
Jack Hendricks
Lloyd F. Randall
Philip Oswald
Oliver Quinton
David Murdock
Reed Adams
E. O. Haskell
Herb Campbell
Glenn E. Clark
Verelan B. Jensen
J. Fred Parker

William D. Wood
John W. Outcelt
Mr. & Mrs. F.L. Pendleton
Ethel E. Rasmussen
Ad. Paxman
W. Glen Robinson
Geneva O. Widsteen
Allen B. Hanson
Marvin L. Anderson
Clarence Haws
Susanna Leavitt
K.W. McKelley
Alta Killian
Helen M. Carter
Anker J. Anderson
Arelie Markowski
Dean Bodily
Willis Welker
Edwin R. Bailey
Lola Smith
Edna Schneiter
James S. Browning
Kenneth G. Dale
Mrs. Rex Price
Don W. Scott
Joan M. Hart
K.L. McClaskey
Brent Barber
Gordon Steiner
J. Lloyd Munk
Annie H. Ricks
W.I. Johnston
Tom Irwin
Elvira Quinton
Ruby Aeschbacher
Fontella Simmions
Albert Miller
Harry L. Stavros
Ida B. Dixon
Duana L. Jensen
G. N. Omanson

Blanche D. Gaines
Al Brownell
Gertrude Lee
L. Clyde Park
Vonda Williams
Elsie M. Robinson
William Strom
Harriett M. Richards
Letha Packer
Ronald Harker
Reuel Nielson
Phyllis M. Clark
Harvey E. Killian
William C. Carter
Jay B. Hammond
Etta N. Bodily
Afton Weeks
Anita G. Barton
Mrs. Ross Bulkley
Ray Wilkins
Lillian Tobin
Ada Browning
VelJean Dale
Norman Godfrey
G.W. Buchanan
Ed Dingman
Viola Larsen
Harvey Schneiter
Norma Steiner
Albert Harding
Arlene A. Randall
Pearl Johnston
Sarah E. Browning
Anna M. Gould
Horace Hale
Annie K. Hillman
Clark E. Sinsel
Mrs. Naoma McEntire
Lulu H. Burggraf
Elaine Parker
Betty B. Omanson

JANUARY 18, 1968

Amos Lyon
Janet Whiting
Elna Staggie
Joan Hart
Shirley P. Brough
Merle Ross
Joseph L. Bell
Virginia J. Borg
Hazel Thomas
Emily Brown
Linda Kirkbride
Gloria Jean Willmore
Nellie Harris
G. W. Thompson
Kermit Hill
Olga Lawrence
Reed S. Starr
Clara Adolphson
Laverne Hatch
Marion L. Priest
Arlene B. Jenkins
Murland L. Green
Roger L. Hoyt
Bonnie L. Staples
Mrs. Ann Pendleton
John R. Hunt
Mrs. W. A. Olsen
Winona Telford
Roxie J. Lewis
John N. Hart
Elma G. Sievers
Ida M. Gordon
Ila Rutt
Morris Wright
Claude W. Newman
Herbert Curtis
Marian Stallings
A. W. Brunt
Rodney Butterworth

Lois Lyon
Glade Whiting
Eleanor Dingman
Marjorie Buchanan
Fred M. Stoll
Donetta Ross
LaRue Bell
Eliza S. Teeples
Florence Love
Anna Christofferson
Kenneth Kirkbride
Mrs. Eugene Willmore
Gerald W. Staker
Coral B. Hill
Peggy L. Taylor
Viola M. Belnap
C. F. David
Mr. and Mrs. H. D. Curran
Charles I. Hatch
Margie Schluter
Maxine Tapp
Elroy Rigby
Mrs. Roger L. Hoyt
Lorraine Ellis
Mr. F. L. Pendleton
Margaret E. Albertson
W. H. Dahlstrom
Evelyn Park
Freda K. Johnson
Ruth C. Hart
Helen Niederhauser
Alvin Allgood
Orvin Bates
Lyle A. Lewis
Jeanne Newman
Vern L. Brown
Mary Ellen Oler
E. H. Cowley

Fred Hanson
Hubert Staggie
Fern Scott
Pat Chapple
Bernice Stoll
Paul T. Schults
Cecil Lofthouse
Jonas Borg
Betsy Teeples
Clarín J. Woolstenhulme
Lou Jean Nielsen
J. Frank Harris
Ila B. Wadsworth
Lee E. Hill
Keith D. Taylor
Beverly B. Huffaker
N. D. Andersen
Mr. and Mrs. Carl M. Havens
Thomas L. Sutton
Nick Bateman
Robert L. Cleveland
Ruby Rigby
Don R. Staples
Elsworth Henrie
Mrs. Frances Bamer
William A. Olsen
Barbara Dahlstrom
David Park
Byron Telford
Sylvín L. VanOrden
Grace Ellen Burke
C. H. Rutt
Orville C. Flitton
Blanche Harris
Alice Curtis
Mr. and Mrs. Butterworth
Donald J. Oler
Rula W. Choules

The Mayor then invited protests and other discussion from the floor. Mr. Dennis Olsen, local attorney, appeared before the Council explaining that he was representing those who signed the large

JANUARY 18, 1968

petition presented this night. Olsen expressed appreciation for the work and study which the City had expended on this proposed project to date and also a constructive tour of the area with City Officials this day. He admitted and agreed that most of his clients recognized that a surface drainage problem does exist. He said it is unfortunate and should be taken into consideration the fact that most of the residents in the area are with limited or marginal income. Olsen asked how many homes in their area have actually experienced flood conditions. Laird said this could not be ascertained because all those affected probably did not report the trouble. Also, Laird said, this would vary from year to year. Olsen, referring to the sewage treatment plant, asked if there were any other storm drainage contributing areas and was answered in the affirmative. Olsen asked if any homes, other than in the low areas ever experienced flood conditions and was answered in the negative. Asked by Olsen if any consideration had been given to draining Hillcrest to the north, Laird explained that that area is higher than Hillcrest and also has the problem of small drainage pipes. Olsen, referring to previous comment by one of the engineers, noted that there was a time when the existing catch basins adequately handled the problem but that they are now inadequate due to development within this and adjacent areas. He said somewhere, sometime, there was a breaking point. He proposed, as a matter of economy, some thought to a system that would correct the problem only back to or slightly ahead of that breaking point. He also suggested the possibility that only the excess water, the portion causing the floods, be drained and the balance still be permitted to find its way into the sanitary system. Olsen felt that not enough study had been given to a natural surface gravity flow system. Olsen concluded his remarks by saying that the affected property owners received their notices only ten day ago and have not had an opportunity, yet, to adequately study the matter.

Mr. Reed Adams, 210 H. Street, referring to the serving of Hillcrest asked why the line should not run down Center Avenue. Laird explained that there is an existing line under that street that would have to be replaced, but that the idea might have merit.

Mr. Richard Jones, 198 E. Whittier, said he had only lived in the area about six months but that, in talking with his neighbors, had found no one with problems and that there was good natural drainage.

Mr. Steve Barton, 459 I. Street, as Chairman of the petition seekers, said, in talking with the people, he encountered little opposition to the project philosophy. He said however, he felt there were other, more economical means and methods. In view of the fact the area is blessed with natural gravity flow, he felt a surface cross drain system would suffice. He felt Hillcrest should be excluded, because the sink well would appear to be serving adequately. He proposed that Willow Creek should serve as a destination for all storm water west of Sage Avenue.

Barton concluded his remarks by noting that the problem exists because of adjacent development and proposed, therefore, that all be assessed who are presently using the sanitary sewer system.

Mr. Paul Brunt, 651 J. Street, said although he would agree that all avenues of savings should be investigated, he favored the district on the grounds that, unless there is correction, contamination

would continue to increase. He said he cannot consider basement renovation until there is correction. He said check valves are a temporary stop gap and are not a satisfactory, permanent solution.

Mr. C. H. Williams, 1365 Sage Avenue, appeared to say that, although he lived on high ground and had no problem, he favored the district in respect to his neighbors who have a problem.

JANUARY 18, 1968

He said he felt however, that 90% of the problem can be solved by natural flow. He said he favored the cross drain theory. Even though these would create dips in the street, he said this would result in slower traffic which would be advantageous.

Mr. Emmett Mitchell, 583 Highland Drive, protested the district on the grounds that he could not afford the added expense.

Mr. Norman Godfrey, 928 N. Blvd., noting earlier comment about the sewage treatment plant, its lack of capacity to handle sewage during storms and the fact that there were other contributing areas, said he felt this was a general City problem, rather than one where property owners within a given area should be assessed.

Mr. Harvey Killian, 240 Alpine Drive, appeared as spokesman for the Hillcrest residents. He protested the inclusion of his addition in the district on the grounds that, if the grate is kept clean, the sink well works satisfactorily and, also, the fact that residents of Hillcrest are facing a local improvement district for street reconstruction and the expense of both would be prohibitive.

Mr. Jack Hendricks, 445 I. Street, said he had lived in both the low and the high areas and he favored a gravity flow solution on the grounds of economy. He volunteered an opinion, however, that if the sanitary sewer is now so loaded that a storm creates overloading, the time will come, through housing development, when the sanitary sewer will give trouble in the low areas even if the storm water is segregated.

Mr. Sammy Reece, 624 I. Street, referring to previous comment pertaining to a lift station on Mound Avenue, suggested that a portion of the Mound Avenue line be lowered. Laird explained this by saying that the lift station was not for the purpose of providing continued flow on Mound but, rather, to bring sewage into the Mound line from the west.

Mr. Howard Price, 640 I. Street, appeared to say that, even though he was one of the initiators of this proposed district he had no idea it would involve so many people. He said he didn't agree that it was this major a problem, citing, for purposes of illustration, the tins that had been used in recent years, temporarily placed over catch basins and the fact that there had been no basement flooding since. He congratulated those present in the spirit of unity this night and he felt sure that said spirit would prevail in the ultimate solution to the problem. He cited, for example, one 15 inch sewer line that had been constructed at the property owners' expense and felt that, working with this same spirit of unity and in cooperation with the City, the present problem would be corrected with minimum expense to all.

Mr. Lorenzo Parker, 645 J. Street, noting a previous question had remained unanswered as to how many homes had actually been flooded, said he counted over 65 just in the area which he canvassed. He said he anticipated the problem getting worse and that, in his opinion, the cross drains would probably be no less expensive than going underground.

Mr. Steve Wilkinson, 690 I. Street, said the only way a project of this size can be successful was for all to work together, financially and otherwise. He said, on an individual basis, if it were figured

that way, the cost to some would be much greater than to others. For example, he said his home was close to an existing sewer but that he was willing to pay more to be part of an entire district for the benefit of and to subsidize those who were farther away from a sewer. He complimented those present on their interest and attitude and said he had complete confidence in the City Administration and the Engineering Department in their desire and ability to provide an acceptable solution.

JANUARY 18, 1968

Mr. Dale Schneider, 538 L. Street, said he felt time was of the essence in the formation of the district and that, in view of constantly higher prices being paid for steel and labor, any further delay would probably result in higher costs later on.

Mr. Webb Frandsen, 348 I. Street, said that, in his opinion, a larger assessment area should be included.

Mr. Harker, 200 Monterey, said he believed, on the basis of contamination, that every effort should be made to segregate the two types of sewage.

Mr. Roger Hoyt, 201 Monterey, noting there was no problem in Hillcrest asked why they were being included. Laird answered that their sewage is running into a sink well which is not in compliance with State regulations. Also, Laird continued, from experience it is known that it is only a matter of time until wells of this nature become non-usable, after which the State will permit no repair nor rehabilitation.

In the absence of further comment, Attorney Olsen reappeared to ask the Council's consideration of all ideas, comments, criticisms and proposal made this night and that another meeting be held where alternates might be aired. The Mayor assured those present that no hasty action would be taken and that all would be notified of another meeting after a further study is made on alternates and costs.

Mr. R. L. Rasmussen, 352 I. Street, asked what would be accomplished at another meeting. Councilman Nelson said the Council, too, are concerned about costs but, that any further study would take time. He asked that the administration be given that confidence that everything possible would be done to represent the best interest of all.

There being no further business, it was moved by Councilman Nelson, seconded by Wood, that this hearing be recessed to a date yet to be determined and that all be so notified at the proper time. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

ATTEST: s/ Roy C. Barnes
CITY CLERK

s/ S. Eddie Pedersen
MAYOR
