

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of the
City Council of the City of Cherry Hills Village, Colorado
Held on Tuesday, February 18, 2020 at 6:30 p.m.
At the Village Center

Mayor Russell Stewart called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Mayor Russell Stewart, Mayor Pro Tem Katy Brown, Councilors Randy Weil, Al Blum, Mike Gallagher, and Dan Sheldon were present on roll call. Also present were City Manager Jim Thorsen, Deputy City Manager and Public Works Director Jay Goldie, City Attorney Kathie Guckenberger, Police Chief Michelle Tovrea, Finance Director Jessica Sager, Community Development Director Chris Cramer and City Clerk Laura Gillespie.

Absent: Councilor Afshin Safavi

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Council conducted the pledge of allegiance.

PRESENTATIONS

Police Department Awards

Chief Tovrea presented awards to Officers Callahan, Nagy, Sack, Ward and Police Technician Klasens for their hard work and efforts for the Police Department's reaccreditation and updates to the policies and procedures manual. She explained the accreditation program was developed and maintained by the Colorado Association of Chiefs of Police, the County Sheriffs of Colorado and CIRSA and was a quality assurance process under which the services and operations of law enforcement agencies were evaluated and verified by an external body of tenured experts and assessors in the field. She indicated the Police Department was first accredited in 2008 and reaccredited in 2014 and 2019. She noted the assessors had commended the Department on the organization and condition of their files.

Chief Tovrea presented awards to Police Clerk McCarthy, Technician Klasens, Support Supervisor Reynolds, Officers Gillett, Ward, Callahan, Firko, Gunther and Sergeant Wood for their hard work on the Department's new records management system (RMS) process. She explained the new RMS improved coordination and increased efficiencies for municipalities throughout the County. She thanked Marsha Adams from Arapahoe County for being the City's project manager. She indicated her staff had manually entered 11,000 files, saving the City \$37,000.

Mayor Stewart expressed the entire City's sincere appreciation for the Police Department.

I-25 & Belleview Interchange Improvements Study Update

City Manager Thorsen indicated the consultant and representatives from Greenwood Village were present.

Scott Waterman, Wilson and Company, 1675 Broadway Suite 200, Denver 80202, indicated Wilson and Company was the consultant hired by Greenwood Village for this project. He stated the partners for the interchange study were Arapahoe County, Denver, Greenwood Village, Cherry Hills Village, CDOT, RTD, DRCOG, the Federal Highway Administration, and the Denver South Economic Development Partnership. He explained the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was made up of staff members and engineers, and the Executive Committee (EC) was made up of elected officials. The study was intended to address current and future congestion, safety, traffic operations,

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

and multi model choices. The groups went through a long and involved process to evaluate various alternatives, resulting in two possible solutions at I-25 and Union. The first was a Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) and the other was a Split Diamond. The groups believed either of these options would alleviate current and future traffic on Belleview. He explained their models showed a reduction or small increase in cut-through traffic with the two options.

Councilor Weil indicated they were concerned with cut-through traffic rather than City resident traffic.

Mr. Waterman noted in general cut-through traffic was reduced when service was improved on the main routes. He indicated the TAC had recommended the Split Diamond option and the Executive Committee was waiting for Cherry Hills Village and Denver concerns to be addressed. If the Executive Meeting concurred with the Split Diamond plan at their February 28th meeting, the next step would be to hold public meetings in April and initiate the NEPA process and preliminary design in May. The project was on CDOT's list to be considered for \$50 million in funding in 5-10 years.

Councilor Blum expressed concern that the cut-through analysis did not account for traffic from I-225.

Mr. Waterman replied they did not believe the new improvements would worsen the current cut-through traffic on Quincy from I-225. He explained the DRCOG demand model showed an extreme increase in traffic at the Belleview Interchange from 2020 to 2040. He indicated the original DRCOG data had not incorporated the development in the northwest corner of Belleview/I-25 and their traffic engineer had worked with DRCOG to include that buildout and demand. He explained a large amount of the traffic demand would be going to the new development.

Councilor Blum asked about wait times on Quebec and Syracuse with the Split Diamond.

Mr. Waterman explained the study planning focused on improving the predicted 2040 levels of service at all the intersections in the study area. He noted in general the levels of service were better with the Split Diamond versus the SPUI.

Councilor Blum indicated it would seem that the Union entrance for I-25 would encourage access via Quincy and Happy Canyon.

Mr. Waterman replied the analysis used the path of least resistance and shortest travel time to model the traffic.

Mayor Pro Tem Brown indicated the City's traffic study showed current cut-through traffic from Hampden through the City to get to Belleview. She questioned how this study could show zero cut-through.

Mr. Waterman replied this study used industry accepted techniques and models. He noted this model only addressed traffic directly related to I-25 on and off ramps. He added the on-ramp location did not change with the Split Diamond.

Mayor Pro Tem Brown clarified the Union entrance was an earlier point for drivers to join the I-25 access and she could not believe the number was zero.

Mr. Waterman indicated it was the industry standard.

Mayor Pro Tem Brown replied did not give her a lot of confidence in the model.

City Manager Thorsen clarified the zero was for traffic going northbound on I-25, and the model did show an increase for traffic going southbound on I-25.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Councilor Sheldon indicated this discussion was very germane to the City's Master Plan Update process. He agreed with Mayor Pro Tem Brown and Councilor Blum that while the model was industry standard many of the numbers did not make sense based on his everyday experience and were much too low. He asked where the data originated.

Mr. Waterman replied it was DRCOG's travel demand model data that they were required to use for this type of study.

Councilor Sheldon asked what would happen at the next Executive Board meeting if it was reported the Cherry Hills Village City Council was not supportive of this plan.

Mr. Waterman indicated they wanted concurrence from every agency.

Councilor Sheldon explained he believed Cherry Hills Village citizens would be concerned with the traffic numbers in the no-build model but would not believe the addition of a ramp at Union would not significantly increase cut-through traffic. He indicated it was a lot to consider and he would not be prepared to support or oppose the plan tonight. He asked if Council could get the full power point with the additional data showing today's traffic numbers.

Councilor Gallagher asked if the model contemplated the development in the northwest corner of Belleview and I-25.

Mr. Waterman explained the DRCOG data had not incorporated those developments but they had their traffic engineer work with DRCOG to integrate those numbers.

Councilor Gallagher indicated the community would not respond well to this plan. He stated having more access points closer to the Village was of great concern. He added he also had trouble with the numbers shown in the model.

Mayor Pro Tem Brown agreed. She explained the City's traffic study had been able to do license plate counts and there had been concern then about cut-through traffic getting to I-25. She recalled the study determined up to 65% of traffic on Quincy in the evening was cutting through to I-25, so there were issues as to how that data lined up with the Belleview Interchange model which caused concern and distrust about the accuracy of the model's predictions. She noted traffic on Belleview was also a concern for many residents and she didn't see how the model would decrease traffic going onto Belleview.

Councilor Sheldon noted if more traffic was directed to Union then more traffic would use Quincy to go west. He urged the consultants to research the history of the City's roundabout discussions to see how the residents react to traffic issues and the importance of Quincy to the City.

Mr. Waterman indicated much of the additional traffic in 2040 was going to the new development in the northwest corner of Belleview and I-25.

Mayor Pro Tem Brown noted sometimes Union was the only way for residents to get out the City because Hampden and Belleview were so backed up. She expressed concern that the proposed plan would take away that option for residents. She agreed with Councilor Sheldon's suggestion for the consultants to review the Council minutes from the roundabout discussions to get a sense of what the community's reaction will be.

Councilor Blum asked how the plan would impact northbound Quebec accessing I-25.

Mr. Waterman replied they could send that data to Council.

Mayor Pro Tem Brown added a ramp at Union would also create an addition short cut for I-225 to I-25 traffic.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Jon Chesser, Wilson and Company, noted City Manager Thorsen had been bringing these concerns to the TAC for a long time, and as a result they had tried to address some of these issues in the model. He explained the issues at the Belleview Interchange were different in 2040 than they were today. He indicated the northwest quadrant development would be so impactful in 2040 that it had broken the model, and the Split Diamond plan would give those drivers a different option other than Belleview to get to the northwest quadrant, which in turn improved service levels on Belleview.

Mayor Pro Tem Brown noted while the model showed the Split Diamond had the most positive impact on travel times, the other options had positive impacts as well. She stated residents of Cherry Hills Village were very unlikely to consider increased access and improved traffic flow as positive, and therefore would likely weight the priorities of the project differently than others in the groups. She noted Denver approved the new development and the majority of the burden should be on them.

Mr. Chesser replied the matrix comparing the various options was meant to be project-wide without weighing any particular partner's priorities above others. He noted City Manager Thorsen had brought up the same issues Council was discussing tonight. He indicated the consultants were committed to helping Council in conversations with their constituents to understand the purpose and scope of the project, the improvements, and addressing their concerns. He stated the goal of the project was to make an improvement not to the detriment of any one community. He indicated the consultants would help to answer any questions and provide any data to help with the process.

Councilor Gallagher asked about the support within the TAC for the Split Diamond vs the SPUI.

Mr. Chesser explained each criterion consisted of several factors and the importance of any factor varied by community. He indicated one of the biggest differences was the Split Diamond could be phased and therefore completed more quickly, while there was no phasing option for the SPUI. He added the ability to phase the Split Diamond also provided more options for funding. He noted the SPUI required replacement of the I-25 bridge over Belleview, which CDOT did not want to do. He added the model showed the Split Diamond would serve significantly more people than the SPUI. He acknowledged Mayor Pro Tem Brown's point that serving more people on side roads like Quincy was not desirable and so it was the group's job to design an improvement that would improve service on Belleview to the point that people would stay on Belleview and not use cut-through routes.

Mr. Waterman stated the cost for either option was estimated at \$100 million.

Councilor Weil noted there were three versions of the Split Diamond in the presentation.

Mr. Chesser replied the TAC's recommendation was for the Split Diamond with two alternatives, the median U-turn and the frontage road, to be further vetted through the preliminary design process.

Council Weil asked that the backup data be sent to Council. He noted he was supportive of improving service on the state highways but cautioned against unintended consequences of increased cut-through traffic.

City Manager Thorsen asked if the project received the \$50 million funding from CDOT if that would result in either the median U-turn or frontage road options being more viable.

Mr. Waterman replied no analysis had been done on how traffic would be affected by phased construction of either Split Diamond option. He noted the ramps on the west side of the interchange could be built in one phase, the relocation alternatives on Belleview could be built in a second phase, and then the east side ramp and frontage road could be built in a third phase.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Mayor Pro Tem Brown expressed concern with the ramp at Union and a ramp at Belleview but no way to get through the Quebec intersection causing a lot more people to take Union to Monaco. She added Belleview had more issues than just this intersection and fixing the intersection would not solve all the problems on Belleview.

Councilor Sheldon expressed concern the next Executive Meeting was in ten days and they hoped to get unanimous approval. He advised the consultants not to underestimate the resolve of Cherry Hills Village citizens. He indicated the consultants would need to be prepared to do a lot of public outreach if they hoped for support from City residents.

Zeke Lynch, Greenwood Village Transportation Project Manager, indicated the project was not driven by Greenwood Village. He stated they were not asking for a decision from Council at this time. He explained they would like to go forward with presenting one plan at a public input meeting for all stakeholders.

Councilor Sheldon suggested having a public input meeting that was focused on Cherry Hills Village in order to get accurate input and have a better chance of explaining the project in a way to get support.

Mayor Stewart asked the consultants to add what percentage of the increase in traffic was from the northwest development. He noted this issue had been discussed years ago when he was on Council. He added City residents needed to realize that development was coming and would severely impact traffic. He agreed with Councilor Sheldon that education was important because everyone's initial reaction to a ramp at Union would be negative, but it was important to explain that the improvement was necessary to improve Belleview to reduce cut-through traffic.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION PERIOD

None

REPORTS FROM CITY BOARDS, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

None

CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Pro Tem Brown moved, seconded by Councilor Weil to approve the following items on the Consent Agenda:

- a. Approval of Minutes – February 4, 2020
- b. Metro Denver Homeless Initiative Flex Fund Support

The motion passed unanimously.

ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA

None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Public Hearing – Council Bill 1, Series 2020; Repealing and Re-enacting Articles I through VIII of Chapter 18 of the Cherry Hills Village Municipal Code (Public Hearing, second and final reading)

Director Cramer presented Council Bill 1, Series 2020 on second and final reading. He noted there had been no changes since first reading and tonight was the public hearing.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Mayor Stewart opened the public hearing at 8:20 p.m. Hearing no comments the public hearing was closed at 8:21 p.m.

Councilor Sheldon moved, seconded by Councilor Blum to approve Council Bill 1, Series 2020 on second and final reading; repealing and re-enacting Articles I through XII of and adding a new Article XIII to Chapter 18 of the Cherry Hills Village Municipal Code, concerning Building Regulations; adopting by reference, with certain amendments, the 2018 International Building Code, the 2018 International Existing Building Code, the 2018 International Residential Code, the 2015 Green Building Standard, the 2018 International Mechanical Code, the 2018 International Plumbing Code, the 2018 International Fuel Gas Code, the 2018 International Energy Conservation Code, the 2017 National Electrical Code, and the 2018 International Fire Code; repealing all ordinances in conflict therewith; and providing penalties for violation thereof.

The following votes were recorded:

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Weil | yes |
| Brown | yes |
| Gallagher | yes |
| Sheldon | yes |
| Blum | yes |

Vote on the Council Bill 1-2020: 5 ayes. 0 nays. The motion carried.

Council Bill 2, Series 2020; Amending Sections 20-2-20 and 20-2-130 of the Municipal Code Concerning Wireless Telecommunication Facilities (first reading – tabled from February 4, 2020 meeting)

Director Cramer presented Council Bill 2, Series 2020 on first reading. He indicated during the Code Modernization process these regulations were removed from Chapter 16 into a new Chapter 20 and in the process the regulations were separated from the variance procedures in Chapter 16. He explained the proposed bill provided relief to the tower height limit for wireless communication facilities on public property. He noted this issue, the technology and the federal regulations were constantly evolving and Council might be considering further amendments to Chapter 20 in the near future. He added the proposed bill also included an amendment to Section 20-2-20 to add the word “demonstrate” where it had been inadvertently left out during the Code Modernization process.

Director Cramer explained during the deliberation of the proposed council bill at the February 4, 2020 meeting Council expressed concern that the proposed tower height amendment might unintentionally allow new towers to be built at an excessive height that could be detrimental to the character of the Village and language in the previously proposed amendment did not provide enough procedures to require the applicant demonstrate that the increased height was necessary. Additionally, Council received an email shortly before the February 4, 2020 meeting from a Verizon representative asking to extend the proposed change in tower height to towers on private property. He noted there were other sections of Chapter 20 that required applicants to demonstrate the needs for the new tower placement and height, specifically Section 20-2-20 and Section 20-2-30, and Section 20-2-120 stated co-location was preferred to the construction of new facilities. He noted the current Code prohibited all wireless telecommunication towers on residential properties that were .5 acres or less. City Council continued first reading of the council bill until further research could be provided, and so contact could be made with the Verizon representative.

Director Cramer indicated staff had contacted the Verizon representative and they had not realized this council bill had limited scope and increasing tower height on private property would be a complex issue requiring more public input. Staff agreed to include Verizon as a stakeholder for future revisions. As a result of the City Council discussion

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

the new proposed bill included additional criteria to be used by the decision-maker when considering an application for a tower with a proposed height in excess of 40 feet. The additional criteria included limiting increased tower height to state highway corridors and additional information the applicants would have to supply to the decision-maker. He added there had been no cap to a variance to the tower height in Chapter 16 and the proposed amendment to Chapter 20 capped the additional height at 70 feet.

Councilor Weil agreed the amendments balanced the concerns of co-location and height. He noted the term “decision-maker” used in Chapter 20 was vaguer than the terms “City” and “applicant” used elsewhere in the Code.

Director Cramer agreed and indicated the term “designated decision-maker” was used elsewhere in Chapter 20 and recommended the word “designated” be added in Section 20-2-130 to clarify and make the section consistent.

Mayor Pro Tem Brown stated limiting the option for an increase in tower height to public lots adjoining a state highway or public right-of-way within 100 feet of a state highway addressed a lot of her previous concern.

Councilor Gallagher asked how Council would make a decision about a potentially controversial application.

Director Cramer replied the applicant would provide additional material with their application when requesting an increase in tower height, and Council would have the discretion to approve the application for the tower without approving the increase in tower height, or Council could decide to approve an additional tower height of only 15 feet instead of the requested additional 30 feet for example.

Councilor Sheldon indicated he still had concern for the residents adjacent to state highways, but supported the bill if Council retained absolute discretion to deny any requested height increase. He noted he appreciated the additional criteria in the new version of the bill.

Councilor Blum agreed with Councilor Weil the word “designated” should be added to “decision-maker”. He asked about the City’s recourse if a 70-foot tower was approved and then later determined to interfere with a resident’s solar access.

Director Cramer replied it would be difficult but not impossible to move an existing tower, for example the tower at the old fire station was being moved for the John Meade Park redevelopment. He added it was always optimal to determine the appropriate height and location during the application process rather than try to correct either of those after a tower was installed.

Mayor Stewart asked about the typical term for tower licenses.

Director Cramer replied the terms were usually negotiated to coordinate with existing leases with specific carriers.

City Manager Thorsen added lease terms were usually only used for towers on City property but not in City right-of-way.

Deputy City Manager/Director Goldie indicated if a tower was placed adjacent to a state highway it would be in CDOT right-of-way and the tower owner would negotiate the lease with CDOT. He noted the leases were typically for as long as possible so the tower owners could protect their investment in the equipment. He added towers in rights-of-way were more difficult to move than small cells in City right-of-way or towers in City owned property.

Councilor Sheldon indicated a 70-foot tower would impact adjacent residents and questioned if he would ever support a 70-foot tower. He stated there were no 70-foot tall

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

trees in the City so there was no location in the City where for a 70-foot tower would blend in. He indicated his approval to allow flexibility through this council bill as long as Council would not ever be required to approve a 70-foot tower.

Mayor Stewart noted there was a lot of discontent among residents with poor cell coverage that might make residents more amenable to 70-foot towers.

Councilor Weil indicated every installation was unique and the decision-making process allowed staff and Council to evaluate each case on its merits. He agreed he frequently heard from residents about poor cell coverage.

Mayor Pro Tem Brown moved, seconded by Councilor Weil to approve Council Bill 2, Series 2020; amending Sections 20-2-20 and 20-2-130 of the Municipal Code concerning Wireless Telecommunications Facilities, with the amendment of adding the word "designated" before "decision-maker" in the introductory paragraph of Section 20-2-130, on first reading.

The following votes were recorded:

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Brown | yes |
| Gallagher | yes |
| Sheldon | yes |
| Blum | yes |
| Weil | yes |

Vote on the Council Bill 2-2020: 5 ayes. 0 nays. The motion carried.

Mayor Stewart moved Item 10a.

Master Plan Kick-off Discussion

Director Cramer introduced Britt Palmberg of RICK Engineering, and Elliot Sulsky of Felsburg, Holt & Ullevig, the City's Master Plan consultants.

Mr. Sulsky noted FHU had conducted the City's 2017 Traffic Study.

Mr. Palmberg reviewed the Master Plan process, beginning with community assessment, then exploring alternatives, and ending with confirming the direction. He explained the process would take about 15 months after the Citizen's Advisory Taskforce (CAT) was formed. He noted the Master Plan would focus on issues like traffic and the character of the Village. He indicated he would return with a more detailed plan after the CAT was formed.

Director Cramer stated outreach would include the CAT, a dedicated website, a mapping input tool, open houses and surveys. He explained the Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z) had discussed the CAT and decided it would serve as a focus group and sounding board but not make any formal recommendations. They believed an informal group would be more thorough and would communicate a wider range of perspectives. They determined the roster should include six members directly appointed by City Council from each District; six of the seven P&Z members; and five seats to be filled by P&Z through an interview process. P&Z inadvertently did not include the PTRC seat in their motion but staff later discussed the issue with P&Z Chair and Vice Chair who agreed it should be included. Staff would bring a motion for Council's consideration at the March 3, 2020 meeting.

Mr. Palmberg indicated the next steps would be data gathering, inventory and setting up the website.

Councilor Gallagher asked how the existing Master Plan would interact with the update.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Palmberg replied the current Master Plan would be very informative to this update process and much of it might carry over or be only slightly changed. He noted this was a community process to create a plan for the next 20 years.

Director Cramer added the updated Master Plan would be the official Master Plan once it was completed.

Mr. Palmberg noted the process and standards for comprehensive plans had evolved since the City's 2008 version was completed and the typical presentation was now shorter with more graphics so as to be more user friendly.

Mayor Pro Tem Brown indicated the existing Master Plan was a good document and, in her opinion, still relevant and she believed most of it would still resonate with the community. She noted the City had new residents and so ideas might have changed over time due to that turnover, but the City needed the community to affirm the current Master Plan or determine what was no longer relevant. She stated her hope that this process would evaluate the zoning standards established through the Residential Development Standards Committee and if they needed to be more or less restrictive.

Councilor Weil agreed and noted although the community had been stable for a long time some aspects such as traffic did change and needed to be addressed. He noted the Master Plan informed Council's decisions. He asked about a timeline for the Council appointments to the CAT.

Mayor Pro Tem Brown suggested Council's deadline be ahead of the application deadline so that P&Z could have an idea of the representation missing on the CAT.

Director Cramer replied February 28th would be a week before the application deadline.

Mayor Stewart agreed the current Master Plan was a good document and would probably still be supported by the community. He agreed this was a valuable opportunity for the community to evaluate the recommendations and Code changes that resulted from the 2008 Master Plan. He indicated a more user friendly document would be helpful to provide to new residents.

P&Z Commissioner Earl Hoellen agreed the current Master Plan was a good starting place even if most of it did not change, and agreed there should be broad representation on the CAT and therefore it would be helpful to get Council's appointments before the other positions were interviewed.

Council Bill 3, Series 2020; Replacing References to Specific Dollar Amounts for Fees, Costs, Deposits, and Other Charges in the Municipal Code with References to a Fee Schedule Resolution to be Adopted by City Council (second and final reading)

City Clerk Gillespie presented Council Bill 3, Series 2020 on second and final reading. She noted no changes had been made since first reading.

Councilor Weil noted the council bill left language in the Code about security alarm non-responses that was repeated in the fee resolution and suggested the language only be kept in one place to avoid confusion.

Mayor Pro Tem Brown moved, seconded by Councilor Weil to approve Council Bill 3, Series 2020, replacing references to specific dollar amounts for fees, costs, deposits, and other charges in the Municipal Code with references to a fee schedule resolution to be adopted by City Council, with the amendment that Section 6-4-100 be revised to read "Charges for responses to false alarms shall be set by resolution of the City Council. Charges, if applicable, shall be paid to the City by the permittee of a security alarm system upon each successive response made by the Police Department to the location of a false alarm during the same calendar year." on second and final reading.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

The following votes were recorded:

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Gallagher | yes |
| Sheldon | yes |
| Blum | yes |
| Weil | yes |
| Brown | yes |

Vote on the Council Bill 3-2020: 5 ayes. 0 nays. The motion carried.

Resolution 6, Series 2020; Adopting a Fee Schedule

City Clerk Gillespie presented Resolution 6, Series 2020 for Council's consideration. She explained this resolution included the fees removed from the Code by Council Bill 3, Series 2020 as well as incorporating fees from previous resolutions to have them all in one place. She noted the only fees staff decided to keep separate were the Construction and Excavation Standards fees in order to keep the fees with the other standards for right-of-way permits.

Councilor Blum asked how fair market value was determined for Section 17-3-30.

City Attorney Guckenberger replied she believed the City Manager had the ability to require an appraisal.

Councilor Sheldon noted an appraisal would be the only way to determine a cash in lieu payment. He asked for confirmation the City had the ability to add to deposit accounts if the funds were used up, and any remaining funds were returned to the applicant.

City Clerk Gillespie confirmed both statements were correct.

Councilor Sheldon noted the \$2,000 initial deposit for floodplain variance applications would likely get used up very quickly.

Mayor Pro Tem Brown moved, seconded by Councilor Weil to approve Resolution 6, Series 2020, adopting a fee schedule.

The motion passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Cherry Hills Village Art Commission Vacancy

City Clerk Gillespie explained due to a resignation there was a vacancy on the Art Commission (CHVAC) and staff was asking for two Councilors to review applications, conduct interviews, and make a recommendation for appointment. She noted two other members had indicated they did not want to be reappointed at the end of their terms this year and staff was hoping replacements could be found from this round of applications.

Mayor Pro Tem Brown and Councilor Gallagher volunteered.

Councilor Sheldon asked why so many Commissioners were resigning.

City Clerk Gillespie replied the two members who did not wish to be reappointed were finishing their third terms and had been on the CHVAC since it began. She added the members had indicated to staff they were ready to allow new members to take their seats.

REPORTS

Mayor's Report

Mayor Stewart reported he had attended the Metro Mayor's Caucus, the CML Policy Committee meeting, the CML Legislative Workshop, the Arapahoe County Commissioners, Mayors and Managers Breakfast, the Arapahoe County Open Space and Trail Advisory Board, and had judged a high school mock trial competition. He explained several pieces of legislation were being considered by the State Legislature that might affect the City, including arbitration for condos; exempting Council email communications from Council from the Open Meetings Law; extending the time municipalities had to reply to records requests for commercial purposes to 21 days; creating a DRCOG taxing entity; and encryption policies.

Mayor Stewart noted the March 17, 2020 agenda was light and at least two Councilors would be absent so that meeting would be cancelled unless there were any objections.

Members of City Council

Councilor Sheldon reported the High Line Canal Working Group would meet March 4th. He asked staff about the e-citation software for the Police Department.

Chief Tovrea replied the e-citation software was budgeted for and paid in 2019, but because of a delay with the software was being implemented in 2020.

Councilor Sheldon thanked Deputy City Manager/Director Goldie and the Public Works crews for their attention to the ice buildup in the City.

Councilor Gallagher thanked Coordinator Black for her work coordinating the food drive and noted it had been successful. He reported his appointment to the CAT would be Scott Roswell.

Mayor Pro Tem Brown also thanked Deputy City Manager/Director Goldie and the Public Works crews for their attention to the ice buildup in the City. She reported on a news story about people hacking Ring cameras, both exterior and interior, and encouraged neighbors to be thoughtful about the negative ways in which security cameras could be used such as blackmail and stalking.

Councilor Weil reported the Board of Adjustment and Appeals had approved an application. He noted House Bill 1151 creating a Regional Transportation Authority had been discussed at the recent DRCOG work session. He indicated he believed the City should support the bill. He noted the Centennial Airport Community Noise Roundtable was working on a new website to provide updated information to the public. He added his thanks for Public Work's service on the streets.

City Manager & Staff

Chief Tovrea thanked Council for their support of the Police awards. She reported the Police Department would be conducting interviews for their open position later that week.

Director Sager reported the City's audit would begin next week.

City Attorney

City Attorney Guckenberger had no report.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Pro Tem Brown moved, seconded by Councilor Blum to adjourn the meeting.

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 9:48 p.m.



Russell O. Stewart, Mayor



Laura Gillespie, City Clerk