

**Woodland Park Downtown Development Authority Board of Directors  
Regular Meeting  
Tuesday, February 11, 2020 – 7:30 AM**

**City Hall – Council Chambers  
220 W. South Avenue, Woodland Park CO**

**MINUTES**

- 1. Call to Order and Roll Call** – Merry Jo Larsen, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:35am

*In Attendance:* Board of Directors -- Merry Jo Larsen (Chair), Elijah Murphy (Vice Chair), Al Born (Secretary), Tanner Coy (Treasurer), Ellen Carrick, Jerry Good, Nick Pinell, Noel Sawyer, Jan Wilson (via phone), Kory T. Katsimpalis (Assistant to the Board)

*Others Present:* Darrin Tangeman, Suzanne Leclercq, Sally Riley, Bob Volpe, Arden Weatherford

- 2. Pledge of Allegiance** – Elijah Murphy, Vice Chair, led the Pledge of Allegiance.

- 3. Additions, Deletions or Corrections to Agenda**

**MOTION:** To combine item 5.d “sales tax” with item 5.a “vendor fee” for discussion. Sawyer/Coy. Passed 9-0

- 4. Development Proposals for Woodland Station**

- a. Update from Negotiating Committee: N.E.S. Inc. updates

-Elijah Murphy, indicates that he and Tanner Coy met last Thursday (2/6/2020) with Mike Williams and George Christian to continue discussions regarding proposed development of Woodland Station. Topics discussed included placement and organization of buildings, as well as regulations. Murphy indicates that the meeting went well. The Williams/Christian group has indicated that their one “must have” is that the proposed jerky story be as close to the street/corner as possible, and be housed in a 35’ structure that would be built at the site.

-During the meeting, the Negotiating Committee and the Williams/Christian group also discussed possible ramifications for Saddle Club Drive, and whether it would need to be pushed through or not, and what effect that may have. Those determinations can be made once final plans/drawings are produced by N.E.S.

-Tanner Coy reports that N.E.S. has produced two preliminary concept plans, and those plans have been shared with the developers and have been reviewed, and changes have been discussed between the developers, N.E.S. and the Negotiating Committee. N.E.S. is working on updating the drawings based on feedback, and Williams/Christian continue to work on details such as architectural style, final building locations, etc. Coy indicates that progress continues, though slowly. At this point, there is no definitive date by which we should expect concept drawings from N.E.S that are ready to present and accurately reflect the developers’ final plans. Developers seem to be a bit uncertain of their final plans; they have asked the DDA a number of times for input and direction. Any direction from the Board is helpful. For instance, how much square footage is available vs. how much does the DDA wish to retain for open/public space (including green space, space around cog railway car, public right-of-way)? The Negotiating

Committee has indicated, based on the Board's previous direction, that they would like to maintain an approximate 60' north-south area spanning from the east boundary to the west boundary of "Lot 2", to provide open public space around the Cog car. Coy reiterates Murphy's comments that the developers have expressed a desire to utilize the North-East corner for retail that will maximize visibility and attraction. The developers are proposing to build a 35'-tall structure that would resemble a historic "frame head" mining structure at that corner.

-Jerry Good asks how close the proposal is to moving beyond the conceptual stage. Is it possible for the developers to submit some sort of plan that would allow the Board to review it and then begin moving forward? It seems that this current proposal has drug on. Can the Negotiating Committee relay to the developers that there is a growing sense of urgency amongst some members of the Board? Good also voices some hesitancy regarding the prospect of having a tall structure placed close to the highway on the corner of the lot, as proposed.

-Merry Jo Larsen requests that the Negotiating Committee request a date in March that the developers can come and present face-to-face to the DDA Board. Larsen states that the development team may not understand the site as well as they need to in order to develop a good plan.

-Noel Sawyer states that he has a feeling of "déjà vu" regarding the current proposal, and feels as if the DDA is in a position where we are developing their site, and they are not coming to us with proposals. The DDA Board are not developers; the developers need to be presenting us with their plans, and then we ought to enter into a contract and start determining dates, goals, etc. The plans we've seen so far don't amount to much more than "napkin drawings". In order to move forward, we need professional drawings.

-Elijah Murphy states that N.E.S. has produced the first round of drawings, which have been reviewed by the Negotiating Committee and developers. The Negotiating Committee has attempted to help the developers better-understand why perhaps a 35' structure may not be desirable. The developers ultimately are concerned with their Return on Investment, and must weigh their investment in this project in relation to their other current projects.

-Al Born conveys two thoughts: first, the proposed elevation of 35' for the jerky structure is allowable within current code. Whether it blocks a view or not is something that can be included in discussion/negotiation. Second, having said that, Born states that he, too, feels that we have been down this road before. If the developers truly want to do something, they can buy the land and start moving forward with developments.

-Merry Jo Larsen relates that yes, the Board is collectively feeling anxious about the current proposal. Must also give the benefit of doubt to the developers regarding the decision of Tava House to pull out, as this resulted in an additional lot suddenly being available.

-Born states that the purpose of himself and Ellen Carrick creating the development application was precisely to cut down on this type of conceptual, non-specific

negotiating. As of yet, the Williams/Christian group has not submitted a completed application.

-Tanner Coy indicates that the Negotiating Committee has expressed to the developers that the DDA is not in a particular rush, and are not attempting to accelerate the pace of development nor dictate what the final development ought to look like. The goal of the DDA has been to stay out of the planning, and rather provide some guidelines and allow the development to exercise their creativity and expertise. Today's comments, however, seem to indicate that there may indeed be a sense of impatience among the Board. Thus, as a member of the Negotiating Committee, Coy feels the need to ask, do we have a deadline? So far, we are not under contract, have given up no rights to the property, and are free to entertain any other proposals that might be submitted. The DDA is still in a strong position. Is there a source of outside pressure to move forward at a certain pace?

-Jerry Good states that we may all be a little gun-shy, and while we perhaps shouldn't be in a total rush, we could be moving a bit faster than we are currently. Good agrees we should not pressure the group, but would like to prod for a bit more information/detail than we have now.

-Ellen Carrick posits that perhaps the Negotiating Committee has seen more at this point than the DDA Board as a whole. Thus, it might not feel as professional as we'd like to see at this point. Are the developers worried about infrastructure costs? Has that been brought up during negotiations?

-Coy responds that yes, infrastructure and associated involvement with CDOT has been discussed. Those types of elements are currently being investigated with the hopes of developing a more-detailed plan that could be submitted to the City, CDOT, and whichever other authorities need to perform reviews. Once that stage has been entered into, the developers will be able to put together cost estimates with the help of engineers.

-Al Born expresses a return to his earlier position and comments that he believes the DDA ought to hire a professional planner to develop the site into a marketable product, and then hire a professional marketer to actively advertise and market the site for development. This may also bring in some development competition for Woodland Station. Regarding the "pressure" to move forward, it seems to have been present for the past 15 years.

-Merry Jo Larsen reiterates that we need to provide the opportunity for the current developers to see their project through. Additionally, the Board ought to see a bit more of the drawings/plans that have been developed by N.E.S.

-Born responds that while N.E.S. has produced a limited amount of plans/drawings, having the help of a professional planner and marketer could substantially increase the development potential for the site.

-Tanner Coy responds that a site drawing could have been produced for public dissemination already. However, because elements are still being moved around and

defined, it makes little sense to develop drawings for the public that do not accurately reflect the final state of the proposed development.

-Ellen Carrick states that it would be really nice to see George Christian in attendance at our monthly meetings, when we are all present.

-Noel Sawyer asks what one "hurdle" might exist in the process that could be preventing the developers from finalizing/formalizing their plans that the Negotiating Committee could address. We've been engaged with this group for almost a year, and are still in a position where we are waiting on concrete information. What can we do to move the needle forward?

-Elijah Murphy responds that Tava House pulling out in December of 2019 resulted in major changes to the concept, as Lot 2 subsequently became available again. This then resulted in substantial changes to the overall layout of the current proposal. Is the DDA willing to dump money into this process for the purpose of making it faster? If not, we are tied to the development speed of the developers.

-Tanner Coy responds that one stumbling block is to identify definitively how much land is available? How much does the DDA want to retain? The Negotiating Committee has indicated that 60' from the northern boundary of Lot 2 toward the South, and all the way from the eastern to the western boundaries. Developers are free to propose a use for that space. The DDA's goal with those buffer zones is to accommodate southern expansion of Bergstrom Park; provide room for circulation around the cog car, and to retain a small area for events. Otherwise, the balance of the land is all available and the DDA is ready for proposals.

-Noel Sawyer asks how often the Negotiating Committee meets with the developers, and whether or not a timeline has been discussed.

-Coy responds that a timeline was loosely discussed some time ago; discussions with the developers occur via phone roughly once a week with emails in between. The only formal meeting, with N.E.S., George Christian, Mike Williams, Elijah Murphy and Coy all participating, occurred last week. That said, Coy performed a preliminary review of the concept drawings from N.E.S. with George and Mike two weeks ago. After that meeting, Coy spoke with Jon at N.E.S. and conveyed their discussion and changes that were requested.

-Merry Jo Larsen asks if it would be beneficial for the Board to have a bit more communication, through Kory, between the Negotiating Committee and the Board as a whole? Additionally, would like to have a meeting sometime in mid-March between Williams/Christian and the Board to discuss current drawings and progress.

-Jan Wilson poses two questions: first, have we provided them with a price per square-foot, and second, why have they not completed and submitted an application?

-Tanner Coy responds that yes, a price per square foot has been provided to the developers. That price was based on previous research provided by Al Born. Two prices have been given – one for Lot 2 and an alternate price for the southern portion of the

property. As for why an application has not been completed and submitted, Coy cannot speak on behalf of the developers; they have not been actively pressed for that material. Coy re-states his understanding of the Board's growing sentiment that drawings need to be finalized and presented soon. The Board desires a meeting with the development team, and that the developers need to get started on their application.

-Al Born reiterates his belief that in order for the developers to actually design where buildings will be placed, they must know where the boundaries of the site actually are. If we had a planner engaged, that person could define what that ground is by means of survey, topographical mapping, setbacks, utilities placement, etc. This knowledge allows a developer to begin fixing their costs. We need to develop a product that is marketable.

-Merry Jo Larsen indicates that site work has already been performed, and that the City may be able to assist with some of the elements Born mentioned. Larsen asks Sally Riley, Planning Director, for comment and/or input.

-Sally Riley indicates that we do have a preliminary plat that shows the boundaries of the property to scale. The preliminary plat is not currently valid, but there has been a survey performed.

-Noel Sawyer makes a strong recommendation that the Negotiating Committee involve Sally Riley in subsequent calls/discussions in order to provide insight and expertise regarding steps they will need to take during development and planning. Mrs. Riley indicates her willingness to participate in that regard.

-Jerry Good acknowledges the validity of Elijah Murphy's statement that Lot 2 only became available again in December after Tava House pulled out, and that perhaps the Williams/Christian group is not acting as slowly as Good previously believed.

-Merry Jo Larsen reiterates request for a mid-March meeting, to include some substantive drawings, plans.

-Tanner Coy will express the Board's desire to meet, and extend an invitation for a face-to-face meeting. The Board provides a consensus to move forward with the invitation. Coy indicates that in the meantime, the Negotiating Committee will work with Sally Riley to get her up to speed and prepped for future conversations.

-Sally Riley provides clarification that her role is that of the City Planning Director, not a consultant for the developer or DDA. Ultimately, Mrs. Riley's position is one of protecting the City's interests and adhering to the rules and regulations that are obligated to be enforced.

-Darrin Tangeman, City Administrator, states that ideally a City development team would include Director of Planning, Public Works Director, and Utilities Director. These staff would be available to answer questions and navigate process and assist with negotiations.

-Jerry Good asks if developers need to be concerned with confidentiality if plans are shared with Planning Dept, etc.?

-Sally Riley responds that she works regularly with clients whose plans are confidential, and that she and her staff are well-versed on the need for confidentiality.

-Noel Sawyer suggests that the DDA must also put ourselves in the developers' shoes, and acknowledge that they certainly have some "gray area" questions. Perhaps when they have the "big picture" answers they need, it will become easier to move forward or not. Let's give them all the information we can up front to assist their decision-making, rather than inching forward. Then we can all feel comfortable moving forward.

-Al Born again reiterates his position that the DDA ought to hire a planner to define the site as a marketable product.

-Elijah Murphy responds that the DDA should not be in a position to be defining projects and developments for developers, but need to be vetting their projects.

## **5. Discussion regarding Taxes/Fees**

### **a. Sales Tax Vendor Fee**

-Merry Jo Larsen begins the discussion by offering background information, stating that this agenda item had been generated based on the recent property tax assessment estimates, which show an increase in anticipated taxes. Larsen states that the DDA was a bit late in addressing the issue in October, when the item was tabled. The DDA Board will now work to develop a recommendation for City Council regarding sales tax vendor fees. Larsen provides clarification on what the "vendor fee" is, stating that it was a fee that businesses were given previously by the City as a way of offsetting the costs incurred by local businesses related to collecting and submitting sales tax. At some point in the past, this fee was removed in order for the City to finance a past expense, which has now been paid. Therefore, the DDA would like to recommend that the vendor fee be reinstated, and that those monies again be returned to those vendors and businesses that collect and submit sales tax.

-Noel Sawyer states that he is unclear why the DDA is discussing this item.

-Larsen responds that the purpose of discussing this item is to make a recommendation representing the businesses of Woodland Park.

-Al Born states that this is a good forum to start the discussion and see where it goes. Born also relates that Woodland Park can be an expensive place for small businesses to succeed. In light of the increase in property tax assessments that businesses will have to pay, returning vendor fees may help to ease the burden a little bit.

-Sawyer offers that the City can control two items: vendor fees as discussed, and the City Sales tax, which has not been raised by the City. Sawyer acknowledges that citizens have themselves voted on sales tax increases, including a 1.09% increase to support the School District and a 0.5% increase to support the ambulance district. Additionally, mill levies have decreased by 10.5 points over the last six years.

-Darrin Tangeman adds that while the City budget has been set for this year (2020), this is a good discussion and these items could certainly be brought up to City Council for

consideration within the 2021 budget. Tangeman offers that the City is currently examining its credit card vendor processing fees expense as a potential area of savings.

-Tanner Coy asks for clarification on what specific credit card processing fees are being referred to.

-Tangeman clarifies that each different type of collection that the City performs has processing fees associated with it throughout the various City operations. Council is also examining other aspects of the City's fee structure that may be able to provide benefit to local businesses.

-Merry Jo Larsen asks that Tangeman bring any current information/findings regarding vendor fee and credit card processing fee expenses to the next DDA regular meeting for continued discussion.

-Tanner Coy states that it is clearly the charge of the DDA to promote the health, safety, welfare, and prosperity of the District. As Al Born has mentioned, this item has to do with the cost of operating; these items being discussed (sales tax and vendor fees) definitely affect the welfare and prosperity of the District. That being said, the DDA has zero authority over the items, so any position we may take is nothing more than a collective opinion and corresponding recommendations, suggestions, or requests that might move on to Council, where the authority is held over these items.

-Coy offers some information regarding the vendor fee specifically. Stating, "the sales tax vendors fee is a portion of sales tax collections, allowed to be retained by businesses that collect, report, and remit sales taxes on time. This fee is in recognition of the actual costs, both administrative, and those assessed by credit card processors, that retailers incur, while carrying out the sales tax processes imposed by State and local governments". Coy also offers a quote from the Colorado Chamber of Commerce website, which opposed a bill intended to limit the vendor fee owed to large retailers. "As most business leaders know well, Colorado has the dubious distinction among the fifty states of possessing one of the most complicated State and local government sales and use tax systems. The administrative burden of businesses to comply with the administrative headaches is real and onerous. It provides an incentive to retailers to promptly remit sales taxes to the State. Past legislators and Governors recognized this fact. The vendor fee was adopted in 1935, and for 30 years it remained at 5.5%. It has varied from 3.33% in 1965, or lower, to 3.33% today. It even dropped to 0% for two years, from 2009 to 2011, during the Great Recession, when the legislature was starved for tax revenue".

-Coy adds that the City of Woodland Park reduced its vendor fee from 3.33% in 1994, to 1% in 1995, to 0% in 1996. The costs of City tax collection and payment have been paid by businesses ever since. Coy states that the City now lists the item in its own revenue line within its annual budget. For 2020, this is projected to be \$223,195, which does not include the vendor fee on the 1.09% RE-2 Sales Tax, which equates to an additional \$80,283 for a grand total of \$303,478 this year alone. Coy states it is worth noting that the City charges the School District an administrative fee for processing the School District's sales tax revenues. The County Treasurer withholds a 3% fee when dispersing tax revenues to each taxing entity. That fee is to cover costs associated with collecting, accounting for, and remitting that revenue, which businesses do constantly while acting

as the sales tax agent for these entities. Also worth noting is that the State, County, and Ambulance District all allow for the 3.33% sales tax vendor fee.

-Noel Sawyer asks for detail/clarification regarding the \$223,195 collected by the City.

-Coy responds that the amount is listed in two different places within the City Budget; approximately \$145,000 is listed in General Fund-Sales Tax Revenue, which is a 2% revenue. 1% Sales Tax goes to the 410 fund in the amount of some \$70,000+. Additionally, the School District revenue, when calculated at 3.33%, is about another \$80,000. These monies reflect the costs that businesses incur to pay the City and School District sales tax.

-Elijah Murphy mentions that he has been trying to figure out how to recoup these fees; however, attempting to recoup these costs creates an exponential increase on everything, because it's by percentage. If prices are raised, then more taxes are charged as well as more credit card processing fees being levied. The Ute Inn is now in a position that it does not pencil to be open seven days a week. By law, a surcharge cannot be charged back to the customer on behalf of a business, so those costs must be eaten by the business.

-Darrin Tangeman provides additional context and information, stating that the \$223,195 amount being discussed represents in general terms the financial buffer the City has, if you were to remove grant funding from the budget. If that amount of revenue was removed in one year, critical safety and capital improvements would not be able to be implemented. There may be ways to gradually reduce this amount over time, but there are things that the City must be able to achieve regarding safety. The City has a number of grants in the General Fund that could potentially go away after a year, so can't always be counted on year-to-year.

-Noel Sawyer suggests that he and Darrin speak with the other Council members and propose a workshop where Council can discuss and consider business taxes, vendor fees etc. and get everything out in the open.

-Tanner Coy asks Darrin Tangeman if he (Coy) understands correctly that the vendor fee effectively acts as the City's buffer within the budget.

-Tangeman responds that the City's "debt service coverage ratio" is about the exact amount as the vendor fees. Vendor fees are included in the general fund, and thus are not earmarked for any specific expense. There is no direct nexus, but it is one of many streams of revenue collected by the City to cover the general fund expenditures.

-Al Born recognizes the complexities and difficulties in managing and maintaining budgets on behalf of governments and taxing entities. Are businesses being unfairly taxed and assessed fees, which in turn make them less competitive and more apt to fail? Maybe. The more that a business can grow and increase their revenue, they can increase their sales tax, which is ultimately more beneficial for the local taxing entities. Keeping the business community healthy is the number one goal.

**b. Business License Fee**

-Merry Jo Larsen states that at one time, Woodland Park and Aspen had the highest business license fees in Colorado.

-Al Born poses the question of what does the business license fee do? For example, if a contractor comes to town and wants to build, they must possess a contractor's license as a demonstration of possessed skills, knowledge, and abilities. Likewise, a CDL license demonstrates that the holder possesses certain unique skills for the job they proclaim to do. Alternatively, the acquisition of a business license is a simple matter of paying a fee. What is the community receiving from the business license fee, other than it being another expense levied on businesses? Is it necessary if it is not protecting the safety and well-being of the community? Is it merely providing another source of revenue for the governmental entity? Is it a hidden tax, not necessarily a fee?

-Merry Jo Larsen thanks Born for his comments, and acknowledges that one purpose of the Business License Fee is for the City to be able to keep track of who is doing business within the community, where is sales tax coming from, etc. However, Larsen states her belief that the fee is a little high as currently set. While not exorbitant, it is another amount that adds up collectively within the business community that could be used instead to put back in to businesses.

-Tanner Coy states his complete agreement with Al Born's previous comments. Coy states that any fee associated with a business license is to some degree an unfair practice, which accomplishes nothing other than transferring money from private business ownership to government ownership. This is in addition to and beyond the tax revenues that have been voter-approved. The government does not have the authority to increase taxes without the voter saying so; but they can impose fees. If we are a business-friendly community that wants to support downtown and retail economic vitality, then why impose the \$50 business license fee on each business? The combined fees collected total approximately \$100,000 per year, which is being siphoned out of the local economy, where it could circulate and generate prosperity and tax revenues. When that money is siphoned out, the market is being impeded. Therefore, there is no question that it is in the District's best interest to recommend that that fee be eliminated.

-Merry Jo Larsen requests that this item be included in next month's Regular Meeting agenda for further discussion, to include any information that Darrin Tangeman is able to bring back after discussion with Council and Staff.

-Al Born adds that many of these philosophical thoughts and discussions apply to the lodging tax as well. We want to make Woodland Park as business and visitor friendly as possible.

-Jerry Good offers thanks for the Board's candid discussion regarding these matters, and states his increased enlightenment towards these matters after having heard his colleagues' comments and opinions.

-Al Born states that for the context, within the City of Woodland Park, he does not have a vested interest in receiving or collecting any of these taxes or fees. But it's important in regards to the community at large.

-Ellen Carrick requests that Tanner Coy send the article referenced regarding vendor fees to Kory T. Katsimpalis (Assistant to the Board), for distribution to the Board.

-Darrin Tangeman also offers to send the Board the State of Colorado's fact sheet regarding vendor fees.

### **c. Lodging Tax**

#### **6. Discussion regarding Grants**

*\*Item tabled to March 2020 agenda\**

#### **7. Colorado EVC**

-Merry Jo Larsen indicates that she has started discussion with Clarke Becker, from Colorado EVC; Mr. Becker has offered to come and speak with the Board regarding potential monies that might be available to assist with the development of Woodland Station and additional opportunities. In order for funds to be accessed, the DDA must work through the City.

#### **8. Cog Railway Train Car Budget Discussion**

-Merry Jo Larsen states that Duane Carter's daughter has had some books produced that contain commemorative photos of the Cog Railway Train Car and its placement within Woodland Station. These books have been made available as a tool for fundraising for upkeep of the car. The DDA needs to get some articles in the paper making it known that we are still accepting donations through the Mountain Arts Council non-profit.

-Ellen Carrick makes the suggestion that the fundraising campaign be kicked-off by members of the DDA Board purchasing individual copies of the book.

#### **9. General Discussion**

-Tanner Coy provides update on the "Moose is Loose" annual sales event, which is now in its 20<sup>th</sup> year and will kick off on Saturday morning (2/15/2020). This year may feature a "Showdown" in front of Tweeds! 250 "moose bags" will be given out; 20 businesses in town are participating by offering a variety of discounts, events, and specials.

-Nick Pinell indicates that he has been contacted by the Teller County work release program; they have made more picnic benches that are now available should the DDA want them.

Perhaps we can create a picnic bench "garden" at Woodland Station? We currently have six.

-Merry Jo Larsen indicates that the DDA is interested in acquiring additional benches.

-Tanner Coy wonders if there may be other areas within the District where benches could be installed, in accordance with the goals stated in our Foundation Plan to create additional picnic areas.

-Elijah Murphy suggest that perhaps benches be acquired now, and turned over to High School art students for decoration/painting over the last of the winter weather months.

-A reminder that February 17<sup>th</sup> is the next Main Street meeting; one topic for discussion will be the examination of public-private partnerships to encourage additional tourism/visitation within Woodland Park.

-Merry Jo Larsen states her excitement for Moose is Loose, especially considering how slow retail has been recently due to the cold and snowy weather. Larsen also urges the Board to consider how they may influence the City to hire a dedicated marketer/event coordinator to draw more traffic to the City. Additionally, there will be no rodeo this year due to the sale of half of the rodeo grounds land. Therefore, a pow-wow is being discussed for a potential August/September date. Larsen asks the Board and Negotiating Committee to consider the feasibility of having the pow-wow on Woodland Station property.

-Kory T. Katsimpalis provides notice to the board of his vacation/absence during the last week of February due to vacation. Therefore, may need some Board assistance in getting the March regular meeting noticed.

-Jerry Good offers kudos to Tanner Coy for the ongoing efforts associated with the annual Moose is Loose events and the inclusion of numerous businesses throughout town.

-Jan Wilson offers to assist with the posting of March agenda materials if needed.

-Suzanne Leclercq indicates that the City has not yet received any promotional materials associated with Moose is Loose; normally these materials are shared with staff and members of the public at the front desk. (Tanner Coy will follow up). Additionally, the City is in full swing in preparation for the local election. Two dates of interest:

-March 3 – Candidate Forum @WPHS, 6:30pm, being put on by Mr. Papadakis’ Civics class students.

-March 11 – Candidate Forum, hosted by Chamber of Commerce. 6pm in Council Chambers.

-Citizens Academy is underway, with 29 citizens participating and a waitlist begun for the next session.

-Sally Riley offers a reminder that the Placemaking Partners will be hosting a community meeting on February 26, 6:30pm @ UPCC. The meeting will be facilitated by Community Builders.

**10. Adjourn**

**MOTION:** To Adjourn the Meeting.      Murphy/Carrick      Passed 9 – 0

Meeting adjourned at 9:06am.

Recorded by Kory T. Katsimpalis, Assistant to the Board

APPROVED THIS 21<sup>st</sup> DAY OF April, 2020

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Al Born, Secretary