



Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: ID-273-17 **Version:** 1 **Name:**
Type: Minutes **Status:** Agenda Ready
File created: 7/24/2017 **In control:** City Council
On agenda: 8/15/2017 **Final action:**
Title: Approval of the July 18, 2017 City Council Minutes
Sponsors:
Indexes:
Code sections:
Attachments:

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
------	------	-----------	--------	--------

City of Brighton

500 S. 4th Avenue
Brighton, CO 80601



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, July 18, 2017

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

City Council

MAYOR - RICHARD N MCLEAN
MAYOR PRO-TEM - KEN KREUTZER
COUNCIL MEMBERS:
LYNN BACA, REX BELL, JW EDWARDS
MARK HUMBERT, JOAN KNISS,
MARY ELLEN POLLACK, KIRBY WALLIN

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor McLean called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

A. Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag.

Local Vietnam Veterans led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag.

B. Roll Call.

Present: 9 - Mayor McLean, Mayor Pro Tem Kreutzer, Councilmember Baca, Councilmember Bell, Councilmember Edwards, Councilmember Humbert, Councilmember Kniss, Councilmember Pollack, and Councilmember Wallin

2. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Approval of the June 6, 2017 City Council Minutes**
- B. Approval of the June 13, 2017 City Council Minutes**
- C. A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BRIGHTON, COLORADO, SHOWING PARTICIPATION IN THE CREATION OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL LINKAGES STUDY FOR THE US HIGHWAY 85 CORRIDOR BETWEEN INTERSTATE 76 AND WELD COUNTY ROAD 100, AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SIGN THE STUDY ON BEHALF OF THE CITY INDICATING THE CITY'S FAVORABLE SUPPORT THEREOF**

Resolution No: 2017-72

Motion by Councilmember Humbert, seconded by Councilmember Kniss, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Motion passed by the following vote:

Aye: 9 - Mayor McLean, Mayor Pro Tem Kreutzer, Councilmember Baca, Councilmember Bell, Councilmember Edwards, Councilmember Humbert, Councilmember Kniss, Councilmember Pollack, and Councilmember Wallin

3. APPROVAL OF REGULAR AGENDA

Acting City Manager Clint Blackhurst asked that the title for the Executive Session be amended to read "For a conference with the City Attorney for the purpose of receiving legal advice on specific legal questions under C.R.S. Section 34-6-402(4)(b) and for the purpose of determining positions relative to matters that may be subject to negotiations, developing strategy for negotiations, and/or instructing negotiators, under C.R.S. Section 24-6-402 (4)(e) regarding the new City Manager".

Motion by Councilmember Wallin, seconded by Councilmember Edwards, to approve the Regular Agenda as amended. Motion passed by the following vote:

Aye: 9 - Mayor McLean, Mayor Pro Tem Kreutzer, Councilmember Baca, Councilmember Bell, Councilmember Edwards, Councilmember Humbert, Councilmember Kniss, Councilmember Pollack, and Councilmember Wallin

4. CEREMONIES

A. Recognition of Sue Corbett for Receiving the CML Municipal Hero Award

Councilmember Kniss recognized Sue Corbett for receiving the CML Municipal Hero Award and Mayor McLean presented Sue with the award.

B. Introduction of New Employees

Parks and Recreation Director Gary Wardle introduced Anneli Berube, Agritourism Innovation Specialist, she will be working with the District Plan for the City of Brighton and Adams County.

5. PUBLIC INVITED TO BE HEARD ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA **(Speakers limited to five minutes)**

Parks and Recreation Director Gary Wardle recognized the Vietnam Veterans in the audience. Director Wardle reported that city staff has been working with the Vietnam Veterans group for the past eight (8) months on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Approval of the master plan will be presented on August 1, 2017 and the funds for the memorial will be included in the 2018 budget. Staff is hoping to have the memorial completed by Memorial Day next year.

Jose Gonzales, 7752 Shoshone Street, Denver. Mr. Gonzales introduced the members of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial group, the Daughters of the American Revolution and everyone that was here to support the veterans. Mr. Gonzales thanked City Council and staff for all of their work on this project and for everyone coming to support this project.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BRIGHTON, COLORADO, APPROVING THE BRIGHTON COMMONS FINAL PLAT AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR APPROXIMATELY 8.5 ACRES OF PROPERTY, GENERALLY LOCATED IN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 11, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 66 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY OF BRIGHTON, COUNTY OF ADAMS, STATE OF COLORADO, COMMONLY KNOWN AS BRIGHTON COMMONS, AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT; AND SETTING FORTH

OTHER DETAILS RELATED THERETO

Mayor McLean read the title of the Resolution into the record.

Mayor McLean opened the public hearing at 7:29 p.m. and City Clerk Natalie Hoel verified the required postings and publications (July 12, 2017 in the Brighton Standard Blade) for this public hearing were completed.

Acting City Manager Clint Blackhurst introduced Associate Planner Josh Tetzlaff.

Associate Planner Josh Tetzlaff explained that this Final Plat application is for a four (4) lot commercial subdivision on the southeast corner of 50th Avenue and Bridge Street known as Brighton Commons. The Plat is on an 8.5 acre property that was annexed into the City in 2008 as the Kreitzer Annexation and was zoned as the Brighton Commons Amended PUD in January, 2017. The property is currently undeveloped with single-family residential homes to the south and east and commercial to the north and west of the property.

The Comprehensive Plan designates this area as Employment/Commercial which this project would comply with. Along with providing commercial lots in a highly visible area the developer would also improve 50th Avenue and Bridge Street adjacent to their property including intersection improvements, and assisting the City in extending the sidewalk to the east off of their property approximately 700 ft. to connect with existing sidewalks. These improvements along with drainage agreements are discussed in the accompanying Development Agreement. The Land Use and Development Code review criteria for a Final Plat states that the Final Plat must comply with the zoning Ordinance and the Subdivision Regulations. Since the land for this project is zoned for the Brighton Commons Amended PUD it must comply with those regulations. Staff finds that it does meet the regulations of the zone district and the Subdivision Regulations. Notice was sent to all property owners immediately adjacent to the proposed project as required by Code. Because the Metro District is immediately adjacent to the property, they received a notice. Signs were posted on the property and a notice was published in the Brighton Standard Blade even though it was not required by Code. Staff has not received any formal comments in favor of or against the proposal. Due to meeting the review criteria of the Land Use and Development Code Section 17-40-210 and complying with the Comprehensive Plan, staff recommends approval of the Final Plat and Development Agreement for Brighton Commons.

Mayor McLean asked if the applicant would like to add anything to the presentation, they did not.

Mayor McLean asked if anyone in the audience had questions for the applicant, there was none.

Mayor McLean asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak on behalf of the request, there was none.

Mayor McLean asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak against the request, there was none.

Mayor McLean asked if any correspondence had been received, there was none.

Mayor McLean asked if there were questions from City Council.

Councilmember Kniss asked if there will be a crosswalk in the middle of the block for residents to cross over to the development on the west side of 50th Avenue. Planner Tetzlaff explained that there have not been any discussions regarding this topic. Staff is always looking to improve pedestrian travel in the City so this may be looked at in the future.

Councilmember Wallin noted that there were a lot of great comments on the ability to help complete the sidewalk infrastructure in the area. Councilmember Wallin is concerned with the requirements in the Code that direct staff to notify a vacant piece of land and not notify the houses associated with the project, the Code may need to be looked at to address this issue.

Mayor McLean closed the public hearing at 7:36 p.m.

Motion by Councilmember Wallin, seconded by Councilmember Edwards, to approve Resolution 2017-73 approving the Brighton Commons Final Plat and Development Agreement for

approximately 8.5 acres of property, generally located in the northwest quarter of Section 11, township 1 south, range 66 west of the 6th principal meridian, City of Brighton, County of Adams, State of Colorado, commonly known as Brighton Commons, authorizing the Mayor to execute the Development Agreement; and setting forth other details related thereto. Motion passed by the following vote:

Aye: 9 - Mayor McLean, Mayor Pro Tem Kreutzer, Councilmember Baca, Councilmember Bell, Councilmember Edwards, Councilmember Humbert, Councilmember Kniss, Councilmember Pollack, and Councilmember Wallin

7. ORDINANCES FOR INITIAL CONSIDERATION

A. AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BRIGHTON, VACATING THAT CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY AND PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY, SITUATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 16, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 66 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY OF BRIGHTON, COUNTY OF ADAMS, STATE OF COLORADO, AND VESTING TITLE TO SUCH VACATED LANDS IN ABUTTING LANDOWNERS PURSUANT TO C.R.S. § 43-2-301, ET SEQ (FINAL READING)

Mayor McLean read the title of the Ordinance into the record.

Acting City Manager Clint Blackhurst introduced Associate City Planner Josh Tetzlaff.

Associate City Planner Josh Tetzlaff presented the vacation request from Prairie Center Village 1 applicant for a few pieces of City right-of-way along 27th Avenue north of Eagle Boulevard. The properties being requested for vacation were annexed as part of the Third Creek 1st Annexation in 1986. Currently the property adjacent to these rights-of-way is zoned as part of the Prairie Center Mixed-Use PUD which is how these parcels would be zoned if they are vacated. The three (3) properties to be vacated are either accesses that will be unused in the new neighborhood or an access that will be used that is not quite the right shape. The Final Plat for the project will re-plat the middle access to the correct size.

The staff was informed by the applicant yesterday that a fourth vacation will be required for the project. Upon review and due to the vacation being similar to the middle access point in that it is not quite the right shape, staff determined it would be best to request from Council that the fourth vacation be added to the Ordinance. This required a minor change to the draft Ordinance to include the fourth parcel and a fourth vacation description and map will be added to Exhibit A; the revised draft Ordinance and Exhibits are in Council's packet this evening. The Final Plat will re-plat this fourth access to be the correct size for the subdivision. Upon approval of the vacation of the four (4) parcels, the City will no longer have any ownership or maintenance responsibilities of these parcels until the two (2) will come in as new roads.

Due to meeting the Colorado Revised Statutes §42-2-303 which describes the vacation of property in the State of Colorado and due to meeting the rights-of-way being unused or not the right shape, staff recommends approval of the vacation for the now four (4) pieces of rights-of-way. Planner Tetzlaff distributed the amended Ordinance to City Council. Planner Tetzlaff and Community Development Director Holly Prather answered questions from Council regarding:

- These properties being the current inlets in the right-of-way on 27th Avenue.*
- The traffic flow in the area and the access to the area from 27th Avenue if the inlets are taken away.*
- Staff having a plat for this area with reports that the traffic flow will work.*

Motion by Councilmember Humbert, seconded by Councilmember Baca, to approve the Ordinance vacating that certain real property and public rights-of-way, situated in the southwest quarter of Section 16, township 1 south, range 66 west of the 6th principal meridian, City of Brighton, County of Adams, State of Colorado, and vesting title to such vacated lands in abutting landowners pursuant to C.R.S. § 43-2-301, Et. Seq. Motion passed by the following vote:

Aye: 9 - Mayor McLean, Mayor Pro Tem Kreutzer, Councilmember Baca, Councilmember Bell, Councilmember Edwards, Councilmember Humbert, Councilmember Kniss, Councilmember Pollack, and Councilmember Wallin

8. RESOLUTIONS

A. **A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BRIGHTON, COLORADO, APPROVING A MODEL SERVICE PLAN FOR USE BY PROPONENTS OF TITLE 32 SPECIAL DISTRICTS WITHIN THE CITY OF BRIGHTON; AND SETTING FORTH OTHER DETAILS RELATED THERETO**

Mayor McLean read the title of the Resolution into the record.

Acting City Manager Clint Blackhurst introduced Associate City Planner Mike Tylka.

Associate City Planner Mike Tylka introduced the proposal to adopt a Model Service Plan for Metro Districts, formerly known as Metropolitan Districts or Special Districts. Planner Tylka introduced Special Bond Counsel Sally Tasker with Butler Snow LLP.

The City has the authority to approve Service Plans for Metro Districts organized within their boundaries by Article 1, Title 32 of the Colorado Revised Statutes. Currently there are thirty-two (32) districts in Brighton centered around eight (8) developments. The City has received several inquiries from large developers looking to form new districts within city boundaries. City staff is taking a proactive approach and has been working with Bond Counsel since February. Staff presented detailed information to City Council regarding Metro Districts and sought policy direction for the proposed Model Service Plan. Since 2005, the City has been operating under general guidelines that leave the process open to drawn out, case by case negotiations where in the end, each agreement could look quite different. The desire of staff in presenting the Model Service Plan is to provide developers and their teams with clear expectations from the City and to create a uniform, streamlined approach that is part of a consistent review process.

There are certain criteria which a Service Plan must address per State Statute including what will be done, how much it will cost and where it will be done. The draft Model Service Plan provides details on all of these requirements to ensure they are addressed comprehensively by any district looking to form within Brighton city limits.

Planner Tylka summarized the proposed service Plan.

- *The introduction states that the district is being created for a specific purpose and that there is a need for the district.*
- *Section 3 lays out the boundaries and estimates of the final population at build out. Section 4 outlines twenty-two (22) specific areas of district powers and limitations, including setting types of infrastructure that can be operated and maintained by the district such as internal streets, parks and drainage facilities. Per City Council, a requirement that major and minor arterial streets within the district and around the perimeter are built to full width.*
- *Section 5 authorizes the district to provide for planning, design, acquisition, construction, installation, relocation, and redevelopment of public improvements from its revenue by and through the proceeds of the debt issued. Additionally, it grants the district operation and maintenance abilities as outlined in the IGA that will be approved with each service plan. The Plan outlines that the district will issue no more debt than it can reasonably expect to pay from those revenues collected within it. It sets the maximum term of debt issued by the district to that of forty (40) years. The debt service mill levy is set at a maximum of fifty (50) mills upon the taxable property within the district. The maximum combined mill levy of debt service and operation and maintenance shall not exceed sixty (60) mills subject to necessary and permitted mill levy adjustment(s) without prior approval of City Council. Staff feels these provisions would serve to protect district residents.*
- *Section 6 requires that the district provide the City with an annual audit and report that includes ten (10) items such as a detailed list of public improvements that the district is responsible to maintain and with that the specific standards for which that infrastructure is supposed to be maintained. Also the construction status of those public improvements each year.*

- Section 8 requires that meetings of the district are held within city limits as requested by City Council. This is a great benefit for residents.
- Section 9 outlines that each district will enter into an IGA as part of the Service Plan with the City. This outlines ten (10) further areas in depth and this is where specific requirements requested by City Council and recommended by staff can be memorialized for a specific development.

The proposed Model Service Plan is a product of City Council direction and discussions among staff from multiple departments, the legal advisory team and special bond counsel. The Model Service Plan will provide uniformity, clear guidance, set expectations in a detailed direction on all required items for everyone involved in the process. Discussions that went into creating this document focused on how best the residents of Brighton could be served by the items the document would put into place regarding development and the long term maintenance of the City's neighborhoods.

Staff compared the draft of the Model Service Plan with those of the peer community along the Front Range. This document is uniquely Brighton but not out of line with what other cities are using. With this proposed Model Service Plan the City's format is set. All of the requirements are laid out and the space for the necessary information, attachments and reports is provided and responsibilities are clearly delineated. Staff and applicant time will be saved and staff feels that these provisions further protect the residents. Staff recommends approval of the Model Service Plan.

Kristen Bear, White Bear & Ankele, 2154 East Commons, Suite 2000, Centennial. Ms. Bear works almost exclusively with the organization and representation of Special Districts. Ms. Bear expressed her concern with the proposed Model Service Plan. A development cannot always be made to fit within a document because there are unique issues. An existing district should be the same as a new district coming in so there will not be discrepancies with the existing residents and the new residents in the services that are being provided and the fees that are being collected. There are also issues with drafting a multiple district structure and the definition of debt in a service plan. There is also a concern about making adjustments to boundaries as phasing or development occurs and having to come before Council for small changes. Ms. Bear expressed concern regarding the debt service and operational mill levy and the Gallagher adjustment that is contemplated in the Service Plan. There are inconsistencies regarding the City approvals that are required prior to the district being able to impose a debt service mill levy. This item requires some clarification.

Kathy Kanda, McGeady Becker PC, 450 East 17th Avenue, #400, Denver. Ms. Kanda represents metro districts and has several projects in Brighton. Ms. Kanda feels that the City is putting new districts at a competitive disadvantage when some of the existing districts are already at 66 mills. Ms. Kanda asked for clarification from staff regarding organizational costs and is concerned about reimbursements from neighboring properties. The timing of the reimbursements may not be consistent with what the debt service is. There is also an issue when the amount of debt issued by the district is not sufficient to reimburse developer advances. Ms. Kanda expressed concern regarding the language regarding the annual audit and single service plans for multiple districts.

Sally Tasker, Butler Snow LLP, Special Counsel for the City. Ms. Tasker explained that staff and counsel are trying to standardize the process. Staff tried to set up a plan that will work for most situations. The concept of entering into an IGA will help to address specific issues for each district. When creating the Model Service Plan staff and counsel felt it would be best to address those specifics in an IGA. There are two (2) ways to approve or consent to changes in the Model Service Plan. One would be to amend the service plan of the district. By statute if one is amending the service plan of the district there are certain procedures that must be followed. A lot of the items in the Model Service Plan state that one might need Council approval which can be done by Resolution. The issue of expanding district boundaries into an inclusion area could be easily addressed in an IGA. Council could allow expansion into the inclusion area without additional consent. If expanding beyond the inclusion area, this item would have to be brought back to City Council for approval. All of the needs in a community cannot be addressed in the Model Plan so the IGA allows for flexibility that can address issues at the beginning. Staff and counsel looked at other entities and what they are doing and the language they are using for their plans. Staff was directed to create a plan that is flexible but also protect the residents that will be living in the area and paying these taxes.

Ms. Tasker addressed the issues that were brought up by Ms. Bear and Ms. Kanda. The concern regarding the definition of debt if one has multiple districts and pledge agreements there would be double counting, there

will not be double counting.

Staff recognized that if there are multiple districts that will be working together typically one of the districts will be issuing the debt, and the other districts would enter into agreements with that district to impose taxes and remit them. Staff would be authorized to tailor this plan to a multiple district structure.

The boundary adjustments were previously addressed.

City approval prior to debt approval is an issue that was not stated until this meeting. The intention was to ensure that the approval process by the City had gone forward sufficiently so the City would have made all of the approvals before there was debt issued for public infrastructure. If there is a technical glitch in the definitions, that can be addressed.

There is nothing in the Model Service Plan that prohibits O&M money from being reimbursed with bond proceeds.

Reimbursements from other developers has been an issue that has been discussed recently and is important to Brighton. If a district builds infrastructure and is then reimbursed by another developer, staff wants the debt to be paid down by that reimbursement since the taxpayers are paying for the infrastructure. If the district has a situation where they would like to reimburse a developer that paid for infrastructure, those situations can be handled in the IGA. This change should not be made in the Model Service Plan since it is a situation that is not happening in all of the districts. It is important for the protection of the taxpayer that if the district is getting reimbursed for something that was financed, the debt should be paid down with that money. Paying off a developer advance does not help the taxpayer.

City Council had requested that an annual audit be done for transparency, the intention was not to make the districts do something that is not required by statute. Staff can look at this in the Plan.

The Model Service Plan does not require a consolidated plan for all districts, there can be multiple districts, each with their own service plan. Staff will have the flexibility to handle these situations.

Special Counsel and staff discussed Gallagher at length with the City Attorney. There is a constitutional provision that a commercial property pays a certain part and the residential pays another. When the commercial assessed value is set at a certain level, if it becomes the case where the residential will be paying more than what is allowed, then the assessment ratio will be lowered on the residential property. If one is paying taxes, their home value X the assessment ratio = the assessed value. That X the mill levy is what a person will pay. The ratio that has been used for residential for a long time is 7.96%. This year that amount was reduced to 7.2%. The Gallagher adjustment means that if there is a change in the ratio and one is paying \$1,000.00 in taxes at 7.96%, one would still pay \$1,000.00 if it was changing to 7.2% because the bond market needs to know that if the percentage changes, they will not lose money. Since the assessed value has decreased, the mill levy must be raised to make up the difference. The development community is asking that the 7.96% be grandfathered in. Special Counsel and staff do not feel this is transparent and is also too confusing, you cannot say you have a 50 mill levy and adjust it the first year. Staff knows that the percentage has changed, so the mill levy adjustment cannot be based on something that no longer exists. If one wants to be competitive, the mill levy limit should be raised rather than doing this through a Gallagher adjustment.

Councilmembers Baca recommended that this item be continued to another City Council meeting so some of the concerns can be addressed.

Councilmember Wallin stated that this issue is critical to the future of the City and feels there is time to get it done right.

Councilmember Pollack does not feel this should be rushed and it should be done right. This item should be continued.

Mayor Pro Tem Kreutzer feels this item is to protect the citizens and address their concerns that infrastructure in their neighborhoods is incomplete even though they are paying district taxes. Council needs to take into account the best interest of the tax paying citizens of Brighton, some feel the City has let them down and that is not the case.

Councilmember Edwards asked that Ms. Bear and Ms. Kanda submit their recommendations to staff in writing.

Motion by Councilmember Wallin, seconded by Councilmember Pollack, to continue the Resolution to August 15, 2017. Motion passed by the following vote:

Aye: 9 - Mayor McLean, Mayor Pro Tem Kreutzer, Councilmember Baca, Councilmember Bell, Councilmember Edwards, Councilmember Humbert, Councilmember Kniss, Councilmember Pollack, and Councilmember Wallin

9. UTILITIES BUSINESS ITEMS

10. GENERAL BUSINESS

11. REPORTS

A. By the Mayor.

Mayor McLean attended several meetings and events. Mayor McLean announced that the City BBQ is Thursday at 5:30 p.m. at Carmichael Park.

B. By Department Heads.

Parks and Recreation Director Gary Wardle announced that the Eagle View Adult Center will be closed for Maintenance from July 31, 2017 to August 4, 2017.

C. By the City Attorney.

D. By the City Manager.

12. REPORTS BY COUNCIL ON BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

Councilmember Bell invited everyone to the City BBQ on Thursday night at Carmichael Park.

Councilmember Humbert attended a BURA workshop.

Councilmember Kniss thanked staff for the movies and concerts in the park. The Cultural Arts Commission will be accepting nominations for the Excellence in Arts award soon.

Mayor Pro Tem Kreutzer attended the Historic Preservation Commission meeting and the 4th of July celebration.

Councilmember Edwards attended the Senior Advisory Board meeting.

Councilmember Wallin attended the CML Executive Committee retreat, the community meeting at Donelson Park and met with members of the Bromley East Charter School and the Bromley Park HOA to talk about safety issues around the school and neighborhood. Members of the Youth Commission will be applying for City Boards and Commissions. Councilmember Wallin attended the Legacy Foundation karaoke event and the Richard Lambert Foundation poker run.

13. EXECUTIVE SESSION

Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Kreutzer, seconded by Councilmember Humbert, to go into Executive Session at 9:02 p.m. for a conference with the City Attorney for the purpose of receiving legal advice on specific legal questions under C.R.S. Section 24-6-402(4)(b) and for the purpose of determining positions relative to matters that may be subject to negotiations, developing strategy for

negotiations, and/or instructing negotiators, under C.R.S. Section 24-6-402(4)(e) regarding the new City Manager. Motion passed by the following vote:

Aye: 9 - Mayor McLean, Mayor Pro Tem Kreutzer, Councilmember Baca, Councilmember Bell, Councilmember Edwards, Councilmember Humbert, Councilmember Kniss, Councilmember Pollack, and Councilmember Wallin

Mayor McLean reconvened the meeting at 10:17 p.m.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Councilmember Humbert, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Kreutzer, to adjourn at 10:18 p.m. Motion passed by the following vote:

Aye: 9 - Mayor McLean, Mayor Pro Tem Kreutzer, Councilmember Baca, Councilmember Bell, Councilmember Edwards, Councilmember Humbert, Councilmember Kniss, Councilmember Pollack, and Councilmember Wallin

CITY OF BRIGHTON, COLORADO

Richard N. McLean, Mayor

ATTEST:

Natalie Hoel, City Clerk

Approval Date