

APPROVED AS SUBMITTED ON FEBRUARY 6, 2007

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

LITTLETON CITY COUNCIL

January 16, 2007

The Littleton City Council met in regular session on Tuesday, January 16, 2007, in the Council Chambers of the Littleton Center, 2255 West Berry Avenue. The regular meeting convened at 7:00 p.m.

THOSE PRESENT: REBECCA KAST
Mayor Pro Tem
DOUG CLARK
Council Member
AMY S. CONKLIN
Council Member
PAT CRONENBERGER
Council Member
TOM MULVEY
Council Member
JOHN OSTERMILLER
Council Member

THOSE ABSENT: JAMES A. TAYLOR
Mayor

ALSO PRESENT: Jim Woods
City Manager
Larry Berkowitz
City Attorney
Julie K. Bower
City Clerk

1. **ROLL CALL**

Upon a call of the roll, six members were present. Mayor Taylor was absent. The following business was transacted.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

3. **AGENDA**

ACTION: APPROVED

Mayor Pro Tem Kast said the agenda had incorrectly listed a study session regarding campaign finance following tonight's regular meeting. The study session would be held following the regular meeting on February 6, 2007.

4. **(a) MINUTES - MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING JANUARY 2, 2007**

ACTION: APPROVED

4. **(b) MINUTES – MINUTES OF SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING JANUARY 9, 2007**

ACTION: APPROVED

Mayor Pro Tem Kast made the following corrections: “TrailMark fire station – Council consensus was to discuss with Littleton Fire Protection District and Highlands Ranch Metro District ~~the combination of~~ Options C and F – purchasing a residence and staffing it with a medic unit ~~and~~ **or** adding an additional medic unit to Station 16. The city would fund the capital improvements and the partners would share personnel costs. **Council Member Ostermiller and Council Member Conklin would hold a discussion with West Metro Fire District.”**

5. **INTRODUCE NEW CITY EMPLOYEES –**

Mr. Woods introduced Eric Green, the city’s new Sales Tax Auditor.

6. **(a) CITIZEN APPEARANCES – GUEST CITIZENS – None**

6. **(b) CITIZEN APPEARANCES - SCHEDULED PUBLIC APPEARANCES – None**

6. **(c) CITIZEN APPEARANCES – UNSCHEDULED PUBLIC APPEARANCES – None**

7. **(a) CONSENT AGENDA - (ordinances and resolutions read by title) –**

ACTION: APPROVED - ITEMS 7(A) – 7(D)

(a) Resolution specifying where notices of public meetings are to be posted (**Resolution No. 1, Series of 2007**)

(b) Resolution Approving Intergovernmental Agreement with the Regional Transportation District (RTD) for Shopping Cart funding (**Resolution No. 2, Series of 2007**)

(c) Motion approving agreement with South Metro Denver Chamber of Commerce for economic development services

(d) Motion approving agreement with Robert Henderson, Artist for purchase of artwork for the Danny Dietz Memorial

It was moved by COUNCIL MEMBER CRONENBERGER and seconded by COUNCIL MEMBER CLARK TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 7(A) – 7(D).

Ayes: Council Members Mulvey, Conklin, Kast, Cronenberger, Ostermiller and

Clark.

Nays: None.

Absent: Mayor Taylor

MOTION CARRIED: 6 to 0

8. **(a) SECOND AND FINAL READING ON ORDINANCES AND PUBLIC HEARINGS**
– ORDINANCE ON SECOND READING INCLUDING THE LILLEY BUILDING,
2529-2559 WEST MAIN STREET, IN THE MAIN STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT

ACTION: ORDINANCE NO. 2, SERIES OF 2007

Mr. Berkowitz read the ordinance by title.

Mary Roberts, Community Development Director, entered the following exhibits into the record:

- Exhibit A - Staff report and attachments
- Exhibit B - Application and attachments
- Exhibit C - City COMPLAN (by reference)
- Exhibit D - Historic Preservation Code (by reference)
- Exhibit E - Proof of posting
- Exhibit F - Proof of publication
- Exhibit G - Public hearing roster

Ms. Roberts said the property owner, Oakley Ventures LLC, had submitted an application to include the Lilley Building into the Main Street Historic District pursuant to Title 4, Chapter 6 of the City Code.

The Lilley Building was built by Harry Hiller Lilley between 1900 and 1907 for a livery stable. The building was representative of early Twentieth Century Commercial style architecture with two-story construction, flat roof, storefront on the first floor and double-hung windows on the second floor oriented towards Main Street. By 1914, the livery had been converted to a garage. The building had many uses over the years and was currently under construction to restore the historic character of the front façade. The property included two non-historic structures at the rear of the Lilley building and the applicant was proposing to demolish the structures to accommodate additional parking.

The application met the criteria for historic district designation based on the exemplification of an architectural period, the economic heritage of the community and its contribution to the identity of the community. On June 19, 2006, the Historical Preservation Board voted to approve the request for inclusion in the Main Street Historic District and to forward a favorable recommendation to Council.

Council Member Cronenberger asked what the “small town” character of Main Street language meant?

Ms. Roberts said that language was included in the downtown design guidelines. It referred to something that was pedestrian friendly and had a relationship to the environment of the street and the buildings that fronted the street.

Mayor Pro Tem Kast opened the public hearing.

JOHN MATTHEWS
MATTHEWS & ASSOCIATES ARCHITECTS
2579 W. MAIN ST.

Mr. Matthews had been involved for the last several years in the redevelopment of the block. An historic rehabilitation of the building had been completed and was a real success. The applicant was committed to quality redevelopment of the downtown block and maintaining the historic character and pedestrian scale of the building. He offered Applicant’s Exhibit A, a photograph of the building, for the record.

Council Member Cronenberger asked why in this case, inclusion in the historic district was not sought prior to the rehabilitation?

Mr. Matthews said the applicant delayed the process of the historic district because they wanted to understand all of the ramifications of being in the district.

It was moved by COUNCIL MEMBER CONKLIN and seconded by COUNCIL MEMBER OSTERMILLER THAT THE PUBLIC HEARING BE CLOSED; THAT THE ORDINANCE APPROVING THE INCLUSION OF THE LILLEY BUILDING, LOCATED AT 2529-2559 WEST MAIN STREET, INTO THE MAIN STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT BE CONDITIONALLY APPROVED; THAT THE INCLUSION OF THIS PROPERTY INTO THE DISTRICT WAS JUSTIFIED IN THAT THE STRUCTURE WAS OVER 40 YEARS OF AGE, WAS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY COMMERCIAL STYLE OF ARCHITECTURE, EXEMPLIFIED THE ECONOMIC HERITAGE OF THE COMMUNITY AND CONTRIBUTED TO THE IDENTITY OF THE COMMUNITY; THAT THE ORDINANCE BE PUBLISHED BY TITLE ONLY; AND THAT THE COUNCIL PRESIDENT BE AUTHORIZED TO AFFIX HIS SIGNATURE THERETO.

Ayes: Council Members Mulvey, Conklin, Kast, Cronenberger, Ostermiller and Clark.

Nays: None.

Absent: Mayor Taylor

MOTION CARRIED: 6 to 0

8. **(b) SECOND AND FINAL READING ON ORDINANCES AND PUBLIC HEARINGS – ORDINANCE ON SECOND READING INCLUDING THE BATSCHELET BUILDING, 2569-2579 WEST MAIN STREET, IN THE MAIN STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT**

ACTION: ORDINANCE NO. 3, SERIES OF 2007

Mr. Berkowitz read the ordinance by title.

Ms. Roberts entered the following exhibits into the record:

- Exhibit A - Staff report and attachments
- Exhibit B - Application and attachments
- Exhibit C - City COMPLAN (by reference)
- Exhibit D - Historic Preservation Code (by reference)
- Exhibit E - Proof of posting
- Exhibit F - Proof of publication
- Exhibit G - Public hearing roster

Ms. Roberts said the property owner, Main Street Partners LLC had submitted an application to include the Batschelet Building into the Main Street Historic District.

The Batschelet Building was constructed in 1908 by E. F. Batschelet. It was a two-story, flat roof brick building that was a good example of the Twentieth Century Commercial style. The building was used for businesses on the first floor, with a hall on the second floor. In 1994, the Council designated the Batschelet Building as an individual historic landmark.

At a public hearing on June 19, 2006, the Historical Preservation Board voted to approve the request and forward a favorable recommendation to Council.

Council Member Clark asked what did being in the district provide that the landmark designation did not?

Ms. Roberts said the district provided parking incentives.

Mayor Pro Tem Kast opened the public hearing. No one wished to speak.

It was moved by COUNCIL MEMBER CRONENBERGER and seconded by COUNCIL MEMBER OSTERMILLER THAT THE PUBLIC HEARING BE CLOSED; THAT THE ORDINANCE APPROVING THE INCLUSION OF THE BATSCHELET BUILDING, LOCATED AT 2569-2579 WEST MAIN STREET, INTO THE MAIN STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT BE CONDITIONALLY APPROVED; THAT THE INCLUSION OF THIS PROPERTY INTO THE DISTRICT WAS JUSTIFIED IN THAT THE STRUCTURE WAS OVER 40 YEARS OF AGE, WAS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY COMMERCIAL STYLE OF ARCHITECTURE, EXEMPLIFIED THE

ECONOMIC HERITAGE OF THE COMMUNITY AND CONTRIBUTED TO THE IDENTITY OF THE COMMUNITY; THAT THE ORDINANCE BE PUBLISHED BY TITLE ONLY; AND THAT THE COUNCIL PRESIDENT BE AUTHORIZED TO AFFIX HIS SIGNATURE THERETO.

Ayes: Council Members Mulvey, Conklin, Kast, Cronenberger and Ostermiller.

Nays: Council Member Clark.

Absent: Mayor Taylor

MOTION CARRIED: 5 to 1

8. (c) SECOND AND FINAL READING ON ORDINANCES AND PUBLIC HEARINGS – ORDINANCE ON SECOND READING INCLUDING 2589 WEST MAIN STREET, IN THE MAIN STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT

ACTION: ORDINANCE NO. 4, SERIES OF 2007

Mr. Berkowitz read the ordinance by title.

Ms. Roberts entered the following exhibits into the record:

- Exhibit A - Staff report and attachments
- Exhibit B - Application and attachments
- Exhibit C - City COMPLAN (by reference)
- Exhibit D - Historic Preservation Code (by reference)
- Exhibit E - Proof of posting
- Exhibit F - Proof of publication
- Exhibit G - Public hearing roster

Ms. Roberts said the property owner Main Street Partners LLC, had submitted an application to include the property located at 2589 West Main Street into the Main Street Historic District. The applicant proposed to include the property in the District provided that the ordinance included a provision that allowed for the total demolition of the building that was currently on the lot. A new structure would be constructed. If the proposed ordinance was approved, the city's land use regulations would prohibit a demolition permit to be issued until the new building plans had been approved by the Historical Preservation Board and the Planning Commission.

The building was probably constructed between 1908 and 1914. It was a small one-story brick structure that had undergone significant renovation. An addition was constructed on the rear and the original storefront was demolished many years ago.

At a public hearing on June 19, 2006, the Historical Preservation Board voted to approve the request and forward a favorable recommendation to Council. The Board felt that demolition was acceptable in this case because the building had little remaining historic character.

Council Member Clark asked how the building could have no historic merit but the dirt underneath it could?

Mayor Pro Tem Kast opened the public hearing.

KEVIN KOERNIG

CHAIR - HISTORICAL PRESERVATION BOARD

Mr. Koernig said there had been a lot of discussion about the issue. The best way to proceed was to include the property so that the entire block would be in the district and would be under the control of the Historical Preservation Board for review.

Council Member Clark asked how the board would review a new building?

Mr. Koernig said the block was so strong architecturally that the board wanted a new building to be sympathetic and fit in a contextual form within the district.

Council Member Clark asked if the design standards applied to any building rebuilt in downtown?

Mr. Koernig said that was correct but if it was not under historical designation, it would be solely reviewed by the Planning Commission and there would not be an historical overview.

BILL HOPPING

VICE CHAIR - HISTORICAL PRESERVATION BOARD

Mr. Hopping said part of the mission of the board was to encourage the economic vitality of downtown. While the building would have been subject to design standards, having it subject to certificate of appropriateness standards brought it to a higher level. The incentives were put in place to help people preserve buildings and he was concerned with being inconsistent with the original goals of the district by granting incentives to dirt. He was very happy with the design of the proposed building.

Council Member Ostermiller asked if there was a problem with designating a building solely to get a parking benefit? Was a parking problem being dealt with through historic preservation? Should it be dealt with separately in the future?

Mr. Hopping said it would need to be addressed down the road. He said a building coming into the district that was not subject to the design guidelines or the certificate of appropriateness standards and then came in to get the parking incentives, was backwards. The board did not want to see that in the future.

Council Member Conklin asked if a property owner chose not to enter the district, the building would be subject to the design guidelines, but could they design a building that would not fit in to the character of the district?

Mr. Hopping said in his opinion, they absolutely could. The design guidelines did not contain the same amount of detail as the certificate of appropriateness standards.

Mr. Matthews presented a rendering of the proposed building that was marked as Applicant's Exhibit A. He said a restaurant would be preferred along with offices in the back or perhaps retail on the ground floor. The building would continue the quality character of downtown and complete the corner.

It was moved by COUNCIL MEMBER CONKLIN and seconded by COUNCIL MEMBER OSTERMILLER THAT THE PUBLIC HEARING BE CLOSED; THAT THE ORDINANCE APPROVING THE INCLUSION OF 2589 WEST MAIN STREET, INTO THE MAIN STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT BE CONDITIONALLY APPROVED; THAT THE INCLUSION OF THIS PROPERTY INTO THE DISTRICT WAS JUSTIFIED IN THAT THE STRUCTURE WAS OVER 40 YEARS OF AGE, WAS IN A PROMINENT LOCATION ON MAIN STREET THAT WAS AN ESTABLISHED AND FAMILIAR SETTING OF THE COMMUNITY; THAT THE ORDINANCE BE PUBLISHED BY TITLE ONLY; AND THAT THE COUNCIL PRESIDENT BE AUTHORIZED TO AFFIX HIS SIGNATURE THERETO.

Council Member Clark would vote against the motion. To designate a building and then tear it down was absurd. He said part of the problem with the direction being taken with historic preservation downtown was that we kept a few buildings that we liked and tried to make the rest of downtown look like it. He was in favor of historic preservation but was not in favor of homogenization. Council Member Clark did not want downtown to look like Main Street Disneyland. He wanted it to maintain its diversity. All that was being done was incentives were being given to reduce the requirement for parking spaces.

Council Member Cronenberger would vote for the motion with some reservation. She thought staff worked hard to make a difficult situation work out. The city basically had a compromise by doing an opt-in district. If the city would have had a district with a set boundary, the Main Street Grill would have been a non-contributing building in an historic district. The Historic Preservation Board was keenly aware and did not want to be seen as an obstacle to economic development and worked very hard to make it work. She said there should be some other kind of provision for buildings that would have been non-contributing and whether there was some other way to take them into consideration. Council Member Cronenberger did not think the city should go through the contortion of saying it was a landmark after it was torn down. It was not what the ordinance intended. The board and staff did the absolute best with the situation and she would support the motion.

Council Member Ostermiller said one of his concerns was if parking was driving the historic preservation district or was the district driving parking downtown. He would support the

motion but wanted to look at the parking requirements in the CA zoned district and if the requirements made sense.

Council Member Conklin said including the building seemed the better way to go but it did seem like things were done backwards.

Council Member Mulvey was a past Council liaison to the Historical Preservation Board. He was not comfortable with making a building historic and then tearing it down but had faith in the board to follow through on it.

Mayor Pro Tem Kast was in support of historic preservation but would vote against the motion. She was worried that it would set a precedent that the city might rue in the future where a building was designated and then demolished.

The vote on the motion was:

Ayes: Council Members Mulvey, Conklin, Cronenberger and Ostermiller.

Nays: Council Members Kast and Clark.

Absent: Mayor Taylor

MOTION CARRIED: 4 to 2

9. **(a) GENERAL BUSINESS** – None

10. **(a) CONSIDERATION OF COMMITTEE, COMMISSIONS AND BOARD MATTERS** – None

11. **(a) ORDINANCES ON FIRST READING** – None

12. **(a) RESOLUTIONS** – None

13. **REPORTS** -

- (a) **CITY MANAGER** – Mr. Woods updated Council on the workshop scheduled for February 2nd. Economic development would take up the morning session and regionalization of police services would be discussed in the afternoon. He asked how many Council members were interested in an optional tour on Saturday? If there were more than two Council members, a larger bus might be needed so that members of the public could be accommodated.

Council Member Cronenberger asked what sort of liability would be incurred by the city?

Mr. Berkowitz did not believe the city would have exposure and would check with CIRSA.

Mayor Pro Tem Kast was not sure that a larger bus would be able to navigate the snow-packed residential streets.

Council Member Clark wanted to look at the physical condition of different neighborhoods, code violations and shopping centers.

Mayor Pro Tem Kast also wanted to look at available senior housing.

Council Member Ostermiller said it would be difficult to see code violations because of the snow.

Council agreed to hold the workshop on Friday, February 2nd. The neighborhood tour would be conducted sometime in the future after the snow melted.

(b) **CITY ATTORNEY** – Mr. Berkowitz distributed an updated copy of Council’s revised legislative rules. Three words had been left out of the recently distributed version.

(c) **COUNCIL MEMBERS** -

COUNCIL MEMBER MULVEY – Council Member Mulvey reported only one camera was working at the last Council meeting.

Ms. Narde said the cameras had been on two different power supplies and one had failed. The cameras had been rewired to one power supply and there was now a redundant system so that if one power supply failed, the cameras could be switched to the other supply.

COUNCIL MEMBER CONKLIN – Council Member Conklin was developing a proposal, along with Ms. Narde, to get Channel 8 up and running. She would like to discuss it at a study session in March or April.

Council Member Conklin congratulated museum employee Margene Hamilton for being recognized as the “Employee of the Month”.

Council Member Conklin had arranged for a tour of fire stations on Thursday at 9:00 a.m.

Council Member Conklin said the meeting she and Council Member Ostermiller had with Leo Johnson of West Metro Fire District was very productive and there should be a proposal forthcoming.

Council Member Ostermiller said there were two or three different talking points. There was probably a need for some Council discussion regarding negotiations. A line of communication had been developed with the board and it might be possible to come up with some alternatives for the situation at TrailMark. Council Member Ostermiller asked for a survey of the response times of other districts in the metro area.

Council Member Conklin wanted to know what the standard for response time was for the metro area.

Council Member Conklin was looking forward to moving ahead with the ad hoc citizen budget advisory committee.

COUNCIL MEMBER CRONENBERGER – Council Member Cronenberger had asked if a presentation on the ULI report would be included at the Council workshop. When would it be discussed?

Mr. Woods said staff was hoping to receive the file any day and would be looking at the study session agenda. He said there might not be enough time at the workshop.

Council Member Cronenberger would be providing information to Council, the Planning Commission and the Citizen Advisory Committee regarding the Transit Alliance's citizen academy about training people in transit-oriented development. She said the city might be interested in sponsoring someone to participate.

Council Member Cronenberger reported she had been interviewed by Governor Ritter's transition team for the Department of Local Affairs. She was not selected but it was quite an honor and quite an experience.

COUNCIL MEMBER OSTERMILLER – Council Member Ostermiller asked Bart Sayyah to report on the South Metro Denver Chamber of Commerce's regarding the United Launch Alliance.

BART SAYYAH
DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
SOUTH METRO DENVER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. Sayyah said the trip was part of the relocation effort for the United Launch Alliance, a joint venture between Boeing and Lockheed Martin. The Alliance would be headquartered in the south metro Denver area and would require up to 1,000 employees of the Boeing facility in Huntington Beach to relocate to the area. The trip was the final orientation meeting with the employees in Huntington Beach.

Council Member Ostermiller reported at the Economic Development Group breakfast Xcel Energy made a presentation regarding the company's future direction, energy demands and power generation. He suggested the very informative presentation be made to Council and the public.

Council Member Ostermiller said the Chamber's Events and Visitors Bureau was already starting to brainstorm on what to do for the Democratic National Convention. He said since Littleton was on the light rail line and delegates could experience Main Street, it was important to get staff involved.

Council Member Ostermiller said Arapahoe County Sheriff Robinson, in an effort to address the shortage of beds at the county jail, had notified Denver that the jail would no longer accept juvenile prisoners from Denver. Sheriff Robinson would also no longer be providing beds for Community Corrections and would also be reducing the number of beds available to municipalities by 50%. Sheriff Robinson would talk to Council and Judge Kimmel prior to implementing the reduction.

Council Member Conklin asked what were the alternatives to the bed shortage? Were there private contractors?

Council Member Ostermiller said it would come down to deciding who got sent to jail and who posed a greater threat to society. He said the county did not charge the municipalities for housing prisoners. A private contractor, if available, would be costly.

Council Member Ostermiller attended the Martin Luther King Breakfast at Arapahoe Community College along with Mayor Pro Tem Kast. It was one of the best breakfasts he had attended. It was very informative.

Council Member Ostermiller was moving forward to meet with the Littleton Fire Rescue partners regarding service to TrailMark.

COUNCIL MEMBER CLARK – Council Member Clark said the criteria for sentencing could be discussed as part of the judge's review.

Council Member Clark said the city charged \$1.25 per copy to citizens. That was clearly more than what the actual cost was to the city.

It was moved by COUNCIL MEMBER CLARK and seconded by COUNCIL MEMBER MULVEY TO CHARGE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS PER COPY.

Council Member Conklin said the \$1.25 charge was not only for the cost of the copy but also covered the cost of retrieving the document.

Mr. Woods said the policy had been in place for several years and he recalled that staff time and other kinds of costs was factored in to the charge.

Mr. Berkowitz said the way the public records law read was that the custodian set the policy and the maximum under the statute was \$1.25 per page. A lot of considerations were taken into account when the charge was set.

Council Member Conklin said a better way to handle it would be if there was a central place where citizens could access the records, find the documents they wanted and make copies of the documents themselves.

Council Member Cronenberger said there was a bigger issue than how much was charged per page. The bigger question was what was available on the city's website and had the city looked comprehensively at that. She would be interested in knowing what the plan was for making as many documents available as possible on the website. She was not interested in voting on the copy charge.

It was moved by COUNCIL MEMBER CRONENBERGER and seconded by COUNCIL MEMBER CONKLIN TO POSTPONE THE MATTER INDEFINITELY.

Council Member Ostermiller said some documents take a considerable amount of time to find. He had no idea how many thousands of pages of documents there were.

Mr. Berkowitz said there were probably millions of pages of documents. There was not one place where all of those documents could be assembled.

Council Member Ostermiller said there was an article in the newspaper regarding how upset the Rocky Mountain News was that the city of Centennial wanted to charge the newspaper \$2,000 to retrieve all of the former treasurer's email and correspondence in a search for a receipt the treasurer had generated. They wanted all of that information and did not want to pay for it. The city charged what was allowed by the state and if staff had to spend 15 minutes searching for a document, \$1.25 did not cover the cost.

Council Member Cronenberger said Centennial had privatized so much of their services and that was why it cost so much to retrieve the information.

Council Member Clark said the city's best goal was to get as much information available on the website but it would be unbelievably expensive to digitize all those records for the website. The \$1.25 was the maximum amount allowed and it was a disincentive. He said if it was changed to 25

cents and there was a problem or pattern of abuse, Council could go back and change it. Government's fundamental job was to provide information and he would vote against the motion to postpone.

The vote on the motion to postpone was:

Ayes: Council Members Conklin, Kast, Cronenberger and Ostermiller.

Nays: Council Members Mulvey and Clark.

Absent: Mayor Taylor

MOTION CARRIED: 4 to 2

MAYOR PRO TEM KAST – Mayor Pro Tem Kast said the MLK breakfast was a wonderful event and former Council member Shirley Harris was awarded the MLK Medal for Distinguished Service. It was a well deserved honor for her.

Mayor Pro Tem Kast reported the new Lowes store opened last week and she, along with Council Members Ostermiller and Mulvey attended the ribbon cutting.

(d) **MAYOR TAYLOR** – Absent

(e) **DRCOG** – Council Member Cronenberger said the board would be making the final revisions to the Metro Vision 2030 plan before embarking on the 2035 plan. It would also be conducting the yearly review of FasTracks.

14. **ADJOURNMENT** - There being no further business, Mayor Pro Tem Kast adjourned the meeting at 8:57 p.m. on Tuesday, January 16, 2007.

Julie K. Bower, City Clerk/Recording Secretary