

FOOTHILLS PARK AND RECREATION DISTRICT
REGULAR BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

October 13, 2009

The regular meeting of the Foothills Park and Recreation District was held at The Peak Community and Wellness Center, 6612 South Ward Street, Littleton, Colorado 80127.

- I. CALL TO ORDER: Director Nunes called the regular meeting to order at 6pm.
- II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Director Nunes led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.
- III. ROLL CALL:
- | | |
|---------------------|------------------|
| Director Maulik: | Present |
| Director Shangraw: | Present |
| Director Frankland: | Absent - excused |
| Director Sutton: | Present |
| Chairman Nunes: | Present |

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Ronald Hopp, Executive Director; Paul Rufien, District Counsel; Tom Woodard, Director of Golf; Colin Insley, Director of Parks, Planning and Construction; Patricia Parkin, Director of Administrative Services; Barb Butler, Manager of Recreation Programs; Derek Eberhardt, Operations Manager of Recreation Facilities; Richelle Riley, Recording Secretary; other Foothills staff and members of the public.

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION: Director Maulik moved that the Foothills Board of Directors approve the October 13, 2009 agenda as submitted. Director Shangraw seconded the motion. Poll of the Board: Director Maulik, aye; Director Shangraw, aye; Director Sutton, aye; Director Nunes, aye. The agenda was approved as submitted.

V. APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 22, 2009 MINUTES:

MOTION: Director Maulik moved that the Foothills Board of Directors approve the minutes of the September 22, 2009 Board meeting as submitted. Director Shangraw seconded the motion. Poll of the Board: Director Maulik, aye; Director Shangraw, aye; Director Sutton, aye; Director Nunes, aye. The minutes were approved as submitted.

VI. COMMUNITY COMMENTS:

A. Staff Introduction – Jaime Villarreal

Barb Butler introduced Jaime Villarreal, our new Children and Youth Program Specialist. She comes to us from Colorado Springs and has worked with community center programming, before and after school camp programming, and teen programming.

VII. OLD BUSINESS:

A. Clement Park Pier and Embankment Contract Approval

Sean Kitners discussed since the last Board meeting, we had bid openings for the pier and embankment project. Eight contractors attended the pre-bid meeting and four contractors bid on the project. Arrow J. Landscape and Design came in as the apparent low bidder, and they were awarded the bid. Mr. Kitners indicated the contract information did not change since the information given at the last Board meeting.

The base bid terminology was explained by Mr. Kitners. We know what areas will be addressed for sure with the base bid, but will expand as much as we can. The base bid includes the three piers on the western side and the two stabilization areas. We do have some extra funds for contingency for unknowns, or will be able to address an alternate area.

MOTION: Director Maulik moved that the Foothills Board of Directors approve the contract for the Clement Park Pier and Embankment Project with Arrow J. Landscape and Design, Inc. in the amount of \$65,829.82, and approve the Executive Director to execute the contract. Director Shangraw seconded the motion. Poll of the Board: Director Maulik, aye;

Director Shangraw, aye; Director Sutton, aye; Director Nunes, aye. The motion was approved.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS:

IX. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

Mr. Hopp indicated that the information provided in his report about the preliminary audit plan with McKinstry and Associates has changed slightly, in case any members of the Board were interested in attending any of those meetings.

A parcel map of the Ridge campus was distributed to the Board. Mr. Hopp explained that in going through the process of cleaning up ownership issues related to the campus with the Building Authority and Foothills, there is a section that was not conveyed to the District or the Building Authority in all the previous land swapping. The triangular shaped parcel is under the ownership of Jefferson County Open Space. They would like to do another land swap for that piece; the piece we would swap would be the same square footage. Mr. Hopp explained that a resolution of intent to swap the property would be brought to the next Board meeting. Then it will go before the Open Space Advisory Committee November 7th.

X. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

A. Mesa View Estates

Mr. Hopp prefaced the discussion saying that there has been some correspondence between Foothills Park & Recreation District and the Mesa View Estates Homeowner's Association's board members. There have been two meetings; one that Director Nunes and he attended with the Mesa View Estates' board and a meeting last week that Paul Rufien and he attended. Mr. Hopp characterized both meetings as very cordial and productive in terms of having dialogue about the areas of concern and the ultimate desires of the Mesa View HOA. At the last meeting, there was discussion in relationship to their desire to have control of Estates Park. Mr. Hopp said they talked about the various mechanisms we had outlined in the letter we sent stating there are multiple options including leasing the entire park, leasing a portion of the park, possible sale of a portion or the entire park, or any other contractual arrangement. He said they talked about the pros and cons of all of those options and quickly came to the realization that any of those would be a policy decision that this Board ultimately would make. Mr. Hopp invited representatives from Mesa View Estates to come before the Foothills Board and state their intentions. In the spirit of creating a win/win situation, Mr. Hopp observed it is excellent that Mesa View Estates representatives are here. Mesa View Estates' board representatives in attendance were Andrew Burt, Debbie Zucker, and Cici Kessler.

Andrew Burt thanked Mr. Hopp, Mr. Rufien, and Director Nunes for their previous meetings with the Mesa View Estates Homeowner's board; the dialogue was very productive. He expressed appreciation for the letter Foothills sent showing willingness that we can maybe find a solution. Mr. Burt explained that many years ago the City of Lakewood opted out of the Foothills District. Referring to the District map, he pointed out the Mesa View area saying it is a 13 mile drive from there to the bulk of the District's services; people don't tend to come down here too terribly much. They are thinking it might be beneficial to everyone if they could take ownership level control of the one park they do have in their subdivision.

To summarize where they are at this point, Mr. Burt said the letter Mr. Hopp sent to them indicated there were five different mechanisms of control transfer including ownership of the whole, ownership of part; lease of the whole or lease of part; and "other". He indicated leasing might be the best way for all concerned; if there is a mechanism to obtain goals best defined by "other", they are open to that. He suggested if we can agree on the goal, the lawyers can get together and hammer out the paperwork and it shouldn't be terribly difficult.

Director Shangraw asked for clarification of the goals. Mr. Burt explained they are after ownership like control. They would be responsible for the maintenance and responsible for whatever happens in the park. Mr. Burt assured they would keep it as a park. If they got ownership and buy-in of the homeowners in the neighborhood, they would like to replace the port-a-pot with a genuine bathroom facility. They would like to get the tennis court resurfacing done.

There may be other structures in the future they might want to improve. He said they don't have a plan, it's more that their owners think the HOA owns the park. It might be easier for everyone if they did own the park and make it a reality what people already think. They don't have a plan but if down the road they want to put in a baseball diamond they could do it. They do plan to keep it as a public park if they were to get ownership; they have no intent to put up gates.

Director Maulik discussed the possibility of forming a sub-district and is not opposed to that idea. The current tax dollars that support the Mesa View area also support the District in its entirety; that is where she has an issue with the amount they want to take away from the District. Mr. Burt agreed they would have to figure out what is a compromised position. He talked about the large amount of money they have been paying to subsidize the rest of the District. A number of owners think it is somewhat unfair that after all these years they have been paying for things they really don't benefit from. Mr. Burt said he would like be able to go to their people and say they have redressed this to some extent and that their money is now staying in their area and they do have use of all the other facilities. It would be a win to present that as opposed to the alternative that they have been exploring in the past of succession. Director Maulik reiterated even if they don't drive 13 miles to use facilities or however many less miles to access parks and trails, we still need those tax dollars to help fund the rest of the amenities that they do have access to as part of our government. She asked how much, dollar wise, are they saying their park needs to take to reach their goals. Mr. Burt said they think the number, including the operating expenses and some share of capital expense, would be approximately 75% of the tax dollars they pay. Director Shangraw mentioned most of the District pays double the taxes they pay and there are many neighborhoods in the District that don't see a dollar for dollar return on their taxes; some of them are closer to the facilities, some of them aren't. It's a big district and we have tried to centrally locate facilities. She said it's important to note that there are other neighborhoods in the same situation that pay for amenities that they may not have in their neighborhood.

Director Nunes expressed she is worried about all of Sixth Avenue, not just Mesa View. Debbie Zucker offered the Sixth Avenue West and the Sixth Avenue Estates people are very intermingled. It would be nice to put in a nice playground; they don't care if everybody else uses it.

Director Nunes asked if we can get to a point where we can create a sub-district. Mr. Burt replied a sub-district may be a component of this. They are open to solutions where they see the utility of being able to add extra revenue dollars that would then be basically tax deductible for their members. Director Maulik asked what about tax loss and home values dropping, are they prepared to carry that area when the treasurer is not collecting taxes and their bankroll is going to diminish, because that's what the District does as a whole. Mr. Burt said they have the benefit of HOA dues; every lot owner pays the same amount and they have a fairly low foreclosure rate. They would not be reliant strictly on tax dollars for funding. Mr. Burt said they are very well funded and don't have the problem of lack of funds. He referred to Turtle Park as the baseline for the kind of maintenance they would put into the park.

Director Maulik expressed concern about setting precedence. Director Sutton replied the mistake here was made years and years ago. He is trying to see if there is some sort of win/win approach that is going to satisfy both sides. Director Sutton maintained he is personally not worried about the precedence issue; Foothills set a terrible precedence in the past and it's a matter of overcoming that. Director Shangraw expressed concern because it is just one portion of that whole area; is it a cascading event - neighborhood after neighborhood. She said we need to look at impacts and equity. Mr. Burt suggested the District would have extreme warning signs if any other area had the same level of dissatisfaction.

Director Shangraw asked if they have done any surveying of their membership and is it possible before we go any further to do a joint survey. Mr. Burt said they have done surveys in the past, and recalled some of those results and levels of response. There was discussion about polling; Director Shangraw said she would like to get a realistic view of what is going on. She added that neighborhoods change; what happens if different people who move in have a different view of how they would like to have things managed. Is there a way to undo it 20 or 30 years down the road. Mr. Burt suggested that could be built into the agreement; but doubtful that would happen. The residents already think the HOA owns it; the HOA gets the complaints and questions.

Director Nunes asked if they are looking to get out of paying any money to Foothills. Mr. Burt replied no, they want to come to an equitable number.

Director Sutton said the HOA has their annual meeting in November this year and it is their kick-off point for succession. He suggested we need to decide before then; they need some positive indication of where this Board is going. Director Nunes recognized that these meetings are the positive indication. For the Board to make a decision, we need to know which one of these options they want. Mr. Burt suggested deferring to the lawyers on both sides to see what is the easiest to implement; but thought a lease might be the easier approach.

Mr. Rufien proposed the issue of ownership like control is one that can be discussed, if not tackled, here tonight as to whether the Board is amenable to that. The Mesa View group wants autonomy as far as control and if there are limitations on that which this Board knows it has right now, they should be discussed. Director Shangraw observed we did discuss public access. Mr. Rufien continued we could make a decision on sale versus lease. The other contractual arrangement discussed was a management agreement. Any type of management agreement provisions can become part of a lease. He said the options in Mr. Hopp's letter were a lease of the whole contrasted with a lease of a partial that could be discussed tonight. We at least need to make some headway as to the proposal's general philosophical concerns. Mr. Rufien reminded the Board there are timing concerns for the Mesa View folks, and if we don't make steady progress from here on out, those timing concerns are not going to be met.

Referring to talk about Mesa View putting in a new pool, Director Shangraw asked if we could require public process such as what the District would do. Mr. Rufien said we can ask for whatever we want and they will respond however they want; it can become a negotiating point or a breaking point. Director Sutton suggested they are under the same public guise as Foothills, but on a smaller scale.

Regarding a sub-district, Mr. Rufien said Mesa View would be governed by this Board and subject to this District's policies. The sub-district nature of it really is a financing mechanism. He suggested a sub-district is probably the strongest point of agreement between the two entities; and talked about a lease and tax dollar issue being worked out. Director Nunes observed we are talking about a sub-district and lease combined; different than the Kipling Villas sub-district. Mr. Hopp explained the Kipling Villas sub-lease process; there is no lease. Mr. Rufien further explained that process.

Director Nunes reiterated this is not just Mesa View's park at this moment, the whole Sixth Avenue area would consider it their park. Do we have to go through a public process with that whole area? Mr. Rufien said it would be a policy consideration. It is typical for this District to involve the neighbors in things that affect the neighborhood. One of the things this Board will have to consider is "what is the neighborhood". He reiterated we are dealing with a contractual arrangement not unlike Rocky Mountain Roller Hockey. Director Nunes feels we need to talk with everybody in the Sixth Avenue area because it is a park that was deeded to Foothills and is a public park. If we make a deal, it could possibly go from a public park to a private entity. Mr. Hopp added that in a lease or management agreement with Foothills being owners of the property, we would have to be involved if there were an improvement that required planning and zoning approval from the County. Mr. Rufien agreed and said details of the agreement would spell out what that role would be or leave it subject to discretion of this Board at the time.

Concerning the duration of an agreement, Mr. Rufien suggested Mesa View would be interested in something that exceeded the 100 year length of a term. If the Board has opinions as to duration of a lease, that's something Mesa View would like to hear now.

Director Maulik indicated she is not opposed to a long term lease if they are taking care of the area, contributing their part to the cost of maintenance, keeping the residents happy, and following the governmental process. There could be a clause that says if they fail to do these things it would revert back to the District.

In reference to the amount of tax revenue to convey, Mr. Hopp elaborated on the letter he sent to Mesa View. He believes it would be reasonable to assume that we could convey the current amount of money we are spending to maintain the park at the current service levels. Director Sutton asked about any monies passed to Mesa View, would they not have to be spent on the management and maintenance of the park so it's 100%, and what would be the mechanism assuring that happens. Mr. Rufien said it would be a contractual requirement for whatever the number and limitations, compliance would be the ultimate enforcement mechanism. Monitoring that would be transparency on behalf of Mesa View as far as their books, whether they produce an audit or whether the District inspects whenever it wants to. Concerning Director Sutton's comment, Mr. Rufien clarified the 100% of the money spent is different than the monies Mr. Hopp was characterizing as far as 100% of what is spent there now. Director Sutton suggested we would have to agree on how much money that is coming in from Mesa View would be returned to them in order to maintain and manage that park. He brought up the question about public process. His answer is to restrict it to Mesa View and give full access to members outside. Regarding an adequate number, Mr. Burt suggested the current maintenance amount and future capital expenditures in the plan to upgrade the park. Director Maulik pointed out we get a lot of that through grants. Director Sutton said Foothills has never applied for money like that in the Sixth Avenue area.

In attendance was Pat Scott who communicated that she lives on the eastern edge of Sixth Avenue West. She cherishes the open space and appreciates the comments about having a broader community discussion. Her neighborhood's major concern would be about their pool and tennis courts; they are a great value to their neighborhood. She has heard rumblings for years that Mesa View wants to build a pool. If there were a second pool in the area, she would be concerned about it undermining what is already a very tenuous financial base for the existing pool. Ms. Scott agrees the precedence issue would be important.

Director Shangraw acknowledged there are issues on our list that we need to address. We are struggling with where we get the funding to do that; we fund only 1% of all the capital projects per year. Discussion continued about improvements and equity between the areas.

Director Nunes voiced that personally, she would be in favor of a sub-district without the lease; as with Kipling Villas. She added Mesa View would have the ability, just like Kipling Villas, to meet with Mr. Insley's group and express their needs with the park. Director Shangraw pointed out that happened with Kipling Villas because they increased their mill levy. To clarify, Director Sutton said these folks are suggesting that they are already paying into the tax base. The money they are talking about is just that money being paid by the Mesa View residents; we are not talking about additional monies at this time. Mr. Burt said that is insufficient and if there is not an ownership level of control associated with it, they will pursue the succession.

Director Maulik indicated she would consider giving them the current dollars we spend to maintain the park plus 10%. Anything above and beyond that, they would need to raise through their sub-district for improvements.

Director Shangraw offered with the sub-district, she could be talked into a lease. She can see allocating the amount that we currently spend, but is not in favor of an additional 10%.

Director Sutton said he is for a lease and could be talked into a sub-district. He knows a win/win has got to be a lot more than the nominal dollars that are spent there to maintain the park today, because maintaining the park as it is today is unsatisfactory.

In terms of the number, Mr. Burt said they pegged \$90,000 per year. Director Shangraw said she can see doing the current maintenance amount and having a priority list that if we were to get capital funds, those monies could be allocated also. It has to be equitable district-wide and has to be the priority list that we already have. She doesn't think it's a dollar amount per year, but priority in terms of the rest of the District.

Director Maulik pointed out that Director Frankland is not here to give his opinion. Mr. Hopp said Director Frankland had requested no formal decision be made. Director Sutton indicated Mr. Hopp needed direction and does not think the Board has given him much direction.

Mr. Hopp summarized we are generally not very far off from the letter he sent back in relation to control of funds and the future increases. There is some dialogue to possibly conveying what we are currently spending. Director Sutton said what doesn't work about that is that we are inadequately maintaining that park and those lesser dollars are not going to be sufficient. Mr. Hopp expressed it is consistent with the rest of the District.

Director Nunes maintained she cannot move forward without a public process, it is a public park. Discussion continued about the situation, present and past, and getting public opinion of the entire Sixth Avenue area.

Moving forward, Mr. Hopp advised we need to have some more concrete steps and thoughts in order to respond. Mesa View wants control of funds; he believes he adequately conveyed where he felt like the Board could be supportive of that. Director Shangraw emphasized she doesn't want to be forced into a deal because of a timeframe that we didn't set, and wants to make sure we do this properly. Ms. Kessler suggested the problem in going forward at this point even to get public opinion from all of the Sixth Avenue area is they don't have any facts to give them. She apologized for the time crunch and added this has been on their agenda for seven years.

Director Shangraw suggested Mesa View come back with a proposal they think would work for the Board and the entire District. Director Sutton proposed what we're talking about is contracting with a local neighborhood organization to manage and maintain the park. Director Nunes indicated what she heard is not just going to be the maintenance part. In the previous meeting the discussion was perhaps a recreation center, perhaps a pool, ballfield, etc. Director Nunes' concern is we're talking about more than just maintenance.

Director Nunes asked Mesa View to come up with a proposal for the Board, exactly how they would like to see it, for the next Board meeting. It was acknowledged their November deadline will not be met unless we consummate a deal tonight. All agreed to bring the discussion to a close, and Mesa View draw up another proposal to discuss at the next Board meeting.

Mr. Rufien asked the Foothills Board what they are looking for other than a dollar amount. He asked if the attorney's need to start documents to start framing at least the captions of what provisions might be contained in a lease. Does the Board want to take that step, understanding they are paying him to do so. Director Shangraw said she is not because we are not in a place where we agree conceptually of how it would look in the big picture. Director Sutton clarified the Foothills Board would want to know if it is going to be a lease or a sub-district, and the dollar amount. Mr. Hopp reiterated the sub-district does not give them control, it's a financing mechanism. Mr. Rufien added that with a sub-district, whatever is approved by the ballot issue must be done, the control is given to the voters. Director Nunes concluded what the Board needs from Mesa View is dollars and cents, what they see the control as; write a proposal and we'll go from there.

B. 2010 Budget Estimates

Mr. Hopp discussed in accordance with Colorado Revised Statutes 29-1-105 and 106, we are required to submit budget estimates to the Board. He said our 2010 budget highlights show our total estimated revenue is \$21,162,024 and total estimated expenditures are \$21,162,024.

Citing some things that are going on around us, Mr. Hopp read that in Aurora, 22 positions will be cut from parks, recreation, and open space; three swimming pools will no longer be open; the pool at the former Fitzsimmons Army Base will remain closed; and the Village Green and Pheasant Run pools will not be back next year. Citing from the City of Denver, Mr. Hopp read work to transition four recreation centers that serve very few residents to organizations who can offer more valued services to the community is underway, they are talking about privatizing to boys and girls clubs or other entities. City-wide reduced equipment replacement, professional services, supplies and miscellaneous expenses have been cut. Moving toward more shared services where-in functions such as accounting, payroll, human resources, and technology services will be relocated into centralized offices. No wage increase for almost all employees, five scheduled furlough days, etc. Mr. Hopp indicated that last year at this time, these were some of the statements that he was making; reminding the Board of some of those decisions with the 2009 proposed budget.

Mr. Hopp indicated that this year we don't have those types of announcements. A lot of that was because of the tone that we set and the culture we have instilled in our organization on developing efficiencies, enhancing our revenues, and generally being good stewards of tax dollars. He provided the Board a PowerPoint presentation of all of the numbers within the budget. This is a draft budget, we anticipate things will change between now and the final budget, and would incorporate the Board's thoughts as well. Mr. Hopp observed with this new culture of efficiency, we feel we have a very good draft presentation. He thanked everyone for working hard on the budget and explained some new formats that were developed; and especially thanked the finance department and Patricia Parkin.

Copies of the PowerPoint presentation were provided to the Board. Hitting some highlights, Mr. Hopp said the budget, at this point in time, includes a 3% increase for all employees, and includes a benchmarking adjustment that we will be proposing later this year. This budget absorbs health insurance increases, approximately 4.5%. It includes \$100,000 for capital equipment which is the same as last year, and \$285,005 for capital repairs. Mr. Hopp discussed a facility surcharge that the District started charging in 1983. Ever since that time, it has been put into the budget as a balancing measure. This year we are breaking the facility surcharge out of the general admissions and will apply those to capital repairs and try to devote those to facilities.

In response to the 3% increase and the District absorbing the 4.5% insurance increase for employees, Director Shangraw believes it is absolutely fair because in the past few years our employees have gotten no increases. She emphasized this is a small step in correcting that. Ms. Parkin explained some changes in the insurance plan that were made which enabled us to save 5%.

Mr. Hopp continued the budget includes \$500,000 for debt reserve. The budget does not anticipate any facility closures at this point in time. Property taxes have gone down and specific ownership taxes have gone down slightly. We have had an approximate \$188,000 increase in admission fees, most of those in children's programming and athletics. We are anticipating about a \$143,000 decrease in rentals; most of that attributable to rentals at the Edge Ice Arena. The facility surcharge fee was moved from admission to capital repairs and the revenues (for example, golf) actually went down because we are not raising fees and we are moving the surcharge fee to a different line item and not attributing it as revenue. For expenditures, we allowed a 4% increase in supplies and overall we have only experienced a 2.6% increase; staff continue to be efficient minded. Purchased services decreased by \$110,000, and utilities decreased by \$172,000 from budget year 2009 to budget year 2010.

Mr. Hopp pointed out that for greater accuracy in all the cost centers, we have removed all debt associated for each department and put it in its own cost center, with the exception of golf revenue bond and golf equipment lease purchases. He summarized the 2010 proposed budget operational revenues and expenses by department. Mr. Hopp noted we have been successful in reducing the administrative costs; that reduction will show in the individual departmental slides. He showed items we are not addressing in the 2010 proposed budget; \$1.8 million in capital repair and \$900,000 in capital equipment replacement. Next he summarized a Long Term Debt Yearly Payments Analysis, and provided operational revenues and expenses information for each departmental area, including explanation of what is being subsidized.

Mr. Hopp concluded the presentation with a reconciliation of property tax and government revenues, total subsidies, annual debt payments, and other expenditures providing a zero budget. He emphasized we have far exceeded the statutory requirements. The two Board meetings in November will be dedicated to presentations from the four departments with greater detail. The final budget approval will be December 8, 2009.

Talking about the change in field rental allocation, Mr. Hopp said Athletics will continue to administer the field rental process and 10% of the revenues from field rental and athletic facility fee usage will be attributed to Athletics; 90% of that revenue will go to Parks as a revenue line item. He proposed it will more accurately reflect actual costs and revenues associated with those cost centers. With shelter rentals, 30% will be attributed to Athletics and 70% to Parks.

October 13, 2009

Page 8

There was discussion about subsidizing for the user groups; Mr. Hopp said it will be part of the presentations but we are very close if not at 100%. Ms. Butler indicated we are recouping between 90% and 100%.

Director Shangraw asked that as we do the budget presentations, is it possible to show how we get where we need to be in the next couple of years. Mr. Hopp agreed and mentioned the forecasting model we have been utilizing; as we anticipate specific changes we update that model.

Mr. Rufien updated the Board that our new wards system has been filed with the courts and needs to get signed. Mr. Hopp would like to wait for that before beginning board candidate workshops. He mentioned there is someone who has stated he would definitely be running for the Board, and would be representing what is now considered ward four.

Concerning the capital repairs list, Director Maulik suggested looking at each area of the District to come up with their highest priority. Mr. Hopp agreed and said we came to the Board with the list of projects and the money needed to spend on which project, we would be willing to hear that input from the Board. Director Maulik suggested putting the subdivision name with the project to identify where it is; Mr. Hopp agreed that can be done.

XI. ADJOURNMENT:

The regular meeting was adjourned at 8:11pm. The next Board meeting will be held at 6pm on Tuesday, October 27, 2009, at The Peak Community and Wellness Center, 6612 South Ward Street, Littleton.

Submitted by:

Richelle Riley, Recording Secretary