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Memorandum

To: Mayor & Council
From: David Reynolds, Paul Smith, Lauren Prentice
Re: Agenda Item: Adoption of the Wildland-Urban Interface Code
Date: 03/21/23

Purpose:

The purpose of this agenda item is to review and discuss the possible adoption of the 2021 Wildland Urban Interface Code (WUI Code). In discussions with Colorado River Fire Rescue (CRFR), town staff has been working to understand threat levels that might be associated with New Castle development, both existing and future, as it relates to our proximity to wildfire risk.

The International Code Council (ICC) has developed the WUI Code in order to assist towns in understanding area risk levels, determining area building code standards, assigning fire resistant building material classifications, and addressing defensible space including vegetation and secondary structures. With the help of CRFR, staff has developed a proposal for adoption of the WUI Code with appropriate modifications specific for the Town of New Castle.

Staff will present the WUI Code with modifications in order to share our understanding of the code and gain feedback from Town Council in order to properly adopt this code for the residents of New Castle.
AN ORDINANCE OF THE NEW CASTLE TOWN COUNCIL ADDING CHAPTER 15.25 TO THE NEW CASTLE MUNICIPAL CODE FOR THE ADOPTION OF THE 2021 EDITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL WILDAND URBAN INTERFACE CODE WITH AMENDMENTS.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Article IV of the Charter of the Town of New Castle (“Town”) and C.R.S. § 31-16-202, the Town is authorized to adopt codes by reference; and

WHEREAS, the Town has previously adopted by reference the 2015 editions of the International Building Code, the International Residential Code, the International Mechanical Code, the International Fuel Gas Code, the International Plumbing Code, the International Existing Building Code, and the International Fire Code (collectively, the “ICodes”);

WHEREAS, the ICodes serve as the building codes for the Town as set forth in Title 15 of the New Castle Municipal Code (“Town Code”),

WHEREAS, Colorado River Fire Rescue (“CRFR”) has recommended that the Town adopt regulations to protect from potential wildfire impacts within Town limits by requiring improved fire resistance of new buildings and provisions for vegetative fuel management; and

WHEREAS, other neighboring municipalities with high exposure to wildland fire risk have adopted similar ordinances meant to improve resilience and safety during a wildfire event; and

WHEREAS, to be consistent with these communities and promote the health, safety, and welfare of Town residents, the Town Building Official has recommended that the Town adopt the 2021 version of the International Wildland Urban Interface Code (“WUI Code”); and

WHEREAS, Town staff has reviewed the WUI Code in light of the Town’s unique physical setting and development needs and determined that the amendments set forth herein will ensure efficient administration and enforcement; and

WHEREAS, on ********, Town Council (“Council”) conducted a public workshop to discuss the merits and practicality of such adoption; and

WHEREAS, on ********, Council conducted a duly notice public hearing regarding the adoption of the updated editions of the International Codes pursuant to C.R.S. § 31-16-203; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF NEW CASTLE, COLORADO AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Recitals. The foregoing Recitals are incorporated as findings of the Town Council.

Section 3. Code Amendments to Town Code Chapter 15.25. New section Chapter 15.25 of the Town Code include the following amendments to the WUI Code. Appendices A through H will not be mandatory but may serve to inform risk assessments and vegetation management planning. Those sections of the WUI Code not expressly amended in this Ordinance shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect. All title pages and tables of contents shall be updated accordingly.

Chapter 15.25 – International Wildland Urban Interface Code

15.25.010 Adoption by reference.

Pursuant to the power and authority conferred by the Town Charter and C.R.S. § 31-16-201 et seq., there is adopted by reference thereto the International Wildland Urban Interface Code, 2021 Edition, promulgated by the International Code Council, Inc., 4051 Flossmoor Road, Country Club Hills, Illinois 60478. The purpose and subject matter of this code is to regulate and govern the safeguarding of life and property from conditions hazardous to life or property in the occupancy of buildings and premises in the Town and provide for the issuance of permits and collection of fees therefor.


The International Wildland Urban Interface Code, 2021 Edition, is hereby amended as follows:

Section 101.1 Insert: “Town of New Castle”

Section 102.4 is hereby amended to read as follows:

102.4 Referenced codes and standards. The codes and standards referenced in this code shall be those that are listed in Chapter 7 and such codes and standards shall be considered as part of the requirements of this code to the prescribed extents of each reference and as further regulated in Sections 102.4.1. and 102.4.2. References to the 2021 editions of the International Building Code and the International Fire Code will be replaced with the currently adopted 2015 editions.

Section 103.1 Insert: “The Town of New Castle Building Department”

Sections 104.3 through 104.3.1 is hereby deleted. Section 15.04.030 of the Municipal Code shall control.

Subsection 106.3 #2 is hereby repealed. Chapter 15.48 of the Municipal Code shall control.
Chapter 3 is hereby repealed and replaced by the following text:

**Chapter 3: Wildland-Urban Interface Area**

**Section 301.1** Studies provided by the Garfield County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (2022, see Exhibit **) demonstrate that all lands within Town boundaries and all lands within the proposed Urban Growth Boundary as represented in the New Castle Comprehensive Plan (Exhibit **) are subject to wildland fire potential that poses hazards to human life, safety, and property. CRFR therefore deems the entirety of these lands to lie within the Wildland-Urban Interface Area as defined in WUI Code Chapter 2 and thereby subject to the mitigation provisions of this Chapter. Council, in consultation with the staff, CRFR, and any other outside referral agencies, may reevaluate and recommend modification to the wildland-urban interface area as necessary.

Chapter 4 is hereby repealed and replaced by the following text:

**Chapter 4: Wildland-Urban Interface Area Requirements**

**Section 401.1** As part of the wildland-urban interface area, all new land use applications submitted to the municipality, including but not limited to annexations, master plans, planned urban developments (“PUDs”), subdivisions, rezoning, PUD or master plan amendments, or any other land use proposals considered by the Building Official to be at risk to wildland fire impact, shall be subject to review and comment by CRFR.

**Section 402.1** Applications subject to CRFR review will be evaluated for wildfire hazard posed to persons and/or property as well as mitigation measures considered with the proposals. CRFR will be asked to evaluate the site plan for planned or existing roads, water supply facilities, configuration and location of lots, topography of the site, types and density of vegetation or other fuels present, the fire protection measures proposed by the applicant, and any other relevant factors in making its recommendation.

**Section 403.1** If CRFR finds that wildfire hazards exist to persons and property as a result of the proposed land use, CRFR is requested to recommend mitigation techniques to be incorporated by the Town into the land use application approval, including but not limited to additional access for emergency vehicles, turnouts, establishment of adequate grades and sight distances, the establishment of fuel breaks, location of proposed vegetation, and any mitigation measures for current vegetation.

**Section 404.1** The Town will consider the recommendations of CRFR and incorporate them into any final land use approval that is determined to be appropriate.

Section 502 and Table 502.1 is hereby repealed.

Section 503.1 is hereby repealed and replaced by the following text:

**503.1 General.** Buildings and structures hereafter constructed, modified, or relocated into
or within wildland-urban interface areas shall meet the construction requirements for Class 1 ignition-resistant construction in Section 504. Materials required to be ignition-resistant shall comply with the requirements of Section 503.2.

Subsection 503.2 #1.1 is hereby repealed and replaced by the following text:

1.1 Flame Spread. Materials shall exhibit a flame spread index not exceeding 75 (Class B). However, in no instance shall materials be excluded from structures which exhibit a lower flame spread index of 25 or less (Class A).

Section 504 shall be amended to include the following exception in all instances were compliance with Section 2303.2 of the International Building Code is listed as an approved method for fire resistant construction:

**Exception:** Materials exhibiting a flame spread index not exceeding 75 (Class B). However, in no instance shall building materials be excluded from structures which exhibit a lower flame spread index of 25 or less (Class A).

Section 504.10 is hereby repealed and replaced by the following text:

**504.10 Vents.** Attic ventilation openings, foundation or underfloor vents, or other ventilation openings in vertical exterior walls and vents through roofs shall not exceed 144 square inches (0.0929 m²) each. Such vents shall be covered with noncombustible corrosion-resistant mesh with openings not to exceed a minimum of 1/16-inch and a maximum of 1/8-inch.

**Exception:** Openings size is not limited where approved rated vents are installed.

Subsection 504.10.1 is hereby amended to include the following exception:

**Exception:** Attic ventilation may be permitted in soffits if vents are listed with an approved testing agency in compliance with ASTM E2886.

Section 505 is hereby repealed.

Section 506 is hereby repealed.

Section 602 is hereby repealed.

Section 603.2 and Table 603.2 are hereby repealed and replaced by the following text:

**603.2 Fuel Modification.** The fuel modification distance shall not exceed 30 feet or the distance to the lot line, whichever is less. The distance shall be measured on a horizontal plane from the perimeter or projection of the building or structure as shown in Figure 603.2. The fuel modification distance may be modified at the discretion of the Building Official if it is found that conditions on the site exist such that the required distance is impracticable.
Section 604.1 is hereby amended to include the following exception:

**Exception:** The Building Official or a designated representative may allow vegetative clustering or the densification of certain species only if such species are listed on the FireWise Plant List provided by Colorado State University or other equivalent list. For purposes of this code, a cluster is any grouping of shrubs, bushes or trees whose stems or trunks occupy no more than fifty (50) square feet (e.g. 8 foot diameter circle). Each vegetative cluster must maintain the required separation between other clusters or vegetation as provided by this Chapter.

Section 604.4 is hereby repealed and replaced by the following text:

**604.4 Trees.** Tree crowns extending to within 10 feet of any structure shall be pruned to maintain a minimum horizontal clearance of 10 feet. Tree crowns within the fuel modification distance shall be pruned to remove limbs up to a minimum of 4 feet above the adjacent ground surface.

**Exception:** For newly planted trees, pruning of limbs above the ground surface shall not be required to exceed a pruning height to tree height ratio of 1:6. However, at no time shall any tree limbs be any lower than one (1) foot above the adjacent ground surface.

Section 4. **Severability.** Each section of this Ordinance is an independent section and a holding of any section or part thereof to be unconstitutional, void, or ineffective for any cause shall not be deemed to affect the validity or constitutionality of any other section or part thereof.

Section 5. **Effective Date.** This Ordinance shall be effective fourteen days after final publication pursuant to section 4.3 of the Town Charter.

INTRODUCED on ************, at which time copies were available to the Council and to those persons in attendance at the meeting, read by title, passed on first reading, and ordered published in full and posted in at least two public places within the Town as required by the Charter.

INTRODUCED a second time at a regular meeting of the Council of the Town of New Castle, Colorado on ************, read by title and number, passed with amendments, approved, ordered, and published as required by the Town Charter.

TOWN OF NEW CASTLE, COLORADO
TOWN COUNCIL

By: ______________________________
Art Riddile, Mayor

ATTEST:
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exterior deck is frequently on the downslope side of a building which presents the potential for heat and embers to attack the underside of the deck, similar to the concerns in Section 504.6 with underfloor areas. This section requires that the attached projection be protected by constructing with one of the following construction options:

1. Construction with a 1-hour fire-resistance rating.
2. Heavy timber construction (see the commentary in Chapter 2 to the definition of heavy timber construction).
3. Approved noncombustible materials.
4. Fire-retardant-treated wood (see Commentary Figure 504.7).
5. Ignition-resistant building materials. However, coated materials cannot be used as the walking surface of decks.

504.7 Underfloor areas. Where the attached structure is located and constructed so that the structure or any portion thereof projects over a descending slope surface greater than 10 percent, the area below the structure shall have underfloor areas enclosed to within 6 inches (152 mm) of the ground, with exterior wall construction in accordance with Section 504.5.

✦ This section deals with the same decks and projections that Section 504.7 addresses. This section adds another requirement that when the deck or projection extends over the downslope side of the building and the slope exceeds 10 percent, then the area below the projection must be protected with materials allowed for exterior walls. This section does not require that the area is protected to the ground; it allows a 6-inch gap between the bottom of the exterior protection and the ground surface. This gap is intended to address several concerns. Since it is not fully enclosed, it does not become a habitable area. Additionally, since this area is commonly below a deck, it allows for water to penetrate the gaps between the decking materials and drain down the slope rather than becoming trapped. See Commentary Figure 504.7.1.

504.8 Exterior glazing. Exterior windows, window walls and glazed doors, windows within exterior doors, and skylights shall be tempered glass, multilayered glazed panels, glass block or have a fire protection rating of not less than 20 minutes.

✦ Windows create openings in the exterior walls. Radiant heat can pass through glass and ignite combustibles inside buildings. This section requires that the glazing in windows and skylights be tempered glass, multilayered glazed panels or glass block. Although it is not a requirement, glazing with a fire-protection rating of 20 minutes or more is also acceptable.

504.9 Exterior doors. Exterior doors shall be approved noncombustible construction, solid core wood not less than 1\(\frac{1}{4}\) inches thick (44 mm), or have a fire protection rating of not less than 20 minutes. Windows within doors and glazed doors shall be in accordance with Section 504.8.

Exception: Vehicle access doors.

✦ Exterior walls are required to be ignition resistant by Section 504.5. Following the desire to create a protective exterior envelope, the doors in those exterior walls must also be protected. This section only addresses doors in the exterior walls and states that the door must be noncombustible, minimum 1\(\frac{1}{4}\)-inch thick solid oak with a fire-protection rating of 20 minutes. Any of these options would protect the door opening.

The exception allows vehicle access doors (e.g., garage doors) not to meet this requirement. This exception does not apply to the door between the garage and a dwelling. That door must still be protected according to Section R302.5.1 in the IBC.

504.10 Vents. Attic ventilation openings, foundation floor vents, or other ventilation openings in vertical walls and vents through roofs shall not exceed 14 inches (0.0929 m²) each. Such vents shall be covered with noncombustible corrosion-resistant mesh with openings not exceed 1\(\frac{1}{4}\) inch (6.4 mm), or shall be designed and app to prevent flame or ember penetration into the structure.

✦ It has become evident through fire investigations and structures lost in wildland fires are often the result of ember attacks entering concealed spaces. Ventilation openings are required in buildings to allow moisture and condensation to escape. Eliminate ventilation openings would lead to mold and other problems. Ventilation openings must be provided, but the size that they are designed to prevent entry of embers.

This section requires the use of 1\(\frac{1}{4}\)-inch mesh, installation of other approved designs. To evaluate other designs, a test standard has been developed by ASTM E2886, Standard Test Method for Evaluating the Ability of Exterior Vents to Resist the Embers and Direct Flame Impingement. While this standard is not specifically referenced in the code, it may be used for guidance or as a nationally recognized standard under Section 104.4. See Commentary Figures 504.10(1), 504.10(2) and 504.10(3).
The fuel modification distances increase as the fire hazard severity increases, with a minimum distance of 30 feet. In all situations, the fuel modification is based on the requirements in Table 603.2 or the distance to the property line, whichever is less. For example, the size of the property may not allow a fuel modification distance of 100 feet when located in an extreme fire hazard area. The property owner only has control over his or her individual property to protect his or her own structure. See Commentary Figure 603.2.

The effect of slope on the intensity of the fire is the reason that the downslope side of structure is naturally the most vulnerable exposure. For this reason, Note a in Table 603.2 and the last sentence in Section 603.2 state that the fuel modification can be increased by the code official. It may be that the downslope side of the structure in a high hazard area should be increased beyond 50 feet because on that downslope side, the fire is coming up a canyon. The canyon presents a higher-risk fire behavior than rolling hills.

### Table 603.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WILDLAND-URBAN INTERFACE AREA</th>
<th>FUEL MODIFICATION DISTANCE (feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderate hazard</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High hazard</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme hazard</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For SI: 1 foot = 304.8 mm.

- **a.** Distances allowed to be increased due to site-specific analysis based on local conditions and the fire protection plan.

### Commentary Figure 603.2
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2021 INTERNATIONAL WILDLAND-URBAN INTERFACE CODE® and COMMENTARY
FIRE PROTECTION REQUIREMENTS

A common practice in many areas is to rake the pine needles, or pine straw, together and use them as a type of mulch or placed around the trunk of a tree or along the exterior wall of the building. This practice is not in concert with creating a defensible space. Pine needles will carry a fire to the structure. Many structures have been ignited simply by a cigarette discarded into this pine straw. The pine straw smolders and ignites, then ignites the structure itself. In a wildland fire situation, an ember can land in the pine straw and smolder even after the fire has passed, later igniting and consuming the structure. See Comment Figure 602.3.2.

3. Fireweed.
5. Camassia.
7. Tamarisk.
8. San Diego Sunflower.

These hardy plants are full of color and resistant to ignition. Several of these plants will survive the fire as it passes through, such as manzanita and yucca. Some of the plants that grow in burnt-out areas after a fire, in fact, that is how fireweed gets its name. Fire-resistant plants do not grow back immediately since they do not add to the vegetative fire load. These plants can also be used to provide safe vegetation within the defensible space. Additional species can be found on the Cal Fire website at https://www.readyforwildfire.org/prepare-for-wildfire/get-ready/fire-resistant-landscaping/ and Fire-resistant Plants for Home Landscapes—Selecting Plants That May Reduce Your Risk from Wildfire published by the Oregon State University.

It is important to understand that "fire-resistant" does not mean "fireproof." Even fire-resistant plants will burn if not well maintained. All vegetation and landscape must be kept healthy with adequate water and proper pruning.

604.1 Responsibility. Persons owning, leasing, controlling, operating or maintaining buildings or structures are responsi-

604.2 Modified area. Nonfire-resistant vegetation or growth shall be kept clear of buildings or structures, in accordance with Section 605, in such a manner as to provide a clear area for fire suppression operations.

Vegetation within the defensible space must be maintained. This is the routine action of trimming shrubs, removing dead branches or plants, mowing grasses, mowing the area, and keeping leaves, woody, and vol-

Similar to the requirement in Section 603.2.1 that the property owner or occupant of the property maintain the structure on his or her property, the property owner is also required to maintain the defensible space. The vegetation will continuously grow and needs mainte-

604.4 Trees. Tree crowns extending to within 10 feet (3000 mm) of any enclosure or over 10 feet (3048 mm). Tree crown within the defensible space shall be pruned to remove limbs less than 6 feet (1829 mm) above the ground surface adjacent to the trees.

Trees within the defensible space must be maintained. Section 603.2.2 requires a distance of 10 feet with tree crowns and tree trunks and structures. The separation between trees must be maintained for the life of the building. In addition to maintaining separation dis-

605.1 General. Chimneys serving fireplaces, barbecues, incinera-

1. California Lilac.
2. Columbia Lily.

605.4.1 Chimney clearance. Portions of tree crowns that extend to within 10 feet (3048 mm) of the outlet of a chimney shall be pruned to maintain a minimum horizontal clearance of 10 feet (3048 mm).

Tree crowns are required to be separated from structures by at least 10 feet. The intent of that separation is to protect the structure from tree fire, which is caused by tree crowns coming in contact with the chimney, and by tree branches from the chimney settling on a tree branch and igniting the tree. This separation is required in addition to the requirement in Section 605.1 for a spark arrester on the chimney outlet. See Comment Figure 604.4.1.

SPARK ARRESTER

MINIMUM SPARK ARRESTER DIAMETER

MINIMUM 6 IN.

MINIMUM 8 IN.

SPARK ARRESTER WITH OPENINGS OF 1.5 D IN.

PROVIDES 80% NET FREE AREA

MIN. 6.0 IN. 1/16,+ 0.05 SQ. FT. OF SURFACE AREA

AREA OF CHIMNEY OUTLET 1 51 SQ. FT.

NET FREE AREA IN SPARK ARRESTER MUST PROVIDE MINIMUM 20 SQ. FT.

Commentary Figure 605.2.1 SPARK ARRESTER
Memorandum

To: Mayor & Council

From: David Reynolds

Re: Agenda Item: Ordinance TC 2023-1 Dog Barking Ordinance

Date: 03/21/23

Purpose:

The purpose of this agenda item is to consider TC 2023-1 which makes adjustments to the Town’s Municipal Code Section 6.12.120 “Barking Dogs.”

During our regular meeting held on March 7, 2023, town staff reported concerns regarding our municipal code related to barking dogs. According to current Municipal Code, the enforcement of Barking Dog issues in New Castle relies on “two or more complaining witnesses from separate households who have signed such complaint ...” Staff has found that this section of code limits the response that our law enforcement officers may take when addressing issues of barking dogs. Having to rely on two or more complainants is not always a practical solution to addressing barking dog reports, and often leaves our Police Officers with very few enforcement options.

With the help of our Town Attorney, Council reviewed the history of this code section, and discussed possible updates that would lower the burden of needing two complainants in order to effectively address a barking dog nuisance. Staff was instructed to address the issue by returning to Council at a later meeting with an adjusted Municipal Code Section for Council consideration.
AN ORDINANCE OF THE NEW CASTLE TOWN COUNCIL AMENDING
SECTION 6.12.120 OF THE NEW CASTLE MUNICIPAL CODE.

WHEREAS, Section 6.12.120 of the New Castle Municipal Code (“Code”) prohibits any person within the Town of New Castle (the “Town”) from keeping or harboring any dog or other animal that, without provocation, by frequent, habitual or continued barking, yelping, howling or other audible sound causes an unreasonable disturbance to any person, and declares such harboring or keeping a public nuisance (the “Barking Dog Offense”); and

WHEREAS, enforcement of the Barking Dog Offense currently requires two or more complaining witnesses from separate households; and

WHEREAS, the Town finds that this requirement has had a chilling effect on complaints and enforcement of the Barking Dog Offense; and

WHEREAS, the Town Council now desires to amend Section 6.12.120 of the Code to remove the requirement of two or more complaining witnesses from separate households and instead implement a warning procedure as set forth below.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF NEW CASTLE, COLORADO:

1. Recitals. The foregoing recitals are incorporated by reference herein as findings and determinations of the Town Council.

2. Amendment. The Town Council hereby amends Section 6.12.120 of the Code as follows, with added language in bold and underlined and removed language stricken. Those provisions of the Municipal Code not expressly amended by this Ordinance shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

6.12.120 – Barking dogs.

B. No summons and complaint shall be issued unless there are two or more complaining witnesses from separate households who shall have signed such complaint, nor shall there be a conviction for violation of this section unless two or more complaining witnesses from separate households shall have testified at trial. Upon receipt of a complaint of an alleged violation of this Section, the Town shall issue a written warning citing this section and describing the nature of the alleged violation. Should the Town receive a second complaint for the same dog or animal, the following penalties shall be imposed, in order of escalation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Fine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second offense</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third offense</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth offense</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fifth offense: $____ [fine] [municipal court summons and compliant]

Complaints may be filed by any citizen of the Town or a code enforcement officer or police officer of the Town who has personally investigated the complaint of a single complainant, or multiple complainants from a single household, and or who has personally observed the problem behavior of the dog or other animal with regard to its frequent, habitual or continued barking, yelping or howling, shall satisfy the requirement for the second complaining witness and may sign the complaint and/or give testimony to such personal observation at trial. All complaints must be signed by the complainant or the investigating officer.

3. **Severability.** If any section, subsection, or clause of this Ordinance shall be deemed to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, the validity of the remaining sections, subsections, and clauses shall not be affected thereby.

4. **Effective Date.** This Ordinance shall be effective 14 days after final publication pursuant to Section 4.3 of the Town Charter.

INTRODUCED on March 21, 2023, at which time copies were available to the Town Council and to those persons in attendance at the meeting, read by title, passed on first reading, and ordered published in full and posted in at least two public places within the Town as required by the Charter.

INTRODUCED a second time at a regular meeting of the Town Council of the Town of New Castle, Colorado, on ____________, 2023, read by title and number, passed without amendment, approved, and ordered published as required by the Charter.

TOWN OF NEW CASTLE, COLORADO
TOWN COUNCIL

By: __________________________
Art Riddle, Mayor

ATTEST:

Melody Harrison, Town Clerk
To: Mayor & Council

From: David Reynolds

Re: Agenda Item: 2022 Capital Committee Report

Date: 03/21/23

Purpose:

The purpose of this agenda item is to review and discuss the 2023 Capital Committee findings and suggestions.

Since the beginning of 2023, the Capital Committee (consisting of Department Heads and two Council members) has met on two separate occasions, and has discussed the following items:

✓ Completed 2022 projects
✓ Status of any projects currently in progress
✓ Review of the total funding available for 2023 projects
✓ Review of long-term capital project funds
✓ Identification of 2023 available grants
✓ Identification of new projects to be added to the Capital Project List
✓ Prioritization of projects within the tiered project list
✓ Targeted 2023 projects with estimated costs and funding sources
✓ Review of the workload and staffing needs required to complete the 2023 projects
✓ Finale estimated balance of capital funds to be carried forward for future projects

During this agenda item Committee Members will present details of the items listed above and discuss any suggested updates that Council may have.
Town of New Castle

Whereas, In 1888 the Colorado Midland Railroad reached New Castle, affording mine owners the means to transport coal to market, and the Denver and Rio Grande Railroad continued tracks west toward Grand Junction; and

Whereas, Now, 135 years later the same train corridor still runs through town, immediately behind the businesses and homes on the south side of Main Street; and

Whereas, Approximately ___ trains per day pass through downtown New Castle, two Amtrak and the rest freight trains carrying variety of materials; and

Whereas, Recent railroad accidents across the country have raised awareness of the dangers such accidents impose; and

Whereas, just as with trucks and automobiles, speed can be a deciding factor in rail accidents; and

Whereas, residents of New Castle have regularly noted that fully-loaded freight trains pass through town at excessive speeds; and

Whereas, These speeds create a danger to animals, people and property;

Now Therefore, the Town Council of the Town of New Castle (as well as the councilors individually) do hereby request that the Garfield County Board of County Commissioners vigorously support the Town as it seeks enroll state and federal officials in a quest to improve rail safety through town.
New Castle Town Council Regular Meeting  
Tuesday, February 21, 2023, 7:00 PM

Virtual Meetings are subject to internet and technical capabilities.

To join by computer, smart phone or tablet click HERE

If you prefer to telephone in:
  Please call: 1-346-248-7799
  Meeting ID: 709 658 8400

Follow the prompts as directed. Be sure to set your phone to mute until called on.

The Council Packet is available HERE or by going to www.newcastlecolorado.org

Call to Order
Mayor A Riddile called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call
Present Councilor Mariscal
  Councilor Carey
  Councilor Hazelton
  Mayor A Riddile
  Councilor Leland
  Councilor G Riddile
Absent Councilor Copeland

Also present at the meeting were Town Administrator Dave Reynolds, Town Clerk Melody Byram, Town Treasurer Loni Burk, Assistant Town Treasurer Viktoriya Ehlers, Town Prosecutor Tim Graves and members of the public.

MOTION: Mayor A Riddile made a motion to approve Councilor Copeland’s absence. Councilor Mariscal seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Meeting Notice
Town Clerk Melody Byram verified that her office gave notice of the meeting in accordance with Resolution TC 2023-1.
Conflicts of Interest
There were no conflicts of interest.

Agenda Changes
Clerk Byram noted that the two executive sessions that had been on the agenda the week prior had been rescheduled for the March 7, 2023, meeting.

Citizen Comments on Items not on the Agenda
There were no citizen comments.

Consultant Reports
Consultant Attorney – not present.
Consultant Engineer – not present.

Items for Consideration

Presentation: Aviation Economic Growth - Evan Zislis, Aspen Institute
Town Administrator Dave Reynolds told the council that Evan Zislis worked for the Aspen Institute and had been working for several years to encourage the communities from Aspen to Parachute to work together for the common good. Recently, he said that Mr. Zislis was working for the Colorado River Valley Economic Development Partnership whose focus was from New Castle to Parachute on an economic development idea that was aviation based.
Mr. Evan Zislis greeted the council and said that he was grateful for the opportunity to share his idea with them. He described the work done by the Aspen Institute across the globe in economic development, health and medicine, technology, issues of social justice, energy, climate, the arts and more. He said the Institute worked with local officials, regional, national and international officials on the full range of human experience globally. He said he was not representing Aspen or Pitkin County, in fact his superiors were in Washington DC.
Mr. Zislis explained the vision of the Colorado River Valley Economic Development Partnership to grow and diversify the local economic base to create good paying and sustainable jobs for the valley’s workforce. The concept is to utilize the existing Garfield County Airport, local terrain, existing shops, hotels, restaurants, workforce and many other assets in order to build and grown an aviation base and create good paying and sustainable jobs for the workforce in the valley.
Mr. Zislis explained some of the areas in the concept which included professional rescuer training (US Military, wildland fire training and aviation fore training); tourism and civilian applications (“Air Sports” teams, pilot academy, aviation mechanic training); Equipment manufacturing & renewable propulsion research and development (light aviation manufacturing, safety equipment manufacturing, electric and green hydrogen research
and development); and long-term community development (base village neighborhoods, social services and transportation hubs). Mr. Zislis said that he will not be asking anyone for money because he planned to do the fundraising himself to bring an internationally renowned aviation consultation firm to do a feasibility study on the concept. He said that he expected the study would likely take a year.

Mr. Zislis asked the council if they would fill out a survey about the concept. The council agreed. The council asked Mr. Zislis to keep them informed as the project moved along and they also thanked Mr. Zislis for a great presentation.

**Discussion: Model Traffic Code Update and Moving Driving Under Restraint / Inoperable Vehicle Infractions to Municipal Court**

Clerk Byram introduced Town Prosecutor Tim Graves to the council. Mr. Graves greeted the council and thanked them for their time. Mr. Graves told the council that the town was currently using the 2010 Model Traffic Code (MTC), and every ten years the Department of Transportation updates the MTC. He said that adopting the newest version of the MTC was appropriate.

Mr. Graves also told the council that staff had been discussing adoption of two additional charges to the code that were not in the MTC, but did have analogous provisions in the statutes. He said the first was driving under restraint, which was exactly as it sounded: a person who was driving with a license, but a license that was restrained, revoked, suspended or otherwise invalid. He noted that those types of tickets were written into district court, and one of two things will happen. It will be dismissed because the DA’s office was too busy to handle such minor offenses or the offender will be given 60 to 90 days to obtain their license, and if they do the charge is dismissed or they are offered a lower plea. Mr. Graves said that the problem was that the cases were being dismissed at a very high rate and subsequently, the police were not writing the tickets so as to not waste everyone’s time. Mr. Graves said that if driving under restraint was moved into municipal court it gave the town some ability to help regulate the issue. He described how the issue was handled in other jurisdictions and how it would be handled in New Castle. He said also that the little bit revenue that the fines brought would somewhat offset the expense of the additional cases brought into court and the additional police activity. Mr. Graves said that ultimately, it will put New Castle in the position of knowing that the people driving on town streets were doing so legally.

Mr. Graves said that in regard to inoperable vehicles, he had been studying it and essentially there were two types of inoperable vehicles. Mechanically inoperable and unlicensed vehicles. Using the City of Rifle as an example of a jurisdiction that had adopted an inoperable vehicle code, he described how the code read, what it meant and how tickets could be written into municipal court. Mr. Graves said that it will provide an opportunity for New Castle to help bring people into compliance with vehicle registration. The council agreed that an ordinance could be drafted.

Mr. Graves thanked the council and said that he was glad to work with the town attorney on the ordinance to move forward.

**Consent Agenda**

February 7, 2023 minutes
Resolution TC 2023-04 - A Resolution of the New Castle Town Council Supporting the Application for a Grant from the Garfield County Mineral Lease District for the Construction of a Dog Park

Resolution TC 2023-5 - A Resolution of the New Castle Town Council Supporting the Application for a Grant from the Garfield County Federal Mineral Lease District for the Streets Capital Maintenance Project

MOTION: Councilor A Riddle made a motion to approve the consent agenda. Councilor G Riddle seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Staff Reports

Town Administrator – Administrator Reynolds said that there were several staff members wanted to attend the Colorado Municipal League Conference and that there was an opportunity for a scholarship. He said he had a letter for the mayor to sign supporting the scholarship application if that was okay with the council. Administrator Reynolds told the council that he had attended several meetings of the steering committee for the detox center, and it had turned out that bids for building the facility had come in more than double the grant funding of $700k. Mind Springs had been working with the contractor and the bid amount had dropped to about 1.4 million. Mind Springs said that they would make up the difference, and the offer caused the committee to question why. Administrator Reynolds said that Mind Springs will submit a whole new proforma at the next steering committee meeting. Administrator Reynolds said that the Middle Colorado Watershed Council has gathered a group of all the municipalities along the Colorado River as well as fire districts, and the group is called the Middle Colorado Collaborative. He said that he learned that there were federal and state monies to fund wildfire mitigation, wildfire pre and post work, and the best way to get those funds was through the collaborative. Administrator Reynolds said that staff had been successful in getting an AGNC grant for funding to move the ice rink to Burning Mountain Park. Administrator Reynolds said that public works had started painting in town hall, and the new carpeting had been ordered. Administrator Reynolds said that there was a meeting scheduled the following day with the DOLA representative, and he and Public Works Director John Wenzel with walk them through some idea for DOLA grants. Administrator Reynolds said that he will likely be at the AGNC meeting because they will be talking about broadband.

Town Clerk – Clerk Byram said that she will have her first training on utility billing the following week, and that she will be doing billing for the next several months. Clerk Byram said that staff had gone live with a program called Monsido that assisted with the town website ADA compliance. Clerk Byram told Director Wenzel that she had posted the public works positions on the town website. Clerk Byram said that she had met with Administrator Reynolds and Administrator Reynolds to discuss the potential of duplicating meeting technology equipment in the community center. Clerk Byram said that registration for the CML conference was open and said that if any of the council members wanted her to register them for the conference to please let her know.

Town Treasurer – Treasurer Loni Burk said that training for Assistant Treasurer Viktoria Ehlers had been going well. Asst. Treasurer Ehlers had been busy with worker compensation audit, a CIRSA volunteer medical audit, an upcoming unemployment audit, she has attended several Caselle webinars, she had been attending some Colorado
Government Finance Officer Association training sessions, she has been attending the
capital committee meetings all while completing payroll accurately. Treasurer Burk said
that Asst. Treasurer Ehlers was anxious to learn and asked great questions. Treasurer
Burk said that she will be in Colorado at the end of March or early April to help with the
audit preparations.
Town Planner – not present.
Public Works Director – not present.

Commission Reports
Planning & Zoning Commission – nothing to report.
Historic Preservation Commission – nothing to report.
Climate and Environment Commission – nothing to report.
Senior Program – nothing to report.
RFTA – Mayor A Riddile said that the Hogback ridership was increasing percentagewise
more than anywhere else in valley. He said they had been speaking to Dan Blankenship
about extending his employment with RFTA. He said that they talked to Blankenship to
extend employment. He said they also talked about getting Silt and Rifle into RFTA.
AGNC – nothing to report.
GCE – nothing to report.
EAB – nothing to report.

Council Comments
Councilor Mariscal said that she had received a fake e-mail from the mayor.
Councilor Mariscal said she was having trouble with her town e-mails going into the spam
folder.
Councilor Mariscal said that she had a meeting Friday with the emergency
communications board that she now held a seat on.
Councilor Carey said that she had seen an article in the newspaper about Caleb
Thompson, a Coal Ridge exchange student in Turkey who was helping with relief because
of the earthquakes. She felt that the council could honor him when he returned to the
U.S.
Councilor Carey said that the first bear meeting would be the following week on the 1st.
Councilor Carey had good talk with Tina White from Snowmass who will comment on a
wildlife ordinance, what worked and did not.
Councilor G Riddile said there was another capital improvement committee meeting on
Friday and they will report to the council soon.
Councilor Leland said that Clerk Byram mentioned ADA compliance on the town website.
He said that he had learned that website compliance was incredibly complicated, so it was
good to hear that there were people and companies that do that work.
Councilor Leland said that Spellebration will be on March 3, and there was not a town
team.
Councilor Leland said that he had received questions about the newsletter including write
ups about town council members. He said it was a good year to do so since it was not an
election year. He asked the council members to begin writing about themselves. Clerk
Byram suggested that the same could be done about the town staff.
Councilor Leland said there had been a Facebook discussion about the bridge potholes and a lot of the discussion was about CDOT coming in summer 2023 to do work. He asked when the town could officially announce the traffic circle. Administrator Reynolds said that he felt that the town could safely announce that the phase I utility work will be done in the 2023 construction season, and then the roundabout in the 2024 construction season. Councilor Mariscal said she had met with Ana Guytan with the New Castle library about events for the Latino community. Mayor A Riddile said that Ambleside School approached him about putting the 7th graders to work volunteering. He said that Elk Creek Elementary was interested in that.

MOTION: Mayor A Riddile made a motion to adjourn. Councilor Carey seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mayor A Riddile

Town Clerk Melody Byram, CMC
Call to Order
Mayor A Riddile called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call
Present  Councilor Carey
         Councilor Hazelton (virtual)
         Mayor A Riddile
         Councilor Copeland
         Councilor Leland
         Councilor G Riddile
         Councilor Mariscal (arrived at 7:22 p.m.)

Also present at the meeting were Town Administrator Dave Reynolds, Town Clerk Melody Byram, Town Treasurer Loni Burk, Assistant Treasurer Viktoria Ehlers, Town Attorney David McConaughy, Police Chief Chuck Burrows, Town Planner Paul Smith and members of the public.

Meeting Notice
Town Clerk Melody Byram verified that her office gave notice of the meeting in accordance with Resolution TC 2023-1.

Conflicts of Interest
There were no conflicts of interest.

Agenda Changes
Clerk Byram asked Attorney McConaughy if he wanted to combine the two executive sessions. Attorney McConaughy said that they could be combined in a single motion, and it will be helpful to the CIRSA attorney who will be joining.

Citizen Comments on Items not on the Agenda
There were no citizen comments.

Consultant Reports
Consultant Attorney – nothing to report.
Consultant Engineer – nothing to report.

Items for Consideration

Proclamation Honoring the Coal Ridge High School Coed Cheer Team
Mayor A Riddile greeted the Coal Ridge Coed Cheer Team and their Head Coach Alyssa Thurmon. He congratulated them on their fifth year in a row winning state competitions. Mayor A Riddile read the proclamation into the record. Mayor A Riddile asked each of the team members to introduce themselves and say what grade they were in and their goal for the future. Councilor Leland gave the team a framed photo of the cheer team of New Castle in 1925 which they thought was fun. The council congratulated the team and thanked them for coming in.

Introduction: Jake Stanton, Colorado Parks & Wildlife
Town Administrator Dave Reynolds told the council that Colorado Parks and Wildlife Officer Jake Stanton was present to meet the council. Councilor Carey told the council that there were two wildlife two wildlife officers in the area. Jake Stanton who was north of the river and Travis Black who was south of the river. Councilor Carey said they had done a wonderful job at the first bear meeting. Jake Stanton, Colorado Parks and Wildlife. Officer Stanton greeted the council, and said that he was brand new to the area, and so any time he had the opportunity to meet people, he appreciated it. Officer Stanton said that first and foremost, wildlife officers managed wildlife. In the summer, they do wildlife counts and in the winter they used airplanes and helicopters for the counts. They also worked with the fisheries, and the job was often fun. He said there was human/wildlife conflict as well, and that was how the conversation with Councilor Carey began. Officer Stanton said they were doing the education programs in the schools; during hunting season they were enforcing CPW laws. He said they were also peace officers for the State of Colorado, so they have to enforce every other law as well. He said it was a huge job, and any time they were able to partner with a municipality to get things done, it took something off their plate and it made everything better. Officer Stanton said that he appreciated being present and looked forward to working with the town.
Mayor A Riddile asked if Officer Stanton worked at the South Canyon location.
Councilor Carey said that the offices in South Canyon served the Roaring Fork Valley and the offices that served the New Castle area were out of Grand Junction. She also said that one of the thing she had learned is that CPW officers were more than just law enforcement, they were al scientists because they had biology degrees. Councilor G Riddile asked if there was anything the council could help Officer Stanton with. He said no, in fact, he suggested that they could probably tell him. Councilor Carey asked that he just keep in touch. Councilor G Riddile felt that CPW had been a great resource especially with the unusual bear activity the previous fall. Councilor G Riddile said that he was surprised to learn where the wolves will be sent, and it was close so he expected that there will be questions about that. The council and Officer Stanton discussed the wolf reintroduction briefly. Councilor Carey said that she had spoken to CPW Officer Kirk Oldham who agreed that if the formatting of the bear meetings went well, they may bring them back to discuss the wolf reintroduction plans before they are released in December 2023. The council thanked Officer Stanton.

Review and Discussion of Barking Dog Ordinance

Administrator Reynolds told the council that recently he and Police Chief Chuck Burrows had a meeting with the CVR HOA, and they had heard from other neighbors. He said that situation was that the current municipal code section related to barking dogs required that in the case of a nuisance barking dog, there needed to be two complainants unrelated to one another that witness the barking dog and were willing to testify. He said that did not work well most times. Administrator Reynolds said that staff was studying it and it seemed that other municipal code did not require two complainants, and that staff was looking to amend the code to have more teeth in it. Police Chief Burrows said that New Castle was the only place he was aware of that handled barking dogs with the two-complaint rule. He explained that two people from two separate households were not required in other places, and that warnings were issued at first complaint, and tickets after that if the issue persisted. He felt that once a complaint was established against someone and they had been warned by the police, he felt that they should be able to go out as law enforcement officers, see it, hear it and issue a ticket. Typically, there was a graduated fine schedule as well, and that got people’s attention pretty quickly. After a brief discussion between staff the council, they agreed that the two-person complaint rule could be removed from the code.

MOTION: Councilor Leland made a motion at 7:35 p.m. to go into Executive Session (1) for a conference with the Town Attorney for the purpose of receiving legal advice on specific legal questions under C.R.S. Section 24-6-402(4)(b) regarding the CVR Investors lawsuit and (2), for a conference with the Town Attorney for the purpose of receiving legal advice on specific legal questions under C.R.S. Section 24-6-402(4)(b) regarding Property on CR 335. Councilor Executive Session concluded.
At the end of the executive session, Mayor A Riddile made the following statement:

“The time is now 8:25 p.m. and the executive session has been concluded. The participants in the executive session were: Councilors Mariscal, Carey and Hazelton; Mayor A Riddile; Councilors Copeland, Leland, and G Riddile; Town Treasurer Burk, Town Administrator Reynolds, Assistant Treasurer Ehlers and Town Clerk Byram, Public Works Director Wenzel, and Town Attorney McConaughy. For the record, if any person who participated in the executive session believes that any substantial discussion of any matters not included in the motion to go into the executive session occurred during the executive session, or that any improper action occurred during the executive session in violation of the Open Meetings Law, I would ask that you state your concerns for the record.”

No concerns were stated.

Clerk’s Office Update
Clerk Byram briefly reviewed the clerk’s office report for the council. The report included information about meetings, training, schooling, projects, licensing, utility billing and court work accomplished since the beginning of the year.

The council asked about the ‘magic mushroom’ study. Clerk Byram explained that Proposition 122 was passed in the November 2022 general election. The proposition legalized the use of some natural medicines, and the rules for those medicines were still being developed. She also stated that local government controls were mostly nonexistent, and the Colorado Municipal League was looking to propose some responsive legislation to implement local control. Clerk Byram said that staff will bring the subject to the next council meeting for further discussion.

The council also asked about the utility billing/meter reading project. Clerk Byram said that they were looking into possible ways to reduce the amount of manpower/hours that were put into reading meters and accomplishing utility billing. Mayor A Riddile said that he understood many municipalities were reading meters electronically. Clerk Byram said that was true, however it turned out that was not as efficient as it may appear. Director Wenzel said that he implemented electronic meter reading in Basalt some years ago, and while it solved some problems, it created a lot of unexpected problems and they found themselves disappointed with the system.

Councilor Leland noted that he was disappointed in that there had only been 115 dog licenses issued. Clerk Byram said that her office kept a database of licenses issued, and renewals were mailed or e-mailed every year. She said that they do have the few that call at say they no longer live in town or their dog had passed away, but getting people to license their pet was difficult. The council agreed that it was an enforcement issue.

Administrator Reynolds said that he felt the answer was to seriously consider getting a code enforcement officer, and the council agreed.

Clerk Byram said that if the council had time later, there was new carpet and paint in the clerk’s office and the office spaces had been rearranged and it was quite lovely.
Consent Agenda
February Bills of $529,174.89
MOTION: Councilor Leland made a motion to approve the consent agenda. Councilor G Riddile seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Staff Reports
Town Administrator – Administrator Reynolds told the council that the Know B4 training had been going pretty well, and a new round will come out soon. Administrator Reynolds said that the detox center project had hit some snags. Bids for the project had come in significantly over budget, and Mind Springs has offered to cover the difference, which did not sit well with the committee. He said the saga was continuing, and no work had been done on the facility yet. Administrator Reynolds said that he had been working with a local wildfire collaborative. He said there was a lot of grant money out there for pre and post wildfire mitigation and the collaborative had been working as a team to understand what that will look like. He said he expected an MOU will come to the town for their consideration in the near future. Administrator Reynolds met earlier in the day with a group called the River Valley Economic Development Partnership which was a partnership of the towns from New Castle to Parachute along with a few others. It was the project that Evan Zislis was speaking to the council about at the last meeting. They had met that same day and it looked like everyone was on board with the project and Mr. Zislis will pursue grant money to do a feasibility study. Administrator Reynolds said he had met with the Town of Silt Manager Jeff Layman to talk about the special recreation district. He said that the Silt Board of Trustees basically had the same opinion as New Castle in that the public would agree to the district until they were asked about the funding mechanisms. The Silt Trustees felt it was a worthy project and they wanted to do some further research. Administrator Reynolds said that staff will meet with the owners of a parcel of land near River Park Condos, between the interchange and the condos, on the river. The new owners were working on a development plan. Administrator Reynolds said that he and Administrative Assistant Rochelle Firth had met with representatives from Senator Hickenlooper’s office regarding congressional direct spending. Initially he said they came away feeling that the raw water project was a good fit, but later they learned that ARPA funds could not be used at match money for congressional direct spending funds. Administrator Reynolds said that the broadband project for the carrier-neutral location up near Shibui had also hit snags. The issue was that the permit through CDOT to access the broadband fiber that runs up and down I-70, CDOT will require in Parachute that they access the fiber a mile or two away and run parallel fiber lines to get to the access vaults. The project calls for the connection to be near the interchanges. He said that the county commissioners have been upset by the issue and have written letters to the governor that state that it was a governor mandate that broadband be provided in rural areas and now there were serious timeline snags in CDOT permitting. There will be a meeting the next day with CDOT. Administrator Reynolds told the council that there will be an upcoming council workshop on April 4 at 5:30 p.m. on the Romero site in Lakota and the corner of Faas Ranch Road and Castle Valley Boulevard. He said that P&Z will be invited as well, and they will witness the story pole that council had asked for that indicate the building heights. Administrator Reynolds said that he and Planner Smith and Director Wenzel had a preapplication meeting with the new owners of the Craven property which is the mixed-use property near the elementary school. He said that the presentation was a good one,
there was a lot of time and effort put into it by the new owner. Administrator Reynolds said that he will be out of the office on March 17 as well as March 23 and 24.

Administrator Reynolds said that the property west of public works that had been approved for a conditional use permit the previous year had hit a few difficulties with the owner in the development of the property that staff was working resolving that. Administrator Reynolds said that the flooring project was 99% done, and thanks to the FMLD for that. Administrator Reynolds said that he will be attending an FMLD meeting the next morning to report on the LoVa Trail grant. He said that groundbreaking for the 800-foot section should begin soon. Administrator Reynolds said that there were several council members that wanted to attend the CML conference. He asked that registration be funneled through staff so that who attended which classes could be coordinated so that everything could be covered. Administrator Reynolds said that the bear meeting the previous week was excellent and he encouraged council members to attend. Administrator Reynolds said that the emergency evacuation plan had been sent to the county emergency team to review. It prompted the 2009 emergency plan to be reviewed as well.

Town Clerk – nothing to report.

Town Treasurer – Town Treasurer Loni Burk said that the representative for Colorado Retirement Association had held a lunch meeting for the staff and gave a presentation. It was well-attended. Treasurer Burk said the finance office was busy as usual. Training for Assistant Treasurer Vikoriya Ehlers and Finance Assistant Michelle Mills was ongoing in preparation for transition. Treasurer Burk said that she planned to be in Colorado at the end of March.

Assistant Treasurer – Assistant Treasurer Ehlers told the council that Finance Assistant Mills was doing well, and that was exemplified the prior week during the office move, which had gone well.

Town Planner – Planner Smith said that he had received the final application in for the Romero project that looked close to what the council had seen previously with some refinements. He said it should go to P&Z in April and council in May. Planner Smith said that his office had been working on adoption of the 2021 International codes as well as the Wildland-Urban Interface code. Planner Smith said that they had put energy incentives on the building department website. Planner Smith said that Assistant Planner Lauren Prentice was close to getting her certification as a building inspector. Planner Smith said they had some discussions over the past year and a half about the McInnis property. He said there were some obstacles to it but many people were interested. He said that staff had discussed in regard to updating the future land use.

Public Works Director – Director Wenzel said that they had selected a contractor and construction will begin the second week of April. Director Wenzel said they had begun working on the security camera installation project for town facilities, and a contractor had been selected. That should begin in the next few weeks as well. Director Wenzel said that he had met with Town Engineer Jeff Simonson regarding final revisions of the digester blower building, trying to get that project finalized. Director Wenzel said they had been looking at the raw water expansion project with Engineer Simonson, trying to finalize that as well. Director Wenzel said he had just finished writing two FMLD grants, one streets capital maintenance and the other the dog park grant. Director Wenzel said that the parks department had defined a scope of work for the Red Rocks Ditch, piping part of that and lining the rest. Director Wenzel said that he was in the process of hiring for three positions: streets maintenance technician, public works coordinator and a water treatment
plant operator. He said that Kim Rider had let him know that she will be retiring in September of 2024. Director Wenzel said that Utilities Supervisor Daniel Becker and his crew were exploring the addition of a surge tank at the River Park lift station to alleviate any potential overflows into those basements. Director Wenzel said they were monitoring the flow levels in the south side interceptor. Engineer Simonson had put out a sonar device that determines the remaining capacity of that interceptor that will assist in the timing of reconstruction. Director Wenzel said he had completed the capital street maintenance scope and that will go out to bid shortly. Last, Director Wenzel said they will pick up two new vehicles the following day.

**Commission Reports**

- **Planning & Zoning Commission** – nothing to report.
- **Historic Preservation Commission** – nothing to report.
- **Climate and Environment Commission** – nothing to report.
- **Senior Program** – Clerk Byram said a few years ago some municipalities were questioning the Traveler expenses and wanted details on rides/uses. The Board made some changes to include more details on the types of rides the traveler provided for people, whether to school or work or the doctor or the salon. Clerk Byram said that detailing the types of rides was causing issues in that they were invading people’s privacy and perhaps HIPAA. She said they had a very lengthy conversation trying to redefine types of rides in ways that would still indicate uses without breaching user’s privacy.
- **RFTA** – nothing to report.
- **AGNC** – Councilor Hazelton said that they discussed the broadband issues, and they would appreciate letters of support. He said the AGNC was also watching some bills that were being introduced.
- **GCE** – Councilor Leland said that Councilor G Riddile will be attending the meeting for him in March.
- **EAB** – nothing to report.

**Council Comments**

Councilor Carey said that she had been watching some house and senate bills as they had been debated. She said there were some coming down that will impact affordable housing, rent control, language in leasing, and prohibition in fees in rents if they are approved. Councilor Carey said that each time she watched a BOCC meeting, they were somehow talking about development in New Castle. She felt they were excited about it. Councilor Carey said she had spoken to John Martin, and he asked if the town could put together a letter, asking for the BOCC’s help in getting the train speeds in New Castle reduced. She said that he preferred that all the council signed it. Councilor Carey said that she and Administrator Reynolds had spoken after the bear meeting about code enforcement officers, but also, based on information they got from the CPW officers, it may be better to consider a wildlife ordinance rather than a trash ordinance. Councilor Carey said that she had randomly run into Perry Will a few weekends ago and he had been a joy to get to know. Councilor Copeland said that HPC had met and they allocated some budgeted money back to the museum for electrical work to be done.
Councilor Copeland thought it may be a good idea to ask the new owners of the Craven property to allow expansion of the dog park onto their property.

Councilor Copeland thanked Director Wenzel and his team for their terrific snow plowing.

Mayor A Riddile thanked Councilor Carey for the bear meeting.

Mayor A Riddile said that the residents at senior housing were again contacting him with issues, primarily parking.

**MOTION:** Mayor A Riddile made a motion to adjourn. Councilor Copeland seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mayor A Riddile

Town Clerk Melody Byram, CMC
TOWN OF NEW CASTLE, COLORADO
RESOLUTION NO. TC 2023-06

A RESOLUTION OF THE NEW CASTLE TOWN COUNCIL APPROVING A(N) INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT WITH GARFIELD COUNTY AND OTHER MUNICIPALITIES WITHIN THE COUNTY.

WHEREAS, Garfield County, the Town of New Castle (“Town”) and the other municipalities within Garfield County desire to work together to provide a county-wide mosquito control and program; and

WHEREAS, the Town will benefit from such a program and its services; and

WHEREAS, the Town Council finds that entering into the Intergovernmental Agreement (“IGA”) attached hereto as Exhibit “A” will further the Town’s goals and is in the Town’s best interests.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE NEW CASTLE TOWN COUNCIL:

1. **Recitals.** The foregoing recitals are incorporated by reference as findings and determinations of the Council.

2. **Adoption.** Pursuant to Section 14.4 of the Town Charter, the Town Council hereby approves the IGA attached as Exhibit A and authorizes the Mayor to execute the same.

INTRODUCED, PASSED, AND ADOPTED by a vote of ___ to ___ at a regular meeting of the New Castle Town Council held on March 21, 2023.

TOWN COUNCIL OF TOWN OF NEW CASTLE, COLORADO

____________________________
Mayor Art Riddle

ATTEST:

____________________________
Town Clerk Melody Harrison, CMC
THE PARTIES to this Intergovernmental Agreement for Mosquito Control (“IGA”) are the BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF GARFIELD COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO, (hereinafter referred to as “County”); the CITY OF GLENWOOD SPRINGS, STATE OF COLORADO, (hereinafter referred to as “Glenwood”); the TOWN OF CARBONDALE, STATE OF COLORADO,(hereinafter referred to as “Carbondale”); the CITY OF RIFLE, STATE OF COLORADO,(hereinafter referred to as “Rifle”); the TOWN OF SILT, STATE OF COLORADO,(hereinafter referred to as “Silt”); the TOWN OF NEW CASTLE, STATE OF COLORADO, (hereinafter referred to as “New Castle”); and the TOWN OF PARACHUTE, STATE OF COLORADO, (hereinafter referred to as “Parachute”).

WHEREAS, the parties to this IGA are authorized by Section 29-1-201, et seq., C.R.S., as amended, to provide for joint funding and cooperation to provide services and functions which each is otherwise lawfully authorized to provide; and

WHEREAS, the parties to this IGA desire to cooperate in funding and making available a County-wide mosquito control and education program; and

WHEREAS, a coordinated effort by the County and the municipalities within the County will permit a more effective mosquito control and education program and specifically will aid control of the mosquito species responsible for the spread of West Nile Virus.

NOW, THEREFORE, in mutual consideration of the premises and the covenants and promises set forth below, the parties to this IGA agree as follows:

1. PROJECT. The Project that is the subject of this IGA is a comprehensive integrated larval and adult mosquito control program, on public and private property throughout Garfield County that will be designed specifically for Garfield County and the municipalities by an independent contractor. The Project will provide surveillance, identifying mosquito breeding habitats and areas with high numbers of mosquito larvae and adults, with an emphasis on Culex mosquitoes. Surveillance will include the use of GIS mapping technology. The Project will include the use of chemical pesticides for adult and larval mosquito control in a manner safe to citizens, the environment and pets. Chemical applications will only be done when the elected officials of each pertinent jurisdiction, or their designated staff member, determine that mosquito levels have reached a threshold that poses a public health risk. Each jurisdiction is responsible for working with the Contractor to ensure that their jurisdiction is in compliance with the Federal Clean Water Act and the Colorado Discharge Permit System as administered by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment. The independent contractor will also provide community outreach and public education.

2. PROJECT COSTS. The cost for the entire Project that is the subject of this IGA shall not exceed Two Hundred Five Thousand Dollars and No Cents ($205,000.00), with each town and city contributing the amounts set forth below for a total contribution of Fifty-Nine Thousand Seven Hundred Dollars and No Cents ($59,700.00) of the Project Cost. The remainder will be contributed by the County for the twenty-nine (29) square miles of service area outside of the municipalities.

3. COUNTY RESPONSIBILITIES. The County shall be the coordinating entity and the contracting and fiscal authority for the Project. The County's responsibilities shall include the
creation of the Request For Proposals (“RFP”), management of the RFP process, selection of the contractor and management of the contract. The County shall pay an amount not to exceed One Hundred Forty-Five Thousand Three Hundred Dollars and No Cents ($145,300.00) of the total Project Cost of Two Hundred Five Thousand Dollars and No Cents ($205,000.00), unless emergency services are required.

4. **GLENWOOD SPRINGS RESPONSIBILITIES.** Glenwood Springs shall be responsible for payment to the County of $6,200.00.

5. **CARBONDALE RESPONSIBILITIES:** Carbondale shall be responsible for payment to the County of $8,200.00.

6. **RIFLE RESPONSIBILITIES:** Rifle shall be responsible for payment to the County of $22,250.00.

7. **SILT RESPONSIBILITIES:** Silt shall be responsible for payment to the County of $6,000.00.

8. **NEW CASTLE RESPONSIBILITIES:** New Castle shall be responsible for payment to the County of $6,750.00.

9. **PARACHUTE RESPONSIBILITIES:** Parachute shall be responsible for payment to the County of $10,300.00.

10. **PARTY RESPONSIBILITIES:** All parties to this IGA shall cooperate with and assist the independent contractor chosen by the County to perform the work of the Project.

11. **REMEDIES.** If any of the cities or towns, identified in Paragraphs 4 through 9 above, fails to perform their payment obligation(s), the County may assume responsibility for the defaulting payment(s), and all other obligations of this IGA shall remain in full force and effect.

12. **CONTRACT AWARD.** The contract anticipated to define the Scope of Work needed for the Project shall be awarded by Garfield County pursuant to the terms of its Procurement Manual. The Notice to Proceed may be awarded prior to the payment obligations of the municipalities and towns being met.

13. **INDEMNIFICATION.** The parties acknowledge each is subject to the constitutional prohibitions against indemnification in Colo. Const. art XI, § 1. Neither can indemnify the other.

   Nothing herein shall be interpreted as a waiver of governmental immunity to which each party would otherwise be entitled under Section 24-10-101, *et seq.*, C.R.S., as amended.

14. **APPROPRIATION.** This IGA is contingent upon appropriation and budgeting for the costs required for the Project. Should any party fail to appropriate or have available sufficient funds to pay for the costs of its obligations set forth herein, this IGA shall be considered of no force or effect, except to the extent that the County has assumed the obligations of another party, as set forth herein. This IGA is not intended to, nor does it create a multi-year fiscal obligation as defined by Section 20, Article X of the Constitution of the State of Colorado.
15. **EFFECTIVE DATE.** This IGA shall be effective January 1, 2023 through December 31, 2023, no matter the date of execution.

16. **AMENDMENT.** This IGA may be amended by the parties solely through a written agreement signed by each.

17. **FACSIMILES AND COUNTERPARTS.** This IGA may be signed in counterparts, and facsimile signatures may be substituted for original signatures.

18. **GOVERNING LAW.** The laws of the State of Colorado shall govern the validity, performance and enforcement of this IGA. Venue for any action instituted pursuant to this IGA shall lie in Garfield County, Colorado.

19. **AUTHORITY.** Each person signing this IGA represents and warrants that said person is fully authorized to enter into and execute this IGA and to bind the party represented to the terms and conditions hereof.

20. **NOTICE.** All notices required under this IGA shall be in writing and shall be hand delivered or sent by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, postage prepaid to the addresses of the parties set forth below. Notice addresses may be changed without amendment to this IGA.

Notice to County: Board of County Commissioners  
Attn: County Manager  
108 8th Street, Suite 213  
Glenwood Springs, CO 81601  
Phone: (970) 945-9150  
Fax: (970) 384-5005

Notice to Glenwood: City of Glenwood Springs  
Attn: City Manager  
101 W. 8th St.  
Glenwood Springs, CO 81601  
Phone: 384-6400

Notice to Carbondale: Town of Carbondale  
Attn: Town Manager  
511 Colorado Avenue  
Carbondale, CO 81623  
Phone: (970) 963-2733  
Fax: (970) 963-9140
Notice to Rifle: City of Rifle
Attn: City Manager
202 Railroad Avenue
P.O. Box 1908
Rifle, CO 81650
Phone: (970) 625-2121

Notice to Silt: Town of Silt
Attn: Town Administrator
231 N. 7th St., Box 70
Silt, CO 81652
Phone: (970) 876-2353

Notice to New Castle: Town of New Castle
Attn: Town Administrator
450 W. Main
P.O. Box 90
New Castle, CO 81647
Phone: (970) 984-2311

Notice to Parachute: Town of Parachute
Attn: Town Administrator
222 Grand Valley Way
Box 100
Parachute, CO 81635
Phone: (970) 285-7630
ATTEST:  

______________________  
Clerk to the Board  

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
OF GARFIELD COUNTY, COLORADO  

By: ______________________  
Chairman  

Dated:____________________  

ATTEST:  

______________________  
City Clerk  

CITY OF GLENWOOD SPRINGS,  
STATE OF COLORADO  

By: ______________________  
Mayor  

Dated:____________________  

ATTEST:  

______________________  
Town Clerk  

TOWN OF CARBONDALE  
STATE OF COLORADO  

By: ______________________  
Mayor  

Dated:____________________  

ATTEST:  

______________________  
City Clerk  

CITY OF RIFLE  
STATE OF COLORADO  

By: ______________________  
Mayor  

Dated:____________________  

ATTEST:  

______________________  
Town Clerk  

TOWN OF SILT  
STATE OF COLORADO  

By: ______________________  
Mayor  

Dated:____________________
ATTEST:

TOWN OF NEW CASTLE
STATE OF COLORADO

______________________
Town Clerk

By: ______________________
Mayor

Dated:____________________

ATTEST:

TOWN OF PARACHUTE
STATE OF COLORADO

______________________
Town Clerk

By: ______________________
Mayor

Dated:____________________
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Permit Application and Report of Changes

All Answers Must Be Printed in Black Ink or Typewritten

1. Applicant is a
   □ Corporation................................□ Individual
   □ Partnership................................□ Limited Liability Company
   License Number
   12-40424-0005

2. Name of Licensee
   Kum & Go LC

3. Trade Name of Establishment (DBA)
   Kum & Go #927

4. Address of Premises (specify exact location of premises)
   801 Castle Valley Blvd

5. Business Email Address
   licenses@kumandgo.com

City
   New Castle

County
   Garfield

State
   CO

ZIP
   81647

Business Phone Number
   515-274-7793

SELECT THE APPROPRIATE SECTION BELOW AND PROCEED TO THE INSTRUCTIONS ON PAGE 2.

Section A – Manager Reg/Change

□ Manager's Registration (Hotel & Restr.)........... $30.00

□ Manager's Registration (Tavern).................. $30.00

□ Manager's Registration (Lodging & Entertainment)........ $30.00

□ Change of Manager (Other Licenses pursuant to section 44-3-301(8), C.R.S.) NO FEE

Please note that Manager's Registration for Hotel & Restaurant, Lodging & Entertainment, and Tavern licenses requires a local fee with submission to the local licensing authority as well. Please reach out to local licensing authorities directly regarding local processing and fees.

Section B – Duplicate License

□ Duplicate License........................................ $50.00

Section C

□ Retail Warehouse Storage Permit (ea)............ $100.00

□ Wholesale Branch House Permit (ea)............. $100.00

□ Change Corp. or Trade Name Permit (ea)......... $50.00

□ Change Location Permit (ea)......................... $150.00

□ Winery/Limited Winery Noncontiguous or Primary Manufacturing Location Change........................................ $150.00

☑ Change, Alter or Modify Premises
   $150.00 x Total Fee: 150.00

□ Addition of Optional Premises to Existing H/R
   $100.00 x Total Fee:

□ Addition of Related Facility to an Existing Resort or Campus Liquor Complex
   $160.00 x Total Fee:

□ Campus Liquor Complex Designation..............No Fee

□ Sidewalk Service Area.................................. $75.00

Do Not Write in This Space – For Department of Revenue Use Only

Date License Issued

License Account Number

Period

The State may convert your check to a one time electronic banking transaction. Your bank account may be debited as early as the same day received by the State. If converted, your check will not be returned. If your check is rejected due to insufficient or uncollected funds, the Department of Revenue may collect the payment amount directly from your bank account electronically.

TOTAL AMOUNT DUE

$ 150.00
# Instruction Sheet

For All Sections, Complete Questions 1-5 Located on Page 1

- **Section A**
  - **To Register or Change Managers**, check the appropriate box in section A and complete question 9 on page 4. Proceed to the Oath of Applicant for signature. Submit to State Licensing Authority for approval.

- **Section B**
  - **For a Duplicate license**, be sure to include the liquor license number in section B on page 1 and proceed to page 5 for Oath of Applicant signature.

- **Section C**
  - Check the appropriate box in section C and proceed below.
    1) **For a Retail Warehouse Storage Permit**, go to page 3 complete question 5 (be sure to check the appropriate box). Submit the necessary information and proceed to page 5 for Oath of Applicant signature. Submit to State Licensing Authority for approval.
    2) **For a Wholesale Branch House Permit**, go to page 3 and complete question 5 (be sure to check the appropriate box). Submit the necessary information and proceed to page 5 for Oath of Applicant signature. Submit to State Licensing Authority for approval.
    3) **To Change Trade Name or Corporation Name**, go to page 3 and complete question 6 (be sure to check the appropriate box). Submit the necessary information and proceed to page 5 for Oath of Applicant signature. Retail Liquor License submit to Local Liquor Licensing Authority (City or County). Manufacturer, Wholesaler and Importer's Liquor Licenses submit to State Liquor Licensing Authority.
    4) **To modify Premise, or add Sidewalk Service Area**, go to page 4 and complete question 10. Submit the necessary information and proceed to page 5 for Oath of Applicant signature. Retail Liquor License submit to Local Liquor Licensing Authority (City or County). Manufacturer, Wholesaler and Importer's Liquor Licenses submit to State Liquor Licensing Authority.
    5) **For Optional Premises** go to page 4 and complete question 10. Submit the necessary information and proceed to page 5 for Oath of Applicant signature. Retail Liquor License submit to Local Liquor Licensing Authority (City or County).
    6) **To Change Location**, go to page 3 and complete question 7. Submit the necessary information and proceed to page 5 for Oath of Applicant signature. Retail Liquor License submit to Local Liquor Licensing Authority (City or County). Manufacturer, Wholesaler and Importer's Liquor Licenses submit to State Liquor Licensing Authority.
    7) **Winery/Limited Winery Noncontiguous or Primary Manufacturing Location Change**, go to page 4, and complete question 8. Use this section to make a current Noncontiguous Manufacturing Location into a Primary Manufacturing Location, or a Primary Manufacturing Location into a Noncontiguous Manufacturing Location. To be eligible for a Winery/Limited Winery Noncontiguous or Primary Manufacturing Location Change, you must be a Colorado state licensed manufacturer of vinous liquor pursuant to section 44-3-402 or 44-3-403, C.R.S.
    8) **Campus Liquor Complex Designation**, go to page 5 and complete question 11. Submit the necessary information and proceed to page 5 for Oath of Applicant signature.
    9) **To add another Related Facility** to an existing Resort or Campus Liquor Complex, go to page 5 and complete question 12.
5. Retail Warehouse Storage Permit or a Wholesalers Branch House Permit

☐ Retail Warehouse Permit for:
  ☐ On-Premises Licensee (Taverns, Restaurants etc.)
  ☐ Off-Premises Licensee (Liquor stores)

☐ Wholesalers Branch House Permit

Address of storage premise: ______________________________________________________

City ______________________, County ___________________________ ZIP _____________

Attach a deed/lease or rental agreement for the storage premises.
Attach a detailed diagram of the storage premises.

6. Change of Trade Name or Corporation Name

☐ Change of Trade name/DBA only

☐ Corporate Name Change (Attach the following supporting documents)
  1. Certificate of Amendment filed with the Secretary of State, or
  2. Statement of Change filed with the Secretary of State, and
  3. Minutes of Corporate meeting, Limited Liability Members meeting, Partnership agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Trade Name</th>
<th>New Trade Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Corporate Name</td>
<td>New Corporate Name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Change of Location

NOTE TO RETAIL LICENSEES: An application to change location has a local application fee of $750 payable to your local licensing authority. You may only change location within the same jurisdiction as the original license that was issued. Pursuant to 44-3-311(1) C.R.S. Your application must be on file with the local authority thirty (30) days before a public hearing can be held.

Date filed with Local Authority __________________________ Date of Hearing __________________________

(a) Address of current premises ____________________________________________________________

City ______________________ County ______________________ ZIP ________________

(b) Address of proposed New Premises (Attach copy of the deed or lease that establishes possession of the premises by the licensee)

Address ____________________________________________________________

City ______________________ County ______________________ ZIP ________________

(c) New mailing address if applicable.

Address ____________________________________________________________

City ______________________ County ______________________ State _______ ZIP ________________

(d) Attach detailed diagram of the premises showing where the alcohol beverages will be stored, served, possessed or consumed. Include kitchen area(s) for hotel and restaurants.
8. Winery/Limited Winery Noncontiguous or Primary Manufacturing Location Change

Select the option that applies to your situation:

- [ ] Make a current Primary Manufacturing Location (Location 1) into a Noncontiguous Location (Location 2); or
- [ ] Make a current Noncontiguous Manufacturing Location (Location 1) into a Primary Manufacturing Location (Location 2).

(a) Address of Location 1: ___________________________________________

City ___________________ County _______________ ZIP _______________

(b) Address of Location 2: ___________________________________________

City ___________________ County _______________ ZIP _______________

9. Change of Manager or to Register the Manager of a Tavern, Hotel and Restaurant, Lodging & Entertainment liquor license or licenses pursuant to section 44-3-301(8), C.R.S.

(a) Change of Manager

Former manager’s name ___________________________________________

New manager’s name ___________________________________________

(b) Date of Employment _______________

Has manager ever managed a liquor licensed establishment? ........................................... [ ] Yes [ ] No

Does manager have a financial interest in any other liquor licensed establishment? ........... [ ] Yes [ ] No

If yes, give name and location of establishment ___________________________________________

10. Modification of Premises, Addition of an Optional Premises, Addition of Related Facility, or Addition of a Sidewalk Service Area

NOTE: Licensees may not modify or add to their licensed premises until approved by state and local authorities.

(a) Describe change proposed Removing 3 feet of non-alcohol product and replacing with 3 feet of wine product

.................................................................

(b) If the modification is temporary, when will the proposed change:

Start __________________ (mo/day/year) End __________________ (mo/day/year)

NOTE: THE TOTAL STATE FEE FOR TEMPORARY MODIFICATION IS $300.00

(c) Will the proposed change result in the licensed premises now being located within 500 feet of any public or private school that meets compulsory education requirements of Colorado law, or the principal campus of any college, university or seminary?

(If yes, explain in detail and describe any exemptions that apply) ........................................... [ ] Yes [ ] No

(d) Is the proposed change in compliance with local building and zoning laws? ...................... [ ] Yes [ ] No

(e) If this modification is for an additional Hotel and Restaurant Optional Premises has the local authority authorized by resolution or ordinance the issuance of optional premises? .................. [ ] Yes [ ] No

(f) Attach a diagram of the current licensed premises and a diagram of the proposed changes for the licensed premises.

(g) Attach any existing lease that is revised due to the modification.

(h) For the addition of a Sidewalk Service Area per Regulation 47-302(A)(4), 1 C.C.R. 203-2, include documentation received from the local governing body authorizing use of the sidewalk. Documentation may include but is not limited to a statement of use, permit, easement, or other legal permissions.
11. Campus Liquor Complex Designation
An institution of higher education or a person who contracts with the institution to provide food services

(a) I wish to designate my existing ___________________ Liquor License # ___________________ to a Campus Liquor Complex ........................................................................................................... □ Yes □ No

12. Additional Related Facility
To add a Related Facility to an existing Resort or Campus Liquor Complex, include the name of the Related Facility and include the address and an outlined drawing of the Related Facility Premises.

(a) Address of Related Facility ____________________________________________________________

(b) Outlined diagram provided ............................................................................................................... □ Yes □ No

---

Oath of Applicant
I declare under penalty of perjury in the second degree that I have read the foregoing application and all attachments thereto, and that all information therein is true, correct, and complete to the best of my knowledge

Signature  
Print name and Title Camille Hayes - Compliance Analyst  
Date 3/1/2023

---

Report and Approval of LOCAL Licensing Authority (CITY / COUNTY)
The foregoing application has been examined and the premises, business conducted and character of the applicant is satisfactory, and we do report that such permit, if granted, will comply with the applicable provisions of Title 44, Articles 4 and 3, C.R.S., as amended. Therefore, This Application is Approved.

Local Licensing Authority (City or County)  
Date filed with Local Authority

Signature  
Title  
Date

---

Report of STATE Licensing Authority
The foregoing has been examined and complies with the filing requirements of Title 44, Article 3, C.R.S., as amended.

Signature  
Title  
Date