



CHEYENNE DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

2101 O'Neil Ave., Room 205
Cheyenne, WY 82001
(307) 433-9730
cheyennecity.org/dda

**Cheyenne Downtown Development Authority
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, March 20, 2025
Room 118, City of Cheyenne Municipal Building
2101 O'Neil Avenue, Cheyenne, WY 82001**

Members Present: Scott Roybal, Wendy Volk, Danica Mrozinsky, Lorrell Bellotti, Amber Nuse, Linda Heath (Ex Officio), Brian Bau (ZOOM), Dave Teubner (ZOOM), Janelle Rose (ZOOM)

Members Absent: Jamie Winters

Staff Present: Charles Bloom, Planning and Development Director; Sophia Maes, DDA Administrator; Irene Parsons, DDA; Miya Debusk, DDA

Members of the Public Present: Stan Hartzheim, Maggie Hartzheim, Corey Loghry, Sam Galeotos, Thomas Cobb (City Engineer); via ZOOM: Glen Garrett, S. Garrett, Renee Smith (City of Cheyenne) Susan Allen, Eric Fountain, Julie Tucker, Sam Payne (City), Amber Ash (City)

Disclosures/Conflicts of Interest: None

Brief introduction of new DDA Administrator Sophia Maes

Approval of the Minutes

Motion to approve Minutes for February 20, 2025, as presented was made by Volk, second by Bellotti. Motion passed unanimously.

Item V.

Item V.A. Financial Report – City Treasurer Robin Lockman

City Treasurer Robin Lockman presented the Financial Report. She asked if any Board members had questions about the financial report.

Nuse: She asked about the balance of the Downtown Planter Program.

Bloom: He believes the invoices are paid in full, but Ms. Parsons could confirm

Parsons: The contract for the planting season of 2024 was paid in full; the remaining balance in the line item will go toward the 2025 planting season, as some will need to be paid prior to the new fiscal year.

Motion to approve the financial report as presented by Volk and seconded by Nuse. Motion passed.

Item V. B. Budget Amendment Two for FY2025 – Irene Parsons, DDA

Parsons: A summary of the Budget Amendment was provided; it balances out two line-items for the remainder of the fiscal year. The first line item is (706) Professional Services increase by \$11,600.00 reduced from (703) Memberships and Subscriptions to cover expenses in (706) for professional consultant payments. The second item is (500) Computer Hardware & Software increase by \$500.00 from (506) Website to cover expenses for computer hardware and software. The funds are only a transfer from expense line items, there

are no additional funds added to the operating budget. Staff recommends the Board approve the FY2025 Budget Amendment Two as presented.

Nuse: Is the transfer for the consultant services because they came in over budget?

Parsons: They were not over budget; it was just a shift of what was spent in the previous fiscal year and what was spent in the current fiscal year.

Volk: Moved to approve FY2025 Budget Amendment Two as presented; seconded by Nuse; motion passed.

Item V. C. Fridays on the Plaza Sponsorship

Maes: The annual summer event in downtown Fridays on the Plaza presented through the CRE department is celebrating the 20th year anniversary. She provided a summary of the event, what it contributes to the downtown district (over 75,000 attendees throughout the summer) and an estimated financial impact between \$1.25 million to \$1.5 million each summer. The DDA is proposing the Festival Partner Level, to support development and redevelopment of the area, which includes public events that support businesses downtown; the Plan of Development prioritizes promotion of public events. DDA Staff recommends approval of the Fridays on the Plaza Sponsorship at the Festival Partner level of \$35,000

Volk: Motion to approve the Fridays on the Plaza Sponsorship of \$35,000 for the 2025 season; seconded by Bellotti; motion passed.

Item V. D. Capital Improvement Grant – Double H Home Loans, LLC

Bloom: He provided a summary of the Capital Improvement Grant (CIG) application for a residential structure that was converted into a commercial structure on 20th between Warren and Central St., 114 E. 20 St. The building has maintained its look, while surrounding buildings have made noticeable improvements. The applicants are making a significant investment, bringing the inside to a more modern level, but also plan external improvements. They are seeking up to \$30,000 for capital improvements. He noted it is ultimately the DDA Board's discretion as to what improvements the Board wishes to fund. The staff report may have one recommendation, but if the Board wants to go in another direction with the program, the Board is more than able to move forward with a recommendation to fund those elements. Bloom summarized the exterior improvements submitted by the applicant, including front railing improvements and east, west, and south façade. Bloom expounded on the windows, stating while staff agrees window replacement is necessary and will extend the life of the property, it was noted the house has some historic character, and he did not think the planned style of the three over one panes of the windows necessarily matched the historical character of one over one. The applicant has some additional discussion to help support the three over one window style. Again, if this is an item the DDA Board wishes to include, they are able to do that. Another proposed item is the addition of an awning; applicant will speak more to the awning. Bloom referenced similar awnings, but those awnings are over bay windows; this recommended awning is not over any bay window and is not a contributing structure. Staff recommendation is not to fund the awning, but once again the DDA board may choose to include this item in the funding if they wish. Another item requested is deck, stairs and railing on the east side. The existing landing is mostly deteriorated. Staff recommends not funding, because they don't fully understand the purpose of this entrance. There are no concerns regarding the general painting and maintenance proposed in this application.

Bloom: Bloom also reviewed available funding in the CIG program, with sufficient funds available to fund this application if it was approved. He also reviewed the provisions of approval for this CIG, which is consistent with all CIG applications previously approved.

Stan Hartzheim: Hartzheim is with Double H Home Loans, and attended here with his wife, Maggie of Double H Home Loans. They've been working with DDA staff and a couple of different administrators for 14 months, and hand selected this building with the intent of giving it the upgrades to give it some love and pop. His understanding was before they came along, the plan was to demolish the building. It was important for them to find a building to bring back to life, and the DDA process has been an instrumental part in them hopefully

being able to do that, and they are thankful to the Board for the opportunity to be here and speak on behalf of their project.

Hartzheim read a statement he prepared for the meeting that included various points and is summarized here. They understand that there has been a slight shift in the purpose of the DDA CIG program to incorporate the historical nature of buildings with more front-facing and street-facing presentation. Hartzheim feels the initial recommendations to exclude portions of their grant application are inconsistent with past grant approvals and do not consider the architectural context of the neighborhood, the extent of public visibility and impact on direct neighbors. Many of the neighbors have provided verbal and/or written testimonials expressing their dissatisfaction with the current appearance of the building and their excitement about the planned improvements. He listed some of those businesses. Hartzheim also provided four additional photo comps to reinforce that their proposed improvements are consistent with the aesthetics and character of the neighborhood. The photos included other buildings within a one-mile radius that have the three- or four-over-one window style, and buildings that provide a hip-roof style awning over doorways and windows. Awnings are a big part of creating safe egress out of buildings and providing shade through street-facing windows. They are trying to accomplish the aesthetic that is correct to the neighborhood while also giving it the shade they need for modern day work, such as working on computers.

They felt the staff recommendation to deny these enhancements is unfounded, as they contribute positively to the overall streetscape. Hartzheim referenced past CIG projects that were approved and completed for various façade improvements that were not necessarily street-facing. He also spoke about the proposed improvements to the east side of the building, which he said would improve a highly visible area and will serve as a shared access point for local small businesses and nonprofit organizations who will be using the newly created community space. Providing a safe entrance on the east side makes an accessible public meeting space for minimal fee for small businesses or no fee for nonprofit organizations, and this reinforces their commitment to fostering a vibrant and accessible downtown environment. If a new precedent is being established for the future of CIG grants, it seems unfair to apply it retroactively to their application, which they started 14 months ago. They seek a fair and consistent application of this grant program.

L Bellotti: She asked if there is a cost outline of what is recommended by staff versus what was requested in the grant application.

Bloom: First of all, he appreciated the additional information provided by Hartzheim, it was very helpful. Bloom stated he did not have a breakdown of those costs, but possibly Hartzheim has a breakdown of those costs.

S Hartzheim: He asked for clarification of the question, to which L Bellotti used the example of the cost between the windows recommended by Bloom and the windows they requested in the grant application. Hartzheim said he believed the cost would be similar, because they are not separate pane windows, but are rather grids in between the panes. He also clarified that he did not get the staff recommendation commentary until yesterday morning (Wednesday), so he did not have time to go out and find different estimates before the Board meeting on Thursday morning. Based on the estimates they received, he does not anticipate the cost will be significantly different.

Volk: She likes the windows Hartzheim is proposing. She said there may be a difference of opinions, but since it is not something historic district related, she thinks it is a personal preference, and she supports what they are doing with the windows and with the awning. She understands how the sun gets hot in the summer, and different times of the year it is uncomfortable, and it would be nice to utilize workspace in front of that window without someone being affected by the hot sun. She supports removing those two staff recommendations. She also clarified that the east side would be a landing, rather than a deck, and she would support having that staff recommendation removed. She asked for clarification on what number that was.

S Hartzheim: It was located higher up in the document, not listed in the abbreviated recommendation at the bottom.

Bloom: It would be deletion of Items #3 and Item #4 and noting the deck would be an eligible expense.

Roybal: Are you making that a motion?

Volk: Yes, I so move. Teubner seconded.

Nuse: Unclear on dollar amount the motion entails. Does the new motion entail an additional amount?

Bloom: The application was up to \$30,000, and that amount is not changing. Whatever the final cost ends up being, the applicant will provide receipts to verify the amount, and the reimbursement will be up to that amount based on the receipts and not to exceed \$30,000. The initial amount did include the awning and windows as presented and east side concrete work.

Mrozinsky: She wants to address the concern of consistency with the program, and it is something that should be addressed by the Board. The decision of whether designs are approved or not should not be based on Board member preference. If there is going to be a new precedence, maybe this should be postponed to have that discussion.

Bloom: Regarding Board member Mrozinsky's response, yes they need to look at having more of an established guideline and standard on what CIG and FIP grants look like, and those are part of the Plan of Development. He does not think it would be appropriate to postpone this application that is already in the pipeline. Mr. Hartzheim has made some very good arguments that Bloom was not aware of when he drafted the staff report. That other discussion should happen in a work session setting, rather than during the approval process for this application.

Roybal: The discussion now is on the motion is to allow the items that were initially recommended as not included. Motion to allow the windows, awning and landing as presented in the initial application passed unanimously.

Roybal: Now we are on the original motion, to approve the CIG application as submitted by the applicant Double H Home Loans, Stan and Maggie Hartzheim.

Volk called the question. Motion passed unanimously.

Item V. E. On-Street Parking design MOU with the City:

Bloom requested this be withdrawn and not move forward on this, so it can be discussed more with downtown business and property owners on what they would like to see.

Roybal: Would Amber Ash with the Mayor's office like to provide any further clarification on this?

Ash: Charles Bloom adequately summarized where they are at. Some correspondence was received, and meetings are set up with stakeholders to gather more information and input from them. So they support withdrawing it at this time.

Roybal: Will there be enough information to put this on next month's agenda, because they would like to act on this?

Ash: She certainly hopes so.

Bau: You mentioned there will be discussions with downtown stakeholders, can the DDA be part of those discussions or do you plan to have those discussions with others. That will be relayed to the Mayor's Office and extend that invitation, and an email will be sent to the Board to let them know how that transpires.

Roybal: Motion to accept withdrawal of this item.

Volk moved, Nuse seconded; motion passed.

Item V. F. Investment Policy (W.S. §9-4-816 through W.S. §9-4-831)

Lockman: An investment policy establishes the framework for managing an organization's investments. The proposed policy prioritizes four key objectives in order of importance: safety of principle; liquidity; yield maximization; and support for Cheyenne's local economy. Prioritization ensures the preservation of capital while maintaining sufficient liquidity to meet operational needs. The policy also aims to maximize returns within these constraints and contribute to the local economic development. All investment vehicles listed in the policy are in compliance with Wyoming state statute. This is something the auditors mentioned during their last audit that needed to be accomplished.

Nuse: She had a question about part VI, Standards of Care, Item 4 Internal Controls. In the paragraph, it references that the investment officer should write and have in place the DDA's Accounting Policy and Procedures document; she asked if that document exists, and secondarily if it does, is it something the Board can review to ensure the controls are in place for the investment officer executing her duties, so the DDA remains protected.

Lockman: That is why it says "shall establish" because it is a work in progress as she has time.

Nuse: Request they review it as a Board once it is ready to be presented.

Bellotti: She asked to add on to what Nuse said and asked if the Board should establish a deadline of when they could expect that document from Lockman.

Lockman: She is currently working on the City budgets and then has the audit, so she will try to get it completed as soon as possible.

Nuse: With Treasurer Lockman's limitations on time, if there are investment decisions she is making, should there be an additional review process with the Board that does not currently exist in this interim period, until we have established internal controls in place?

Lockman: She said that worked for her.

Bloom: The DDA currently invests in the WGIF account, and that was an action that was brought before the Board. If we were to change or modify that, we would bring that to the Board for approval.

Lockman: She stated she will not be doing any investing in this interim period, it will all stay in WGIF, which was approved by the Board.

Volk made the motion to adopt the policy as presented by Staff; Nuse seconded. Motion carried.

Item V.G. Downtown Sidewalk Snow Management Options

Maes: The options presented came about through discussions about sidewalk snow removal in the DDA District. She cited City code for this requirement for property owners in this area and the severity ranges. There are several options to consider in downtown Cheyenne sidewalk snow removal management.

1. **DDA-Funded Snow Removal:** The DDA could contract a snow removal company to ensure sidewalks within the DDA district are cleared. This would involve creating a \$25,000 line item in the FY26 budget, issuing an RFP for snow removal services, and establishing a structured downtown sidewalk snow removal program. The initial focus would align with the Clean and Safe routes (see attached map) and could later expand to all sidewalks within the DDA district. A key requirement in the RFP would be that the contractor must begin sidewalk clearing before or by 4 AM to coordinate with Clean and Safe's on-street parking snow removal.

Additionally, the DDA could explore expanding this contract to include summer landscaping services for the downtown planter program, potentially making it more attractive and sustainable to a vendor. However, some business owners may oppose using mill levy funds for this purpose, particularly if they already clear their sidewalks and prefer enhanced enforcement for non-compliant properties. The contract's scope would likely need to address all public sidewalks within the DDA district for fairness to all mill levy payers. However, since Clean and Safe does not clear snow from all on-street parking areas within the district, the contract may need to include both sidewalk and select on-street parking snow removal where Clean and Safe does not operate.

2. **Business Owners Pay Contractor Directly:** Business and property owners could opt into a group contract for sidewalk snow removal, while those who clear their own sidewalks would not be required to participate. The DDA could coordinate group rates with a contractor but would serve only as a facilitator, not a representative. Property owners who neither participate in the contract nor clear their sidewalks would be subject to fines or tickets from City Compliance. However, enforcement remains a challenge due to limited capacity.

3. **City Enforces Stronger Compliance with DDA Participation:** If the City Compliance Department is willing, the DDA could enter into an MOU to fund an additional Compliance staff member dedicated to downtown enforcement. While this approach may help drive long-term behavior change, it would be costly, potentially risky for the staff member, and would not provide an immediate solution for ensuring safe and accessible sidewalks after snowfall.

To enhance compliance, the DDA would develop and implement a communication and outreach plan to educate business and property owners about City Code § 8.60.090 and best practices for timely sidewalk snow removal. DDA staff would share information through multiple channels (email, social media, and direct outreach) both before and after snow events to reinforce responsibilities and ensure widespread understanding of the code (this is the DDA's current approach to be implemented in the coming weeks).

4. **Hybrid Program of Awareness and Heightened Enforcement:** The DDA staff could serve as downtown ambassadors monitoring and contacting frequent snow removal violators. Warnings could be posted and contact made with business owners to deter lack of compliance. If outreach is unsuccessful, DDA staff could forward complaints to the Compliance Division for enforcement under current staffing. This approach may also help drive long-term behavior change but could be time consuming for DDA staff and City Compliance Department staffing deficiencies and workload could result in untimely enforcement.

It is likely that a combination or variation of these options may provide the most effective solution for managing downtown sidewalk snow removal. The DDA goal is long term behavior change.

Nuse: What kind of outreach has been done with downtown stakeholders to this point to get their thoughts and concerns about these options before the Board makes a decision.

Maes: During her tenure of three weeks, the DDA has not done any outreach specifically about this issue. Social Media Assistant Miya prepared some brochures that we have available for you to review today, and the plan is to go handout these brochures to downtown stakeholders. Also, once language and process is approved, the DDA will create a webpage campaign about educating property and business owners.

Nuse: Is the Board expecting to make a decision today? She would prefer them to wait and get stakeholder feedback before proceeding.

Roybal: The Board does not necessarily need to make a decision today. Summarized what Clean & Safe does with their snow removal process. Today can be informational only for discussion and hold off on a decision.

L. Bellotti: She appreciates the work of the staff, but she is not prepared to make a decision today. Her concern is that she sees the role of the DDA to be the encouragers downtown, not the enforcers. The downtown collective of business is clearly communicating with each other, so she would like to have that conversation to ask what they are doing to hold their peers accountable, especially if it impacts their businesses, and then the DDA can support that. She does not want to make a decision today.

Robal: This issue could be included with the meeting on the parking and see what the downtown stakeholders think.

Volk: She moves that they postpone any decisions on the Downtown Sidewalk Snow Management Options until they have further input. Seconded by Bellotti.

Mrozinsky: She would be in favor of a partnership with the DDA and Clean & Safe, to build a consistent program throughout all sidewalks downtown. It would create some visual cohesiveness as people are walking down the sidewalks. Other Board members gave their perspective on how they manage snow removal at their businesses.

Jason Sanchez: Community Rec and Events Director – First of all, thank you for the support on the Fridays on the Plaza, they absolutely could not do it without the DDA's support. As for the snow removal issue, it is a prudent move if a snowstorm is in the forecast, the DDA should put out an email that requests overnight

parking be in the parking structures whenever possible, so they can clear up as much as possible when they start at 4:00AM. Also to let downtown stakeholders know that it's OK to push that snow off the curb if they clear their sidewalks, because Clean & Safe will plow it out. If they leave it on the edge of the sidewalk, there is about a foot of snow that people have to trudge through to get to the cleared sidewalk. Take these simple steps to make progress and then have the meeting and decide the strategy for businesses going forward.

Heath: As a user in the downtown area, it gets difficult to park close to the curb, when plowed snow is pushed against the curb. She would encourage snow removal away from the curb, rather than against the curb.

Sanchez: They've met with Public Works, who will be notified when piles exist in the downtown area, to have those removed the following day.

Roybal: Advised this is not an actionable item, so there is no need to move for postponement.

Volk withdrew her motion; Nuse seconded.

Rose: She appreciates that we are engaging stakeholders. She would like to also talk about trash removal and alley cleanup, to go beyond winter, and discuss how to clean up downtown with business owners.

Roybal excused himself from the meeting; Volk took over as presiding officer over the meeting. (11:05)

Item V.H. Draft FY 2026 Budget Proposal

Maes: Provided a summary of the proposed budget for July 1, 2025, to June 30, 2026. The budget represents an increase in Mill Levy collections of \$23,000 and a decrease in interest earned from WGIF of about \$400.00. She reviewed line items, and most of them remained the same as the current FY budget. Any line items that were changed, she explained the changes in amounts. The DDA Board may elect to adopt the budget as presented or make modifications.

Nuse: She wanted to acknowledge the significant decrease we have coming into the FY2026 budget from Revenue from reserves. That has historically been a much larger number, and she feels more comfortable with the amount now proposed, because it represents acknowledgement that the DDA has plans to use a set amount of money, and they aren't going into the next year thinking they can deplete the reserves completely or by 50%. Does not want the DDA to be too aggressive with depleting reserves. Was this intentional with the same thought process?

Bloom: Yes, this was the intent of reducing the amount of Revenue for reserves. There is still about \$600,000 earmarked from prior Mill Levy's that could be operational in the event the DDA was not housed in the City. Another roughly \$700,000 earmarked in the investment account that would be able to be pulled at any time for funding of specific items if the Board so wished. This is more reflective of the true operating budget. In addition, the DDA operating budget does have other effects. For example, as members of the IDA, membership levels are based on the operating budgets, so the rate should be reflective of what the DDA is actually doing and pay a lesser rate on some of those memberships.

Nuse: In the event something significant popped up that the DDA wanted to support, we could always do a budget amendment and dip more into reserves, correct? Bloom confirmed that.

Nuse: She also wanted to acknowledge the mural and arts budget line item going away and asked for explanation on that. She would like the Board to consider increasing the sponsorship budget line item by \$10,000 to \$45,000, since they just approved a \$35,000 sponsorship for Fridays on the Plaza, and that does not leave any room for any other sponsorships.

Bloom: It is the purview of the Board to increase any of the line items or modify those items; they could increase by \$10,000 or \$15,000 simply by decreasing the reserve amount or do a transfer based on what is seen in today's budget.

Nuse: She made the motion to increase the sponsorship line item by \$10,000.00 and take that off reserves. Seconded by Teubner.

Mrozinsky: Is line 745 Community Events for sponsorships as well and could the money come from there?

Maes: That line item is for events the DDA puts on, such as Screen on the Green and other community events that are not Visit Cheyenne specific.

L. Bellotti: She questioned the amount of \$5,000 for Marketing and Advertising, and she wondered if that was enough. She referenced the need for more outreach to stakeholders, and the expenses of direct mailing and email platforms.

Volk: We've discussed creating a Communications Plan, and once we have more relevant information on costs, we can formulate a budget for that item through budget amendments. She asked to move forward with a motion to approve the FY 2026 budget as presented by staff.

Moved by Nuse; seconded by Bellotti.

Nuse: She would like to have her previous question about the Mural program addressed by staff.

Bloom: The mural program was active prior to the DDA coming under the City, but no actions have occurred in the past year to move that program forward.

Mrozinsky: She wants to see the Communication line item separate from the Marketing and Advertising line item, because she sees them as being separate actions. She also asked about the COVID Rental Assistance program.

Mae: It is still at \$25,000 and funds that need to be spent by December of 2026, with maximum grant amounts of \$5,000 each. Staff is working on more outreach about this program. Working with Renee Smith and John Brodie to modify the application requirements to make it easier for those having hardships during that time. May possibly have some potential applications to turn on.

Motion to approve budget passed unanimously.

VI. Other Business

A. Bonding for Board Members (verbal update)

Bonding for certain board members and Bloom, Maes, President, Vice-President, and Treasurer.

B. Board Strategic Planning Session (verbal update)

Time to plan this, consider dates to work together to define tasks and subcommittees to move forward on the Plan of Development. Board members discussed time options. A poll will be sent to Board members to see what times and spaces work best for the Board.

C. Board Downtown Tour (verbal update)

Option to include a Board trolley tour with the Work Session or at another time. Could possibly be smaller tours on foot, to discuss specific issues. Look at the projects that are specifically discussed within the Plan of the Development. The tour could be hybrid. This tour could also include CIG projects as well and seeing some of the success of the CIG program, as well as look at the planters. The board will look at itineraries that may include or be separate from the work session.

D. Micromobility/Dockless Vehicles (verbal update)

Bloom provided an update of what the City is doing with the dockless vehicles ordinance. A revised ordinance would establish an RFP option that would provide for one exclusive provider for that service, and it would allow the City to generate more revenue from the scooters being in rights-of-way. It would allow the City to work with one provider, to detail how they interact within public spaces, to accomplish their tasks without becoming a nuisance.

E. Plan of Development Update (verbal update)

Maes: The final Plan of Development package has been delivered to the DDA, and that will be uploaded to the DDA website. We also have the work plan template with the higher priority items that were discussed in the Plan of Development. This will be a tool for the work session.

F. Branded Clothing for Outreach (verbal update)

Parsons: Councilman Roybal came to the DDA Administrator with a suggestion of the DDA purchasing swag or branded clothing for marketing, so Parsons was asked to reach out to vendors to get pricing on these items. She contacted two local vendors, and we are still waiting on their information. We also priced a major on-line vendor. We are looking at t-shirts, hats, vests, and safety vests. Roybal wanted to put the idea before the Board to be thinking about, but we do not have final costs on what that would look like at this time.

G. Public Outreach Group question by Mrozinsky

Mrozinsky recalled a possible email or discussion about putting together a public outreach group and wasn't sure if that was happening or what the status is on that.

Maes: She said she did not recall those emails, but she is planning to meet with a group of downtown stakeholders for a formal introduction, and that email chain showed the urgency of having that meeting. The DDA plans to have a subcommittee for marketing and outreach, and DDA staff will start work internally to develop a short-term strategy for outreach now.

Item VII. Public Comment

- **Corey Loghry**, Downtown Business Owner – She would like to see more stakeholder meetings and input when preparing for strategic planning meeting; April 9th 9:00 AM meeting with the Mayor at Paris West; she would like to address moving the DDA back into a downtown location and out of the City building. She said it would make the DDA more visible and accessible, more engagement with stakeholders.
- **Sam Galleotos**, Downtown Property Owner – Harken back to the discussion on snow removal, and the enforcement. He encouraged more discussion between the DDA, property owners, and the City; the DDA's role should be as facilitator to bring business and property owners together in ideas of contracting for snow removal. He questioned the comment of the DDA being under the purview of the City, and he feels the DDA should be back to an independent organization with its own staff and location. The MOU is coming up for renewal, and the diligence of the Board in determining if the DDA is organized correctly today. He thinks this is an important issue with regard to the mill levy.

Announcements or Other Business:

- Next regular board meeting will be April 17, 2025

Adjournment:

Motion to adjourn by Nuse, seconded by Mrozinsky. Meeting adjourned at 11:40 AM