

August 17, 2025

Dear Jamie,

I am receipt of your proposed Agenda for the meeting on Thursday, August 21, 2025. In your introductory e-mail, you state that the goal of the meeting is to better understand 'feedback from **folks in favor of the GID**'.

That's correct. This is not a "Stop the GID" meeting. If you have your mind made up and do not wish to hear anything further about the GID, this is not the meeting for you. The intent of the working groups is to hear out those that stated they would like more information about what a GID could look like before moving forward or not and to suss out those details. The construct of the engagement will also allow us to suss out specificity on concerns and ideas for the neighborhood that we may be able to tackle via other funding strategies. All that said, you are welcome to attend, but misinformation will not be welcomed.

I write on behalf of the hundreds of residents of Cherry Creek North who have joined the "STOP the GID" movement.

First, we would like to address the formation of a GID and why we are moving forward with a meeting on August 21 (or any other meeting). As an expert in GIDs I am sure you are familiar with the statute associated with creating a GID.

**GID Creation Guide  
(GID statutes outlined in CRS 31-25-601 through 25-633)**

*Forming a GID should be a grassroots effort originated by the property owners. Since it involves property owners voting to tax themselves for additional services, the City does not mandate a GID be created. GIDs are typically created by engaged property owners with a strong desire and need for GID activities. The need for a GID typically arises out of the limitations of the property owner's ability to construct public improvements and a desire to provide greater services. In the City and County of Denver, GIDs have been used to provide enhancements and perpetual maintenance to large City funded projects.*

I will cut and paste the response I provided to Cynthia Tullman on this same topic via a separate email this morning since I see she was also copied on your email: To your comment about the special districts guide, I am well aware. And it's correct, stakeholders who would pay the fee do have to drive it and take ownership of the concept. That said, it is not unusual at all for council people to seed fund a process to explore districts for their constituents. In fact, Wayne New - when he was councilman - funded the feasibility study and early exploration phases of a GID for the Golden Triangle which I oversaw. The City

also has a special districts loan fund communities can tap into to support district formation efforts. Amanda is not leading this process - in fact you will not see her in the next phases as we dive deeper into community engagement. The working groups will assist in leading discussions and conversations that shape a conceptual plan with details so individuals interested in those details can make an informed assessment. But there is benefit to having the City at the table as a willing partner who can possibly support the GID with committee resources should it be formed.

Over the course of 9 months, you have engaged property owners in Cherry Creek in multiple ways, publicly & behind closed doors, through multiple venues and even surveyed the residents of Cherry Creek. In your statistically significant survey 65% of the residents in Cherry Creek said they do not want a GID. This directly contradicts the GID Statute requiring GID Property Owners to have a “Strong Desire and Need for GID Activities”.

And here I will cut and paste my response to Cynthia Tullman to this exact same question she asked me in an email: As I shared in my July 22nd presentation which can also be viewed on the [denvergov.org/CCGID](http://denvergov.org/CCGID) website, the first phase of work I was hired for was a "Feasibility Study" which by its very definition is an assessment of the practicality of a plan before significant resources are committed, and which looks at the various aspects of a possible GID to determine if the project is viable and can be successfully executed. Districts are complicated and complex tools. For people not familiar with their nuances, the feasibility study is a time in which we are both educating folks on the mechanism while hearing initial gut reactions. In the July 22 report you will see we've identified where there are possible pathways for success and possible concerns. This was never intended as the vote on the district. There isn't even a fully-fleshed concept to vote on... just ideas, thoughts, questions and concerns that should shape that plan. Right now you are vetoing a concept without details. There are many people out there who have also shared that they are hesitant about the concept, but want more details to make an informed decision. So Amanda has greenlit an additional phase of engagement to be able to answer specifics. After 25 years of doing this, a 35% interest rate (which, considering a margin of error of 5% could be closer to 40%) to the concept, and factoring in the many additional conversations we've had with stakeholders, leads me to believe there is potential... though a GID may not look anything like where we started.

Democracy works best when under the bright light of government transparency and accountability. A such, in the interest of further understanding how you perceive such a “Strong Desire” to exist and for the hundreds of concerned Cherry Creek Residents that are questioning where a “Strong Desire” originated from, we request that you and Amanda Sawyer produce the following:

- Describe the inception of this process including the citizen(s) who reached out to request exploration of the GID

A special district tool to fund special services was first identified in the 2012 Cherry Creek Area Plan as a mechanism to fund special services that the city wouldn't otherwise fund. It has come up again - as I understand it from CW Sawyer - throughout the last several years. Ultimately the desires of the community being expressed to her office were via things that the city would not fund. When she approached me, it was basically to answer the question "is this something people really want to get what they want or not - let's answer that question."

· We note that all the interaction with Cherry Creek residents is recorded and in the public domain and, in the interest of full transparency, we believe that interactions with anyone concerning this GID should also be in the public domain. Provide video, audio recordings, transcripts or notes for the following meetings that occurred with developers and other organizations prior to citizen engagement:

- a) Broe Real Estate Group (Feb)
- b) East/West Partners Cherry Creek West (Feb)
- c) Cherry Creek Mall/Taubman (Mar)
- d) Matt Joblon/BMC (Mar)
- e) Alder Real Estate (Apr)
- f) Transportation Solutions Board Meeting (Mar)
- g) Cherry Creek North Neighborhood Association Board (Mar)
- h) Cherry Creek East Neighborhood Association (Mar)
- i) Cherry Creek East Neighborhood Association (Apr)
- j) Cherry Creek Chamber of Commerce

There are no formal notes from any of these sessions. I have attached the same initial PPT that was presented to all of these groups. It was used as a "level setting" presentation to inform them on the concept and let them ask questions.

· Provide all financial detail from the beginning of your consulting engagement through July 31, 2025 as well as a copy of your signed engagement letter, contract and proposed budget. As taxpayers of Denver we are paying for these services and deserve to understand the cost for such services.

My feasibility study contract as well as my proposal for the additional engagement through the fall are attached.

Please respond to the above requests prior to the opening of the August 21 meeting.

The Members of the "Stop the GID" movement have consolidated their initial questions into the following. We would like to start the meeting by having you and Amanda Sawyer

address each of the following questions in detail. Upon completion of your responses the meeting can begin.

This is not a Stop the GID Meeting and you do not get to dictate the terms of a meeting intended to answer questions that other thoughtful citizens have brought up. I would be happy to meet with you and other Stop the GID members separately, but it will not be as part of this week's meeting.

### **CCN Resident Questions To Be Answered at 8/21 CCN Work Group Session**

- 
- 1) Following the July 22<sup>nd</sup> GID Survey Results Zoom Meeting, the most asked question by CCN residents was: “Since 65% of surveyed CCN residents answered that they are not interested in forming a GID, why are you continuing with this GID feasibility study and these work groups? Please do not use a handful of selected comments from the minority of people surveyed to justify the answer. We are focused on the will of the 65% of the people surveyed.

I've answered this question above.

- 
- 2) GID Beginning – Councilwoman Sawyer formed a planning group of a few selected CCN and City officials and began the GID formation discussion and planning with the Centro consultant without communicating clearly to the CCNNA Board and not at all to CCN residents. The first GID presentation to the CCNNA Board by Councilwoman Sawyer and her consultant was March 13<sup>th</sup>, 2025. Within days residents received the pre-printed post card without any context. Why was there no earlier resident communication, explaining the GID and its mandatory taxing requirement? Please see my feedback about this being a feasibility study.

-

The post card communication was extremely ineffective. As of this date, a large percentage of CCN residents still do not know what this GID is. How are you going to communicate with all the 2,000 CCN households, when CCNNA can only reach approximately 22% of these residents through email? The leaders of the “Stop the GID” movement request that are provided with the same detailed resident information to allow us to communicate, in the same format as CENTRO and/or city officials, to the identical population of households. Each of these households deserve to hear both sides of this issue prior to moving forward.

You can request registered voter data from the Denver Clerk and Recorder's office and property data from the Denver assessor's office. It is public information, but when it is obtained I am required to sign a confidentiality clause that does not allow me to distribute the data.

-

4) In February Councilwoman Sawyer and the consultant begin presenting the concept of a GID to the Developers and Commercial Property Owners of Cherry Creek. Not until March were the leaders of the CCNNA engaged. Given that residents will fund 52% of the GID revenue, why were neighborhood leaders and residents brought into the discussion after Developers and Commercial Property Owners? The decision to move forward with the GID feasibility appears to have been made before residents, who are paying most of the tax, were engaged in any meaningful way. Why were the voting residents of Cherry Creek not engaged prior to Developers and Commercial Property Owners?

The order was only driven by the fact it took us a longer time to pull together larger residential sessions which had to be postcarded and a place had to be identified while the individual owner meetings were meetings we could start more rapidly.

-

5) Why was the GID interest question positioned, in confusing language, at the end of the multi-page survey? In the interest of completeness and transparency, we request (demand) the following:

- i) The first question on any future communication be stated plainly: “Do you want Cherry Creek to create a GID”
- ii) The information leading to the first question clearly outline the expected cost that each household would bear if a GID is adopted
- iii) The information leading to the first question clearly articulate that, if a GID is adopted, apartment rents in the Cherry Creek Neighborhood would likely increase because property owners will likely pass these costs onto tenants.

Because this is a feasibility study - and at this stage we simply do not have a clear plan to propose in which we can tell you what the costs would be, nor do we know exactly how this will impact renters. This is all part of the discussion.

- 6) What are the Administrative Costs associated with this GID?
- a. Formation Costs (legal, filing and your consulting fees)
  - b. Ongoing Administrative Costs (legal, audit, filing and your ongoing “management costs”)?

I've attached the proposals you requested so you can see what the fees are for feasibility and the next round of engagement. I do not yet know the full formation and legal costs as those are driven by the size and complexity of the district and the number of stakeholders. Typically we see district formations costing anywhere from \$75K to \$125K total. But again - much varies based upon a number of factors. There are no assumed ongoing management costs for Centro - some districts seek to obtain me for a short period of time (3-6months) after formation to get them on their feet... others do that themselves.

We look forward to the Zoom meeting on August 21 and appreciate your cooperation.

Thank you,  
David W. Patterson

--

Jamie Giellis  
Founder and President | Centro Inc.  
303.345.8285  
[jamie@becentro.com](mailto:jamie@becentro.com)  
[www.becentro.com](http://www.becentro.com)

[TEDx RiNo Origins Speaker](#)