



City of Colorado Springs

City Hall
107 N. Nevada Avenue
Colorado Springs, CO
80903

Meeting Minutes City Council

City Council meetings are broadcast live on Channel 18. In accordance with the ADA, anyone requiring an auxiliary aid to participate in this meeting should make the request as soon as possible but no later than 48 hours before the scheduled event. Documents created by third parties may not meet all accessibility criteria.

Tuesday, October 14, 2025

9:00 AM

Council Chambers

How to Watch the Meeting

Coloradosprings.gov/springstv | Facebook Live: Colorado Springs City Council
Facebook Page @coscity Council | SPRINGS TV - Comcast Channel 18 / 880 (HD)
- Stratus IQ Channel 76 / 99 (Streaming)

How to Comment on Agenda Items

Before the meeting, you may email general comments for items not on the agenda or comments regarding agenda items to: allcouncil@coloradosprings.gov

Estimated agenda item times are provided for planning purposes and do not constitute notice of a specific time for any item. Items may take more or less time than estimated. City Council may amend the order of items.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

President Crow-Iverson called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM.

Present: 9 - Councilmember Tom Bailey, President Lynette Crow-Iverson, Councilmember Dave Donelson, Councilmember Kimberly Gold, Councilmember Nancy Henjum, Councilmember David Leinweber, Councilmember Roland Rainey Jr., President Pro Tem Brian Risley, and Councilmember Brandy Williams

Councilmember Gold left the meeting at 11:35 AM and returned at 12:05 PM.

Councilmember Williams left the meeting and attended virtually at 1:05 PM.

2. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

The Invocation was made by Pastor Stan Lightfoot from the Rustic Hills Baptist Church.

President Crow-Iverson led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Changes to Agenda/Postponements

There were no changes to the Agenda.

4. Consent Calendar

These items will be acted upon as a whole, unless a specific item is called for discussion by a Councilmember or a citizen wishing to address the City Council. (Any items called up for separate consideration shall be acted upon following the Mayor's Business.)

4A. Second Presentation:

4B. First Presentation:

4B.A. [25-534](#) City Council Regular Meeting Minutes September 23, 2025

Presenter:
Sarah B. Johnson, City Clerk

Attachments: [9-23-2025 City Council Meeting Minutes Final.pdf](#)

The Minutes were approved on the Consent Calendar.

4B.B. [25-229](#) A Resolution Authorizing the Acquisition of Real Property, Permanent Easements, and Temporary Easements using PPRTA funds for the Tutt Boulevard Extension: Dublin Boulevard to Templeton Gap Road Project

Presenter:
Gayle Sturdivant, PE, PMP, City Engineer/Deputy Public Works Director
Kellie Billingsley, Real Estate Services Manager

Attachments: [1 JE Martin - Location Map](#)
[2 JE Martin - Resolution.docx](#)
[3 JE Martin - Exhibit A and B](#)
[4 JE Martin - Exhibit C and D](#)
[5 JE Martin - Exhibit E and F](#)
[6 JE Martin - Exhibit G and H](#)
[7 JE Martin - Exhibit I and J](#)
[8 JE Martin - Exhibit K and L](#)
[9 JE Martin - Presentation](#)

This Resolution was adopted on the Consent Calendar.

4B.C. [25-462](#) A Resolution of the City of Colorado Springs approving an amended and restated Service Plan for the Bradley Ranch Metropolitan District located generally southeast of the intersection of Old Ranch Road and North Union Boulevard.

Council District #2

Presenter:

Allison Stocker, Senior Planner, City Planning Department
Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [BradleyRanchServicePlan-RES-2025-09-15](#)

[Comparison to Model Service Plan](#)

[Exhibit_1_Amended&Restates_BradleyRanchMD_ServicePlan](#)

[Exhibit A Legal Description](#)

[Exhibit B Vicinity Map](#)

[Exhibit C District Boundary Map](#)

[Exhibit D 2024 Financial Statements 12-31 \[Audited\]](#)

[Exhibit E Permitted Services](#)

[Petitioner_Cover_Memo_Bradley_Ranch_MD](#)

[Resolution 130-06 Approved Service Plan](#)

This Resolution was adopted on the Consent Calendar.

4B.D. [25-463](#)

Resolution of the City of Colorado Springs, Colorado approving the issuance of debt by the Ellston Park Metropolitan District Senior Limited Tax General Obligation Bonds and Subordinate Limited Tax General Obligation Bonds, Series 2025, in the estimated principal aggregate amount of \$4,000,000.

Council District # 1

Presenter:

Allison Stocker, Senior Planner, City Planning Department
Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [EllstonVillage MD Debt Issuance Resolution](#)
[Exhibit A Preliminary Plan of Finance Bond Documents](#)
[Exhibit B Signed Bond Resolution](#)
[Exhibit B Unsigned Bond Resolution Ellston Park MD](#)
[Exhibit C List of Public Improvements & Cost](#)
[Exhibit D Certificate of External Financial Advisor](#)
[Exhibit E1 Senior Bond Form Series 2025A](#)
[Exhibit E2 Subordinate Bond Form Series 2025B](#)
[Exhibit F1 Senior Indenture Series 2025A](#)
[Exhibit F2 Subordinate Indenture Series 2025B](#)
[Exhibit G1 Series 2025A Bond Opinion - Ellston Park MD 2025](#)
[Exhibit G2 Series 2025B Bond Opinion - Ellston Park MD 2025](#)
[Exhibit H Opinion Letter General Counsel - Ellston Park MD - Series 2025](#)
[Exhibit I Approved ServicePlan Signed Resolution 81-21](#)
[Exhibit J Approved Development Plan](#)
[Petitioner EllstonPark MD Bond Issuance Cover Memo](#)
[EllstonPark MD Bond Issuance Staff Presentation](#)

This Resolution was adopted on the Consent Calendar.

- 4B.E. ZONE-25-00** Ordinance No. 25-78 to amend the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs pertaining to 4.09 acres located at 4955, 4965, 4985, 4995, and 5015 Austin Bluffs Parkway from MX-N/cr/AP-O (Mixed-Use Neighborhood Scale with Conditions of Record and Airport Overlay) and RE/AP-O (Single-Family Estate with Airport Overlay) to MX-M/AP-O (Mixed-Use Medium Scale with Airport Overlay). (Quasi-judicial) (Second Reading and Public Hearing)

13

Related Files: N/A
Council District #6

Presenter:
Allison Stocker, Senior Planner, Planning Department
Kevin Walker, Director, Planning Department

Attachments: ZONE-25-0013_Ordinance
ZONE-25-0013_Staff Report_v2
Attachment 1- CPC CU 02-00184-A2MN12
Attachment 2 - Ordinance 82-15
Attachment 3 - Land Use Statement
Attachment 4 - Project Statement
Attachment 5 - Exhibit A Legal Description
Attachment 6 - Exhibit B Zone Change Map
7.5.704 ZONING MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)
ZONE-25-0013_Presentation_CC

This Ordinance was approved on first reading on the Consent Calendar.

Approval of the Consent Agenda

Motion by President Pro Tem Risley, seconded by Councilmember Bailey, that all matters on the Consent Calendar be passed, adopted, and approved by unanimous consent of the members present. The motion passed by a vote of 9-0-0

Aye: 9 - Bailey, Crow-Iverson, Donelson, Gold, Henjum, Leinweber, Rainey Jr., Risley, and Williams

5. Recognitions

5.A. [25-553](#) A Resolution recognizing October 2025 as Arts Month in the Pikes Peak Region

Presenter:
Nancy Henjum, Councilmember District 5

Attachments: [Arts Month in the Pikes Peak Region 2025](#)

Councilmember Henjum stated she and Councilmember Gold attended the theater production of Cabaret at the Ent Center for the Arts.

Scott Levy, President, Executive Director, Green Box Arts, and Board Chair, Cultural Office of the Pikes Peak Region (COPPeR), provided an overview of the various art and cultural opportunities throughout the community.

Councilmember Henjum read the Resolution recognizing October 2025 as Arts Month.

Councilmember Gold encouraged everyone to participate in the City's arts economy throughout the year.

Motion by Councilmember Gold, seconded by Councilmember Williams, that the Resolution recognizing October 2025 as Arts Month in the Pikes Peak Region be adopted. The motion passed by a vote of 9-0-0-0

Aye: 9 - Bailey, Crow-Iverson, Donelson, Gold, Henjum, Leinweber, Rainey Jr., Risley, and Williams

- 5.B.** [25-561](#) A Resolution Honoring The U.S. Senate's Designation Of October 14, 2025, As National Day Of Remembrance For Charlie Kirk, Recognizing The Importance Of Protecting Free Speech, Encouraging Open Dialogue, And Condemning Political Violence.

Presenter:

Brandy Williams, Councilmember District 3

Attachments: [Resolution Honoring National Remembrance Day for Charlie Kirk](#)

Councilmember Williams encouraged citizens to live with love and grace and read the Resolution honoring the United States (U.S.) Senate's designation of October 14, 2025, as National Day of Remembrance For Charlie Kirk, recognizing the importance of protecting free speech, encouraging open dialogue, and condemning political violence.

Councilmember Donelson stated Charlie Kirk was murdered in cold blood, and he supports the strongest penalty for his murder, but believes this Resolution is a mistake because it is political, alienates/divides citizens, and does not allow for public comment.

Motion by Councilmember Donelson, seconded by Councilmember Henjum, that the Resolution honoring the United States (U.S.) Senate's designation of October 14, 2025, as National Day of Remembrance For Charlie Kirk, recognizing the importance of protecting free speech, encouraging open dialogue, and condemning political violence be tabled. The motion failed by a vote of 5-4-0-0

Aye: 4 - Donelson, Gold, Henjum, and Rainey Jr.

No: 5 - Bailey, Crow-Iverson, Leinweber, Risley, and Williams

Councilmember Rainey stated there should not be any room in society for political violence or lose their life for speaking their mind and the nation needs to get back to focusing on civil discourse.

Councilmember Leinweber stated he supports what Mr. Kirk represented and the values he held.

Councilmember Henjum stated she is deeply concerned about the first amendment and the violence which occurred from someone speaking their mind, but the name of one particular person in the Resolution is

very polarizing.

Councilmember Gold stated City Council has the job to be the light, hope, and instill positivity for the future of the City, but feels they are failing due to some of the decisions they have made.

Motion by Councilmember Bailey, seconded by Councilmember Williams, that the Resolution honoring the United States (U.S.) Senate's designation of October 14, 2025, as National Day of Remembrance For Charlie Kirk, recognizing the importance of protecting free speech, encouraging open dialogue, and condemning political violence be adopted. The motion passed by a vote of 5-4-0-0

Aye: 5 - Bailey, Crow-Iverson, Leinweber, Risley, and Williams

No: 4 - Donelson, Gold, Henjum, and Rainey Jr.

5.C. [25-516](#) City Council Appointments to Boards, Commissions, and Committees

Presenter:

Lynette Crow-Iverson, Council President and Councilmember
At-Large

Attachments: [10142025 Boards Commissions and Committees Appointment](#)
[10142025 City County Drainage Board Packet](#)
[10142025 Fire Board of Appeals Packet](#)
[10142025 Planning Commission Packet](#)
[10142025 Stormwater Advisory Committee](#)

President Crow-Iverson presented the City Council Appointments to Boards, Commissions, and Committees.

Several Councilmembers expressed appreciation for the nominees who wish to serve the City.

Motion by President Pro Tem Risley, seconded by Councilmember Williams, that the City Council Appointments to Boards, Commissions, and Committees be approved. The motion passed by a vote of 9-0-0-0

Aye: 9 - Bailey, Crow-Iverson, Donelson, Gold, Henjum, Leinweber, Rainey Jr., Risley, and Williams

6. Mayor's Business

6.A. [25-562](#) Updates from the Mayor's Office Representative

Presenter:

Jamie Fabos, Chief of Staff

There was no Mayor's Business.

7. Items Called Off Consent Calendar

There were no items called off the Consent Calendar.

8. Unfinished Business

There was no Unfinished Business.

9. Utilities Business

- 9.A.** [25-552](#) Public Hearing for the Consideration of Colorado Springs Utilities' 2026 Rate Case, consisting of: Resolutions Setting Certain Electric Rates Within the Service Areas of Colorado Springs Utilities, Certain Changes to Electric Rate Schedules, Accepting Conclusions and Recommendations Concerning the Public Utilities Regulatory Policy Act Standards, Certain Changes to Utilities Rules and Regulations and the Open Access Transmission Tariff, and Adopting the Transmission Formula Rate, Initial Rates, and Implementation Protocols for Colorado Springs Utilities' Transmission Owner Filing.

Presenter:

Travas Deal, Chief Executive Officer, Colorado Springs Utilities

Attachments: [10-14-2025 CC Agenda Memo-2026 Rate Case Hearing](#)
[Rate Hearing Agenda-2026 Rate Case 10-14-25](#)
[City Attorney Instructions-2026 Rate Case 10-14-2025](#)
[Issues For Decision-2026 Rate Case \(002\).doc](#)

Chris Bidlack, Senior Attorney, Colorado Springs Utilities (CSU) Division, introduced the public hearing for the consideration of CSU's 2026 Rate Case, consisting of: Resolutions setting certain electric rates within the service areas of CSU, certain changes to Electric Rate Schedules, accepting conclusions and recommendations concerning the Public Utilities Regulatory Policy Act Standards, certain changes to Utilities Rules and Regulations (URR) and the Open Access Transmission (OATT) Tariff, and Adopting the Transmission Formula Rate, initial rates, and implementation protocols for CSU's Transmission Owner Filing. He presented the 2026 CSU Rate Case Hearing agenda and read the Colorado Springs Utilities rate setting standards and the role of City Council. Mr. Bidlack polled Council concerning whether any members had received any ex parte communications. Councilmember Leinweber, Councilmember Henjum, and Councilmember Williams, Councilmember Bailey identified the meetings they attended and the information they received and/or stated they are able to be fair and impartial.

Scott Shirola, Pricing and Rates Manager, CSU, provided an overview of the procedural compliance, 2026 rate case filing, large load

background/principles, Electric Rate schedules, URR, clerical Tariff corrections/procedural actions, and OATT and Transmission Filing. He identified the Energy Wise rates, net metering background/process, CSU Board engagement, electric cost recovery, renewable energy integration, Cost of Service Study (base rates), rate design, net metering system interaction, and system cost versus solar exchange. Mr. Shirola went over net metering cost shifting, energy charge recovery of demand cost, and proposed net metering rate design.

Councilmember Leinweber asked what is binding in the ten-year contract. Travas Deal, Chief Executive Officer, CSU, stated with all infrastructure, CSU requires them to pay up front.

Councilmember Leinweber asked if water use will be addressed. Mr. Shirola confirmed it will be in their provisions for the URR large load study fees.

Councilmember Henjum asked if CSU will be freezing the participation for industrial time of day. Mr. Shirola explained the three types of industrial rate schedules and how the new rate schedules would affect them.

Councilmember Leinweber asked if there will be incentives for businesses using energy during the daytime hours. Mr. Shirola confirmed there will be an Energy Wise Plus rate option for energy use from 9:00 AM to 1:00 PM when energy is at its cheapest.

Councilmember Rainey asked if there will be any restrictions for the Energy Wise Plus rate which will influence the base rates. Mr. Shirola stated those Energy Wise customers will not have an effect on the base rates.

Councilmember Henjum requested additional information on including both transmission and distribution at the same rates. Mr. Shirola stated the military has stated they do not want to participate in the Southwest Power Pool.

Councilmember Leinweber requested additional information regarding the amount of energy solar customers added back into the system. Mr. Shirola stated they will provide that information.

Councilmember Henjum asked if the proposed rate design model was presented to the CSU board prior to August 18, 2025. Mr. Shirola stated it was not presented this year, but the design model dates back to 2018.

Councilmember Williams asked if the prior main changes were the size and the interconnection fee. Mr. Shirola confirmed there were changes

to the size, a new application fee, and annual cashout charges in prior years.

Councilmember Williams stated there have been three different versions of this item since it was first introduced to the CSU Board on August 18, 2025 and she does not feel comfortable voting on this everything has been vetted especially since it will have such a huge impact on citizens.

Councilmember Henjum requested clarification on how the under quantification of imports and exports results in significant cost shifting to non-net metering customers. Mr. Shirola stated CSU rates are designed to collect the overall revenue requirement allocated to the residential class regardless of whether they are solar or non-solar customers and that cost does not go away when charges for net metering customers do not collect the full cost of service so the rates for all other customers are set higher to meet that under-recovery.

Councilmember Williams asked why the under recovery was not addressed earlier. Mr. Shirola stated that even though CSU knew under recovery for net metering was an issue, the number of net metering customers did not grow exponentially until 2017 and that was when they started redesigning rates.

Councilmember Williams asked why the rates were not redesigned once the number of net metering customers reached two thousand. Tristan Gearhart, Chief Planning and Financial Officer, CSU, stated CSU was purchasing requisitions and obtaining rebates through 2022 which is value which went back to all customers to cover the subsidy. Travas Deal, Chief Executive Officer, CSU, stated CSU has also had solar arrays come online which CSU purchases power from which created another cost shift to rate payers.

Councilmember Leinweber stated with this new format, installers need to inform solar customers to maximize afternoon sun for production and get a battery which lasts four hours.

Councilmember Leinweber asked if solar customers could use the extra energy they produce during the middle of the day during the peak pricing hours of 5:00 PM to 9:00 PM when energy production is at its highest cost. Mr. Shirola stated the crediting of excess generation is complicated by State Statute policy

Councilmember Henjum asked what the value is to CSU for the excess energy generation solar customers collect. Mr. Shirola explained that CSU receives renewable energy credits which go toward meeting compliance with the state mandate for CSUs ten percent energy coming from renewable energy sources.

Councilmember Henjum asked if CSU batteries could be used for rooftop solar. Mr. Gearhart stated that the net metering solar generation from homes is not the lowest cost energy that they want to store in their 100-MW batteries because CSU's solar farms are four to five times lower.

Councilmember Henjum stated she is struggling with the timeline in which this rate case has been introduced to City Council. Mr. Gearhart stated he needs to look at the rates for all of CSU's 250,000 customers and these rates will not go into effect until 2027.

Councilmember Williams stated the rates have been unduly discriminatory for years and they need to take the time to review other options.

Councilmember Rainey asked what the ramifications are for the solar industry. Mr. Gearhart stated it is important to give them the true cost of rooftop solar so that the problem is not perpetuated and CSU can deal with the \$5.5 million deficiency.

Councilmember Rainey asked what the incentive is for people to get solar panels now. Mr. Gearhart stated it is a financial decision customers will need to make based on their knowledge of the rates.

Councilmember Bailey stated the inaction of the prior City Council is irrelevant, but they need to address the deficiencies regarding net metering customers now because the costs are going to continue going up.

Mr. Gearhart provided an overview of the electric rate schedules, kilowatt hour versus kilowatt, proposed demand change, and example demand calculation. He provided an overview of net metering - residential rate design, demand change, customer control, net metering proposal/key considerations, and customer outreach.

Natalie Lovell, City Auditor, Office of the City Auditor, stated the Office of the City Auditor, concluded that overall modifications included in the 2026 Rate Case Filing reports and the supporting schedules for proposed rates and fees for the electric service were prepared accurately and consistently, methodology changes were appropriately disclosed in the utilities' filing reports, changes were consistent rate design guidance approved by Utilities Board and based on the five year Electric Cost Of Service Study approved by City Council effective January 1, 2025.

Citizens Tanner Cox, Colorado Program Director, Solar United Neighbors (SUN), Casey Becker, Colorado Solar and Storage Association (COSSA), Ellen Howard Kitzer, General Counsel, COSSA, Scott Carter, Rona Culp, Liz Clement, Jean Taylor, Devin Rand, Kate Brady, Carolyn Dickerson, Derek Law, Nancy Stilwagon, Brian Safyan, Patti Freudenburg, Paul Burger, Frank Fox, Jeff Waalkes, Wes Montoya, Wendy Crawford, Matthew Schniper, Ramona Szoke, Amy Willard, David Havlick, Charles Peterson, Karen Ying, Mike Moerk, Jeanette Caproon, Steve Radil, Cathy Wernley, Bob Wernley, Chris Duval, Landon Hartman, Dale Munson, Will McNaley, Kevin Eber, Dwight Baker, Todd Doropinghaus, Kevin Bowersox, Sherri Parrish, Salomon Medina, Barb Fox, Rick Hart, Tim Smith, Lonnie Imlay, Damon Betha, John Harner, Joshua Callahan, and Lotus spoke in opposition of the proposed net metering rate case.

Councilmember Henjum recommended that the net metering part of the rate case should either be removed, or City Council take more time to review.

Councilmember Henjum asked when new solar customers were notified that there would be a change in net metering, when this proposed rate case was determined, whether CSU sees solar customers as valuable to the energy system, and why they chose to use the word "subsidy" in relation to net metering customers.

Councilmember Rainey asked what state statute citizens are stating CSU's net metering is non-compliant with, what the impact would be of grandfathering in current net metering customers, and what the cost would be if CSU increased their investment in battery storage.

Mr. Bidlack responded to citizen and Councilmember questions by

stating the Colorado Renewable Energy Standard that went into place in 2004, established the net metering provisions which are applicable to both privately owned and municipal utilities with municipal utilities having more flexibility. He stated that discriminatory rate making provisions do not prohibit different rates when there are appropriate justifications based on the customer's usage of the utility system, CSU is not subject to the Colorado Public Utilities Commission (PUC), and the net metering agreements between CSU and the customers state that rates may change over time subject to City Council making those rate changes.

Councilmember Henjum asked what CSU's obligation is to notify customers of rate changes. Mr. Bidlack stated per City Code Section 12.1.108 and City Council's Rules and Procedures Chapter 4, tariff changes are noticed in The Gazette, online, as well as other CSU outreach. He stated what has been proposed is defensible and fits within the existing structure of contracts.

Mr. Gearhart also responded to citizen and Councilmember questions by stating CSU recognized the benefits of solar customers by offering rebates to everyone coming onto the system from 2006 through 2022 and they are continuing to offer credits for energy per state law by exchanging at one-to-one for banked energy, CSU is not responsible for customer's return on investment because those are personal financial decisions, CSU can not grandfather the existing net metering customers due to the \$5.5 million revenue shortfall those nine thousand customers are creating, the \$50 per month, per net metering customer charge was reduced to \$25 per month due to the averaging peak energy usage, Excel Energy is an investor owned utility which has different applicable laws/regulations, CSU may offer incentives to solar customer which produce net energy back to the grid during peak times, the three hundred solar customers which utilize their batteries during the peak period will be able to greatly reduce/eliminate their demand cost, CSU educates people regarding solar, but does not advise/encourage customers to install solar, besides providing proper public notice, CSU also emailed their net metering customers to inform them of this rate case, the cost shift calculation was based on the demand related charges identified in the 2025 Cost of Service Study, the Open House venue location needed to be changed due to the number of RSVPs they received, the Colorado Open Records Act (CORA) requests are replied to with the information they have available, but some of the information is proprietary/trade secret and has to be redacted, and another word

that could be used instead of subsidy is cost-shift due to the under collection of revenue.

Councilmember Henjum recommended that the Utilities Policy Advisory Commission (UPAC) explore the opportunities for programs to incentive solar customers for their contributions to the grid.

Renee Congdon, Division Chief, City Attorney's Office-Utilities Division, stated regarding the CORA request, there were tens of thousands of documents to be reviewed to make sure they were responsive, public record, determine if an exception applies, and if it is confidential or proprietary. She stated they initially estimated to take 259 hours to review, have already released approximately thirty percent of the records.

Councilmember Donelson asked if since this would not take effect until 2027, if net billing could be an option for citizens who would want to do that instead. Mr. Gearhart confirmed there is opportunity for optional rates to be put in place.

Councilmember Donelson asked if solar customers could provide energy to their neighbors as a solution. Mr. Gearhart stated the collection of energy usually occurs from 9:00 AM to 1:00 PM so the issue still remains during the peak period of 5:00 to 9:00 PM.

Mr. Bidlack polled City Council regarding the proposals brought forward by CSU except for net metering (see attached draft Decision and Order document). Consensus of City Council agreed to move forward with the rate case without the net metering item.

Councilmember Henjum stated this is about fairness, trust, choice, and freedom and CSU should be treating their solar customers who invested \$10,000 to \$20,000, or more of their own money, like stakeholders, not adversaries. She stated CSU should reward their solar customers like what Texas does, not penalize them and requested that net metering be tabled to give it the time it deserves.

Councilmember Donelson stated that even if the net metering is passed with the rate case, there is time for the CSU Board to look at optional programs and CSU is not penalizing solar customers, they are asking for them to pay for the service provided by CSU as all other CSU customers

are asked to do.

Councilmember Rainey asked if there is a specific time frame for the CSU Board to recommend the net metering rate case back to City Council if it is not approved to move forward. Mr. Bidlack stated there is not a specified timeline established.

Mr. Bidlack polled City Council regarding the proposal for net metering brought forward by CSU. Consensus of City Council agreed to not move forward with the net metering changes.

- 9.B.** [25-554](#) Ordinance No. 25-79 Approving the Annual Budget for Colorado Springs Utilities and Appropriating Monies for the Several Purposes Named in the Colorado Springs Utilities' Annual Budget for the Year Ending December 31, 2026

Presenter:

John Hunter, Manager Financial Planning and Risk, Colorado Springs Utilities

Tristan Gearhart, Chief Financial Officer, Colorado Springs Utilities
Travas Deal, Chief Executive Officer, Colorado Springs Utilities

Attachments: [10-14-2025 CC Memo - 2026 Budget App](#)

[CSU-2026Budget-ORD-2025-09-24](#)

[10-28-2025 CC Memo - 2026 Budget App](#)

[CSU-2026 Budget-ORD-2025-10-28](#)

There were no comments on this item.

Motion by Councilmember Donelson, seconded by President Pro Tem Risley, that the Ordinance approving the annual budget for Colorado Springs Utilities and appropriating monies for the several purposes named in the Colorado Springs Utilities' annual budget for the year ending December 31, 2026 be approved on first reading. The motion passed by a vote of 9-0-0-0

Aye: 9 - Bailey, Crow-Iverson, Donelson, Gold, Henjum, Leinweber, Rainey Jr., Risley, and Williams

- 9.C.** [25-555](#) Ordinance No. 25-80 identifying and approving the Colorado Springs Utilities' Annual Sources of Funds for the Year Ending December 31, 2026

Presenter:

John Hunter, Manager Financial Planning and Risk, Colorado Springs Utilities

Tristan Gearhart, Chief Financial Officer, Colorado Springs Utilities
Travas Deal, Chief Executive Officer, Colorado Springs Utilities

Attachments: [10-14-2025 2026 Sources and Uses for City Council](#)
[10-14-2025 CC Memo - 2026 Sources of Funds App](#)
[CSU-2026SourceFunds-ORD-2025-09-24](#)
[10-28-2025 CC Memo - 2026 Sources of Funds App](#)
[CSU-2026 SourceFunds-ORD-2025-10-28](#)

There were no comments on this item.

Motion by Councilmember Henjum, seconded by Councilmember Gold, that the Ordinance identifying and approving the Colorado Springs Utilities' annual sources of funds for the year ending December 31, 2026 be approved on first reading. The motion passed by a vote of 9-0-0-0

Aye: 9 - Bailey, Crow-Iverson, Donelson, Gold, Henjum, Leinweber, Rainey Jr., Risley, and Williams

10. New Business

11. Public Hearing

North Gate Boulevard Addition No. 10 Annexation

Estimated Time: 15 minutes

- 11.A.** [ANEX-25-00](#) A Resolution adopting findings of fact and conclusions of law
[01RF](#) based thereon and determining the eligibility for annexation of
property known as North Gate Boulevard Addition No. 10
Annexation.
(Legislative)

Council District #2 (if annexed)

Presenter:

Tamara Baxter, Planning Supervisor, City Planning Department
Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [ResFindofFact_North Gate Blvd Add No. 10](#)
[Exhibit A - Legal Description_North Gate Addition No 10.pdf](#)
[Exhibit 12A - Planner Affidavit](#)
[Exhibit 12C - Surveyor Affidavit](#)

Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department, presented the Resolution and Ordinance for annexation of property consisting of 0.33 acres known as North Gate Boulevard Addition No. 10 located south of the intersection of North Gate Boulevard Struthers Road. He provided an overview of the vicinity map, applications, project summary, site plan, timeline of review, stakeholder involvement, agency review, PlanCOS compliance, application review criteria, and optional motions.

There was no Councilmember or public comment on this item.

Motion by Councilmember Henjum, seconded by Councilmember Gold, that the Resolution adopting findings of fact and conclusions of law based thereon and determining the eligibility for annexation of property known as North Gate Boulevard Addition No. 10 Annexation consisting of 0.33 acres be adopted. The motion passed by a vote of 8-0-1-0

Aye: 8 - Bailey, Crow-Iverson, Donelson, Gold, Henjum, Rainey Jr., Risley, and Williams

Excused: 1 - Leinweber

- 11.B.** [ANEX-25-0001](#) Ordinance No. 25-81 annexing into the City of Colorado Springs the area known as North Gate Boulevard No. 10 Annexation consisting of 0.33 acres located south of the intersection of North Gate Boulevard Struthers Road.
(Legislative)

Council District #2 (if annexed)

Presenter:

Tamara Baxter, Planning Supervisor, City Planning Department
Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [Annexation Ordinance - North Gate Blvd Add No 10 Annexation](#)

[Exhibit A - Legal Description North Gate Addition No 10](#)

[Staff Report North Gate Boulevard Addition No 10 TPB](#)

[Attachment 1 - Vicinity Map](#)

[Attachment 2 - Project Statement](#)

[Attachment 3 - Annexation Plat](#)

[Attachment 4 - Legal Description](#)

[Attachment 5 - Petition for Annexation](#)

[7.5.701 ANNEXATION OF LAND](#)

Please see comments in Agenda item 11.A.

Motion by Councilmember Rainey Jr., seconded by Councilmember Gold, that the Ordinance annexing into the City of Colorado Springs the area known as North Gate Boulevard Addition No. 10 Annexation consisting of 0.33 acres south of the intersection of North Gate Boulevard and Struthers Road, based upon the findings that the annexation complies with the Conditions for Annexation Criteria as set forth in UDC Section 7.5.701 be approved on first reading. The motion passed by a vote of 8-0-1-0

Aye: 8 - Bailey, Crow-Iverson, Donelson, Gold, Henjum, Rainey Jr., Risley, and Williams

Excused: 1 - Leinweber

Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane Addition No. 1 Annexation Estimated Time: 45 minutes

- 11.C. [ANEX-24-00](#) A Resolution adopting findings of fact and conclusions of law
[16RF](#) based thereon and determining the eligibility for annexation of
property known as Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane Addition No. 1
Annexation.
(Legislative)

Council District #6 (if annexed)

Presenter:

Tamara Baxter, Planning Supervisor, City Planning Department
Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [ResFindofFact Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane](#)
[Exhibit A - Legal Description-Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane](#)
[Addition No. 1.pdf](#)
[Exhibit B- Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane Add No 1 Annexation](#)
[Agreement](#)
[Exhibit 12A - Planner Affidavit](#)
[Exhibit 12C - Surveyor Affidavit](#)

Tamara Baxter, Planning Supervisor, Planning Department, presented the Resolutions and Ordinance for annexation of property, amending the zoning map establishing a R-Flex Medium/SS-O/AP-O (R-Flex Medium with Streamside and Airport Overlays) zone district, Land Use Plan for proposed residential use, and Service Plan for the Miller Downs Metropolitan District, consisting of 21.37 acres known as Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane Addition No. 1 located at 7020 Wyoming Lane. Tamara Baxter, Planning Supervisor, Planning Department, presented the informational presentation for the Annexation Policy Checkpoint on the proposed Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane Addition No. 1 Annexation. She provided an overview of the vicinity map, applications, project summary, Land Use Plan, 30-foot remanent property, timeline of review, stakeholder involvement, agency review, PlanCOS compliance, Planning Commission's unanimous approval, application review criteria, and optional motions.

Councilmember Henjum asked what Planning Commission's vote was on this item. Ms. Baxter stated the vote was unanimous and voted 9-0 in favor.

Bryan English, Development Projects Manager, Colorado Springs Utilities (CSU), went over the vicinity map, CSU's application of City Code 12.4.305.B., City Code 7.5.701.A.4.-requirements of annexation, electric service area overlap, City Code 7.5.701.A.3.b-Conditions for Annexation, water/wastewater/natural gas/electric/fiber infrastructure, and CSU capital cost estimate.

Councilmember Henjum asked if a property owner is currently using a functional well if they can continue to use it. Mr. English confirmed they could along with septic if it will serve the property in the same manner as connecting to the CSU system.

Councilmember Donelson asked what the plan is to cover the costs. Mr. English stated they are looking at their budget estimates for capital project costs, looking for opportunities for monies they anticipated spending which came in at lower costs, and find allocations which can cover the capital expenditure costs associated with these types of annexations such as the Rock Creek Mesa Annexation.

Councilmember Donelson asked what the initial full cost is before 2029. Mr. English stated \$2.3 million to \$3.5 million.

Erik Carlson, Land Use Counsel, Foster, Graham, Milstein, and Calisher, representing the applicant, introduced Noah Bremer, Civil Engineer, Kimley Horn and Associates, representing the applicant, identified the site location, surrounding residential density, project summary, Planning Commission's Conditions of Approval, contiguity to the City, neighborhood input/concern, and actions taken.

Councilmember Rainey asked if the traffic study and the stormwater runoff were discussed at the community engagement event. Mr. Bremer confirmed it had been and that is where the reduction in units came from.

Councilmember Rainey asked who owns the strip of property which was in question. Mr. Carlson stated it is owned by the Miller Downs entity.

Councilmember Donelson asked if the examination of the wetlands by a third-party specialist has been completed. Mr. Bremer confirmed it the analysis was completed several months ago.

Mr. Carlson identified the rezoning, Land Use Plan, and annexation approval criteria.

Councilmember Gold asked what the average price of these properties will be. Mr. Carlson stated they do not have the market study done on that yet.

Councilmember Donelson asked what the ratio of single-family to multi-family is in that neighborhood. Mr. Carlson stated there will not be apartment buildings, there will be two single-family-attached products in the middle of the site, with single-family homes around the perimeter.

There was no public comment on this item.

Motion by Councilmember Henjum, seconded by Councilmember Bailey, that the Resolution adopting findings of fact and conclusions of law based thereon and determining the eligibility for annexation of property known as Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane Addition No. 1 Annexation consisting of 21.37 acres be adopted. The motion passed by a vote of 8-0-1-0

Aye: 8 - Bailey, Crow-Iverson, Donelson, Gold, Henjum, Rainey Jr., Risley, and Williams

Excused: 1 - Leinweber

- 11.D. [ANEX-24-00](#) Ordinance No. 25-82 annexing into the City of Colorado Springs
[16](#) the area known as Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane Addition No. 1
Annexation consisting of 21.37 acres located at 7020 Wyoming
Lane.
(Legislative)

Council District #6 (if annexed)

Presenter:

Tamara Baxter, Planning Supervisor, Planning Department
Kevin Walker, Planning Director, Planning Department

Attachments: [Annexation Ordinance - Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane Annexation](#)
[Exhibit A - Legal Description-Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane](#)
[Addition No. 1](#)
[Staff Memo Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane TPB](#)
[Attachment 1 - Project Statement](#)
[Attachment 2 - Vicinity Map](#)
[Attachment 3 - Annexation Plat](#)
[Attachment 4 - Petition for Annexation](#)
[Attachment 5 - Zone Exhibit A and B](#)
[Attachment 6 - Land Use Plan](#)
[Attachment 7 - Fiscal Analysis](#)
[Attachment 8 - Mineral Estate Affidavit](#)
[Attachment 9 - Public Comments](#)
[Attachment 10 - Public Input Response Letter](#)
[Miller Downs Additional public comments](#)
[7.5.701 ANNEXATION OF LAND](#)
[Miller Downs - CPC 8 13 2025 Minutes Excerpt](#)
[09292025 City Council Regular Meeting - Miller Downs](#)

Please see comments in Agenda item 11.C.

Motion by Councilmember Bailey, seconded by Councilmember Rainey Jr., that the Ordinance annexing into the City of Colorado Springs the area known as Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane Addition No. 1 Annexation consisting of 21.37 acres located at 7020 Wyoming Lane, based upon the findings that the annexation complies with the Conditions for Annexation Criteria as set forth in UDC Section 7.5.701 be approved on first reading. The motion passed by a vote of 8-0-1-0

Aye: 8 - Bailey, Crow-Iverson, Donelson, Gold, Henjum, Rainey Jr., Risley, and Williams

Excused: 1 - Leinweber

- 11.E.** [ZONE-25-00](#) Ordinance No. 25-83 amending the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs pertaining to 21.37 acres establishing a R-Flex Medium/SS-O/AP-O (R-Flex Medium with Streamside and Airport Overlays) zone district located at 7020 Wyoming Lane.
[15](#) (Legislative)

Council District #6 (if annexed)

Presenter:

Tamara Baxter, Planning Supervisor, City Planning Department
Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [Zoning Ordinance Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane.docx](#)
[Exhibit A - Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane Legal Description](#)
[Exhibit B - Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane Exhibit](#)
[7.5.704 ZONING MAP AMENDMENT \(REZONING\)](#)

Please see comments in Agenda item 11.C.

Motion by Councilmember Henjum, seconded by Councilmember Rainey Jr., that the Ordinance establishing 21.37 acres as a R-Flex Medium/SS-O/AP-O (R-Flex Medium with Streamside and Airport Overlays) zone district, based upon the findings that the zone establishment request complies with the criteria for granting a zone establishment as set forth in UDC Section 7.5.704(D) be approved on first reading. The motion passed by a vote of 8-0-1-0

Aye: 8 - Bailey, Crow-Iverson, Donelson, Gold, Henjum, Rainey Jr., Risley, and Williams

Excused: 1 - Leinweber

- 11.F.** [LUPL-25-000](#) Establishing the Miller Downs Land Use Plan for proposed
[6](#) residential use consisting of 21.37 acres located at 7020 Wyoming Lane.
(Legislative)

Council District #6 (if annexed)

Presenter:

Tamara Baxter, Planning Supervisor, City Planning Department
Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [Miller Downs Land Use Plan updated](#)
[7.5.514 LAND USE PLAN](#)

Please see comments in Agenda item 11.C.

Motion by Councilmember Rainey Jr., seconded by Councilmember Bailey, that the Miller Downs Land Use Plan related to 21.37 acres based upon the findings that the request complies with the review criteria for Land Use Plans as set forth in City Code Section 7.5.514 be approved. The motion passed by a vote of 8-0-1-0

Aye: 8 - Bailey, Crow-Iverson, Donelson, Gold, Henjum, Rainey Jr., Risley, and Williams

Excused: 1 - Leinweber

12. Added Item Agenda

There were no items added to the Agenda.

13. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

14. Following adjournment of the Regular City Council meeting, City Council shall reconvene as the Board of Directors of the Briargate General Improvement District 2021 for action on the following item:

- 14.A. [25-447](#) Request to set November 10, 2025 as the Public Hearing date for consideration of adopting the proposed 2026 Colorado Springs Briargate General Improvement District 2021 Budget and to advertise as required by law

Presenter:

Charae McDaniel, Chief Financial Officer

Attachments: [NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING Briargate GID 2021-2026 Bud](#)
[2026 Briargate GID 2021 Budget](#)

Charae McDaniel, Chief Financial Officer, presented the request to set November 10, 2025 as the Public Hearing date for consideration of adopting the proposed 2026 Colorado Springs Briargate General Improvement District 2021 Budget of \$2,083,911.00, with the mill levy unchanged, and to advertise as required by law.

Councilmember Rainey asked how this public hearing will be noticed since both the Work Session and Regular Meeting are scheduled for November 10, 2025. Ms. McDaniel explained it will be noticed at the end of the Regular City Council meeting agenda for November 10, 2025.

Motion by Councilmember Bailey, seconded by Councilmember Henjum, that the request to establish November 10, 2025 as the date of the Public Hearing to consider the 2026 Colorado Springs Briargate General Improvement District 2021 budget be approved. The motion passed by a vote of 8-0-1-0

Aye: 8 - Bailey, Crow-Iverson, Donelson, Gold, Henjum, Rainey Jr., Risley, and Williams

Excused: 1 - Leinweber

15. Following adjournment of the Board of Directors of the Briargate General Improvement District 2021, City Council shall reconvene as the Board of Directors of the Marketplace at Austin Bluffs General Improvement District for action on the following item:

- 15.A. [25-451](#) Request to set November 10, 2025 as the Public Hearing date for consideration of adopting the proposed 2026 Colorado Springs Marketplace at Austin Bluffs General Improvement District Budget and to advertise as required by law

Presenter:

Charae McDaniel, Chief Financial Officer

Attachments: [NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING Marketplace at Austin Bluffs
GID 10 14 25](#)
[MAB GID 2026 Budget](#)

Charae McDaniel, Chief Financial Officer, presented the request to set November 10, 2025 as the Public Hearing date for consideration of adopting the proposed 2026 Colorado Springs Marketplace at Austin Bluffs General Improvement District Budget of \$402,425.00, with the mill levy unchanged, and to advertise as required by law.

There were no comments on this item.

Motion by Councilmember Henjum, seconded by Councilmember Rainey Jr., that the request to establish November 10, 2025 as the date of the Public Hearing to consider the 2026 Colorado Springs Marketplace at Austin Bluffs General Improvement District budget be approved. The motion passed by a vote of 8-0-1-0

Aye: 8 - Bailey, Crow-Iverson, Donelson, Gold, Henjum, Rainey Jr., Risley, and Williams

Excused: 1 - Leinweber

16. Following adjournment of the Board of Directors of the Marketplace at Austin Bluffs General Improvement District , City Council shall reconvene as City Council

17. One Hour of Citizen Discussion for Items not on Today's Agenda per City Council Rules

Citizens Kirstien Anderson and Karen Fleming spoke against the closing of Meadows Park Community Center.

Citizen Alycia Rendon expressed appreciation for the assistance in her application for Medicaid which covered her recent hospitalization.

Citizen Derek Shetrone spoke about his concerns with Artificial Intelligence (AI) data acquisitions.

Citizen Lawrence Clark thanked Councilmember Donelson for his comments regarding Charlie Kirk and the preservation of freedom of speech.

18. Adjourn

There being no further business to come before City Council, Council

adjourned at 6:37 PM.

Sarah B. Johnson, City Clerk

BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF
THE CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS

IN THE MATTER OF THE REVISION)
OF THE ELECTRIC TARIFF OF) DECISION & ORDER 25-02 (E)
COLORADO SPRINGS UTILITIES)

1. Colorado Springs Utilities, an enterprise of the City of Colorado Springs (“City”), a Colorado home-rule city and municipal corporation (“Utilities”), provides electric utility service within the City and within its Colorado Public Utilities Commission-certificated service territory outside of the City.
2. Utilities submitted the 2026 Rate Case, which proposes changes to the Electric Rate Schedules, Utilities Rules and Regulations (“URR”), the Open Access Transmission Tariff (“OATT”), completion of a Public Utility Regulatory Policy Act (“PURPA”) evaluation, and proposes a Transmission Owner Filing pursuant to anticipated membership in the Southwest Power Pool (“SPP”) Regional Transmission Organization (“RTO”). Utilities’ filing included service specific reports, Resolutions, Tariff sheets, Worksheets, and Transmission Owner Formula Rate Tables with full details.
3. Utilities engages in the production, purchase, and distribution of electricity. These activities incur fuel related (production and purchases) and non-fuel related (production and distribution) expenditures. Fuel related expenditures are currently recovered through the Electric Cost Adjustment (“ECA”) and Electric Capacity Charge (“ECC”). Non-fuel related expenditures are recovered through Access and Facilities Charges and Demand Charges. Utilities’ filing proposes changes to the Electric Rate Schedules. Utilities’ filing does not include any changes to the Electric base rates.
4. Utilities proposed Electric Rate Schedules changes and actions as follows:
 - a) **Industrial Service – Large Load Tariff –**
 - i. Electric demands from prospective large load customers present significant challenges for Utilities’ infrastructure, resources, planning, and financial position. Utilities proposes the addition of a new large load rate schedule applicable to industrial customers with loads greater than 10 MW to advance and balance the principles of: (1) Supporting economic development and rate competitiveness; (2) Ensuring resource and infrastructure adequacy; (3) Minimize cost shifting to existing customers; (4) Mitigate stranded cost risk; and (5) Protect Utilities’ financial health.
 - ii. Utilities coordinated with an industry leading firm to survey and analyze electric utility trends in large load tariff and rate design development. Utilities’ proposed rate schedule incorporates best practices including, but not limited to, the following considerations:

1. A minimum 10-year initial contract period;
 2. Customer responsibility for the cost of infrastructure extension and/or modifications;
 - a. Service subject to applicable studies, conditions, and resulting costs to Utilities and any Regional Transmission Organization
 3. Interim service through purchase power agreements (“PPA”) until resource adequacy is obtained;
 - a. Bill components including: (a) Access and Facilities, per day; (b) Demand Charge; (c) System Support Charge; (d) Resource Adequacy Charge; (e) Pass through PPA charges; (f) ECA; (g) ECC; and (h) All other applicable charges
 4. Minimum Monthly Bill based on all applicable bill components and the highest of:
 - a. Billing period maximum demand and energy, or
 - b. Contracted demand and energy requirements, or
 - c. 100% of maximum 12-month demand and billing period energy
 5. Collateral requirement of cash or letter of credit equal to 36-months of estimated Minimum Monthly Bills;
 6. Automatic Customer contract renewal for additional 36-month periods, unless customer provides notice to request termination; and
 7. Late payment fee of 1.5% per month will be assessed on overdue balances.
- iii. For this proposed rate, Utilities proposed establishing the Access and Facilities, per day, and the Demand Charge, per kW, per day, equal to the Industrial Service – Large Power and Light (ELG) charges as supported by the 2025 Electric Cost of Service Study included in the 2025 Rate case approved by City Council on November 12, 2024.
 - iv. Utilities’ ability to provide service to large loads may require interim service through PPAs. If PPAs are required for interim service, the full cost of PPA energy, capacity, and deliverability will be passed through to the Customer as specified by contract in lieu of ECA and ECC charges. When interim service through PPAs is no longer necessary, the ECA and ECC will be applicable.
 - v. When interim service through PPAs is required, Customers will be subject to the System Support Charge and the Resource Adequacy Charge for a period of ten (10) years. The proposed System Support Charge is designed to mitigate risk associated with serving large loads and to insulate existing customers from potential added costs. The System Support Charge is

calculated at 10% of the Demand Charge, per kW, per day. The proposed Resource Adequacy Charge, per kW, per day, is based on preliminary projections of the Cost Of New Energy (“CONE”) as part of Utilities’ Electric Integrated Resource Plan currently in progress. The 10-year period of applicability for the System Support Charge and Resource Adequacy Charge provides a reasonable period of marginal cost recovery for Utilities to plan and acquire adequate resources to service the large load Customer while mitigating risk to existing customers.

b) **Renewable Energy Net Metering (Net Metering)** – Utilities’ proposed changes to Net Metering were updated in Utilities’ October 1, 2025, Supplemental Filing. The following includes Utilities original proposal as modified by the Supplemental Filing.

- i. Utilities worked over the past few years to assess its resource portfolio with respect to energy regulations, customer growth, and system efficiency. Utilities sees customer growth and increased demand on its system and generation portfolio. To meet the increasing number of stringent state requirements and the needs of a growing community, Utilities initiated the development of an Electric rate design strategy in 2018.
- ii. Over the course of the last eight years, this strategy was developed with Utilities Board guidance and coordinated with Utilities’ energy vision workshops, integrated resource planning efforts, and major metering and billing system project implementation. Utilities’ draft proposal builds upon the Energy Wise rates strategy to improve alignment of customer demand with the cost of providing service.
- iii. Energy Wise rates better reflect Utilities’ time-varying cost of providing service while offering both system and customer benefits. Energy Wise rates are expected to play a significant role in helping reduce high demand and delaying the need to build additional sources of electric generation. With the Energy Wise rates, most customers will pay different rates for the electricity based on the time of day it is used. This approach more equitably recovers the cost to provide service, while also playing a significant role in incentivizing customers to shift electric use to periods when demand is lower and the cost of providing electricity is cheaper. These rates give customers more control over their bill since they can shift electricity use to less costly time periods. Shifting some electric use to non-peak hours also supports Utilities’ sustainable energy transition. Recent investment in smart meters and customer information systems enable Utilities to make Energy Wise rate options available to most customers.
- iv. In 2024, Utilities proposed Energy Wise rate changes effective October 1, 2025. Utilities expects to transition all existing customers to Energy Wise rates by early 2026. Due to the unique interaction Net Metering customers

have with Utilities' electric system, the Energy Wise rates available to most customers do not adequately reflect the cost of providing service to customers with solar behind the meter. As such, Net Metering customers were not included in the 2025 transition to the Energy Wise rates. Through 2024 and into 2025, Utilities continued its evaluation and analysis of the most appropriate and fair rate design for Net Metering customers.

- v. In 2004, Colorado adopted renewable energy Net Metering standards through Colorado Revised Statutes § 40-2-124. C.R.S. § 40-2-124 establishes Net Metering standards for municipal utilities, which include: (a) Treatment of excess monthly and annual generation in kWh; (b) Nondiscriminatory rate requirements; (c) Interconnection standards; and (d) Size specifications for Customer system.
- vi. Utilities first established Net Metering service in 2005 as a pilot program with availability limited to 50 residential customers. In 2007, the limitation on the number of participating customers was removed and the service became available as a regular service option to residential and commercial customers. Since the service's inception, the number of Net Metering interconnections has steadily increased, with more than approximately 1,000 new interconnections per year in recent years and more than 9,000 total customers' electric service being Net Metered in 2025.
- vii. The decrease in photovoltaic cost has also supported Utilities in integrating renewable energy resources to its energy portfolio, including the Pike Solar array which features 175 MW of solar energy. After adding Pike Solar to the existing solar, wind and hydroelectric power resources, renewable energy is estimated to represent about 27% of Utilities' energy portfolio.
- viii. As defined in statute, energy generated by Customer solar systems under Net Metering service is netted against Customer consumption on a monthly billing period basis. Additionally, if monthly solar generation exceeds the Customer's monthly consumption, the excess generation credits are rolled forward to the subsequent months and offset future consumption. Netting Customer generation and Customer consumption on a monthly basis under-quantifies the amount of energy the Customer is consuming from Utilities' system and under-quantifies the amount of energy the Customer pushes onto Utilities' system.
- ix. Specifically, for a typical Net Metering Customer, Customer consumption exceeds Customer generation during the early morning hours, resulting in consumption from the Utilities' system (imports). During the middle of the day, when solar generation is highest, Customer generation exceeds consumption and energy is pushed back onto Utilities' system (exports). As Customer consumption increases in the afternoon and into the evening and Customer generation decreases, Customer consumption once again exceeds

Customer generation resulting from additional consumption, or imports, from the Utilities' system.

- x. Current rate designs applicable to residential and commercial Net Metering Customers recover capacity cost through energy charges, which compounds the cost shifting to non-Net Metering Customers. Although some level of intraclass cross subsidization is a reality with any rate design, for non-Net Metering Customers, recovery of capacity cost through energy charges can reasonably reflect the cost of providing service.
- xi. Further analysis to quantify the Net Metering subsidy related to Utilities Net Metering customers was conducted using the cost-of-service approach. Based on the cost-of-service analysis, the median customer subsidy for a Utilities Net Metering customer is approximately \$600 annually or \$50 per month. This level of subsidy is consistent with results of similar studies across the United States, with subsidies ranging from \$20 to \$100 per month. All Net Metering customers are unique in terms of usage and system size, and therefore the \$600 is not reflective of every customer. However, the median customer is representative of a typical Net Metering customer and can be used to estimate overall subsidy levels. Utilizing the \$600 median subsidy, when attributed to over 9,000 Net Metering customers, the total cost shift from Net Metering customers to non-Net Metering customers is estimated to exceed \$5,500,000 annually.
- xii. To promote fair and equitable cost recovery and to align rates with the cost of providing service in the transformed electric landscape, Utilities proposes the addition of Renewable Energy Net Metering Rate Options applicable to residential and commercial Customer Net Metering Customers, effective January 1, 2027. The proposed rates are supported by the 2025 Electric Cost of Service Study included in the 2025 Rate case approved by City Council on November 12, 2024. The proposed rate options include:
 - 1. Access and Facilities, per day charges based on costs classified and allocated as Customer cost in the Line – Secondary, Electric Service, Meters and Installations, and Customer functions;
 - 2. Access and Facilities, per kWh charges based on costs classified and allocated as Energy cost in the Generation Non-Fuel, Transmission, and Surplus Payments to the City functions and a portion of costs classified and allocated as Demand cost in the Generation Non-Fuel, Transmission, Substation, Line – Primary, and Line – Secondary functions;
 - 3. Demand Charge, per kW, per day charge based on a portion of costs classified and allocated as Demand cost in the Generation Non-Fuel, Transmission, Substation, Line – Primary, and Line – Secondary

functions. The demand determination for the proposed Demand Charge is the average of each daily greatest 15-minute net load during the On-Peak hours in the billing period;

4. ECA, per kWh; and
 5. ECC, per kWh.
- xiii. Utilities proposes to migrate all residential and commercial Net Metering Customers from Frozen Rate Options (“Frozen”) to the new Renewable Energy Net Metering Rate Options effective January 1, 2027. Industrial and Contract Service Energy Wise Rate Options currently include appropriate demand charges. As a result, additional Net Metering options are not necessary for Industrial and Contract Service Net Metering Customers. Utilities proposes to migrate any Industrial Net Metering Customers receiving service under Frozen to the Energy Wise Standard Rate Options effective January 1, 2027.
 - xiv. The proposed Net Metering rate options are designed to be consistent with C.R.S. § 40-2-124. Utilities proposed rate options have a rational nexus to the cost of providing service to Net Metering Customers, meet the requirements of the State statute, and as a result are just, reasonable, and non-discriminatory.

c) Contract Service – Military Wheeling (ECW) –

- i. The Department of Defense (“DoD”) receives retail service for the majority of its loads under Utilities’ Contract Service – Military (ECD) Rate Schedule. The Contract Service – Military Wheeling (ECW) Rate Schedule is available to the DoD for the purpose of wheeling hydroelectric power from the Western Area Power Administration (“WAPA”) and the Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District over Utilities distribution system. The DoD load served under the ECW Rate Schedule represents less than 14% of the overall average DoD monthly load. Historically, the wheeling service over Utilities transmission system has been billed under Utilities’ OATT rates and wheeling through Utilities’ distribution system has been billed under the ECW rates.
- ii. Utilities anticipates joining the SPP RTO and upon approved membership into the RTO, Utilities OATT will be withdrawn in its entirety and utilization of Utilities transmission system will be administered under the SPP RTO’s OATT based on Utilities’ Transmission Owner Filing materials to SPP.
- iii. As a retail Customer of Utilities, the DoD expressed interest in maintaining Utilities’ billing treatment for loads served by WAPA energy rather than

being considered a transmission Customer under SPP's OATT. In support of DoD's position, Utilities anticipates successfully demonstrating to interested parties including, but not limited to, DoD, WAPA, and SPP, that DoD's WAPA energy becomes part of Utilities network load to self under SPP's OATT, and as such is appropriately billed to the DoD under Utilities' proposed ECW rate as described below. Furthermore, if additional transfer of ownership or other administrative action is necessary to demonstrate the appropriateness of retail treatment, Utilities will participate in discussions to develop mutual agreements or transfers to facilitate appropriate treatment under Utilities' Rate Schedules.

- iv. To appropriately recover cost of providing wheeling service over both Utilities' transmission and distribution systems, Utilities proposes to modify the ECW rate to include transmission and distribution allocations as supported by the 2025 Electric Cost of Service Study included in the 2025 Rate case approved by City Council on November 12, 2024. The proposed rates result in billing treatment approximately equal to current charges under the current ECW and Utilities' OATT, but consolidate the charges into a single rate component under the ECW Rate Schedule.

- d) **Other Rate Schedule Clerical Changes or Corrections** – Utilities proposed several clerical changes to the Electric Rate Schedules to add clarity and/or make administrative corrections. The full detail of proposed changes is found in Utilities' proposed resolution and tariff sheets.

- 5. In addition to the proposed Electric Rate Schedules revisions, Utilities' 2026 Rate Case filing also proposes changes to the OATT and the URR, completion of a PURPA evaluation, and the Transmission Owner filing.
- 6. The proposed effective dates for Utilities' tariff changes are November 1, 2025, January 1, 2026, April 1, 2026, and January 1, 2027.
- 7. Utilities filed its tariff changes with the City Auditor, Ms. Natalie Lovell, on August 8, 2025, and with a copy to the City Attorney on August 8, 2025. Utilities then filed the enterprise's formal proposals on September 9, 2025, with the City Clerk, Ms. Sarah Johnson, and a complete copy of the proposals was placed in the City Clerk's Office for public inspection. Notice of the filing was published on-line at www.csu.org on September 9, 2025, and in *The Gazette* on September 11, 2025. These various notices and filings comply with the requirements of §12.1.108 of the City Code and the applicable provision of the Colorado Revised Statutes. Copies of the published and mailed notices are contained within the record. Additional public notice was provided through Utilities' website, www.csu.org, and a complete copy of the proposals was placed on that website for public inspection.
- 8. The information provided to City Council and held open for public inspection at the City Clerk's Office was supplemented by Utilities on October 1, 2025. The supplemental

materials contained revisions to the proposed Net Metering tariff changes: (1) changing the billing demand charge determination to the average of daily highest 15-minute demands during On-Peak hours of a billing period, rather than a single peak demand, and (2) increases the proposed Access and Facilities, per kWh rate. The modifications to Utilities original filing result in a median Net Metering customer seeing an electric bill increase of approximately \$25 per month, as opposed to \$50 per month under the original approach.

9. The information provided to City Council and held open for public inspection at the City Clerk's Office was supplemented a second time by Utilities on October 9, 2025. The supplemental materials contained:
 - a) Revised information related to the proposed changes to the Electric Rate Schedules, OATT, and the Transmission Owner Filing, including updated resolutions, additional references for tariff clarity, and formatting corrections;
 - b) A clerical correction to Utilities' Rate Manual;
 - c) New Electric Tariff sheet revisions to include a reference to the ELL rate in the Electric Cost Adjustment and Electric Capacity Charge rates and to clarify billing determination for Interruptible Service Demand Credits;
 - d) The Office of the City Auditor's audit report;
 - e) A record of *ex parte* communications;
 - f) The legal notice affidavit of publication;
 - g) Public outreach information; and
 - h) The Notice of Intent to Present Witnesses of the Joint Solar Parties.
10. The Office of the City Auditor issued its findings on the proposed tariff changes prior to the rate hearing, dated October 2025, which found that the overall modifications included in the 2026 Rate Case Filing Reports and the supporting schedules for proposed rates and fees for the electric service were prepared accurately and consistently. A copy of that report is contained within the record.
11. On October 14, 2025, the City Council held a public hearing concerning the proposed changes to the Electric Rate Schedules, OATT, PURPA action, Transmission Owner Filing, and URR. This hearing was conducted in accordance with §12.1.108 of the City Code, the procedural rules adopted by City Council, and the applicable provisions of state law.
12. City Council President Lynette Crow-Iverson commenced the rate hearing.

13. The presentations started with Mr. Christopher Bidlack, a Senior Attorney with the City Attorney's Office – Utilities Division. Mr. Bidlack briefed City Council on its power to establish rates, charges, and regulations for Utilities' services. In setting rates, charges, and regulations for Utilities' services, City Council is sitting as a legislative body because the setting of rates, charges, and regulations is necessary to carry out existing legislative policy of operating the various utility systems. However, unlike other legislative processes, the establishment of rates, charges, and regulations is analogous to a quasi-judicial proceeding and requires a decision based upon evidence in the record and the process is not subject to referendum or initiative.
14. Mr. Bidlack provided information on the statutory and regulatory requirements on rate changes. Rates for Water and Wastewater service must be reasonable and appropriate in light of all circumstances, City Code §12.1.108(F). Rates for Natural Gas and Electric service must be just, reasonable, sufficient, and not unduly discriminatory, City Code §12.1.108(E).
15. At the conclusion of his presentation, Mr. Bidlack polled the City Council Members concerning any *ex parte* communication that they may have had during the pendency of this proceeding. Several Council Members provided information on potential *ex parte* communications.
16. Council Member David Leinweber stated that he will be fair and impartial when evaluating the rate case before him, regardless of any prior comments he made.
17. Council Member Tom Bailey stated that prior to the rate hearing he received a number of emails from citizens and had a conversation with a neighbor. He also affirmed his ability to act fairly and impartially.
18. Council Member Brandy Williams noted that she attended Utilities' October 7, 2025, Energy Wise and Net Metering open house, but did not have any conversations while in attendance.
19. Councilmember Nancy Henjum stated that, after consultation with the City Attorney's Office, she (1) attended a Colorado Solar and Storage Association ("COSSA") symposium, but did not discuss Utilities' rate case, and (2) watched a recording of Utilities' October 7, 2025, Energy Wise and Net Metering open house. She also affirmed her ability to remain fair and impartial.
20. Mr. Scott Shirola, Utilities' Pricing and Rates Manager, provided the enterprise's proposals.
21. Mr. Shirola started by providing a summary of Utilities' procedural compliance and the dates each compliance obligation was met. He then provided the 2026 Rate Case Overview, with proposed changes to the Electric Rate Schedules, URR, PURPA action, Transmission Owner Filing, and OATT.

22. Next, Mr. Shirola presented Utilities' proposed Large Load Rate Schedule. He noted that utilities across the country have developed similar rates based on the dramatic increase in large load customers. Utilities' proposed rate is based on the principles of (1) supporting economic development and rate competitiveness, (2) ensuring resource and infrastructure adequacy, (3) minimizing cost shifts to existing customers, (4) mitigating stranded cost risks, (5) protecting Utilities' financial health, and (6) supporting consistency with RTO provisions.
23. Based on those parameters, Mr. Shirola explained Utilities' proposed Industrial Service – Large Load Rate Schedule. The rate is applicable to customers with an electric load of greater than or equal to 10 MW and service conditions include: (1) a 10-year initial contract period, (2) customer responsibility for the cost of infrastructure extensions and modifications, (3) customer being subject to and responsible for the costs of studies required by Utilities and the RTO, (4) customer responsibility for the costs of electric service acquired through power purchase agreements until adequate resources are obtained, (5) monthly bill provisions including, but not limited to, Access and Facilities per day, Demand Charge, Resource Adequacy Charge, System Support Charge, and Power Purchase Agreement pass through charges, (6) collateral requirements, and (7) payment of late fees.
24. Council Member Leinweber asked what will be done to ensure that the 10-year contract is binding on the Large Load customers and what is to stop them from leaving Utilities' service territory prior to the expiration.
25. Mr. Travas Deal, Utilities' Chief Executive Officer, explained that Large Load customers will be required to pay up front for infrastructure costs related to their utility service and that over the course of their 10-year contract they will be paying into reserves to support Utilities' ability to meet the needs associated with their status as a customer.
26. Additionally, Mr. Shirola noted that Large Load customers will be contractually responsible for minimum bills throughout their contract period and will be required to maintain a rolling 36-month collateral posting. Furthermore, there are charges applicable during a Large Load customer's first 10-year contract period that provide marginal costs to fund resources long term.
27. Council Member Leinweber furthered his question, asking how water resources are addressed for Large Load customers, noting that it was outside the scope of the discussed electric rate. Mr. Shirola explained that water costs are included in the URR Large User application fees for all four utility services, to be discussed later in Utilities' presentation.
28. Council Member Roland Rainey asked whether Utilities' participation in the SPP RTO would impose any restrictions related to on-peak and/or off-peak energy usage. Mr. Shirola explained that while SPP RTO participation may present opportunities to find cost advantages in energy purchases, it will not impact the base rates being discussed.

29. Mr. Shirola then presented Utilities' proposed change to the Contract Service – Military Wheeling (ECW) rate which is being modified to address Utilities' transition into the SPP RTO by bringing the transmission costs applicable to the rate from the OATT into the ECW rate, as it relates to Military customer's receipt of federal hydroelectric power energy.
30. Council Member Henjum asked for further explanation for the need for the ECW change. Mr. Shirola explained that Utilities' military customers indicated that they did not wish to participate directly in the SPP RTO and that the proposed change allows Utilities to maintain costs and provide a simpler approach for the Military customers per their request.
31. Next, Mr. Shirola presented Utilities' proposed changes to the URR.
32. Council Member Henjum asked whether the remaining issues related to Electric Service in Utilities' filing documents were still to be presented, to which Mr. Shirola confirmed that they were.
33. Mr. Shirola's presentation of the proposed URR changes addressed: (1) Electric Industrial Service – Large Load – Addition of substation and transmission fees and the addition of recovery agreements for advance transmission cost related to development of mixed use, commercial, and/or industrial sites; (2) Large Load Requirements Study Fee – Clarification and changes to the URR provisions added in 2025 related to large load requirements/interconnection studies, including reducing the minimum load sizes requiring payment of study fees; and (3) Hydraulic Analysis Report (HAR) – Addition of a \$200/hour fee for minor HARs meeting requirements enabling them to be performed under the basic HAR fee of \$1,600.
34. Mr. Shirola then noted that clerical corrections are proposed for the Electric Rate Schedules, URR, and OATT. Specifically noting that the corrections include a reference correction with the Community Solar Garden program and changes to better explain methods used and add language clarity.
35. To address a procedural requirement, Mr. Shirola shifted to the PURPA evaluation and recommend that City Council close the proceeding opened in 2022, with finding that existing Energy Wise rate schedules, programs, and practices sufficiently address the new load response and electric vehicle standards, and no additional action is required.
36. Next, Mr. Shirola presented Utilities' proposed changes to the OATT based on Utilities' joining the SPP RTO. In addition to the clerical change above addressing a typographical error to a single date, the proposals are to (1) rescind the OATT upon Utilities officially joining the SPP RTO and (2) approve Utilities' Transmission Owner Filing. Both proposals would be effective on the date Utilities joins the SPP RTO, which is anticipated to be April 1, 2026.
37. Next, Mr. Shirola presented Utilities' proposed changes to Net Metering. He started by explaining Utilities' shift to Energy Wise rates and the benefits they provide in reducing peak electric use and creating customer optionality. Net Metering rates were not modified

in the initial Energy Wise roll-out and Utilities' proposed changes bring Net Metering customers in-line with the Energy Wise rates.

38. Mr. Shirola then provided a summary of the State of Colorado Renewable Energy Standard that established Net Metering requirements across the state in C.R.S. § 40-2-124. The requirements include: (1) Offset monthly consumption, with real time offset and one to one exchange throughout the month, (2) Monthly excess generation carried forward from month to month and one to one exchange within the calendar year, (3) Annual excess generation, (4) Nondiscriminatory rates, (5) Interconnection standards, and (6) Size specifications.
39. He noted that Net Metering is not storage of excess generation for customer's use in future periods nor selling of excess generation to utility providers.
40. Subsequently, Mr. Shirola explained the process a customer follows to install solar equipment at their location and enroll in the Net Metering program. A customer who has decided to install solar equipment must choose a third-party solar installer, submit an application to Utilities for Utilities' review and approval, acquire the applicable permits, and request meter installation and activation. A customer's solar system must comply with applicable electric and building codes, Utilities' Electric Line Extension and Service Standards, and applicable regulations. The Net Metering agreement required by all Net Metering customers is subject to present and future laws, rules and regulations, and Utilities' Tariffs, as amended. Utilities has never sold a solar system and does not advise customers on viability of a solar system purchase for their home.
41. Utilities established its Renewable Energy Net Metering Service in 2005 to follow the requirements of the State law applicable to municipal utilities. There are currently, approximately 9,000 customers on the rate; with approximately 1,000 customers joining each year since 2021. Rebates for roof top solar systems from Utilities started in 2006 and were periodically reduced over time, and ended completely in 2022.
42. Council Member Henjum asked Mr. Shirola to repeat the history of solar incentives. Mr. Shirola provided the summary, noting that rates historically associated with roof top solar have been an incentive to the solar industry in addition to the rebates mentioned.
43. Council Member Leinweber asked how Net Metering customers' roof top solar has contributed to Utilities' compliance with State of Colorado mandated renewable energy standards. To which Mr. Shirola noted that the question would be addressed subsequently in Utilities' presentation.
44. Next, Mr. Shirola provided a chart listing a summary of discussions Utilities held with the Colorado Springs Utilities Board of Directors ("Utilities Board") relating to Energy Wise rates and Net Metering between 2018 and 2025.
45. Council Member Henjum expressed her concern that the model used in Utilities' proposed changes to Net Metering were not communicated to the Utilities Board prior to the Utilities

Board Working Committee on August 18, 2025; and that while there had been prior discussions related to Net Metering, she did not recall any on the proposed model.

46. Council Member Williams requested confirmation that the proposed changes to Net Metering are recent developments, with prior discussions and changes being related to solar system capacity limits and the adoption of an application fee, which was not charged at the implementation of the program. Mr. Shirola confirmed Council Member Williams' statement and noted that several changes to the cash out process were also made previously.
47. Council Member Leinweber asked why solar customers were not included in the initial development of the Energy Wise rates and how solar customers could benefit from the rates. He also explained his belief that Colorado Springs is a community that believes in conservation and wants to do the right thing, and that financial incentives can help the community reach those goals. He also expressed his understanding that Utilities did not include Net Metering in the initial Energy Wise process because of the ongoing state discussions.
48. Mr. Shirola provided a summary of Utilities' participation in the 2024 Colorado Net Metering Working Group led by the Colorado Energy Office. Ultimately, the working group, involving the solar industry, electric utilities, consumer advocates, organized labor, environmental conservation groups, and local governments, was unable to reach consensus on any reforms to Net Metering.
49. Council Member Williams asked what prompted the statewide discussion of Net Metering. Mr. Shirola answered that the conversation was driven by multiple utilities proposing methods of modifying Net Metering, with concepts such as a delivery charge and grid access charges.
50. City Council then took a five-minute recess.
51. Next, Mr. Shirola explained the breakdown of rate components and noted the impact of solar generation as a whole on Utilities energy portfolio and noted that utility scale solar generation provides more renewable energy than behind the meter solar, at a cheaper cost. Utilities' Net Metering customers produce a collective, name plate capacity of approximately 50 MW. Utilities' portfolio includes approximately 290 MW of utility scale renewable energy. The cost of utility scale renewable generation is less than \$0.03 per kWh, while Net Metering generation is currently exchanged at \$0.12 per kWh.
52. Council Member Henjum noted that 50MW is a substantial source of electric capacity.
53. Mr. Shirola then moved to an explanation of the electric Cost of Service Study and its relation to Utilities proposed changes to Net Metering. He broke costs into those applicable to the customer, energy, and demand. Demand costs do not vary based on a customer's energy consumption, but vary based on the customer's level of peak usage. The peak usage level sets the capacity needed to serve a customer. The current rate design for Net Metering customers does not address demand, and thus does not correctly collect it in the context of

the credits that are provided through the rate. As such the current rate under-quantifies the energy consumed by Net Metering customers from Utilities' electric system.

54. Council Member Williams expressed her concern with the fact that Utilities modified the information presented throughout the rate case process. She further stated that while she appreciates the change to the proposed demand charge averaging customers' peak usage, she does not support moving forward with Utilities' proposed changes.
55. Council Member Dave Donelson asked wither the presentation slide addressing a Net Metering system's interaction with Utilities' electric system has changed. Mr. Shirola confirmed that the table was updated to be reflective of the median Net Metering customer, but that the scope of the slide has not changed.
56. Council Member Henjum asked how the provided interaction chart compared to what was in Utilities' initial filing and what was the base of data sampling. Mr. Shirola answered that the slide is intended to show a typical customer's hourly interactions with the electric system and that data sources will be addressed throughout the remainder of the presentation.
57. Council Member Leinweber commented that the vast majority of Utilities' customers are not Net Metering customers and that the proposed changes attempt to align Net Metering customers with the overall Energy Wise program. Additionally, non-Net Metering customers will be paying a premium rate during on-peak hours.
58. Additionally, Council Member Leinweber noted that, if a Net Metering customer has a battery as part of their system, they are able to store their own energy which can be used during peak hours, and asked if customers have been encouraged to install batteries. Mr. Shirola furthered that Net Metering customers with batteries present a different dynamic as it allows those customers to store energy at their premises.
59. Council Member Henjum noted language from Utilities' rate case filing regarding the under-quantification of energy usage by Net Metering customers and the associated cost shifting. Mr. Shirola responded that residential rates are designed to collect the overall revenue requirement for the residential customer class. The overall cost remains constant even if Net Metering customers do not provide all of the costs associated with their energy usage. As a result, other residential rates are set higher to collect the amount that is under-recovered from the Net Metering portion of the residential class.
60. Council Member Williams expressed her frustration that Utilities has known of the Net Metering under-collection for the entirety of the program, but has not acted until this filing. She expressed her position that a different conversation is needed to establish a path from the status quo to resolving the under-collection.
61. In response, Mr. Shirola said that while the cost shift is a known issue, the exponential growth in Net Metering customers is the factor that drove Utilities to its proposed changes.

62. Council Member Williams restated her position that the discussion should have started when far fewer customers were on the rate.
63. Mr. Tristan Gearhart, Utilities' Chief Planning and Finance Officer, addressed several questions. He explained that renewable energy credits ("RECs") acquired through rebates provided to Net Metering customers do provide value to Utilities and all its customers. In 2022 the rebate program was discontinued, so RECs are no longer being acquired as the number of Net Metering customers increases dramatically. Additionally, Utilities would like to see the Net Metering process align with the Energy Wise process, but felt it was valuable to let the State working group evaluation move forward prior to acting. Lastly, he noted that the January 1, 2027, effective date for the proposed changes provides additional time for communication with customers.
64. Mr. Deal explained that Utilities' addition of large-scale solar generation coming online allows Utilities to acquire lower price renewable resources than were available at the commencement of the Net Metering Program.
65. Council Member Leinweber commented that solar installers should change their approaches to take advantage of afternoon sun and evaluate battery options.
66. President Crow-Iverson stated that the lunch recess would be taken.
67. Upon return, Mr. Shirola reiterated the summary of Utilities' Net Metering customers' overall energy usage in relation to the energy produced.
68. Council Member Leinweber commented to highlight the importance of the time of day in which cost to deliver energy is the highest and the fact that it aligns with less solar production. This emphasizes why there is not an equitable trade of energy from off-peak to on-peak times, as they inherently have different values. Non-solar customers want the cheapest energy to purchase, which creates the need to balance costs between customers and energy costs.
69. Mr. Shirola noted that the requirement established by State law for a one to one exchange under the Net Metering program creates many of the difficulties being discussed.
70. Then, Mr. Shirola moved to a discussion of the cost impacts of Net Metering to Utilities and the methods of rate making used to transition to the Energy Wise program. He noted that under the current approach Net Metering customers shift costs to non-Net Metering customers, with a typical annual cost shift of approximately \$600 per Net Metering Customer, with a total impact of \$5.5 million to remaining residential customers. The total shifted cost impacts a sample non-Net Metering customer by approximately \$25 per year.
71. Council Member Henjum asked Mr. Shirola to provide additional context on the cost shift evaluation. Mr. Shirola explained that the cost shift study is based on an overall residential sample size of over 700 customers, as selected by Utilities' consultant. Within that sample, 28 Net Metering customers were selected as the representation of the overall residential

customer class, approximately 4.5%. That study was used solely to estimate the cost shifts and showed the level of under-collection per year. The proposed changes are not based on the sample of 28, but the overall class usage.

72. Mr. Shirola noted that this type of cost shift or subsidy is comparable to many other utilities.
73. Council Member Henjum asked Utilities to explain what the value of solar generation by solar customers during the generation period is to Utilities. Mr. Shirola commented that a benefit was RECs acquired through the rebates when those were in effect, which allowed the rest of Utilities' customers to benefit from meeting the state mandate and Utilities' ability to avoid purchasing some amount of power during the day.
74. Council Member Henjum followed up by asking if the value of the generation was considered in the calculation. Mr. Shirola replied that the rates are based on the cost of service of providing service to Net Metering customers, no changes are being proposed to the base rate component, and Net Metering customers continue to get the value of the base rate and Electric Cost Adjustment rate components.
75. Mr. Gearhart further noted that in the middle of the day, there is energy that is much less expensive than what is produced by Net Metering, as result the energy produced by Net Metering customers may not be used in support of off-peak system use. Additionally, Utilities must provide an electric system for the Net Metering customers sufficient to meet their on-peak and nighttime usage.
76. Council Member Henjum asked whether there is any capacity in Utilities' existing batteries to store roof top solar energy production. Mr. Gearhart explained that Utilities uses batteries to store the lowest cost energy available, which would not include Net Metering produced energy. Net Metering energy is four to five times more expensive than energy produced by utility scale solar arrays.
77. Mr. Gearhart noted that Net Metering State requirements provide limited ability to recovery demand costs through volumetric energy charge. Net Metering allows excess solar generation to be carried forward and offset energy in future periods. Furthermore, the approach presented by Utilities is also recommended by its consultant. Ultimately, Utilities must recover the cost of providing service and the current rate does not do so.
78. Based on these factors, Mr. Shirola explained Utilities' proposed changes to Net Metering Service. The changes are driven based on establishing rates that are just, reasonable, and not unduly discriminatory and Utilities' Rate Design Guidelines which prioritize, in order: (1) Economic Efficiency, (2) Revenue Stability, (3) Equitability for All Customers, (4) Customer Satisfaction, and (5) Customer Bill Stability. These standards require the proposed Net Metering changes to eliminate the current under-collection.
79. Council Member Henjum explained that the rate design guidelines cut to the core of her struggle with Utilities' proposed Net Metering changes. While she supports the guidelines and the need to address the reality of the costs presented, she struggles with the timeline

on which the proposed changes were provided and believes the process missed addressing customer satisfaction and created a situation customers perceive as inequitable and a threat to bill stability. She does not believe Utilities provided Utilities Board and City Council the time to fully evaluate the proposal and that the process should have been carried out over a longer period of time.

80. Mr. Gearhart acknowledged the concerns regarding Utilities' timing, but confirmed that Utilities' rate case filing complied with legal obligations and provided that the rate change will not go into effect for one year. He also noted his belief that the proposed changes need to be viewed within the scope of all Utilities' customers, not just Net Metering customers. Rates must be presented to address under-collection in the best possible method and other residential customers should not be asked to subsidize roof top solar.
81. Council Member Williams questioned Utilities' urgency for a change presently if the issue has been in place for a number of years and urged that the process does not need to be rushed. She also commented that she does not believe she was given sufficient opportunity to review the proposed changes and potential alternatives as a Utilities Board member.
82. Council Member Rainey asked if Utilities engaged with the solar industry to gauge their input on the proposed changes. Mr. Gearhart stated that broad level work has been done by Utilities with the large-scale solar industry and that Utilities is not currently sending the right price signal to the roof top solar industry in Colorado Springs.
83. Next, Council Member Rainey asked what a ratepayer's incentive to acquire solar panels would be under the proposed changes. Mr. Gearhart said that a customer must evaluate their purchase of solar panels individually and in the context of the then current rates. Utilities does not guarantee static rates, as they must be set to recover costs over time.
84. Council Member Bailey expressed his position that City Council must address the situation at the table currently and that there is not any value in relitigating the actions of past decision makers. He believes that Utilities' proposed changes are an appropriate method to address the subsidy and that they should be approved to avoid pushing the issue further down the road.
85. Mr. Gearhart then summarized the details of Utilities' proposed changes to Net Metering. Utilities proposed the addition of a Renewable Energy Net Metering rate, to include an Access and Facilities, per Day Charge, Access and Facilities, Per kWh Charge, Demand Charge, per kW per Day; each with applicability to Residential and Commercial Customers. The proposal would migrate all Residential and Commercial Net Metering Customers from Frozen to new Renewable Energy Net Metering rates. Additionally, the change would migrate any Industrial Net Metering customers from Frozen to Energy Wise standard rates.
86. Additionally, Mr. Gearhart explained that the proposed changes: (1) continue traditional Net Metering of energy charges at a one to one exchange; (2) recognize peak cost aligning rates with the cost of providing service through the addition of a demand charge; (3)

maintain a commitment to Net Metering with sustainable rate design; and (4) empower customers to control their bill by shifting usage to off-peak periods or spreading usage across on-peak periods.

87. Council Member Henjum noted her appreciation that Utilities modified its proposal through its supplemental filing, but emphasized that such a change would not have been necessary if customers had been involved for a longer time period and questioned what additional improvements could be achieved through additional customer involvement.
88. Mr. Gearhart explained that Utilities' initial proposed demand charge related to a customer's highest on-peak usage in a billing period aligned with industry standard, but that Utilities found several examples of other utilities that use the now presented averaging methodology.
89. Mr. Gearhart concluded the Net Metering portion of Utilities' presentation by listing Utilities' key Net Metering rate considerations: (1) Solar does not generate electricity 24-hours per day; (2) Utilities' customers do have 24/7 access to Utilities electric grid and resources to serve their electricity needs; (3) Utilities has an obligation to serve the energy needs of its customers; (4) Current Net Metering rates shift the costs of needed infrastructure to other, non-Net Metering customers; (5) Utilities is directed by City Council and the Utilities Board to ensure pricing practices that result in just, reasonable, and not unduly discriminatory rates; and (6) Without direction from City Council to change current Net Metering rates, costs will continue to shift from one set of customers to another.
90. Next, Mr. Gerhart provided a summary of Utilities' customer outreach, which included communication through the csu.org website, general customer emails, Utilities Board meetings, Media interviews, one-on-one meetings and calls, direct customer emails and responses, and the October 7, 2025, Energy Wise and Net Metering open house.
91. The October 7, 2025, Energy Wise and Net Metering open house was held at the Ent Center for the Arts at the University of Colorado, Colorado Springs from 5:30 to 7:00 p.m. It consisted of an Energy Wise open house and Net Metering presentation and moderated Q&A.
92. Council Member Rainey expressed his appreciation to Utilities for holding the open house based on his prior request to do so.
93. City Council next took a five-minute recess.
94. Ms. Natalie Lovell, the City Auditor, then provided comments on her office's review of Utilities' proposals. Ms. Lovell explained that her office is not recommending or opposing any of Utilities' proposed changes, but verifies that the math, methodology, and documentation presented is accurate. Her office's review concluded that the proposed rates and proposed documents were prepared accurately and that the proposed changes are consistent with Utilities Board Direction.

95. After Utilities' presentation, President Crow-Iverson opened the floor for public comment.
96. The Joint Solar Parties, representing the Colorado Solar and Storage Association ("COSSA"), Solar United Neighbors ("SUN"), and certain Colorado Springs Utilities ratepayers, including Tanner Cox and Scott Carter, submitted a request for presentation of witnesses on October 3, 2025, in relation to the proposed Net Metering modifications.
97. The Joint Solar Parties noted an intent to provide comments from KC Becker, CEO, COSSA; Ellen Howard Kutzer, General Counsel, COSSA; Wil Gehl, Senior Manager, State Affairs, Intermountain West Region, Solar Energy Industries Association; Tanner Cox, Colorado Program Direction, SUN and Utilities ratepayer; and Scott Carter, Utilities ratepayer.
98. President Crow-Iverson granted the Joint Solar Parties a total of 15-minutes of time to comment, to be allocated amongst their group at their discretion.
 - a) Mr. Cox started the Joint Solar Parties' presentation. He stated that Net Metering is a crediting system that recognizes the energy solar customers send to the grid and saves the applicable utility on generation and transmission costs. The Net Metering credit is provided for the service provided by solar customers to the grid. He does not agree that solar customers shift any costs between rate classes and emphasized that solar is available for customers from all walks of life. He stated that the proposal should be rejected.
 - b) Next, Ms. Becker argued that the proposed Net Metering changes are not in compliance with state law, specifically that this is not an issue of local concern, but a matter of statewide concern. Additionally, Ms. Becker stated that the solar subsidy claim is over blown, and the proposed changes are bad public policy. She also stated that existing solar customers should be grandfathered and proposed changes will reduce new solar and therefore reduce resiliency. Ms. Becker noted that she previously submitted several Colorado Open Records Act ("CORA") requests and that she continues to wait for Utilities' disclosure of documents. She concluded that the rate proposal process has not been transparent and that City Council should reject the proposed changes.
 - c) Then, Ms. Kutzer contended that the proposed Net Metering changes are prohibited and discriminatory as they include costs that cannot be offset by solar production, while also echoing Ms. Becker's comments.
 - d) Council Member Henjum requested additional time for the Joint Solar Parties, with Council President Crow-Iverson granting an additional five minutes.
 - e) Ms. Kutzer added to her argument that the proposed demand charge approach taken is confusing and fails to address issues noted by Utilities' consultant.

- f) Mr. Carter concluded the Joint Solar Parties' testimony with his contention that the proposed changes to Net Metering are irreparably flawed and fail to properly account for the benefit provided by Net Metering customers.
 - g) The Joint Solar Parties requested that their written comments be considered, that the proposed changes be rejected, and that any future Net Metering evaluations be done with input from the solar industry.
99. Council Member Henjum requested that Utilities address the points presented by the Joint Solar Parties during its response opportunity.
100. Public comment was then provided by 44 citizens and ratepayers. All speakers spoke in opposition to Utilities proposed Net Metering modifications. The speakers' objections to the proposed changes followed the following themes:
- a) The proposed changes significantly diminish the value of the investment Net Metering customers have made in their solar systems.
 - b) The proposed changes fail to account for the full benefits Net Metering provides to Utilities' electric system.
 - c) The proposed changes should be tabled so that all stakeholders can be involved in evaluating the best path forward for Net Metering.
 - d) Existing Net Metering customers should be grandfathered into the existing Net Metering rate.
 - e) The proposed changes are punitive and punish customers with roof top solar systems.
 - f) Utilities should invest in battery systems to be able to best use the energy produced by Net Metering customers, or alternatively, incentivize customer batteries.
 - g) The proposed changes harm the energy transition to renewable energy.
 - h) Existing Net Metering agreements with customers prohibit the proposed changes.
 - i) Utilities previously encouraged customers to install solar systems, and the proposed changes are contrary to that prior action.
 - j) The proposed changes are discriminatory and unlawful.
 - k) The proposed changes will damage the local solar industry.
 - l) The current rate process has not been transparent or well communicated, and as a result, has eroded the public's trust in Utilities.

- m) The deficiencies in the Net Metering program are a result of Utilities' mismanagement and should have been corrected when they first became apparent.

101. City Council then took a ten-minute recess.

102. Following the opportunity for public comment, President Crow-Iverson opened the floor to questions or comments from City Council.

103. Council Member Henjum provided a list of questions for Utilities:

- a) At what point were customers made aware of the proposed changes to Net Metering?
- b) When did Utilities determine that the methodology for the proposed Net Metering changes would be used?
- c) Why is Utilities comfortable with the changes it proposed to Net Metering in the October 1, 2025, supplemental filing?
- d) Because many people do not understand the proposed Net Metering methodology and the cost shift calculations, present the calculations of each and include the benefit of roof top solar in doing so.
- e) How did Utilities fail to understand the level of response it would receive from Net Metering customers in response to the proposed changes?
- f) Accepting that Net Metering was not included in the 2025 transition to Energy Wise rates, when did Utilities plan to bring the Utilities Board into the Net Metering conversation?
- g) Did Utilities think about the word choice implications when using the word "subsidy"?

104. Council Member Rainey then provided additional questions to be addressed by Utilities:

- a) Would Utilities comment on the CORA request mentioned by the Joint Solar Parties?
- b) Could Utilities provide clarity on the rate filing's proposed changes to Net Metering compliance with applicable law?
- c) What would be the outcome of grandfathering existing Net Metering customers to the current rate?
- d) Has Utilities evaluated increasing its investment in battery storage facilities?

105. Next, Utilities presented its answers and commentary to the questions that were contributed by the public and City Council.
106. Mr. Bidlack addressed the questions regarding legality. He started by explaining that Utilities is subject to the Colorado Renewable Energy Standard (as noted previously by Mr. Shirola and codified at C.R.S. § 40-2-124) which was put into place in 2004. However, municipal utilities such as Utilities are subject to different provisions of the Renewable Energy Standard than investor-owned utilities. While there are Net Metering requirements, such as the one for one crediting, there is additional local control.
107. In relation to discriminatory rates, Mr. Bidlack commented that customers being subject to different rates alone does not create discrimination. Discrimination is based on similarly situated customers being treated differently. It is up to City Council, as Utilities rate setting authority, to determine if the rates proposed by Utilities are just and reasonable.
108. Next, Mr. Bidlack noted that Utilities is not subject to regulation from the Colorado Public Utilities Commission. As a municipal utility, Utilities is regulated by City Council.
109. Lastly, Mr. Bidlack addressed Net Metering agreements. He explained that the agreements are binding contracts, but that they are specifically subject to Utilities' tariffs as they are amended from time to time.
110. Council Member Henjum asked Mr. Bidlack if the notice requirements associated with the Net Metering agreements were met and if there are any additional obligations that should be read into the agreements. Mr. Bidlack stated that the legal notice requirements were met and that it would be Utilities' decision as to whether any additional steps were warranted.
111. Mr. Gearhart then presented Utilities' responses to the remaining questions. Prefacing his comments with the statement that while there are benefits from Net Metering to Utilities, such as the RECs and compliance standards they help achieve, Utilities is seeking to avoid discrimination against non-Net Metering customers and that the impacts of Net Metering customers to the system must be accounted for. Ultimately, Utilities' electric system must be built to handle a Net Metering customer's maximum use of system infrastructure.
112. He explained that solar energy delivered during the day does not benefit on-peak usage. Additionally, imposing a demand charge on Net Metering customers is designed to address the usage concerns, not to remove the one to one credit standard.
113. In following Mr. Bidlack's comments on customer Net Metering agreements, Mr. Gearhart noted that recognition of changing rates within contracts is a requirement for municipal utilities given their structure.

114. From a timing perspective, Mr. Gearhart explained that Utilities started to look at demand charge concepts when peak usage information became available to Utilities. The decision to move forward with the presented mechanism was made over the summer of 2025.
115. In addressing Net Metering customers' return on investment in their solar infrastructure, Mr. Gearhart stated that Utilities is not in a position to back the personal investments of customers. Doing so would be discriminatory to non-solar customers. Many customers make investment decisions on appliances and other items that impact their utility usage.
116. In relation to grandfathering existing Net Metering customers, Mr. Gearhart explained that doing so would eliminate Utilities' ability to remove the cost shift that is taking place, and is thus not a proposal that Utilities felt was appropriate.
117. In response to questions regarding Utilities' confidence in the proposed Net Metering changes' ability to recover necessary costs following the supplemental filing, Mr. Gearhart noted that it is possible the move to a median customer and average peak use method of demand charge calculation may not cover the full Net Metering cost shift. However, he believes that it will be a positive step and will provide additional information into the overall impact of the methodology change.
118. Next, Mr. Gearhart addressed the distinctions between Utilities as a municipal utility and Xcel Energy, as an investor-owned utility. Xcel's for-profit status allows it to offer additional Net Metering rate options. For Utilities, there is potential to look for additional Net Metering rate options if an appropriate standard is first set. He also noted that customer batteries could provide additional paths to rate options for Net Metering customers.
119. Council Member Henjum asked Mr. Gearhart why Utilities has not explored potential Net Metering rate alternatives. Mr. Gearhart commented that establishment of a compliant program was a prerequisite to additional rate options, but that alternative options may be available in the future. Council Member Henjum noted her regret that the Utilities Board had not directed the Utilities Policy Advisory Committee to explore Net Metering.
120. In addressing Utilities' cost shift calculation, Mr. Gearhart explained that it is tied to the demand costs associated with customer usage and the infrastructure that is required to serve in that time frame. The one to one credit creates the shift based on when energy comes on the system vs. when energy is taken from the system. Numbers come from the 2025 Cost of Service Study.
121. Mr. Gearhart addressed the Energy Wise and Net Metering open house and explained that it was originally scheduled for Utilities' Leon Young Service Center, but was moved when a greater number of RSVPs were received than expected. The number of attendees also prompted the structural change, as individual conversations became impractical. He expressed a desire to continue conversations with customers.
122. Regarding the CORA request mentioned by the Joint Solar Parties, Ms. Renee Congdon, Division Chief, Colorado Springs City Attorney's Office – Utilities Division, explained

that the specific CORA request resulted in the review of tens of thousands of documents, many requiring redaction or being withheld. As of the hearing date, approximately 30% of the records have been released and diligent work continues.

123. Lastly, Mr. Gearhart expressed his position that the use of the word “subsidy” is appropriate in describing the cost shift seen between customers.
124. Council Member Donelson then asked if Utilities would be willing to consider Net Metering alternatives during 2026 if the proposed changes were approved. Mr. Gearhart said that alternative rate options are possible.
125. Council Member Donelson next asked if generation across Utilities’ system has a benefit to the system. Mr. Gearhart stated that the timing of energy generation is the key factor in its value to the system.
126. President Crow-Iverson determined that an executive session was not necessary.
127. Mr. Bidlack then polled City Council regarding the issues central to the Electric Rate Schedules, OATT, PURPA action, Transmission Owner Filing, and the URR. Per City Council’s request, Mr. Bidlack did not present every Issue for Decision, but instead asked that City Council indicate approval of Utilities’ proposals as a whole, excluding the proposed changes related to Net Metering. City Council indicated unanimous approval of those changes.
128. Mr. Bidlack then polled City Council regarding the proposed changes to Net Metering.
129. Council Member Henjum commented that additional time is warranted to evaluate the best approach to Net Metering and emphasized the value of roof top solar generation.
130. Council Member Leinweber asked for clarification on the impact of City Council rejecting the proposed Net Metering changes. Mr. Bidlack indicated that a rejection of the current proposal does not preclude future action related to Net Metering.
131. Council Member Donelson expressed his position that a vote approving the proposed changes requires Net Metering customers to pay their fair share and that future changes would still be possible.
132. Council Member Rainey asked if a rejection of the proposed changes would set any specific timeline for reconsideration. Mr. Bidlack stated that no timeline would be created.
133. Following the additional City Council comment, Mr. Bidlack polled City Council for direction on the proposed Net Metering changes. City Council indicated a rejection of the proposed changes, by a poll of four in favor and five opposed.
134. Mr. Bidlack then restated the future schedule for Utilities’ rate filing, with the draft Decisions and Orders being presented to City Council at the Council Work Session on

October 27, 2025, and for final approval at the Regular City Council Meeting on October 28, 2025.

135. The following are the proposed changes and the votes by City Council addressing the Electric Rate Schedules:

- a) Should Utilities freeze participation in the Industrial Service – Time-of-Day Transmission Voltage (ETX) rate schedule?

The City Council held that Utilities shall freeze participation in the Industrial Service – Time-of-Day Transmission Voltage (ETX) rate schedule.

- b) Should Utilities implement the addition of Industrial Service – Large Load (ELL) rate schedule applicable to industrial customers with loads greater than 10 MW?

The City Council held that Utilities shall implement the addition of Industrial Service – Large Load (ELL) rate schedule applicable to industrial customers with loads greater than 10 MW.

- c) Should Utilities implement the Energy Wise Time-of-Day program to address changes related to energy regulations in the State of Colorado, sustainable energy transmission, Net Metering technology, and growth in the community as proposed?

The City Council held that Utilities shall not implement the Energy Wise Time-of-Day program to address changes related to energy regulations in the State of Colorado, sustainable energy transmission, Net Metering technology, and growth in the community as proposed. Council President Crow-Iverson, Council President Pro Tem Brian Risley, and Council Members Donelson and Bailey supported the change. Council Members Leinweber, Williams, Rainey, Kimberly Gold, and Henjum opposed the change.

- d) Should Utilities revise the Contract Service – Military Wheeling (ECW) rate schedule to shift transmission expense recovery from the Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT) to ECW non-fuel rates, reflecting costs for transmission wheeling service as Utilities will no longer maintain its independent OATT in conjunction with planned membership in joining the Southwest Power Pool Regional Transmission Organization?

The City Council held that Utilities shall revise the Contract Service – Military Wheeling (ECW) rate schedule to shift transmission expense recovery from the Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT) to ECW non-fuel rates, reflecting costs for transmission wheeling service as Utilities will no longer maintain its

independent OATT in conjunction with planned membership in joining the Southwest Power Pool Regional Transmission Organization.

- e) Should Utilities make administrative changes removing the Fixed Seasonal Options (ETR-F, ECS-F) as exceptions to availability under the Community Solar Garden Program and updating the reference lettering order to reflect those exception removals?

The City Council held that Utilities shall make administrative changes removing the Fixed Seasonal Options (ETR-F, ECS-F) as exceptions to availability under the Community Solar Garden Program and updating the reference lettering order to reflect those exception removals.

- f) Should Utilities make clerical corrections as proposed?

The City Council held that Utilities shall make clerical corrections as proposed.

136. President Crow-Iverson then concluded the 2026 Rate Case Hearing.

ORDER

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

The Electric Tariff sheets as attached to the Resolution are adopted and will be effective on and after January 1, 2026, and April 1, 2026, as applicable. Such tariff sheets shall be published and held open for public review and shall remain effective until changed by subsequent Resolution duly adopted by the City Council.

Dated this 28th day of October, 2025.

CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS

Council President

ATTEST:

City Clerk