

Please turn off all cellular phones and/or audible pagers.

All Council meetings are digitally recorded, and Council members may participate by remote electronic means.

Click on the Agenda Packet tab for an Accessible View.

Council Chambers is ADA-accessible – Hearing-impaired apparatus available.

Handheld amplified receivers and headsets are available upon request.

For accessibility information and requests, call 303-804-4113 or email

TheVillage@GreenwoodVillage.com at least one business day prior to the meeting.



Monday, May 18, 2026

6:00 PM

Community Room

STUDY SESSION - 6:00 PM

- A. High Line Canal Irrigation Western Expansion Update (Suzanne Moore - Parks, Trails, and Recreation Director) (2026-131)
- B. Discussion Regarding Proposed Police Department Compensation Mid-Year Adjustment (Shawn Cordsen - Deputy City Manager, David Oliver - Deputy Police Chief) (2026-114)

File # 2026-131

Agenda Date: 5/18/2026

High Line Canal Irrigation Western Expansion Update (Suzanne Moore - Parks, Trails, and Recreation Director)

To: Honorable Mayor and City Council
Through: John Jackson, City Manager
Shawn Cordsen, Deputy City Manager
From: Suzanne Moore, Parks, Trails, and Recreation Director

Executive Summary:

With the near completion of the first phase of irrigation along the High Line Canal, and the second phase budgeted for 2026, analysis was performed on the approach to source water for this section. Whether it is to install an additional conveyance pipe to transfer well water from the first phase to the second phase or to purchase another potable tap, the cost is similar. The future cost of the water would be less, and the City would have full control of the well water if that option were chosen. Additionally, Denver Water is still working through the approach they would take toward the tap owner being different from the property owner for where water will be applied.

Recommendation:

Information provided for discussion purposes.

Attachments:

1. HLC Irrigation Exhibit

Discussion

The Marjorie Perry Nature Preserve (MPNP) Well project has an amended budget of \$2,250,000. \$177,667 of this amount was covered by cost-sharing for pond augmentation by the Weoestermeyer Trust and the Crown Trust. The initial budget for the High Line Canal (HLC) design and construction was \$900,000. \$150,000 of this budget was provided by the High Line Canal Conservancy, and \$300,000 was provided by an Arapahoe County Open Space Grant.

The well drilling was completed at a final cost of \$982,763. The construction of the well pump, well house, and distribution system is underway, along with the construction of the first phase of the High Line Canal irrigation from Belleview Avenue south to Orchard Road just west of Jackson Street. The current contract amount for this work is at \$1,119,825. The cost for Xcel to bring an electrical transformer to the well location is quoted at \$220,784. Another \$320,100 was budgeted for engineering consultant fees and construction testing.

An additional \$950,000 was budgeted in 2026 for the continuation of the irrigation to the west side of the City, from south of Long Road to Green Oaks Drive, just north of Orchard Road, and west of University Boulevard. See attached exhibit. An analysis has been performed to help determine the best approach for sourcing water, including 1) a new potable tap or 2) expansion of the well water.

New Potable Tap

- The most feasible potable tap location is between University Boulevard and Long Road at the extension of Platte Avenue. This location is where an 8" diameter water mainline crosses the High Line Canal at the intersection of the Platte Ave equestrian trail. Thus, the connection can be made on City property without requiring street restoration, and no canal crossing is required.

- System Development Charges from Denver Water for the 1-1/2" diameter tap would be \$70,450, and \$37,904 for Southgate Water & Sewer District. With another \$20,000 in construction costs and equipment, the total tap cost would be around \$130,000.
- Denver Water is still working through the approach they would take toward the tap owner being different from the property owner for where water will be applied.
- Denver Water irrigation (total service) rate during the watering season is \$9.88 per 1,000 gals. Thus, the cost of water would be estimated at \$4,315 per year for the western extension.

Extension of Well Water

- The City's groundwater rights are for 87.082 acre-ft annually, and only 17.63 acre-ft is needed for pond augmentation. The first phase irrigation is estimated at 1.75 acre-ft, and the second phase irrigation is estimated at 1.34 acre-ft per year. Thus, providing water from the well is within the City's annual water rights allotment.
- Multiple alignments were explored to deliver the well water from the first phase to the second phase since the High Line Canal leaves the City's jurisdiction to the south near Long Road. The most feasible and cost-effective route is to connect at Garden Avenue from the first phase irrigation line and then continue west and south down Steele Street to rejoin the High Line Canal south of Long Road.
- A booster pump would be required, located just south of Long Road on the City's property for the equestrian trail.
- An additional 3,630 feet of 3 inch diameter HDPE pipe would need to be installed for the transfer, and the pipe would need to be horizontally bored under Little Dry Creek and Long Road.
- The contractor performing the first phase work has quoted a total additional cost of \$60,589 for the pipe and boring and \$62,000 for the booster pump, for a total of \$122,589.
- The annual water cost would be nominal, with only electrical fees for operating the well pump.

Lastly, the City already owns a 3/4 inch diameter potable tap for the Green Oaks Playground, which would be extended to irrigation along the High Line Canal from Green Oaks Drive to Orchard Road.

File # 2026-114

Agenda
Date: 5/18/2026

Discussion Regarding Proposed Police Department Compensation Mid-Year Adjustment (Shawn Cordsen - Deputy City Manager, David Oliver - Interim Police Chief)

To: Honorable Mayor and City Council
Through: John Jackson, City Manager
Shawn Cordsen, Deputy City Manager
From: Jason Kotz, Human Resources & Risk Manager
David Oliver, Interim Police Chief

Executive Summary:

In August 2022, City Council approved a compensation philosophy establishing a market-based, position-specific approach using survey data from the Front Range corridor, with emphasis on the Denver metropolitan area and C-470 beltway.

The 2026 compensation analysis, completed in mid-2025, applied this approach using broad-market data from more than 70 municipalities, collected by the Colorado Municipal League (CML) and the Employers Council. However, the sworn police labor market has evolved in ways that limit the effectiveness of a broad sampling approach and has become increasingly segmented between higher-paying and lower-paying agencies. As a result, broad-market averaging has understated the City's true competitive position, contributing to compensation levels that fall below those of the agencies most relevant to recruitment and retention.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of a revised pay plan for sworn positions within the Police Department (i.e., Officer, Detective, Corporal, and Sergeant), effective June 28, 2026.

Attachments:

1. Salary Survey Participating Agencies
2. PD Pay Plan Comparison

Discussion

As outlined in the Executive Summary, the City's Compensation Philosophy established a market-based, position-specific approach using survey data from the Front Range corridor, with emphasis on the Denver metropolitan area and C-470 beltway. The 2026 compensation applied this approach appropriately, relying on broad-market data collected through Colorado Municipal League (CML) and Employers Council surveys, representing more than 70 municipalities (not all participating municipalities report data for every position).

Under the current methodology, the sworn personnel pay scale remained unchanged in 2026, resulting in no market adjustment. Shortly thereafter, staff began noting emerging and relatively significant discrepancies between the City's pay plan and salaries being offered by surrounding local agencies.

To ensure the most accurate and comprehensive data possible, staff conducted an in-house salary survey using the Colorado Open Records Act (CORA), collecting information from 53 different municipalities and counties. The in-house survey included all participating agencies from the initial Colorado Municipal League (CML) and Employers Council surveys. However, as not all comparable jurisdictions participate in those

surveys, staff also contacted and included eight additional jurisdictions based on geographic proximity and comparative relevance to the Greenwood Village Police Department, including operational similarities and agencies from which the City has historically lost or recruited personnel.

Analysis of the in-house salary survey confirmed a notable shift in the sworn police market, in which compensation across agencies had not increased uniformly. Instead, the market has become increasingly segmented, with some agencies making significant, accelerated investments in sworn personnel compensation, while others have not.

This divergence uncovered a structural limitation in broad-market datasets. While they continue to provide a large, statistically valid sample, they include a mix of agencies that do not necessarily compete equally for the same workforce (e.g., differing service models, financial capacity, priorities, etc.). As a result, averaging compensation across a broad group of municipalities has understated the pay levels of the agencies that most directly influence the City's ability to attract and retain sworn personnel. This has contributed to Greenwood Village falling below the compensation levels of its most relevant competitors, particularly at the entry and early-career levels, which represent the primary entry and hiring levels for the department, and has resulted in a recent uptick in officers leaving for surrounding jurisdictions as well as difficulties recruiting new staff.

To better reflect actual market dynamics and align with the compensation philosophy's allowance for targeted evaluations in response to recruitment and retention challenges, staff began discussing a revised approach to ensure that compensation decisions are informed not only by the size of the dataset, but by the relevance of the data to the City's competitive environment.

Following extensive review and discussion by a committee comprised of the Mayor, City Manager, Deputy City Manager, Human Resources & Risk Manager, Police Chief, and Deputy Police Chief, the dataset from the in-house salary survey was refined to a subset of eighteen highly comparable agencies. This targeted approach enables a more precise evaluation of competitive conditions by focusing on relevant and reliable data, particularly when broader datasets do not accurately reflect the market. The refinement represents an evolution in methodology, not a departure from policy, and remains fully aligned with the compensation philosophy's emphasis on using the most relevant and credible data available.

Based on the comprehensive assessment the staff was also directed to redesign the pay structure, which identified areas where the current model differs from prevailing industry practices. The existing step plan was intentionally built to prevent overlap between sworn positions. While this provides clear role differentiation, it has also contributed to pay compression and reduced flexibility in maintaining appropriate internal relationships. The revised structure introduces calibrated overlap between ranks to ease compression and support more natural career progression. Additionally, the standalone Detective pay range is removed and replaced with a 3% hourly stipend paid within the Officer range, aligning with common industry standards. Together, these adjustments maintain internal equity while improving flexibility and overall responsiveness of the classification and compensation system.

As proposed, an implementation date of June 28, 2026, will result in additional personnel costs of approximately \$274,437. This estimate reflects a partial-year impact and includes not only base salary adjustments but also the associated employer-paid obligations, such as payroll taxes and employee benefits.

On a full-year basis, the ongoing financial commitment beginning in 2027 is expected to increase to approximately \$548,874 annually. This figure represents the sustained budgetary impact of the compensation changes and does not account for any future citywide salary adjustments or changes in benefit rates.

Salary Survey Participating Agencies

Adams County	Grand Junction
Arapahoe County*	Greeley
Arvada*	Johnstown
Aurora	Kersey
Black Hawk	Lafayette
Boulder	Lakewood*
Brighton	Lasalle
Broomfield*	Littleton*
Castle Rock*	Lone Tree*
Cherry Hills Village*	Longmont
Colorado Springs	Louisville
Commerce City*	Loveland
Dacono	Manitou Springs
Denver	Mead
Douglas County*	Monument
Eaton	Northglenn*
Englewood*	Parker*
Erie	Platteville
Evans	Severance
Federal Heights	Sheridan
Firestone	Thornton*
Fort Collins	Timnath
Fort Lupton	Westminster*
Fountain	Wheat Ridge*
Frederick	Windsor
Glendale*	Woodland Park
Golden*	

*Eighteen highly comparable agencies as identified by the committee.

PD Pay Plan Comparison

Current Pay Scale								
Position	Perf Level	Entry	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6
Recruit	N/A	\$ 68,640.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Officer	Meets	\$ 75,774.00	\$ 81,058.00	\$ 86,341.00	\$ 91,624.00	\$ 96,907.00	\$ 102,190.00	\$ 107,494.00
	Exceeds		\$ 81,869.00	\$ 87,214.00	\$ 92,539.00	\$ 97,885.00	\$ 103,210.00	
	Excels		\$ 82,680.00	\$ 88,088.00	\$ 93,454.00	\$ 98,862.00	\$ 104,250.00	
Detective	Meets	N/A	N/A	\$ 108,576.00	\$ 110,344.00	\$ 112,112.00	\$ 113,880.00	\$ 115,637.00
	Exceeds			\$ 109,117.00	\$ 110,906.00	\$ 112,674.00	\$ 114,442.00	
	Excels			\$ 109,658.00	\$ 111,467.00	\$ 113,235.00	\$ 115,024.00	
Corporal	Meets	N/A	N/A	\$ 116,771.00	\$ 118,494.00	\$ 120,224.00	\$ 121,950.00	\$ 123,698.00
	Exceeds			\$ 117,354.00	\$ 119,080.00	\$ 120,827.00	\$ 122,554.00	
	Excels			\$ 117,936.00	\$ 119,683.00	\$ 121,430.00	\$ 123,157.00	
Sergeant	Meets	N/A	N/A	\$ 124,946.00	\$ 127,650.00	\$ 130,354.00	\$ 133,058.00	\$ 135,762.00
	Exceeds			\$ 125,570.00	\$ 128,294.00	\$ 130,998.00	\$ 133,723.00	
	Excels			\$ 126,194.00	\$ 128,939.00	\$ 131,643.00	\$ 134,389.00	

Proposed Pay Scale								
Position	Perf Level	Entry	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6
Recruit	N/A	\$ 74,880.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Officer	Meets	\$ 82,243.20	\$ 87,963.20	\$ 93,683.20	\$ 99,403.20	\$ 105,123.20	\$ 110,843.20	\$ 116,584.00
	Exceeds		\$ 88,842.83	\$ 94,620.03	\$ 100,397.23	\$ 106,174.43	\$ 111,951.63	
	Excels		\$ 89,731.26	\$ 95,566.23	\$ 101,401.20	\$ 107,236.18	\$ 113,071.15	
Detective (3% Stipend)	Meets	N/A	N/A	\$ 96,493.70	\$ 102,385.30	\$ 108,276.90	\$ 114,168.50	\$ 120,081.52
	Exceeds			\$ 97,458.63	\$ 103,409.15	\$ 109,359.66	\$ 115,310.18	
	Excels			\$ 98,433.22	\$ 104,443.24	\$ 110,453.26	\$ 116,463.28	
Corporal	Meets	N/A	N/A	\$ 116,355.20	\$ 118,996.80	\$ 121,638.40	\$ 124,280.00	\$ 126,921.60
	Exceeds			\$ 117,518.75	\$ 120,186.77	\$ 122,854.78	\$ 125,522.80	
	Excels			\$ 118,693.94	\$ 121,388.64	\$ 124,083.33	\$ 126,778.03	
Sergeant	Meets	N/A	N/A	\$ 126,172.80	\$ 131,352.00	\$ 136,541.60	\$ 141,731.20	\$ 146,889.60
	Exceeds			\$ 127,434.53	\$ 132,665.52	\$ 137,907.02	\$ 143,148.51	
	Excels			\$ 128,708.87	\$ 133,992.18	\$ 139,286.09	\$ 144,580.00	

Net Increase/(Decrease)								
Position	Perf Level	Entry	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6
Recruit	N/A	\$ 6,240.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Officer	Meets	\$ 6,469.20	\$ 6,905.20	\$ 7,342.20	\$ 7,779.20	\$ 8,216.20	\$ 8,653.20	\$ 9,090.00
	Exceeds		\$ 6,973.83	\$ 7,406.03	\$ 7,858.23	\$ 8,289.43	\$ 8,741.63	
	Excels		\$ 7,051.26	\$ 7,478.23	\$ 7,947.20	\$ 8,374.18	\$ 8,821.15	
Detective (3% Stipend)	Meets	N/A	N/A	\$ (12,082.30)	\$ (7,958.70)	\$ (3,835.10)	\$ 288.50	\$ 4,444.52
	Exceeds			\$ (11,658.37)	\$ (7,496.85)	\$ (3,314.34)	\$ 868.18	
	Excels			\$ (11,224.78)	\$ (7,023.76)	\$ (2,781.74)	\$ 1,439.28	
Corporal	Meets	N/A	N/A	\$ (415.80)	\$ 502.80	\$ 1,414.40	\$ 2,330.00	\$ 3,223.60
	Exceeds			\$ 164.75	\$ 1,106.77	\$ 2,027.78	\$ 2,968.80	
	Excels			\$ 757.94	\$ 1,705.64	\$ 2,653.33	\$ 3,621.03	
Sergeant	Meets	N/A	N/A	\$ 1,226.80	\$ 3,702.00	\$ 6,187.60	\$ 8,673.20	\$ 11,127.60
	Exceeds			\$ 1,864.53	\$ 4,371.52	\$ 6,909.02	\$ 9,425.51	
	Excels			\$ 2,514.87	\$ 5,053.18	\$ 7,643.09	\$ 10,191.00	