



Comments regarding Streamlining of License Application Process- July 13

1 message

Susan Ortiz <Sortiz@greenwoodvillage.com>

Mon, Jul 10, 2023 at 5:19 PM

To: "LED_Rulemaking - DOR, DOR" <dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us>

Cc: Colleen Nicol MMC <cnicol@riversideca.gov>, "tarao@TOWNOFBRECKENRIDGE.COM" <tarao@townofbreckenridge.com>

My apologies, I would have submitted through the Google Form link for public comment provided on the LED website; however the form is requesting sign-in from a Google account. The City does not utilize any of the Google platforms.

While I am in favor of an online system for licensees to confirm relevant license information at the time of renewal verses submitting actual paper work, the alternative proposed with an additional form may have some difficulties in providing a seamless process. If the intent is to provide a concurrent review process by submitting with the local jurisdiction and the state authorities at the same time with a proposed revised renewal paper form, the process of ensuring receipt and issuance between the two entities would need to be consistent. If the state is the first to issue the renewal license back to the local authority, what happens if there is a renewal hearing and the license is not renewed by the local authority?

Just this past week, we experienced something similar to the proposed concurrent process and it was not a positive experience for our licensees or my office.

We submitted an unapproved application to the Movelt platform per guidance received from the CMCA Liquor Advisory Committee that doing so would assist with quicker and smoother processing. The licensee had already paid through the state's online portal the state renewal fees. However, it appears that the process was a bit too quick in this case as the renewal application was still in my possession awaiting approval from our other departments and we received a letter notifying us the application was not approved. The received letter raised concerns that were not necessary to our licensee or our office. Further, within 2 days, the license was issued in the Movelt account for the city still without the local authority approval.

A concurrent approval process could cause problems should the licensee call the state to inquiry where their license renewal is in the process, (an increase to calls.) If the application has already been submitted to the LED and approved how would requesting a refund, if not approved by the Local Authority for renewal be handled?

Should the state move forward with a concurrent review process of this nature, I would encourage the State consider the current letters or notifications be eliminated and no longer part of the process. Perhaps a simple email stating the application is incomplete back to the licensee would be more efficient? Would this put the burden of collecting complete applications from the licensee on the state?

Sincerely,

Susan

Susan M. Ortiz, MMC, CERA

City Clerk, City Clerk's Office

City of Greenwood Village

6060 South Quebec Street, Greenwood Village, CO 80111

Main: 303-773-0252 | Desk: 303-486-5752 | Dept: 303-804-4113

Sender and receiver should be mindful that all my incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, § 24-72-100.1, et seq.