

## Summary Minutes

### Infll and Revitalization Steering Committee

City Hall- Pikes Peak Room (107 N. Nevada Ave., Colorado Springs)

Monday April 21, 2015

1:30 p.m.

Members Attending: Gaebler, Pico, Donley, Beck, Gibson, Harris, Nelson, Bishop, Shonkwiler, Nicklasson, Day

Members Absent: Craddock, Seibert

Staff Present: Wysocki, Schueler, Nunez, Schubloom, Geitner, Kurt Schroeder, Parks Dept.; Chris Lieber, Parks Dept.; Karen Palus, Parks Director; Corey Farkas, Streets Division Manager); Tom Wasinger, City Code Enforcement; Dave Grossman, CSU; Jon Carlson, SIMD Manager; Jay Hein, Parks Dept.

Guests: Rick Hoover, CONO; Marla Novak (HBA); Rich Kramer (UPAC Chair Dave Munger CONO; Susan Davies, TOSC; Brianna Carman, student guest.

#### Call to Order/ Adjustments to Agenda

Ms. Gaebler called the meeting to order, and introductions were made. Some announcements were made regarding the 4/23 Workshop

#### Public Property Maintenance Presentations

##### **Carl Schueler, Land Use Review Division**

Mr. Schueler presented information on some of the geography of public property care and maintenance using a PowerPoint (copy available on web site). He focused on the continuum of entities responsible for City owned property and right-of-way including the general City, its enterprises, districts, property owners associations and individual property owners (in the case of sidewalks and landscape strips in lieu of any other entity.

##### **Corey Farkas, Streets Division Manager**

Mr. Farkas also presented from a PowerPoint (also available on website). He described the extent of the City streets system including about 5,600 roadway lane miles, along with available

City staff and budget for maintenance (e.g. snow and ice response, street sweeping) as well as minor maintenance (e.g. crack sealing) and major maintenance (e.g. overlay). He described the life cycle of pavement and how it is extended providing routine maintenance is accomplished. A substantial portion of the City system has been allowed to be degraded to a point where repairs are costly. He noted the more dollars are being spent on pot holes than in the past in part due to extreme weather but also because these are a “symptom” of the larger problem of degraded infrastructure. Mr. Farkas also described the status related public works infrastructure including stormwater systems.

In response to a question, Mr. Farkas noted that preventative and capitalized maintenance (e/g/ overlays and sidewalk repairs) are managed and implemented using a systematic approach base on regions within the City.

**Karen Palus, Kurt Schroeder, Chris Lieber, Parks Department**

Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services staff presented using a PowerPoint (available on web site) beginning with Ms. Palus. She described the multi-faceted nature of her Department’s function including but not limited to parks, open space, trails, medians, cemetery and golf course enterprises, recreation, community centers, cultural facilities, medians, street trees (about 200,000) and public art.

Mr. Schroeder described their role from a maintenance perspective, noting limited available staffing, accumulating capital maintenance needs and the high cost of water (even though total irrigated acreage has been reduced and watering efficiency has been improved in some areas.

Mr. Lieber described their Department’s recently completed Master Plan, noting the City has a parks, trails and open space system with “good bones” available to support significant infill an redevelopment. The challenges will include addressing gaps, changes in service and facility demands in response to evolving socioeconomic trends, and taking care of existing property and infrastructure. He concluded with a slide suggesting topics the Committee might consider in making recommendations. These included potential modifications to the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) to address infill area differently from greenfield areas to potentially include capital maintenance contributions/fees rather than fees in lieu of land dedication for mature areas.

Mr. Bishop stated he would not be opposed to an equitable fee structure for infill projects that allowed funds to be used to upgrade parks infrastructure in the vicinity of these projects. In response to a question from Mr. Shonkwiler, Mr. Lieber explained the use of funds contributed in association with the PLDO. Use is generally restricted to acquiring new additional property, which might not be a need in some infill areas.

## **Dave Munger, CONO**

Mr. Munger provided comments following from the prior presentations. He noted streets have purposes extending beyond just carrying motor vehicle traffic. Care and maintenance of alleys can be a big issue. “Double-fronted” residential lots major roadways represent an acute maintenance issue in cases where the landscape areas outside of the fences are not actively being maintained by and entity such as a district or a property owners association. The individual owners are often cut off from these properties, and maintenance is complicated by multiple ownerships. He also noted that parks are defining aspect of neighborhoods and places. Neighborhoods should be engaged in taking care of parks.

He suggested we should give ownership of major streetscapes to major institutions. He also suggested the City including its City Attorney's Office could provide assistance to neighborhoods potentially willing to create maintenance districts. He also suggested considering the Seattle model which gives neighborhoods some discretion in allocating a share of the City budget specific to their neighborhoods.

### Follow-up on Utilities Recommendations

The latest Utilities recommendations were provided as part of the agenda. Changes have been made as discussed by the Committee, along with the addition of one new recommendation. Mr. Schueler also noted that Mr. Seibert (who was not able to attend this meeting) commented that the recommendation were fine but general in nature, and would need to be further articulated via the UPAC process.

### Introduce/Discuss Code Enforcement Recommendations

A general outline of recommendation areas was provided.

Laura Nelson commented that the ‘same couple of people’ have been and continue to be responsible for them acute, continuing and egregious Code Enforcement violations.

Robert Shonkwiler suggested a Code enforcement distinction should be made among those who likely have the resources to comply with codes but choose not to, versus those who likely may not have the resources.

Mr. Munger suggested that Henry Yankowski, head of the Pikes Peak Regional Building Department has ideas on code enforcement (based on his prior experience) and these would be worth sharing.

### Discuss Presenters and Approach to Next Topic- Transportation

Due to the absence of time, staff will work with the Chair to set up the approach to this topic.

### Other Updates and Announcements

There were no additional updates and announcement, other than some additional discussion of the upcoming Infill Steering Committee Workshop.

### Next Steps and Meetings

The next meeting will be Tuesday, May 4, 2015, 1:30 p.m., with a focus on Transportation. Neither the chair nor co-chair will be in attendance.