

## Summary Minutes

### Infill and Revitalization Steering Committee

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

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

1:30 p.m.

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

Members Absent: Craddock, Gibson, Siebert, Bishop

Staff Present: Wysocki, Schueler, Nunez, Tefertiller, Geitner, Craig Blewitt and Brian Vitulli, Mountain Metropolitan Transit; Brian Whitehead and Brent Schubloom, CSU

Guests: Rick Hoover, CONO; Marla Novak (HBA); Jenny Elliot; Walter Lawson

#### Call to Order/ Adjustments to Agenda/Opening Discussions

Ms. Gaebler called the meeting to order, and the hard copy agenda packet was described. There was some discussion of big picture direction, recommendations and outcomes. Peter Wysocki stated a first draft of the Comprehensive Plan Chapter would be available for the next meeting. Carl Schueler referred to the attached generalized outline of proposed contents. Related to this, there was discussion of how to integrate other concerns, topics and content in addition to the subject-specific format which has mostly been used for the meetings. Ms. Day asked about a position to dis-incentivize greenfield development. Mr. Wysocki responded that the intent at this time is not to dis-incentivize greenfield, but instead focus on determine what is needed to encourage infill. Mr. Schueler noted there is a proposed section on greenfield development in the draft Plan, so there is an opportunity for the Committee to address this. Ms. Harris asked about the need to address housing and diverse/ higher density housing needs in general. Mr. Wysocki suggested this was somewhat of a broader issue, to also be addressed by other plans. Mr. Shonkwiler reported that he had another zoning-related recommendation and handed out a section of the Code. He and Mr. Schueler will follow up. Ms. Beck reiterated that she did not want us to be entirely limited the “what’s working/not working” topics. Mr. Donley noted some of the recommendations will be “geography” driven. Ms. Nicklasson would like to see it all together.

## Transit Presentations and Discussion

Craig Blewitt, Transit Services Manager presented from a PowerPoint (available on website). He described current and planned routes, systems and level of service, noting several areas where plans and opportunities align closely with infill objectives. He noted the 3 "Ds" for successful Transit Oriented Development (TOD), which are Density, Diversity and Design. Also discussed was the importance of demographics. There was great deal of discussion about alignment of infill priorities with transit capacity. Federal funding (80%) is potentially available for capital investments in the system through programs such as Small Starts. However, these programs have minimum land use density thresholds. He discussed several recommendations in some detail:

- 1) Revise City regulations to allow for transit-supportive land use polices
- 2) Agree on a definition of TOD and how it could fit into this community
- 3) Incorporate TOD as a community improvement tool to respond to community trends and needs.

There was extensive discussion and questions. Mr. Shonkwiler emphasized the order of magnitude differences in per capita operational and capital funding in the Denver metro area compared with our area. Ms. Beck asked about the concentration of the service area (only about 50% of the population being served. There was discussion of what happens when special grants run out for new service options and lines (such as Powers), In the case of Powers the grant pertains to service level employees and although initial ridership has not been high adjustments are being made (there are also issues with having no stops on Powers itself). Mr. Blewitt noted that some pilots do end up being successful and continued, with the Manitou shuttle being an example. There needs to be an ability to test, adjust, adapt and also be willing to remove unproductive service.

Mr. Wysocki asked about how fixed routes are from the perspective of developers being able to rely on them with as a basis for land use investments. The response was most of the core routes are fairly well established. Ms. Harris commented that it is imperative that we have a strong transit vision and system to support infill. Ms. Beck agreed and added transit has to be a driver. Mr. Pico noted that the market needs to be able rely on the system in order to make market decisions based on it.

## Recommendations

Mr. Schueler briefly highlighted the status of the draft recommendations contained in the handout, noting those for earlier topics have been edited to include some updates as well as more of a "direct" tone. New initial drafts have been created for property maintenance and

transportation. Most of the limited remaining discussion time centered on the Utilities recommendations, and a new draft recommendation concerning reconnection fees. Brent Schubloom noted that less than ½ of one percent of all meters (less than 700) were currently inactive or abandoned, meaning they have been shut off for 5 years or more and therefore are potentially incurring charges. These tend to be scattered throughout the City. Only about 10-12 inactive meters are restored to service in a typical year, with average charges of about \$1,000 for inactive service lines and \$3,000 for abandoned service lines being paid over the past four year. He also clarified that the maximum reconnection fee is capped at 50% of the development charge for multifamily units, but represents a lower percentage for other meter sizes, with the ratio becoming lower as the meter sizes increase. (Later Mr. Schubloom also clarified that some of the inactive meters in his reported accounting, are effectively abandoned and therefore may have no prospect of ever being reactivated). Ms. Nelson noted that some of the properties accruing the most costly charges might not be reconnecting. Ms. Jenny Elliot commented that there is the option of turning service back on briefly to “reset the clock”, but not all property owners are aware of this, and there can be major cost implications. She is accumulating \$150/month in charges associated with her Castle West property.

Mr. Schubloom was asked if he had any additional recommendations. He noted he did not have anything more specific beyond some of the recommendations already being moved forward. He went on to explain that there will be implementation challenges for some of the recommendations if they are adopted, as there are not policy , programs and funding currently in place. Ms. Nicklasson emphasized the importance of having CSU proactively involved not only in individual redevelopment project, but also looking at the issues more holistically as the crop up. There was also discussion of the difficulty in prioritizing which redevelopment areas should get CSU attention for reinvestment.

Mr. Shonkwiler reiterated his concern with having free or low cost digital access to CSU information related to the development process.

In conclusion, it was noted that Committee members should continue to work off line primarily with Carl Schueler on the recommendations to maximize the effectiveness if discussion and progress at meetings.

### Transfer of Meter Credits

Ms. Nunez distributed a May 19, 2015 draft of an ongoing proposal to all limited transfer of tap fee credits from vacant properties only, to other benefitting infill properties under the same ownership. This will go through a stakeholder process.

## Other Updates and Announcements

The May UPAC Phase I report will be provided to the Utilities Board tomorrow (May 20<sup>th</sup>).

Staff, Chuck Donley Placeways are working on a “hybrid” strategy map that provides one best sense for an emerging infill land use assumption and vision, and which can also be used to model CSU wastewater capacity.

## Next Steps and Meetings

The next meeting will be Monday, June 1, 2015, 1:30 p.m., with a focus on ongoing recommendations.