

Summary Minutes

Infill and Revitalization Steering Committee

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

Tuesday, July 21, 2015

1:30 p.m.

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

Members Absent: Craddock, Nicklasson, Siebert, Bishop

Staff Present: Schueler, Nunez, Wysocki, Whitehead

Guests: Rick Hoover, CONO; Dave Munger, CONO; Marla Novak HBA; Carrie Baatz, The Independence Center

Call to Order/ Adjustments to Agenda/Opening Discussions

Ms. Gaebler called the meeting to order, and the hard copy agenda packet was described.

Economic Vitality Tools and Incentives Follow-up Discussion and Recommendations- and Priorities

Mr. Schueler presented four recommendations to begin the discussion:

He noted that this discussion will also pertain to the next topics on the agenda.

- 1) *Extend the strategic use of City incentives (such as tax sharing agreements) customarily allowed only for primary employment projects, to high value infill projects, especially in the highest priority areas.*
- 2) *Recognize the importance of publically funded infrastructure improvements in the assuring the economic viability of infill and redevelopment projects, and align capital improvements plans and priorities with these areas, when feasible and appropriate.*
- 3) *Strategically use urban renewal authority to support infill and redevelopment in eligible areas.*
- 4) *Support the creation of new area or corridor-wide special districts (such as the Downtown BID) to finance and maintain public realm infrastructure in priority redevelopment areas.*

An extensive discussion ensued and intertwined the topics of incentives and priorities. There was a great deal of discussion of urban renewal as a tool. Ms. Gaebler and Mr. Wysocki made cases of identifying priorities, and Mr. Wysocki noted the potential for dilution of effort and results in the absence of priorities. Ms. Beck observed that limited resources are key to the issue.

There was discussion of existing incentives and priorities for those. Mr. Shonkwiler reviewed recent changes to the approach of the Urban Renewal Authority and how they are attempting to become both more pro-active and integrated with the City. The fact that the budget for the Urban Renewal Authority is all internally generated by projects, limits options for pro-active activities. Designations and plans in the last few decades have been almost entirely developer driven. Other communities have some City support/subsidy for urban renewal. In some cases City Council is the Authority. He also noted that there have been some successes with urban renewal in the City.

Suggested edits for the incentives recommendations included the following;

- Beef up the language in #1 to stress having demonstrated community benefits and community benefit agreements

- For #2 there was discussion of shifting the culture to focus more on community character. The language "where feasible and appropriate" was questioned. It was suggested there should be some suggested guidelines for the priority of improvements.

- For #3, stronger language was suggested, including the importance of the City taking on a more pro-active role.

With respect to priorities, Mr. Donley generally counseled against these being in this document in part because we may not at this point always know what the practical priorities should be. He cited South Nevada Avenue as an example noting it may be seriously constrained by floodplain limitations. There was follow-up discussion, including on what is in the current and prior versions of the text. The majority viewpoint of those present was that the document should provide guidance on priorities.

Ms. Aubrey suggested that the document should include a simple matrix which describes priorities. Ms. Harris talked about some examples she is working one with respect to the Downtown Partnership. She recommended the approach be outcomes-based. Mr. Shonkwiler agreed as to being outcomes based, but also stressed the importance of focusing on places. Denver, for example picks places and then spends years focusing attention and resources on them. Mr. Pico did not disagree, but noted the importance of also having policies, tools and

approaches that are replicable to all areas. Mr. Schueler will work on a version, possibly in conjunction with Ms. Harris.

Document Text

There was limited time available to discuss the current draft of the document. The Committee was provided with Mr. Donley's edited version which greatly shortens the document, primarily retaining just the key Committee- agreed statements along with the recommendations. Mr. Schueler suggested these can provide 'bookends' for what would be the most versus the least the document would include. There was discussion, but not opportunity to go through the text and discuss the value or retaining, modifying or deleting certain segments.

Updates and Announcements

There was limited time for updates and announcements.

Next Steps and Meetings

The next meeting will be Monday, August, 2015, 1:30 p.m.

.