

## Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (02-13-18)

### Question:

How will the proposed Amended and Restated Banning Lewis Ranch Annexation Agreement impact Colorado Springs Utilities and its ratepayers? What assumptions were used in this evaluation?

### Answer:

The Amended and Restated Banning Lewis Ranch Annexation Agreement is expected to have a positive net present value to Colorado Springs Utilities and its ratepayers. For electric, natural gas, and water service, the obligations under the original Agreement remain very similar to the proposed Agreement.

The primary changes between the original Agreement and the proposed Agreement for Utilities relate to responsibility for centralized wastewater treatment system costs. Under the original Agreement, BLR property owners are responsible for all costs related to wastewater treatment. As a result of this requirement, BLR wastewater development charges are limited to sludge treatment and disposal, or \$445 per house as compared to \$1,868 in the rest of the City. Under the proposed Agreement, Utilities would be responsible for costs of treatment and BLR property owners will pay the same wastewater development charge as the rest of the City of \$1,868 per house.

The changes to the wastewater obligations are significant and required thorough financial analysis. The assumptions used in this analysis are provided below, and were reviewed as part of the TischlerBise analysis.

### Analysis Assumptions:

- Normal development policies would apply to Banning Lewis Ranch, including:
  - Utilities would pay for the cost of centralized wastewater treatment facilities. These facilities would be paid for through standard \$1,868 wastewater development charges and rates, rather than BLR-specific charges.
  - Utilities would pay for certain other wastewater system improvements. BLR property owners would contribute to the cost of these improvements through \$469 advance recovery agreement charges and rates.
  - Developer/property owner pays for collection systems and other similar improvements necessary to serve new areas
  - Standard development requirements for electric, natural gas, and water.
- Revenue growth averaging at 1.2% per year resulting from new Utilities' customers, 2/3rds of which is expected to result from growth within BLR over time.
- Expected normal O&M cost increases of 2.75% per year.
- Normal rate increases averaging approximately 1.4% per year
- BLR-specific Utilities infrastructure projects escalated at 2% inflation in the following years:
  - 2018-2019: \$9.5M
  - 2026: \$5M in current dollars, \$6.2M escalated
  - 2033: \$5M in current dollars, \$7.1M escalated
  - 2038: \$24M in current dollars, \$37.8M escalated
  - 2040: \$44M in current dollars, \$70.7M escalated

- Net Present Value was calculated on an annual cash flow basis discounted at 5%
  - Cash flow included additional revenue from new customers within BLR, recovery agreements inside and outside BLR, and flat fee scenarios, minus debt service for additional Utilities' infrastructure project costs.
- No recovery agreement for treatment related projects
- All revenue sources are used to fund incremental O&M and future projects

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

Question	Response	Author	City Department
<p>Please provide the official summary of the August 25, 2017 court decision related to the BLR Annexation Agreement.</p>	<p>There is no official summary of an August 25, 2017 court decision related to the BLR Annexation Agreement because there was no court decision issued on August 25, 2017 that related to the BLR Annexation Agreement.</p>	<p>Gardner</p>	<p>City Attorney</p>
<p>What is the status of BLR litigation?</p>	<p>The status of the BLR litigation as summarized in the November 2017 Quarterly Litigation Report is attached; QR-BLR-November2017</p>	<p>Hoiles</p>	<p>City Attorney</p>
<p>BLR Annexation Amendment should go to the citizens for a vote.</p>	<p>Pursuant to C.R.S. § 31-12-110 and 31-12-111, the governing body must determine whether it is necessary to impose any additional terms and conditions upon an Annexation. Additional terms and conditions are embodied in an Annexation Agreement, which is approved by the governing body of the municipality, the City Council. A vote of the City's electorate on the terms and conditions of an Annexation is not authorized by the statutes.</p>	<p>Prichard</p>	<p>City Attorney</p>

## Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>Council needs to clearly define the "owners" in both the current and Amended &amp; Restated Agreement so we the taxpayers have a clear understanding if who is benefiting from this Agreement.</p>	<p>The term "Annexors" was used in the 1988 BLR Annexation Agreement. A .pdf of the first page of the 1988 Agreement, which contains the names of the Annexors, is attached. For purposes of the proposed Amended and Restated Annexation Agreement, the term "Owners" refers to anyone who owns property within the Banning Lewis Ranch Annexation area that has not "fully performed its obligations under the Original Annexation Agreement with respect to property platted prior to the date of the approval of the proposed Amended and Restated Annexation Agreement."</p>	<p>Talbott</p>	<p>City Attorney</p>
<p>Clarify interim wastewater facilities - characterize properly.</p>	<p>Both the original and Amended and Restated Agreement contemplate the ability to do interim service consistent with City Utilities policies and rules. Sections 35(D) and 42(E) of the Utilities Rules and Regulations provide that "Interim facilities are those not in conformance with Utilities' long-range system master plan. If interim or temporary facilities are necessary to serve a proposed development, the property Owner or developer will be responsible for the full cost of the interim and permanent facilities on a non-refundable basis. The nature and timing of necessary interim or permanent facilities is at the sole discretion of Utilities. When interim facilities are being utilized, Utilities may approve an Advance Recovery Agreement based on its estimate of the total recoverable cost for the permanent facilities."</p>	<p>Joseph</p>	<p>City Attorney</p>
<p>Has Utilities policy changed to require developers and builders to pay the full cost of utilities capacity, transmission and distribution infrastructure to serve the new residential, commercial and industrial construction?</p>	<p>City Code, Utilities Rules and Regulations (URRs), Utilities Tariffs, and Utilities' Line Extension and Service Standards (LESS) spell out a property owner's responsibilities for utility infrastructure needed to serve their property. The original Annexation Agreement included requirements in addition to those included in City Code, the URRs, Tariffs, and Utilities' LESS, which is allowed as part of the Annexation process. The draft Amended and Restated Annexation Agreement requires the property owner to pay for those utility-related costs for which the property owner would be responsible under City Code, the URRs, Tariffs, and LESS, which is consistent with current Annexation practices.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>City Attorney</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>How many council members received campaign funds from the developers?</p>	<p>Citizens can search for all campaign information by clicking on the City Clerk's website link:  <a href="https://campaignfinance.coloradosprings.gov/campaignfinance">https://campaignfinance.coloradosprings.gov/campaignfinance</a></p>	<p>Prichard</p>	<p>City Council</p>
<p>Was a potential downturn in the economy considered in the analysis?</p>	<p>Yes. The analysis utilized long term growth projections over 30 years that would be consistent with reasonable average growth rates over a period that would include years of robust growth, normal growth, and periods of downturn.</p>	<p>Falcone</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>Does the Amended Agreement apply to 7,300 acres, 18,000 acres, or all 24,684 acres?</p>	<p>The Amended and Restated Annexation Agreement would apply to BLR in its entirety, which is 24,684 acres owned by more than 40 owners.</p>	<p>Gardner</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>Did the study include the cost to the city for economic development incentives to attract employers for the residents of BLR?</p>	<p>No. The study did not include the cost of economic development incentives. The City's economic development incentives are performance-based, and utilize incremental revenue generated by a company's investments to provide any incentive. Economic development incentives are considered on a case by case basis, and require their own economic impact analysis that must show a net positive impact.</p>	<p>Gardner</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>We've been told the developers of BLR will pay for all necessary infrastructure. Is this true? How do we know? Is there a pro forma showing this?</p>	<p>The Amended and Restated Annexation Agreement will require developers to build and maintain infrastructure, as is required by City Code, Utilities Rules and Regulations, Utilities Tarrifs, and Utlities' Line Extension and Service Standards. The fiscal analysis is basically a pro forma which indicates that the City will receive approximately \$49 million in additional (net) revenue after 30 years, after all operating and capital expenditures.</p>	<p>Gardner</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>Why did the Economic and Fiscal Impact Analysis council received in December apply to just a fraction of BLR? Is it prudent for us to assume the rest of the project will have similar financial outcomes?</p>	<p>The economic and fiscal impact analysis applied to all of BLR. It was a 30-year analysis, and it projected that approximately one-third of BLR would be developed over that 30-year period.</p>	<p>Gardner</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>How BLR is developed will have a very significant impact on what our city looks like, how it functions, and how it succeeds. We advise and request that a six-month process be put into place for this, and that all information the city has about this be provided at the start of this process. It should not be rushed.</p>	<p>The City has been discussing how BLR will be developed for several years. In December 2016, the initial TischlerBise Study was discussed by City Council. The remaining current schedule has been extended to April for approval, and includes additional Town Hall meetings. This schedule is subject to change. All documentation will continue to be released to the public as soon as it is available.</p>	<p>Gardner</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>Development of BLR represents enormous impacts, opportunities, liabilities and risks to the citizens of Colorado Springs. Therefore, we request additional (town hall) meetings. We also request that the meetings be more than just “listening” sessions; that citizens be given the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered at some of these town halls.</p>	<p>The remaining current schedule has been extended to April for approval, and includes additional Town Hall meetings. This schedule is subject to change. All documentation will continue to be released to the public as soon as it is available.</p>	<p>Gardner</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>How much would be paid for by Special District financing as opposed to developer payments?</p>	<p>The Amended and Restated Annexation Agreement does not dictate the manner in which developer required infrastructure is paid for. Special Districts are one of the tools available to developers to finance infrastructure in all areas of the City.</p>	<p>Hoiles</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>Which study is more accurate in regards to city obligations? Planning's study, with obligations set at \$900M, or Tischler Bise's study at \$403M?</p>	<p>The Shared Obligation Study and the TischlerBise Fiscal Impact Analysis are two distinctly different types of analysis. The Shared Obligation Study established a fair and equitable method for all owners to share the obligations associated with the development of BLR under the Existing Annexation Agreement. It did not seek to establish the actual cost to serve BLR. The TischlerBise Fiscal Impact analysis determined the costs of providing current levels of service associated with the development of BLR.</p>	<p>Hoiles</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>What is the urgent need to cut the developers of Banning-Lewis Ranch a break by amending the Annexation Agreement?</p>	<p>The amendment does not cut the developers of BLR a break because they will be providing all of the infructure necessary to serve the property. The Existing Annexation Agreement has resulted in leapfrog development into unincorporated El Paso County. This has in turn resulted in sprawl outside the City, lost economic growth to the City, and lost sales tax revenue to the City. Putting appropriate amendments in place will result in more development occurring within the City limits, will result in significant fiscal and economic benefits to the City, and will help keep housing costs affordable.</p>	<p>Hoiles</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>Is this the largest single increase in city population via Annexation in Colorado Springs history?</p>	<p>BLR has been annexed into the City of Colorado Springs since 1988. The Colorado Springs metropolitan area is projected to grow with or without the Amended and Restated Annexation Agreement. The Amended Agreement will allow growth to occur within the City limits as opposed to unincorporated El Paso County. This will decrease sprawl, increase economic growth to the City, and increase sales tax revenue to the City. BLR is the largest area to have been annexed by the City. Population within BLR will not increase significantly until development becomes more robust.</p>	<p>Hoiles</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>



Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>Requests that the City temporarily delay for 90 days consideration of changes to the Banning-Lewis Ranch Annexation Agreement until these necessary studies are complete.</p>	<p>The current schedule has been extended to April 10 for approval. This is subject to change.</p>	<p>Hoiles</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>What are the taxes generated under all the districts?</p>	<p>Tax revenues were only analyzed for the City of Colorado Springs and not for all taxing entities.</p>	<p>Hoiles</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>What is the true tax when you add city taxes and all the other taxes (fees) generated by all the different types of districts granted under DAB 106?</p>	<p>Tax revenues were only analyzed for the City of Colorado Springs and not for all taxing entities.</p>	<p>Hoiles</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>What is the mill levy of property taxes</p>	<p>The current mill levy for Colorado Springs is 4.279. The properties in BLR currently pay this same mill levy for property taxes to the City.</p>	<p>Hoiles</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>What has happened to transportation routes, parks, fire and police costs per citizen when we have urban sprawl?</p>	<p>The Amended and Restated Annexation Agreement will require developers to build and maintain infrastructure, as is required by City Code. The fiscal analysis indicates that the City will receive approximately \$49 million in additional (net) revenue after 30 years, after all operating and capital expenditures for police, parks, fire, and public works.</p>	<p>Hoiles</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>Why are the taxpayers still picking up the tab for service facilities?</p>	<p>Taxpayers will not be picking up the tab for service facilities. The Amended and Restated Annexation Agreement will require developers to build and maintain infrastructure as required by City Code. The fiscal analysis indicates that the City will receive approximately \$49 million in additional (net) revenue after 30 years, after all operating and capital expenditures. Additionally, City Utilities will also receive \$435 million net revenue.</p>	<p>Joseph</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>Parks language should waive the open space credit.</p>	<p>The language relating to park land dedication is fair and balanced. A minimum 50% credit is given if the City choses to accept an open-space land dedication, and credits can only be used for meeting up to 50% of future neighborhood or community park dedication requirements.</p>	<p>Joseph</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>Are the acquisition expenditures included in the modeling? If not, then would the revenue need to be excluded, too?</p>	<p>The fiscal analysis includes all operating costs and all capital costs.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>How does low density pay for itself?</p>	<p>The fiscal analysis illustrates in detail that development at the projected density generates approximately \$49 million in net City revenue in excess of the cost to serve. As in the rest of the City, revenue is generated by property taxes and sales tax paid by the 60,000 new residents. Additionally, City Utilities will receive \$435 million net revenue.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>Why are there so many low density plans? Where are the affordable housing options?</p>	<p>Projected density is consistent with Oakwood's current development in the northern part of the Ranch and the existing Master Plan. There is nothing in the Amended and Restated Annexation Agreement that would prohibit the development of affordable housing or other housing options in the future.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>Please provide the proposed amendments to the public.</p>	<p>The latest draft of the Amended and Restated Annexation Agreement has been provided to the public.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>Were capital expenses for expansion of courthouse and other municipal buildings (other than police and fire), additional staff, municipal service centers, snow plows, etc., included in the cost projections?</p>	<p>All operating and capital expenditures necessary to provide current levels of service are included in the analysis. Development and the resulting population growth triggers capital expenditures for some departments, such as police, fire, and parks, but not for others, such as Finance and Human Resources.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>What are the costs and revenues to the county (county facilities expansion, for example)?</p>	<p>Fiscal impacts to El Paso County were not studied. It is anticipated that the fiscal impact to the County would be positive since the County receives sales tax and property tax within BLR, but it does not provide services, such as police, fire, or parks to BLR.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>Are we relying only on statements from the developer?</p>	<p>The Economic and Fiscal Analysis was conducted by an outside consultant hired by the City, and all data was independently obtained. Once the Amended and Restated Annexation Agreement is approved, all land owners developing in the BLR will be required to follow the terms of the Agreement and to follow City Code.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>How do we know the current Annexation Agreement prevents development?</p>	<p>Since the Annexation Agreement was adopted in 1988, development has leapfrogged BLR into unincorporated El Paso County. Little to no development has occurred. Oakwood Homes has been able to develop a small portion of BLR after purchasing property with existing infrastructure paid for by a previous developer that went bankrupt.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>Are we going to be pressured to fund economic development efforts, including staff, abatements, rebates, incentives, etc. to create jobs for those 60,000+ new residents?</p>	<p>No. The City's current economic development program will continue, and will not be impacted by the approval of an Amended and Restated Annexation Agreement.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>Are any of the costs of required I-25 or major arterial roadway capacity expansion included in the study?</p>	<p>No. Regional transportation infrastructure and major arterials should be funded on a regional basis, and not by any one development.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>Are induced and secondary revenues included in this study?</p>	<p>Indirect and induced revenues are included in the economic impact analysis, but are excluded in the fiscal impact analysis.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>Does leaving inflation out of both revenue and cost sides tilt the results to show a surplus that might be less likely were we to include inflation in the modeling?</p>	<p>Projecting inflation is difficult, and would add complexity to the model and would make the results less reliable. It is assumed that inflation would impact revenues and expenditures equally.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>What impact would major infrastructure expenses over 30 to 50 years have on the math?</p>	<p>Infrastructure costs over 30 years are factored into the analysis.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>What will bring the jobs?</p>	<p>Amending the BLR Annexation Agreement will simply redirect growth into the City limits. Per the State Demographer, the Colorado Springs metropolitan area and the job market are projected to grow with or without the Amended and Restated Annexation Agreement. It is anticipated that job creation will continue to be a top priority for the community, and significant economic development and job efforts will continue for the foreseeable future.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>If we were to bring levels of service up to desired standards, is it likely the costs would consume and far exceed the projected \$1.6 million annual surplus in BLR?</p>	<p>Increasing levels of service should be a community-wide decision, and should not be made on a neighborhood by neighborhood basis. If the community decides to increase levels of service, BLR residents will participate, along with all other residents of the City will participate. A community decision to increase levels of service would not diminish the projected surplus.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>Will proceeding with the proposed plan for levels of service and salaries paid at market doom the city to another 30 years of inadequate levels of service and below-market pay?</p>	<p>The fiscal impact level of service analysis is a study and not a plan. It simply analyzes fiscal impacts at current levels of service. Nothing in the Amended and Restated Annexation Agreement would prevent the City from increasing levels of service citywide. If such a decision were made, then BLR residents would participate equally with all other residents, City pay practices are not an annexation issue for BLR, or any other area.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>What is the added burden anticipated for the library district? Will anticipated revenue cover these costs?</p>	<p>Impacts to the library district were not analyzed. Property owners in BLR will continue to pay the same PPLD mill levy as will all other citizens in the City.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>



Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>Please add additional public meetings to both educate the public and collect public feedback.</p>	<p>Additional public meetings have been added to the schedule.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>Please extend the timetable for review and Council approval, to include public review time and question/answer sessions.</p>	<p>The current schedule has been extended to April 10 for approval and includes additional Town Hall meetings. This is subject to change.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>What is the projected cost for capacity enhancement of all arterial roads, and construction of new arterials, to serve the residents of BLR?</p>	<p>Under the terms of the Amended and Restated Annexation Agreement, developers will be required to build all roads. New owners buying homes and property in BLR will pay the same taxes as the rest of the City to help the City take care of and enhance infrastructure. The fiscal impact analysis indicates that the City would spend approximately \$20 million to maintain roads during the first 30 years. The analysis also indicates that development in BLR would generate significant PPRTA and 2C revenues, in the event those taxes were extended.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>Does this study therefore assume we'll continue paying salaries below market for the next 30 years?</p>	<p>The City's pay practices are not an annexation issue for BLR, or any other area.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>What is the added burden anticipated for school districts? Will anticipated revenue cover these costs?</p>	<p>Impacts to the school districts were not analyzed. All subdivisions are subject to public dedication ordinances that require land or fees for school development. All BLR property owners will also pay the appropriate mill levy for applicable school districts.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>Why aren't Stormwater, PPRTA, 2C Road tax revenues listed in the report?</p>	<p>Stormwater, PPRTA and 2C revenues are listed as other revenues in the report.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>Wouldn't a small error or change in circumstances have a real possibility of turning the \$1.6M per year net revenue surplus into a deficit?</p>	<p>No. It is expected that any changes to growth rates and/or revenue would be accompanied by a reduced cost to serve and delayed triggers for capital improvements. Even in a worst case scenario, the City would not be obligated to make capital expenditures if revenue was not available.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>Are there any costs for subsidizing transit?</p>	<p>The Level of Service Fiscal Impact analysis determined that the projected growth in BLR over the next 30 years would not trigger additional transit routes. If the community decides to increase levels of transit services, then BLR residents will participate along with all other residents of the City.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>Did they include utilities infrastructure in their analysis?</p>	<p>All utilities infrastructure and capital costs were considered in the analysis. There is significant enhanced fiscal and economic value to City Utilities by having new development in BLR. Colorado Springs Utilities analysis indicates that rate payers will benefit by an additional \$435 million dollars in net revenue over 30 years as a result of the Amended and Restated Annexation Agreement. This is in addition to \$49 million of new revenue to the City.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>Is the \$435 million cumulative net fiscal impact over 30 years for utilities "any remaining surplus?" Is this all PIL T? How could Utilities overcharge to accumulate this surplus?</p>	<p>The \$435 million in net revenue is generated by CSU selling utility services in BLR. This is net revenue that will benefit rate payers through lower rates or investment in utility infrastructure. Over time, revenues generated by BLR development will likely result in additional PILT from City Utilities to the City, but this was not included in the analysis.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>Were recessions built into the modeling in this study?</p>	<p>Yes. The analysis utilized long term growth projections over 30 years that would be consistent with reasonable average growth rates over a 30-year period, that would include years of robust growth, normal growth, and periods of downturn.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>How much did the revenue study cost the city? Who wanted it?</p>	<p>The City of Colorado Springs contracted for the Economic and Fiscal Impact analysis at a cost of \$92,360.</p>	<p>Prichard</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>Has the council created another BLR Annexation Agreement comparison table similar to the one dated 12/8/2017? If so, is it available to the public?</p>	<p>If and when the 12-20-17 comparison table BLR Annexation Agreement comparison table is updated, it will be made available to the public.</p>	<p>Talbott</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>Owners initially required to convey land and construct and fully equip five fire stations. Now they pay a fire protection fee, and a portion of that fee may be offset by dedication of land for new station. Why?</p>	<p>First, Annexation Agreements have typically required developers to pay a police and fire fee to offset the cost of new police and fire stations. While developers have been required to convey land, build and equip fire stations in a few instances, that has been the exception and not the rule. One of the objectives in amending the Annexation Agreement is to create a more level playing field for BLR and all other developments. The fiscal impact analysis indicates that the City will receive approximately \$49 million in additional (net) revenue after necessary capital, expenditures for police and fire stations. Second, because the City expects the Ranch to develop at lower densities than those anticipated in 1988, the number and locations of the fire stations identified on the master plan may not meet fire department needs or standards when the Ranch develops. Requiring fire fees gives the City maximum flexibility to plan for and locate fire facilities to meet actual needs.</p>	<p>Talbott</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>
<p>The original BLR Annexation Agreement covered 24,684 acres. Norwood acquired 18,000 acres. What is the disposition of the remaining acreage?</p>	<p>The Planning staff is currently working on the ownership list.</p>	<p>Gardner</p>	<p>Planning</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>How much of the acreage has been developed?</p>	<p>Approximately 850 acres have been developed.</p>	<p>Gardner</p>	<p>Planning</p>
<p>Is there a new master plan for BLR? If so, please provide.</p>	<p>A new master plan is not proposed. The original master plan approved in 1988 has been Amended several times for some limited development and the most recent version will remain in place unless and until such time as changes are proposed. Any changes to that master plan will require City review and approval. As well, the Amended and Restated Agreement requires a PUD plan to be submitted with any development which provides the City with additional protections and authority to review proposed developments.</p>	<p>Gardner</p>	<p>Planning</p>
<p>Please provide a detailed list of all public development costs and total for a median market value house in Colorado Springs, (including all fees, taxes and other charges).</p>	<p>This question is not answerable at this time.</p>	<p>Gardner</p>	<p>Planning</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>How much per acre is the decrease in Annexation fees as proposed by the City?</p>	<p>This cannot be accurately determined. The obligations required by the BLR Annexation Agreement are not solely based on per acre methodology; they are based on infrastructure assumptions determined in 1988. The proposed Restated Annexation Agreement requires that future development comply with the current City Code requirements at the time an application for development is submitted to the City.</p>	<p>Hoiles</p>	<p>Planning</p>
<p>How do we compare to other cities in terms of development fees?</p>	<p>Development fees in Colorado Springs are similar to other cities of its size and are set by City Code. For example, many cities, including Colorado Springs, require development fees or dedication of land in lieu of fees. Development fees are unique and specific to each city based on the size, demand, and capital improvement plan/programming of the city. Generally, development fees are assessed at the time a development application is filed with a city.</p>	<p>Hoiles</p>	<p>Planning</p>
<p>Is the deficit collected from developers and builders for the full cost of city planning activity required to process applications reflected in the projected expenses?</p>	<p>Costs to review and process development applications within BLR were considered in the fiscal impact analysis. The cost of providing development review services is based on the amount of applications filed within the city, regardless of their locations. Staff needs are evaluated annually as part of the City's annual budget.</p>	<p>Lawson</p>	<p>Planning</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>What is the right way to move forward with development?</p>	<p>The City implements sound planning and land development principles according to City Code. If BLR does not develop, development will likely occur east and south of it, farther away from the City in unincorporated parts of El Paso County effectively causing sprawl. Development in BLR, as well as in other parts of the City, is regulated by land development regulations adopted in City Code and other regulatory manuals.</p>	<p>Milner</p>	<p>Planning</p>
<p>Initially, owners must dedicate two sites for air quality monitoring. Now no requirement. Why?</p>	<p>There is no City Code requirement for dedication of air quality monitoring stations or similar facilities. Furthermore, there is no nexus (or legal justification) for a specific development to dedicate land to a municipal government that is not necessary to mitigate any significant impacts generated by that development. This obligation did not specify where these stations were to be located, when they should be dedicated, or which owner should dedicate the land.</p>	<p>Talbott</p>	<p>Planning</p>
<p>Owners initially must dedicate dumping and disposal sites. Now no requirement. Why?</p>	<p>There are other regional disposal facilities in El Paso County. This requirement is not longer needed.</p>	<p>Talbott</p>	<p>Planning</p>



Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>Radio repeater station; owners must pay \$210,000. Now no requirement. Why?</p>	<p>Due to significant technological advances in mobile telecommunication, repeater stations are no longer necessary.</p>	<p>Talbott</p>	<p>Planning</p>
<p>Initial Agreement for land use showed entire ranch was hard zoned. Why has that changed?</p>	<p>The Restated Annexation Agreement does not change the current zoning of BLR. The current BLR Annexation Agreement does not prohibit zoning changes. Any proposed changes to the zoning will be evaluated based on the criteria set forth in City Code and require a new PUD Plan for any proposed development.</p>	<p>Talbott</p>	<p>Planning</p>
<p>Would adding all the additional volume of cars on Powers make the already congested traffic worse?</p>	<p>The goal of any Street Plan is to successfully accommodate traffic whose origin or destination is within the development. This is the same for BLR. Some trips from BLR may use Powers Boulevard as part of a longer trip. This will add traffic to SH 21, as would any increased development in the City of Colorado Springs or surrounding El Paso County. This type of background traffic increase is accounted for in the Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG) traffic model and is incorporated in design improvements by CDOT for the roadway. CDOT is currently designing an interchange at Research and Powers and is conducting a planning study for improvements from Dublin to Constitution.</p>	<p>Hoiles</p>	<p>Public Works</p>

Banning Lewis Ranch Citizen Q A (1-31-18)

<p>Pre-decreases in Annexation fees, it might be prudent to have a regional traffic study of what the City's overall road system would look like with the increased density of development projected for Banning-Lewis Ranch.</p>	<p>Since BLR was annexed, the regional model of traffic kept by PPACG and associated planning has assumed the construction of BLR to the zoned densities. The new plan is anticipated to reduce the projected number of vehicles and reduce the demand shown on the 2040 long-range plan. Once an applicant is ready to develop, they will be requested to provide Traffic Impact Studies based on Master Plan or development requests.</p>	<p>Hoiles</p>	<p>Public Works</p>
<p>Why are they reducing the width of the BLR Parkway ROW when it should be preserved as a potential limited-access eastern beltway route connecting to I-25 north and south?</p>	<p>A four to six lane arterial street will provide the capacity needed to serve the revised land uses on BLR. Encouraging BLR Parkway to become a beltway or freeway would encourage continued growth to the east of BLR. Such sprawl is not consistent with the City Council plan for infill development. Powers Blvd is the designated State Highway and is intended to serve as an eastern beltway when fully built out with intersection enhancements.</p>	<p>Hoiles</p>	<p>Public Works</p>
<p>The initial Agreement said owners pay 100% of costs associated with traffic control devices and street lights. Now, the city and taxpayers will pay. Why?</p>	<p>The draft of the Amended and Restated Annexation Agreement identifies 8 arterial street to arterial street signals that the master developer will pay for. Additional signals will be requested after analyzing specific development plans. Signal funds will be charged to accommodate construction. The City is not expected to pay for signals within BLR.</p>	<p>Talbott</p>	<p>Public Works</p>