



City Manager's Office
300 LaPorte Avenue
PO Box 580
Fort Collins, CO 80522
970.221.6505
970.224.6107 - fax
fcgov.com

**MINUTES
CITY OF FORT COLLINS
FUTURES COMMITTEE MEETING**

Date: September 14, 2015
Location: Mugs Coffee Lounge, 261 S. College Ave.
Time: 3:00–4:00pm

Committee Members Present:

Wade Troxell, Chair
Kristin Stephens
Gino Campana

Committee Members Absent:

City Staff:

Jeff Mihelich, Deputy City Manager
Darin Atteberry, City Manager
Dianne Tjalkens, Admin/Board Support
Tyler Marr, Graduate Management Assistant

City Staff Absent:

Jacqueline Kozak-Thiel, Chief Sustainability Officer

Invited Guests:

Peter Kageyama

Community Members:

Kevin Jones, Fort Collins Area Chamber of Commerce
Dale Adamy, citizen

Wade Troxell called meeting to order at 3:05pm

Chairman Comments: Darin introduced the committee and guests. Mayor Troxell said a Council retreat in 2011 was the impetus for Council Futures Committee—they had discussed a City architect, higher perspective, and how land use and planning can become cohesive. There are only a few subcommittees of Council. The purpose is to look at horizon issues, beyond the normal term of a councilmember. Discussions focus on vector and direction, thinking about issues like water, transportation, innovation, etc. and keep track. Meetings are presentations with robust discussion.

Approval of Minutes:

Held to next meeting.

Think Tank Item 8-2015: Cultivating the Love of Our City—*Peter Kageyama*

Discussion:

- Institute of the Future d.school at Stanford. Organization that is all about thinking of the future. Not sure how it impacted public policy.

- CSU is resource to City and Council. Draw from university in many ways, but not much in policy arena.
- Push-pull in community regarding growth. Chief planner evaluated city for build-out capacity. Thinking of how that aligns with City Plan. Make decisions accordingly. 255,000 build-out population, so designing for that, including in water.
 - Adversarial/controversial issues. Not debating future, but what want community to be. When frame with data, can get to better decisions.
- High speed internet, should it become another utility? Have infrastructure and own a lot of fiber.
 - Fiber ring around multiple neighboring communities.
 - Has become a ballot issue. Investigating which way to go. Need voter approval to move forward.
 - Harder sell is whether we can afford it.
 - 21st century infrastructure. Transportation infrastructure: as soon as built fills to capacity. Digital infrastructure is similar.
 - Real estate prices differ based on broadband availability.
 - Owner of Mugs is millennial, has created Community Fund for crowdsourcing.
- We have conversations about housing affordability and appreciation. Need to make the town better, but not too good, so it doesn't get too expensive. How do we reconcile telling our story, having people move here, and pushing people out?
 - Good problem to have. Palo Alto is most livable city in America, where no one can afford to live. No one has the solution. Right answer is to think about it, understanding externalities, to improving the city. Continue to try to make it better, understanding the effort is deleterious to certain aspects of community, and mitigate. Use same creativity and innovation and apply it to less "sexy" issues such as seniors having trouble aging in place, college kids with too much debt, people getting stuck. Must recognize challenge. Don't apologize for success. In San Francisco tech has thrown it out of wack. It is an extreme case, but can look at their mitigation strategies.
 - Had debate about adding curbs and gutters in downtown and whether it would increase value of homes. Pushback.
 - Gentrification. People getting huge offers for homes. Once they leave, they can't afford to come back in. Citizens have requested gentrification ordinance to prevent pricing out.
 - Those complaining, once they are ready to move will be happy with home values. People fear change. City will not interfere with market forces, but can help ensure character stays the same, work on design guidelines, work on getting to know neighbors (improve social capital), increase importance of churches, schools, policing, etc.
 - Neighbor relationships are 60-80 years in the making and in traditionally Hispanic neighborhoods. Improvements are driving up values, impacting property taxes, and pricing people out. Three generations of history. Value in legitimate issues. Losing historical value. Also, people starting out in careers looking for starter homes. Social issues. Complicated.
 - Ebbs and flows. Old town is popular now, but wasn't always. Other areas are ebbing—rentals, for example. Dynamic that occurs over years. Don't want to get on downside of economic cycle and lose what we enjoy about the community. Balance and good foundational principles.
- When visiting other cities/regions, always meeting with councils, or others too?

- Often it is city council, but also community foundations, downtown partnerships, chamber of commerce, etc..
- Most clients are high level moving up, or struggling?
Trends in leadership?
 - Fort Collins is exception. Not many 9s trying to become 10s. Most are somewhere in the middle and want to become better. Fort Collins is in enviable position. Denver and Front Range are in good economic state. “The New West.” Akron is more typical case study—an older city trying to modernize. Common thread with elected officials is they seem to be getting younger. They are incredibly well intentioned and wanting to do new and different things, willing to take risks. Doing these jobs out of love for communities. Worry about younger generation—don’t like conflict and see politics as conflict. Trying to fix cities “despite government,” but need government on board. Need to work together. Cities have resources and clout. Need city engaged to get movement.
 - Partisanship in government. Local elections are nonpartisan in Fort Collins. Our Council does pretty well, not necessarily true elsewhere.
 - Cities with strong mayoral system get things done that state and federal government can’t do. Mayors have led on climate change, immigration reform, etc. Progressive city managers get things done too.
- Local politics is not very “sexy” so pay more attention to state and federal. Hard sell to show citizens that municipal government is the place to get things done. Same six people who show up to each listening session.
 - Those listening sessions are new.
 - Would love to have standing room only, young families, more diversity. When had ADA bus stops session, felt like democracy as different people showed up. Want excitement and participation.
 - Stop calling “listening sessions” and go have coffee or beer with Council. Take out of office environment.
 - Listening is not engagement. Want conversation.
 - Table that is higher up than participants is off-putting also.
 - Frame matters. When cities do planning and visioning, charrettes, etc. very formal and get same people who always show up. What you call the event is important. Bruce Mao was commissioned by Jerusalem to do 1000 year forecast.
- Having discussions about citizen engagement such as public input, listening sessions, boards and commissions, but they don’t leverage and create dynamic conversation. Topics we deal with are issue-related. Want to engage millennials, use technology, wisdom of crowds, etc.
 - Use citizen input on priority-based budgeting. Something interesting in gamification of it. Prius has made a game of trying to optimize fuel efficiency. Apply game theory and get different level of participation. Ask people other interests to move beyond specific individual agendas. Finding commonalities makes conversations more possible.
 - Videos on Councilmembers to learn common interests.
 - Fifty years from now if Council meetings are going to govern decisions—we have 30 boards and commissions. In 30 years millennials won’t engage that way. Celebrate that and revise structure. Currently we have rules about being physically present to speak at Council. That will change. But when? Boards and commissions structure—tried to make changes and got pushback—but won’t last 30 years. How do we get there?

- Circles back to broadband. Makes telepresence more possible.
- Rise of creative class—can live anywhere. Why would they choose Fort Collins? Having connection is critical. Broadband is economic development and looking out for health of community.
 - Moving toward telepresence that feels more connected/intimate. If you can choose where you live without work consideration, want home to be very interesting. Missing out on social engagement with telecommuting. Dynamic community environment becomes more necessary. Great arts, culture, coffee, parks, nature, etc. Community.
- Millennials don't like cars. Has become a burden. Want to use public transportation, Uber, etc. Building roads and systems around cars, and have generation that doesn't care for it. Getting licenses later, lower ownerships, more sharing.
 - Fort Collins is infill city now. Activity centers along transportation corridors.
 - If developer, still have to meet parking requirements. But millennials don't have same ownership levels. Why hold developers accountable for same parking?
 - Interesting case where swung too far with that with Summit.
 - Student housing with minimal parking, right on transit, but didn't have enough parking.
 - Very recent that people can get to Denver by bus. Getting to that place, but not there yet.
 - For Gen X, the thought of being downtown is becoming more attractive. Want same things millennials want.
 - Millennials, young professionals and Gen Xers want the same things, but at different times of the day. Wide spectrum, time sharing ideas, etc. Ex: new high school—during day it is traditional, in the evening becomes daycare and has evening programs for adults.
- General sentiment of American citizens—what are other 4/5 level communities thinking? Do they have a sense of optimism?
 - Yes. Hopeful. Bigger cities have to tackle on fractal platform. Ex: Look at Chicago neighborhood, not all of Chicago.
 - Politically, what are people thinking?
 - Meeting coolest, most engaged, innovative people. People who are remarkably positive in spite of challenges.
- Met with mayor of Cheyenne. He was positive about community. Made comment about not wanting to do certain things because Fort Collins is. Upward trajectory, but not wanting to copy others.
 - Challenge is there are best practices, and will get similar results if following them. Opportunity is in idiosyncratic, culturally defined things.
 - Mindset of meeting DNA of community, rather than copying.
 - Place based solutions.
 - Ex: Bubble Gum Alley—others think it is disgusting.
 - Distinctive.
 - Estes Park is doing tiles, and other art for the library.
 - Public art opportunities.
 - Have to listen to ideas of people in our community.
 - How do we create the ecosystem to allow ideas to come through and get vetted?
 - Can't do everything. Can support the project without funding.
 - Ex: Really like idea and ask person to become designated/appointed person who can then use title for fundraising.

- Empowering citizens. Interesting what people can do without money. Ex: Homelessness issue. Montrose doesn't get funding for it, but had creative solutions to homeless issues.
- At community gatherings with Peter, the City is giving \$500 each night for projects developed at the events.

DO: Next Steps

- Not discussed.
-

Future Agenda Items

- October: Art of Neighboring; Periodic Review Process/Citizen Engagement Strategies
 - November: Volunteerism; 2016 Agenda Planning
 - December: KFCG (tentative)
 - January: Arts and Culture
 - February: Diversity and Inclusivity
-

Meeting adjourned at 4:07pm.