



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:** December 12, 2016  
**Location:** CIC Room, City Hall, 300 Laporte Ave.  
**Time:** 4:00–6:00pm

**Committee Members Present:**

Wade Troxell, Chair  
Gino Campana  
Kristin Stephens

**City Staff:**

Jeff Mihelich, Deputy City Manager  
Jacqueline Kozak-Thiel, Chief Sustainability Officer  
Darin Atteberry, City Manager  
Ryan Mounce, City Planner  
Katy Bigner, Environmental Planner  
Laurie Kadrich, Director of PDT  
Meaghan Overton, City Planner  
Sam Houghteling, Economic Health Analyst  
Seth Lorson, Transit Planner  
Mike Beckstead, Chief Financial Officer  
Paul Sizemore, FC Moves Program Manager  
Timothy Wilder, Service Development Manager  
Aaron Iverson, Senior Transportation Planner  
Chris Wolf, Emergency Management Specialist  
Mark Jackson, PDT Deputy Director

**Invited Guests:**

Joe O'Keefe, Department of Homeland Security

**Community Members:**

Kevin Jones, Fort Collins Area Chamber of Commerce  
Dale Adamy, citizen  
Myles Crane, Human Rights Commission  
Sam Solt, Economic Advisory Commission  
Chris Johnson, Bike Fort Collins  
Clint Leach, CSU  
Miranda Fix, CSU  
Kellie Falbo, Rocky Mountain Climate Organization

---

**Wade Troxell called meeting to order at 4:05pm**

**Approval of Minutes:**

Kristin moved to approve the November minutes as presented. Wade seconded. Motion passed unanimously, 2-0-0.



---

**Think Tank Item 12-2016: Resilient Infrastructure—Joe O’Keefe**

- Leading regional effort for resiliency—part of national initiative. Leading federal portion of infrastructure protection team.
- US Dept. of Homeland Security conducting regional resilience assessment—selected Fort Collins—have braved many disasters—proactive and integrative in planning. Aligning with NIST.
- Project started in January—bulk of work will be conducted by July 2017. 3 year project.
- Working with State, Larimer County, and City of Fort Collins. Mike Gavin is City staff on project.
- Goal is to build framework to help communities that aren’t as resilient as Fort Collins.
- Office of infrastructure protection. Easy to look at resilience of building—harder to look at community. Includes social dimensions. Met with 8 different groups to find out what is needed to do jobs. Ex: What does Rescue Mission need on day without power? Supplies? Transportation?
- Understand where want to be, look at all documents, provide options to close gaps.
- Aspects of Resiliency:
  - Family, kinship, religious and cultural beliefs, media, government, community services, languages, education, economy.
  - Energy, transportation, buildings, water and wastewater, communication.
    - Social functions drive built infrastructure.
    - Taking into consideration anticipated population growth.
- Six Step Process:
  1. Collaborative planning team—selected stakeholders
  2. Understanding the situation—interviewing groups
  3. Determining goals and objectives—to support community plans
  4. Plan development—gaps and solutions
  5. Implementation strategy
- Once have findings will brief office of emergency management. Community engineers and planners to help City staff. Project funded with tax dollars. No additional cost to City than staff time.
- Annual Community resilience panel—best practices. Has blog to talk about progress.
- Prioritizing resources.
- Building on previous steps.
- Working with others—public and private.
- Fort Collins Collaborative Planning Team—Larimer County Office of Emergency Management, Larimer County Public Works, City Utilities, PDT, Colorado Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management.
- Sampling of planning documents—Colorado Resiliency Framework, Colorado Energy Assurance Emergency Plan, Larimer County Unmet Needs and Community Fragility Study, etc. Over 50 plans. Staff in DC reading plans, looking for connections and disconnects.
- Objectives:
  - Implement NIST Community Resilience Planning Guide for Building and Infrastructure Systems
  - Depict lifeline sector infrastructure—look at all key facilities and commonalities—where does water and electric come from? Assess those sites to make sure they are resilient.

- Actual performance vs. desired performance of lifeline systems under stress—what needs to be done to get back online?—outside Utilities
- Analyze impact of alternative mitigation strategies—will demonstrate impacts on infrastructure and community functions when a piece is taken offline
- Establish framework for other communities to use
- Implementation:
  - Assessments
  - Mapping infrastructure systems—will share with GIS
  - Communication of priorities and recovery time objectives
  - Community resilience plan—executive summary
  - Facilitated workshops and tabletop exercises—surveillance training, bomb detection training, etc.
- Layers of mapping include major employers
  - Show interdependencies. Start with electricity—look at whole supply chain. Focus on critical pieces.

## Discussion

- Office of Emergency Management through Poudre Fire Authority—Chris Wolf is at meeting for Mike Gavin. OEM is not part of PFA contract, separate BFO offer.
- How complete is interdependency?
  - No more than five levels, unless specifically required. Ex: Power level—where does coal come from? Manufacturing? Transportation?
  - Look at distributed energy?
    - Exactly—Smart grids are way we’ll be going. Testing in Fort Carson. Build new connections, install back-up generators for communities, etc.
- How do you represent jurisdictional boundaries?
  - Have to be able to cross boundaries, bureaucratic hurdles, etc. Larimer works well. Not as easy in other places.
- How does this interface with other resilience activities going on? \$20M project funded by NIST.
  - CSU selected to create Fort Collins model. Will validate plan.
- Digital recording of all building plans—created need for security to protect vulnerabilities. How are vulnerabilities you identify protected?
  - Federal program—protecting critical information. Once declare vulnerability cannot provide that information to anyone unless federal judge orders.
  - Assessment will point out vulnerabilities?
    - Some information protected. Public report vs. private report.
    - Transparency vs. protection. Don’t make public vulnerable. Ex: Substation designs, critical facilities. Constant balance. Not always completely clear.
    - Working with Utilities—agreement to only share with federal government and state.
  - Focused on eight social functions—show who primary customer is. Most of report is written about services and businesses that relate to community. Purpose is to avoid New Orleans-type situation where people left and didn’t come back to the community. Want to return to normal life as quickly as possible. Ex: If one substation damaged, would send officers to ones that are still working to protect them. Would not make this information public.
- TBL lens. Reconcile how we think of environmental health.
  - Natural environment, or provision of drinking water and waste water treatment?

- Looking at CAP, snowfall, aquifers, etc. from source asset perspective. Water quality determined by EPA.
- If compromised, that is water quality vulnerability.
  - When look at threats and hazards, look at most common. Ex: Backflow contaminant into system—how to react to flush system.
  - Reactive or proactive system? Ex: Know quality of water when it leaves the plant, but not when used.
    - Can look into this more.
- Opportunities for resiliency in distributed energy. Looking through first responder lens or more proactive?
  - Both first responder and broader issues. Objectives based on needs of community.
  - How is office of sustainability looking at this?
- Resiliency is being used in many ways—resilience to climate change vs. resilience to natural disaster. But what if data gets into wrong hands? Policy that if affects multiple communities that isn't shared? Only a small group knows the information?
  - Will share best practices, how to work better together. Would not share vulnerabilities with other communities.
  - Looked at active attacker, severe weather, telecommunication outage, sun flares, etc. Formula—risks, vulnerabilities, consequences. Protect against what is most likely and does the most damage. Threats vs. consequences.
- Social dimensions—How do you get at needs of social institutions?
  - Invited in stakeholders like United Way, Red Cross, etc.
- In 2008 was major earthquake in China—69K people killed. Invited to go there for emergency planning conference. Concept of reconceiving recovery. When have natural disaster, tend to rebuild exactly what we have. Don't reconceive. Social network—when someone is displaced for long period due to natural disaster—suicide rates go up. When rebuild, may not be back with same people. Move to other places. Try to get social networks back together in 48 hours—neighbors, parents, etc. People lose hope when lose social network, especially when have lost loved ones. Ex: Flood in Estes Park. Do we rebuild the same housing units along Hwy 34 corridor? Do we re-permit? Critical discussion.
- Group reading plans—Will they determine whether plans cover whole city or only part?
  - Yes.

### **DO: Next Steps**

- Water storage and water supply plans—all are water utility and don't cover all of the GMA. Other utilities don't have these plans in place. Cast light on vulnerabilities that could be tackled immediately.
- Need to see report on gaps to have mitigation action items.
- Send follow up questions through Jackie
- John van de Lindt—see modelling of Fort Collins.

### **Think Tank Item 13-2016: Plans for the Future: City, Transportation and Transfort—Ryan Mounce**

Updating City Plan, Transportation Master Plan and Transit Master Plan in 2017.

#### **City Plan**

- Potential focus areas:
  - Growth and Community Buildout—uptick in growth rate since end of recession. Have GMA. Had high growth in 90s, but has been moving up again since 2010. 1600 permitted dwelling units this year.

- Trending toward more multifamily. Used to have more “garden-style” apartments—moving toward mix with urban oriented sites (infill and redevelopment, taller, etc.)
    - Neighboring communities are building out. What is vision for remaining lands? Keep track of vacant lands and redevelopments.
  - Climate/Environmental Protection
  - Equity & Inclusion—more about social aspects of community
    - Affordable housing and housing affordability, diversity, health and wellness metrics, access to facilities (playgrounds, nature, employment), preparing for aging population.
    - Income gaps, rental rates, where jobs are now, jobs-housing balance, commuter-shed, CAP goals, ADUs, etc.
  - Regionalism—hub of shopping, cultural amenities, education, and changing roles
  - Technology & Trends—EV
  - Livability—safe community, historic preservation
  - Innovation
  - Partnerships—cultivate existing and new
- Community Engagement—traditional and innovative events, all audiences, more visual and interactive presentations. Opportunity for newer residents to get involved.

### **Transportation Master Plan**

- 2011 plan had big paradigm shifts. Will carry forward. Policies don’t work in isolation. Fully incorporates TBL and continuous improvement.
- Successful outcomes:
  - Completed Mason corridor
  - Bike culture
  - Improved safety
  - Infrastructure
  - Enhanced travel corridors
- Update potential topics:
  - Alignment with CAP
  - Ongoing efficiencies—spot improvements, adaptive signals, etc.
  - Changing behaviors—get people to drive less, especially alone
  - Balanced system—accommodate all modes, but favor cars
  - Accommodating growth—infrastructure challenges
  - Moving Toward Zero—safety initiative for zero transportation fatalities.
- Trends:
  - Shared mobility—car share, bike share, on demand services
    - Already seeing impact on system: reduced vehicle ownership, reduced VMT, fleet fuel efficiencies, reduced parking infrastructure, GHG reductions, etc.
  - Electric/Alt Fuel vehicles—infrastructure, CAP goals
  - Autonomous vehicles—could change how transportation system works
- Enhanced Travel Corridors—connections between major activity centers. Infill and redevelopment along corridors.
- Travel Efficiencies and Parking—travel demand management—put in programs/options to allow people to not drive cars. Bus passes, car shares, etc. Incentive programming. Parking—balancing need for parking with desire to incentivize mode shift.
- Reshaping Streets—Removing lanes for other uses and travel modes. Improve safety; accommodate vehicles, bikes and pedestrians.

- Challenges: congestion, accommodating all modes, parking, funding, project impacts (ex: property)



### **Transit Master Plan**

- Melding land use and transportation.
- Seeing growth nationally in transit use. 25% increase 2104-15.
  - Changes at CSU. Parking and investment in transit
  - Embracing of Max—5400 daily rides (300% increase). Investment—economic driver along corridor
  - Multifamily housing increases
  - Better perception of transit
  - Increasing congestion
- Trends:
  - Demographic transitions (esp. aging population), mobility innovations, autonomous vehicles
- Coverage vs. Productivity—trying to cover whole community vs. focusing on highest demand. Finding balance.
- Tie to land use—keys to high ridership: density, jobs/activities, walkability to stops, linearity (uses that support transit along route), proximity.
  - Matching land use with service type
- Funding—over-reliant on general fund
- Priorities—transit must work efficiently with growing congestion
- Regionalism and Partnerships—CSU, Northern Colorado regional system, transportation network companies (Uber, Lyft, etc.)
- Technology and Innovation—improving access and efficiency
- R2020—reducing climate impact. Multi-modal planning and development 13% of 2020 goal.

### **Discussion**

- Functional areas from prior presentation. Equity and inclusion is broad descriptor. More specific?
  - Still investigating. Going to internal equity team to determine focuses.
- Point-to-point mass transit. Important to do experiments. Rifle shots vs. cannonballs. Autonomy and other unknowns. Build flexibility into systems.
- Interested in equity and inclusion and increasing engagement—how people participate in government—more creative. How we’ve done engagement traditionally doesn’t work for the future. Also need to talk more about shifting demographics—millennials, aging, less desire for house with big yard—desire for higher density.
  - Need to get vision of everyone, not just ask for reaction to images. Engaging everyone in community, so they see selves in community in the future. On their terms, not just ours.
- Productive ways to engage community in planning, but also how our residents interact with local government in next 20 years. Co-creator models, not just coming to Council meetings. Fluid, dynamic engagement. Desire of Council to have less prescriptive, top-down model. Harder part is building community that builds on co-creator model—ability, right and responsibility. Includes board and commission structures.
- How is this process going to take place? Original City Plan was group of citizens appointed by Council. Update committee appointed by Council—got strong, similar opinions. Last update did not involve citizen group?

- Had specific focus areas led by City staff but including citizens. Open to using new best practices in this planning process. How to get citizens to embrace these plans. How various demographics tie into these plans. Get specific input.
- Citizen group—a lot of information to take in when have multiple plans working together. Very engaged cross section of population, but often same characters. Subgroups—burden is more on staff and get “soup du jour.” Ex: equity and inclusion is hot right now—how much will that influence the plan?
- Schedule for Council Work Sessions? Would be good to offer options to Council—large group, sub-groups, etc.
- GMA—used to push it out. In 2004 voted to not push it. However, did not decide to never push it out again. Could discuss expanding GMA.
  - Some areas outside GMA may need to come in. Ex: Hughes Stadium area. Not completely fixed.
  - Map didn’t show annexations. Should show neighboring community GMAs too.
  - With exception of minor changes, the GMA boundary is fixed.
    - Not a lot of space left.
    - As practice, it is fixed, with exception of nuances/corrections.
    - GMA should be evaluated with each update.
- Transfort funding—amazed how much have to subsidize rides. Normal charge is \$1.25. Have been asked why we charge at all. If free, more likely to be used. Fares will not cover cost. Could push cost to fees, taxes, etc.
  - Conversation on fares and funding structure can be included in the update.
- Will give presentations to ELT and have multiple Council Work Sessions.
  - Saturday morning extended conversation. Bigger than regular Work Session.
  - Start with quick history, how started, updates, lessons learned, outcomes, etc.
  - More unknowns than the past. Best practices.
  - Aligned for community vision in these plans. This is highest level vision clarification. Individual goals and performance tie back to City Plan.
- Maps—highlight regionalism—will be important. Housing, transit, etc.
- Market study—net 12K people driving in more than 20 minutes to Buckingham area. More people driving in—rising rents, little vacancy.
  - Look at community separators as well.
- Suggestions:
  - Cultural Plan—start using this language
  - Glad to see driverless vehicles—needs to be solidly seated in transportation plan. Not just a trend. Already here.
  - Connectivity and enabling—encourage
  - Community architecture—need to be intentional for when town of 250K.
    - Anchors, sense of place. Higher level than development planning.
    - Will be more scrutiny on building heights in downtown.
  - Infill and redevelopment critical to success—social systems to make sure people stay connected. How do we continue to have small town feeling with amenities of medium sized city?
  - Financial sustainability—cost of transit, bike lanes, etc.
  - Neighborhood and community centers, gateways, nodes, etc.—How has our thinking changed since last plan? Branding.
  - Nature in the City—fundamental piece of build-out
  - I-25 forecast/impact to economy (will be 3hrs to DIA)—commuter rail?
    - Regional airport, air transportation changes
  - Scope of project—\$1.3M total for all three plans. Keep scope manageable.
    - Other plans drill down to details.

- Columbia—connectivity—put escalators and trams from villages to work centers.
- Equity and inclusion—changing demographics—immediacy of recent events makes it rise to the top, but we are becoming a more diverse community. Can do better if not being reactionary.
  - Very important but easy for hottest topic to consume the discussion. Need good guidance and metrics.

**DO: Next Steps**

- New emerging themes: infill, redevelopment, diversity, Nature in the City, etc.
- Engaging in the future—how citizens interact with government going forward
- Framing the GMA
- Transfort funding model
- Saturday Work Session—process including citizen advisory committees
- Driverless vehicles—key component
- Connectivity
- Community architecture
- Financial sustainability of options
- How to brand as high level vision

---

**2017 Meeting Planning**

- Will cover list of 2017 topics in January meeting.

---

*Meeting adjourned at 6:06pm.*