

## MINUTES

Parks and Recreation Advisory Board  
September 11, 2014  
1401 Recreation Way, CSC 80905

**Board Members Present:** Gary Feffer, Charles Castle, Ron Ilgen, Alex Johnson, Mina Liebert, John Maynard, Hank Scarangella

**Absent:** Jackie Hilaire, Scot Hume

**Alternates Present:** Bob Lally, Jason Rupinski

## CALL TO ORDER

**Opening:** In absence of Chair Hilaire, Vice Chair Feffer called the meeting to order at 7:31 a.m.

## CITIZEN DISCUSSION

**Remembering Dr. Richard Beidleman:** Dr. Richard Beidleman, Professor Emeritus at Colorado College and a pioneer in conservation in Colorado Springs, passed away in August.

Melissa Walker, President of the Friends of the Garden of the Gods, read the following tribute to Dr. Beidelman which she wrote:

*Dr. Richard Beidleman, Professor Emeritus of Colorado College, was one of the most important people in the history of Garden of the Gods Park. He died on August 7 at the age of 91 at his California home. **We have Dr. Beidleman to thank for saving the Garden's magnificent Gateway Rocks view, and the property that is now Rock Ledge Ranch Historic Site, and for the fact that Garden of the Gods is a National Natural Landmark.***

*In the late 1960s, the land that comprises the Garden of the God's main east entrance was almost sold to a developer to become high-density housing. Because of Dr. Beidleman's tenacious leadership and successful efforts to secure funding, the property was not developed. The land was saved because Dr. Beidleman cared so much, that he put up his own personal money as earnest money. He stalled the sale long enough to work with other citizens to find funding to purchase the acreage so it could be saved as parkland—parkland that is the foreground of the Garden's world-famous view of the red rocks and Pikes Peak as seen from the Visitor and Nature Center, and the land that is Rock Ledge Ranch Historic Site—now listed on the National Register of Historic Places.*

*Dr. Beidleman also researched and authored the detailed document that convinced the Department of the Interior to designate the Garden of the Gods as a National Natural Landmark in 1971. In that document, Dr. Beidleman wrote the inspiring description of the Garden that endures and is often quoted:*

***"Here is, perhaps, the most striking contrast between plains and mountains in North America, with respect to biology, geology, climate and scenery."***

*Although Dr. Beidleman was a nationally acclaimed author, biologist and naturalist, he always made time to speak to local Colorado Springs groups. He led hundreds of field trips and presented countless programs about the ecology, flora, fauna and pioneer naturalists of the Pikes Peak Region. Even after he retired from Colorado College in the late 1980s and moved to California to continue his natural history research, he returned to Colorado every summer to lead field studies in the mountains he loved.*

*The last program that Dr. Beidleman presented for the Garden of the Gods was during the Park's 100<sup>th</sup>*

*Anniversary Celebration in 2009. His Centennial Lecture was entitled "More Than Just A Garden." He challenged the audience to continue to preserve the extraordinary "Plains to Peaktops" ecology of the Pikes Peak Region. Dr. Beidleman concluded his lecture by quoting William Cullen Bryant and urged all of us to "Go forth under the open sky and listen to Nature's teachings."*

**Tamaha Spring in Monument Valley Park:** Tim Boddington, Treasurer of the Historic Preservation Alliance (HPA) of Colorado, said that the HPA would like to partner with the City of Colorado Springs in the restoration of Tahama Spring in Monument Valley Park. The HPA has been working on this project for some time. The work to determine the drinkability of the water that flows in the Spring is being advanced by the Colorado Springs Utilities' Water Division. An architect, Jim Fennell, has drawn a detailed replica of the original pavilion which they will be working to erect in due time. The original pavilion is believed to have been stucco and brick. They will likely use the same materials, perhaps leaving the exterior brick and incorporating some limestone bricks on the inside which can be carved with the names of donors on the project. They have determined that the water flows at a two gallon per minute rate, is pretty clean, but contains some contaminants that they are hoping an ultraviolet filter and cleansing device can make the water potable. This project is an extension of their previous work to get the Monument Valley Park listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The State Historic Fund does not fund reconstruction projects. When the HPA has determined the costs based on final approval of the plans and scope of work within the Memorandum of Understanding with the Parks Department, they will raise the necessary funds. Photos and history regarding the Tahama Spring was provided by Mr. Boddington. ([See attachment](#))

**Jones Park:** Susan Davies, Executive Director of the Trails and Open Space Coalition, said that City Council began seeking input on the sale of Jones Park. The property is currently owned by Colorado Springs Utilities (CSU). CSU is recommending donating Jones Park to the National Forest Foundation who will turn it over to the US Forest Service. In the meantime, the El Paso County Board of Commissioners is seeking possession of Jones Park. Ms. Davies wanted the Parks Board to be aware of this and asked for their support in preserving it as a park.

**November Ballot Item 1A "Yes for Parks":** Susan Davies, Executive Director of the Trails and Open Space Coalition, said that the El Paso County Commissioners voted unanimously to place "Tabor Surplus for Parks" on the November ballot to allow them to spend \$2 million on "County" parks and trails and asked for the Parks Board's support on the ballot item.

**Concept of Complete Creeks (Waterways for Bikes):** Al Brody said that in the past, the City adopted a concept called "complete streets", and the City now has complete streets. Mr. Brody said that the City can now look for opportunities for complete drainageways/creeks, which can be used as "trails" for bikes. A good example is Union Boulevard and Austin Bluffs Parkway which has a perfect concrete drainageway that includes a trail.

**Conservation Easement for White Acres:** Don Ellis requested the Board to look for opportunities for a conservation easement for White Acres in order to protect it like Red Rock Canyon Open Space and Section 16.

**City Auditorium:** Dave Weesner said that there is a rumor in the community regarding selling the City Auditorium again. He said that the City Auditorium should not be sold. Mr. Weesner also said that some of the Lodgers and Automobile Rental Tax (LART) dollars should go to the City Auditorium. He also mentioned the items which the Board of the Friends of the Historic City Auditorium requested. ([See attachment](#))

**Green Tag Program:** Britt Tonnessen, referencing an article which she wrote for the Gazette recently (Pups in Parks), asked that the Department consider various options regarding dogs in the park system (i.e. the City of Boulder's Green Tag policy; making certain places off-leash (i.e. trails and open spaces); and making certain times and locations available for dogs to be off-leash, etc.).

Kurt Schroeder, Manager of Park Operations and Development, said that the Department is planning to meet with staff from the City of Boulder regarding their Green Tag program. Staff will provide an update to the Board.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Vice Chair Feffer, Board members Johnson and Maynard made the following corrections:

- Page 2, second paragraph under the Action Item #1: Change Joe Pock's name to Joe Poch.
- Page 2, under "NOTE", after the Action Item #1: Change Alex John to Alex Johnson.
- Page 2, second to last line under "Nays" in voting: Remove Charles Castle's name and add "None" then add Charles Castle's name under "Ayes".

**John Maynard made a motion to approve the minutes from the August 14, 2014 Board meeting as amended above. Motion seconded by Charles Castle and carried unanimously.**

**Ayes: Gary Feffer, Charles Castle, Ron Ilgen, Alex Johnson, Mina Liebert, John Maynard, Hank Scarangella**  
**Nays: None**  
**Absent: Jackie Hilaire, Scot Hume**

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **Park System Master Plan (Item #1)**

Chris Lieber, Manager, Park Development and TOPS Program, said that the Parks Department has been engaged in a robust public process to develop a new Park System Master Plan for the City of Colorado Springs. At this time, a final draft of the Park System Master Plan has been developed for review and approval. Mr. Lieber presented a summary of the draft plan recommendations, along with a summary of comments received from the public and stakeholders through a PowerPoint presentation. ([See presentation](#))

Board member Ilgen asked if there would be a final publication of the Master Plan and/or if the Master Plan would be updated throughout the year as different items come up.

Mr. Lieber said that the Master Plan will be the final document for the next ten years in terms of vision and direction. However, the action plan has flexibility in terms of changing and/or addressing needs such as a new recreational trend, etc. The action plan will set priorities and provide direction during the Budget process.

In response to Board member Maynard's question regarding if the term "complete creeks" (which was heard during Citizen Discussion) could be added to the Master Plan, Mr. Lieber said that the Master Plan identifies a number of creek corridors (page 157) with goals around these corridors, such as the creek system is viewed as an organizational tool for future park development; for instance, the notion of placing parks as nodes along a system/greenway corridor. The Plan identifies and emphasizes the idea that corridors are valuable as trail corridors and for natural resource preservation. However, the term "complete creeks" can be added.

Board member Maynard suggested adding an executive summary.

Mr. Lieber said that was discussed. The first five pages called "Plan Summary" include the overall general concept of the Plan. This can be published separately as an executive summary, which was the intent. Board member Maynard recommended a separate document.

Board member Castle suggested including information on kiosks, markers, information booths, wi fi-access, phone usage, trails maps, etc. throughout the city as a way of communicating as well as advertising about the park/trail system.

Mr. Lieber said that the Master Plan includes "managing parks for better usability and greater enjoyment" as well as a section on directional signage and interpretive signage. He said that this would be the same goal as Board member Castle's suggestions.

In response to Board member Johnson's question regarding if the County would be involved with the Parks foundation, Mr. Lieber said that he received a letter from the County asking to look at a broader foundation. However, the consultants consistently suggested looking for ways to start small, with a few City parks, then expand as the Foundation becomes successful. Thus, the Master Plan recommends focusing only on City parks.

Board member Liebert suggested emphasizing public awareness and education (i.e. City parks vs. County parks, etc.).

In response to Board member Liebert's question regarding how the Department would evaluate itself with the Plan, Mr. Lieber said that the Action Plan is created from the Master Plan to include a prioritized list of action items. The Action Plan also includes accountability and reporting sections as a way to evaluate the Department's efforts.

Ms. Liebert said that the public should be able to access information regarding the Department's accomplishments.

Vice Chair Feffer thanked staff for the follow ups and changes regarding the Board's comments as well as the Council's comments.

Vice Chair Feffer asked for public input.

Bob Lally asked the Board to consider a backup plan in the event that the Master Plan is not approved. He said that if the Master Plan can be in a draft form then it could continue to move forward. Mr. Lally said that this is a budget issue and the priority is on an annual basis.

Susan Davies, Executive Director of the Trails and Open Space Coalition (TOSC), said that TOSC was pleased with the Plan. Staff has accepted and incorporated public input. Ms. Davies said that she was concerned about the Council's vote, though she felt that there will be a majority vote. Ms. Davies suggested reaching out to Council members to let them know that this was a well-attended community process and that the Council needs to look at this as a vision for the community.

**Charles Castle made a motion to approve the Park System Master Plan as presented with the changes discussed by the Board members. Motion was seconded by Ron Ilgen.**

Board member Maynard commended staff and consultants for the Master Plan, which was extremely well done. He said that staff responded appropriately and thoroughly to the TOPS Working Committee, Parks Board, citizens and City Council's comments which were received during the review process. In this process, staff heard very strong support for the City's park system, trail system, TOPS program and other programs that the City has relative to the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services. Board member Maynard said that there will be a discussion regarding the TOPS extension in the future. He hopes that at that time, the constituency of the TOPS program will successfully adjust the TOPS funding appropriately for the future.

**The Board voted on the above motion and carried unanimously.**

**Ayes: Gary Feffer, Charles Castle, Ron Ilgen, Alex Johnson, Mina Liebert, John Maynard, Hank Scarangella**  
**Nays: None**  
**Absent: Jackie Hilaire, Scot Hume**

Vice Chair Feffer encouraged the Board members to attend the Council meeting on September 23<sup>rd</sup> and asked staff to provide information regarding this item once posted on the Council's agenda.

**Proposed Valley Hi Master Plan Amendment (Item #2)**

Kim King, Manager of Administration and Recreation, said that this item is a request for an amendment to the Valley Hi Master Plan for the construction of a short game practice area where the outdoor pool is currently located as well as the modification of Hole #1 and its surrounding area at the Valley Hi Golf Course, pending execution and completion of a Letter of Intent with the First Tee of Pikes Peak. ([See presentation](#))

Jeff Stedman, with First Tee, thanked staff and the Board for their support of the First Tee program. He said that the funding was available for the proposed project. If the proposal is approved he would like to start the program in 2015.

Vice Chair Feffer asked for public input but there was none.

**Charles Castle made a motion to approve the proposed Valley Hi Master Plan Amendment pending execution and completion of a Letter of Intent with the First Tee of Pikes Peak by November 30, 2014. Motion seconded by John Maynard and carried unanimously.**

**Ayes: Gary Feffer, Charles Castle, Ron Ilgen, Alex Johnson, John Maynard, Hank Scarangella**  
**Nays: None**  
**Absent: Jackie Hilaire, Scot Hume, Mina Liebert** (*Ms. Liebert was out of the meeting room during the vote.*)

**Business Licensing (Item #3)**

Sarah Johnson, City Clerk, said that she conducted a thorough review of all business license types and requirements to ensure they are relevant and meeting the needs of the City. Ms. Johnson worked closely with CSPD, the City Forester, and Engineering, on their respective licenses. This review includes proposals to delete several license types, removal of certain requirements, insertion of consistent language, general clarifications and fee changes resulting in approximately 20 proposed ordinances.

Jay Hein, City Forester, explained the change specifically related to Tree Service Licensing will occur in 2.3.301 - DEFINITIONS, 2.3.303 A and B - CLASSES OF LICENSES, 2.3.304 A, B, and C - EXAMINATION BY CITY FORESTER, and 2.3.305 – INSURANCE REQUIRED.

A summary of the significant adjustments to the Tree Service Licensing Sections is as follows:

- 1) License Fees: Proposed changes to the Tree Service Licensing fees to include the elimination of the exam packet fee.
- 2) Classes of Licenses: Tree Service Licenses have been split into two classes; a **General License** which authorizes the Licensee to perform tree work from or above the ground through climbing, use of an aerial lift, or a ladder exceeding the height of twelve (12) feet, and a **Limited License**, which authorizes the licensee to perform tree work from the ground only except by use of a ladder not exceeding the height of twelve (12) feet.

- 3) Examination by City Forester: Item C has been added which gives the City Forester the right to waive any or all of the examination requirements upon the applicant's submission of documentation verifying that the licensed representative is a Certified Arborist or Tree Worker of the International Society of Arboriculture or any successor organization.

Vice Chair Feffer asked for public input but there was none.

**Charles Castle made a motion to authorize the City Clerk's Office to work with the Parks Department and other agencies (as needed) to finalize the updated language in the Tree Service License section of Colorado Springs City Code. Motion seconded by Alex Johnson and carried unanimously.**

**Ayes: Gary Feffer, Charles Castle, Ron Ilgen, Alex Johnson, Mina Liebert, John Maynard, Hank Scarangella**  
**Nays: None**  
**Absent: Jackie Hilaire, Scot Hume**

**Velodrome Roof Enclosure at Memorial Park (Item #4)**

Chris Lieber, Manager of Park Development and TOPS Program, said that the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) has requested permission to construct a temporary/seasonal roof structure on the Velodrome in Memorial Park. In April 2014, representatives of the USOC presented alternatives for enclosing the Velodrome, including an inflatable "bubble" structure and a "tent" structure. The USOC has engaged a team of consultants to evaluate alternatives and has determined that a "bubble" enclosure is the preferred option. This item was presented to City Council at their Worksession on September 7<sup>th</sup>. This item is scheduled to go back to City Council as an action item at their Formal meeting on September 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Aron McGuire, with USOC, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding their current plans for a temporary/seasonal roof structure on the Velodrome in Memorial Park. ([See presentation](#))

There was a brief discussion between the Board members, staff and Mr. McGuire regarding, the foundation, the color of the structure, the Olympic logo; safety issues (after the temporary structure is removed); remaining footings for the structure; noise issues; construction plan; regional building permit; and the public process.

Vice Chair Feffer asked for public input but there was none.

**John Maynard made a motion to approve the proposed temporary/seasonal roof structure over the Velodrome at Memorial Park. Motion seconded by Charles Castle and carried unanimously.**

**Ayes: Gary Feffer, Charles Castle, Ron Ilgen, Alex Johnson, Mina Liebert, John Maynard, Hank Scarangella**  
**Nays: None**  
**Absent: Jackie Hilaire, Scot Hume**

*Break: 10:05 a.m.*

*Reconvened: 10:19 a.m.*

**White Acres and Section 16 Annexation (Item #5)**

Sarah Bryarly, Landscape Architect, said that Red Rock Canyon Open Space, including Manitou Section 16 and White Acres, is located along the south side of Highway 24. Red Rock Canyon was annexed into the City limits and rezoned PK shortly after the City's acquisition of the property. Over the past decade, additional property has been added to the Red Rock Canyon Open Space, including parcels commonly

known as Manitou Section 16 and White Acres. These additions to the open space are currently outside the City limits and are zoned within the County as F-5. ([See attachment](#))

Currently Manitou Section 16 and White Acres have been open to the public as open space and have been included in the Red Rock Canyon Master and Management Plan. The City of Colorado Springs, Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Services Department would like to annex both of these properties into the Colorado Springs City limits and at the same time rezone the property to one zone, PK. The proposed zoning will not change the use of the property as public open space.

Manitou Section 16 and White Acres were purchased using the City's TOPS fund, grants, and donations from interested organizations. The Red Rock Canyon Open Space Master and Management Plan (which includes the original Red Rock Canyon, Manitou Section 16 and White Acres) has previously been approved by the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board. The proposed annexation and zone change is consistent with the existing uses of the property including passive open space for conservation and recreational use. The proposed annexation and zone change are also consistent with the approved Red Rock Canyon Master Plan and Management Plan. The annexation of the properties will provide a consistent jurisdictional boundary for emergency responders, City codes and regulations, and management considerations.

The TOPS Working Committee approved the annexation process for the two properties at their meeting on September 3, 2014.

With a favorable recommendation by the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, the proposed annexation will be considered by the Colorado Springs Planning Commission and the Colorado Springs City Council.

In response to Board member Johnson's question regarding the encumbrance of law enforcement, Ms. Bryarly said that the Annexation Steering Committee, which consists of staff from various departments including the Fire Department, met on September 5<sup>th</sup> to discuss the annexation of White Acres and Section 16. Staff from the Fire Department was not concerned about bringing in the additional acreage. In fact, it actually clarifies the roll of law enforcement.

In response to Board member Maynard's question regarding if the Red Rock Canyon Master Plan recommended placing a conservation easement on White Acres, Ms. Bryarly said that the Master Plan recommended that the Department continue to pursue a conservation easement. This (annexation) is a different issue.

In response to Board member Maynard's question regarding mineral rights on the two properties (Section 16 and White Acres), Ms. Bryarly said that when Section 16 was purchased, there was a 99-year lease on the gravel within Section 16, which is retained by the State. The lease has to be renewed after 99 years. The State leased the gravel rights to the City of Colorado Springs.

Chris Lieber, Manager of Park Development and TOPS Program, said that by the State's statutes, the State Land Board cannot sever its mineral rights. It is a part of the overall State Trust. Therefore, the best way for the City of Colorado Springs to secure those rights was for the City to lease those rights for 99 years, which is the maximum number of years allowed by the State. Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) provided funds to help the City lease those rights.

Board member Maynard said that the parcels of land between the proposed annexation and the existing city limits would create an enclave and asked if staff has communicated with the private owners regarding this potential situation.

Ms. Bryarly said that issue was discussed during the Annexation Steering Committee meeting. She explained the area which is within the County and the area which will be annexed, will be contiguous on a map. Therefore, an enclave will not be created. Ms. Bryarly said that staff has not communicated with the private property owners because the Planning Commission has not yet directed staff to do so.

In response to Board member Scarangella's question regarding the County's position on the annexation, Ms. Bryarly said that staff has not met with the County. However, they will receive a notification stating that an application has been submitted, at which time they would have an opportunity to provide input.

In response to Board member Scarangella's question regarding the financial impacts (i.e. Parks, Fire, Police Departments, etc.), Ms. Bryarly said that the Department is already assuming the financial impacts from the two properties because all improvements from the time when the City purchased the property until now and into the future will be through the Department.

Vice Chair Feffer asked for public input.

Don Ellis provided a brief history regarding White Acres. He said that an application for White Acres had been submitted to the TOPS Working Committee years before the property was purchased. White Acres was owned by the Bethany Church. Just before White Acres was purchased by the City, the Church had approached a developer to sell their property. The City could have purchased White Acres at a lower price if TOPS could have dealt directly with the Church; however, the developer had to be brought in because the Church had approached them. The developer was there because of an unintended consequence of annexing Red Rock Canyon, which created an adjacent boundary for him. That unintended consequence cost us money.

Mr. Ellis said that he was not sure what the unintended consequence would be for annexing Section 16 and White Acres but it will not be beneficial to the City. The City can have people vote to sell the property. This would be an unintended consequence of annexation.

Regarding creating an enclave or not, Mr. Ellis said that "when White Acres was purchased, there was a house on the Church property the City did not want. This property was sold to the Clint's. Mr. Clint was present at the meeting earlier to oppose the annexation of White Acres and Section 16 because of the unintended consequence and future possibility of creating an enclave if Bear Creek Canyon Park is ever annexed. Bear Creek Canyon Park is a City park in the County which is not a problem for the City. The City has had a park in the County over a century and that is not a problem. Other cities have city parks outside of their city (i.e. Denver, Red Rock, Boulder, etc.). The jurisdiction issue is essentially a none-problem. You own it to have jurisdiction." Mr. Ellis said that "the City has jurisdiction. The City does not need annexation for jurisdiction."

Mr. Ellis said that he urged the Board in the strongest possible way not to approve the annexation of White Acres and Section 16.

In response to Board member Scarangella's question regarding the point of the City having jurisdiction without annexation, Mr. Ellis said that as a part of the City owning White Acres and Section 16 the City already has jurisdiction (i.e. creating a master plan, bringing Police to the property, etc.).

In response to Board member Maynard's question regarding jurisdiction of North Cheyenne Cañon Park, Karen Palus, Director of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services, said that North Cheyenne Cañon is a multi-jurisdictional area (i.e. City, Federal, etc.), especially regarding the enforcement side.

In response to Board member Maynard's question regarding enforcement by the Colorado Springs Police Department (CSPD) at the Powell property (parking area) which was recently purchased with TOPS funds, Ms. Palus said that the Parks Department has asked CSPD to help in that area but that is one of the dialogues which has come up over and over again regarding who has jurisdiction in that area. However, through multi-jurisdictional procedures, CSPD has the ability to enforce in that area. It is also a City park property; therefore, CSPD can help deter unwelcome activities (car break-ins).

Mr. Lieber said that the Powell property is a County parcel. From a Land Use perspective, the parcels which are outside of the City limits fall under the jurisdiction of the County and the County Commissioners. One of the advantages to bringing a parcel into the City limits and zoning it under the

PK zone from a Land Use and ownership perspective is that it would fall under the City's Parks Board's purview.

In response to Board member Johnson's question regarding if it would be easier to place a conservation easement over White Acres versus annexation, Mr. Lieber said that he was not sure if that would be easier but it would be a separate choice or decision by a land owner. Section 16 already has a conservation easement. In terms of consistency and protection, a conservation easement should/could be extended to White Acres.

Board member Scarangella asked Mr. Ellis to restate his objection to annexation.

Mr. Ellis said that

1. "First objection is unintended consequences of potentially making future open spaces less affordable." He pointed at a privately-owned boundary and a strip of area, which he said was very desirable open space, on a map and said "that is an issue, potentially. It gets to be a very challenging issue if you annex Section 16. And then a part of that is a private individual and a part of it is the Crystal Park Homeowners Association. If they decide to sell that for development and you're adjacent to Colorado Springs city limits, you said, well look, I could apply for annexation but that's miles from City services. But it still could impact the potential for getting open space there in a very desirable open space area."
2. "If we fail to put a conservation easement on White Acres and there was a proposal to sell it for development, having it inside the city would make it that much more developable and that much more at risk."
3. "The potential for creating an enclave, if you move forward at some point, and annex Bear Creek Canyon Park. I think there're all strong negatives."

Bill Koerner, with the Trails and Open Space Coalition (TOSC), said that "TOSC was involved with the acquisition of White Acres, as well as Section 16 and Red Rock Canyon, to facilitate discussions between the developer, the Church and the City. TOSC is on record of supporting placing a conservation easement on White Acres property. Annexation would make White Acres more developable. Conservation easements are in perpetuity. A part of the conservation easement process is that the property is monitored by the Palmer Land Trust on a yearly basis to see that the conditions of the conservation easements are maintained. It takes a burden off the City to some extent. Also the argument, that's been made for a conservation easement on it, is that it's consistent with the other properties within the greater Red Rock Canyon Open Space."

Mr. Koerner said that "I would request that you make a condition of approval of this item to place a conservation easement on the White Acres property as a part of any annexation process."

In response to Board member Ilgen's question, Mr. Koerner said that Red Rock Canyon Open Space and Section 16 already have conservation easements. White Acres needs one.

Vice Chair Feffer asked for staff's input on the conservation easement for White Acres.

Mr. Lieber said that there have been a lot of discussions related to conservation easements over the years. Conservation easements and annexations are two different subjects and processes. Mr. Lieber recommended having more discussion regarding the conservation easement and the issues related to that, perhaps at a later date. Mr. Lieber said that he would rather postpone this item rather than to have these items (conservation easement and annexation) put together in the same motion.

In response to Board member Maynard's question "that there hasn't been a petition for an annexation to file at this point", Ms. Bryarly said that an application has been submitted to the Planning Department.

However, staff was seeking the Board's recommendation to move forward before going to City Council for their review and action.

In response to Board member Maynard's question "that the issues which have been raised by Mr. Ellis would be vetted by the public process once the annexation petition has been accepted by City Council", Ms. Bryarly said that was correct.

Board member Maynard asked "if staff was looking for the Board's support to endorse the concept of going forward with the annexation petition, which will then go through the public process to determine whether or not the land should be annexed."

Ms. Bryarly said yes.

Board member Maynard said that he was in favor of that. He said that Mr. Ellis raised some good questions which need to be vetted in that process but it cannot be vetted unless an application is put forth.

Board member Scarangella asked "why there isn't a conservation easement at White Acres?"

Ms. Bryarly said that "conservation easements are usually tied to dollars that are given to the City through a grant. It is a requirement of GOCO when the City receives money from them, that we put a conservation easement on that property. We did not receive a GOCO grant for White Acres. It was purchased through private fundraising and City dollars so there was no easement requirement with those dollars."

Mr. Lieber said that "why the conservation easement has not moved forward is because the City specifically has a prohibition that we cannot divest ourselves of any property or property interest. So when our attorney's looked at that, they saw the placement of the conservation easement, which ultimately has the effect of diminishing the economic value, the market value, which some would say is a very good thing, but it also was viewed as a divestment as a part of the value of the property. So that is largely where the concern is or was when we carried this forward the last time based on your recommendation." Mr. Lieber suggested that a further conversation take place around this issue.

Mr. Koerner said that "the whole purpose of TOPS is to preserve open space for public use. Should the City Council decide to put White Acres up for sale, they would have to go through a public vote to accomplish that. The purpose of the TOPS ordinance is to preserve the property in perpetuity. The conservation easement would guarantee that would occur. We have a public trust to do that as a body, as a City to commit to the public when public dollars and private dollars (\$75,000) have been contributed to purchase White Acres. A conservation easement on White Acres would be consistent with Red Rock Canyon Open Space and Section 16."

Board member Scarangella said that staff's recommendation was not to tie the conservation easement to this issue and that the Board would discuss that at a later date.

Board member Castle said that "a conservation easement needs to be placed on it but one (annexation) is much further ahead and you don't want to tie the two. It is best to table it until the conservation easement catches up to the proposal that is being discussed today."

Board member Maynard said that he was not sure if that will happen and that he would not support that idea. The petition for the annexation will be taken to City Council with or without the Board's recommendation. The question is whether or not if the annexation review process will vet the issues which were discussed, which they probably would; therefore, it would be prudent to go forward. The Council may or may not choose to annex. Board member Maynard said that the only issue for him is whether the expenditure of staff time and some other resources is appropriate at this time.

Board member Johnson asked if the Board should send a letter with the application requesting more discussion or ask them for more public comments in addition to passing a recommendation.

Ms. Bryarly said that “isn’t the purpose of this process to request for annexation in order to have a public process.”

Board member Liebert asked, “Isn’t the purpose of this process to request for annexation in order to have a public process? So in order for this meeting to provide a recommendation whether or not we believe a public process for annexation should exist. This is how I am looking at this. It is the opportunity for the public to weigh in on this. So whether or not we want the conservation easement on it or what we would like to do in the future with this actual property, the purpose of this is to have or facilitate a dialogue to weigh the pros and cons in a bigger forum than just the nine of us.”

Vice Chair Feffer said that he agreed with Board member Maynard and that he was in favor of the annexation going forward.

**Charles Castle made a motion to approve the annexation process for White Acres and Section 16. Motion seconded by John Maynard, with an amendment to the motion, to include that the minutes clearly reflect the discussion which the Board had regarding this topic. The Board voted on the amended motion and carried unanimously.**

**Ayes: Gary Feffer, Charles Castle, Ron Ilgen, Alex Johnson, Mina Liebert, John Maynard, Hank Scarangella**  
**Nays: None**  
**Absent: Jackie Hilaire, Scot Hume**

**Amended 2015 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Capital Improvement Projects Budget (Item #6)**

Chris Lieber, Manager of Park Development and TOPS Program, said that a preliminary CIP Budget was presented to the TOPS Working Committee meeting on May 7, 2014 and the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board on May 8, 2014. The TOPS Working Committee recommended approval of the 2015 CIP Budget on June 4, 2014. The Parks and Recreation Advisory Board recommended approval of the 2015 CIP Budget on June 12, 2014. Since then, changes to the proposed 2015 CIP Budget have been made to address increases in water rates, to provide funding for Venezia Community Park, and to respond to decreases in the General Fund for park related capital projects. The amendments include changes to the following funding categories: Conservation Trust Fund, PLDO, General Fund CIP, and TOPS Parks Category. No changes are proposed for the TOPS Open Space Category, TOPS Trails Category, TOPS Maintenance Category, or TOPS Administration Category. The TOPS Working Committee recommended approval of the amended 2015 CIP Budget on September 3, 2014.

This meeting is open to the public for comments/input as well as the upcoming City Council budget hearings.

Mr. Lieber provided a detailed presentation regarding the proposed changes through a PowerPoint presentation. ([See presentation](#))

**Charles Castle made a motion to approve the amended 2015 CIP Budget as presented. Motion seconded by Alex Johnson and carried unanimously.**

**Ayes: Gary Feffer, Charles Castle, Ron Ilgen, Alex Johnson, Mina Liebert, Hank Scarangella**  
**Nays: None**  
**Absent: Jackie Hilaire, Scot Hume, John Maynard (left the meeting at 11:30 a.m.)**

**STAFF REPORT**  
**(See attached)**

- Update on Wolfe Ranch Community Park
- Update on Manitou Incline
- Update on Rampart Park Master Plan Amendment
- Update on Balloon Classic
- Monument Valley Park Ballfield Modification Update
- Upcoming Events:
  - Mt. Shadows Playground Ribbon Cutting: September 13<sup>th</sup>, 11:00 a.m.
  - Spruce Up the Springs Project at Pulpit Rock: September 20<sup>th</sup>, 8:30 a.m.
- City Outreach Program for Volunteers, Committee and Board Members: October 15<sup>th</sup>, 9:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m. at City Auditorium
- Media Information

### **BOARD BUSINESS**

- **Board Representative for a Request for Proposal (RFP) for City Auditorium Architectural Services including Renovation of Restroom Facilities**  
Alex Johnson volunteered to be the Board representative.
- **Board Representative for a Request for Proposal for Large Signature City-Wide Event**  
Ron Ilgen volunteered to be the Board representative.
- **City Auditorium Task Force**  
Board member Johnson proposed creating a City Auditorium Task Force which would be tasked with offering solutions and actionable items to the Parks Department and the City regarding the Auditorium.

There was a consensus by the Board to move forward with the creation of a Task Force. Gary Feffer and Alex Johnson volunteered to be the Board representatives.

- **Board Committee Reports and Remarks**
  - **Get Well Card for Chair Hilaire:** Board member Castle brought a card for the Board members to sign for Chair Hilaire who is recovering from a medical condition. Karen Palus, Director of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services, said that contributions for an Amazon gift card for Chair Hilaire would be sent to her.
  - **City Council Action Items:** Board member Ilgen requested Council's feedback on the agenda items which passes through the Parks Board to City Council for actions. He also mentioned that it would be good to have Parks Board representation at the Council meetings.
  - **Jones Park Update:** Ms. Palus provided a brief update on the status of Jones Park. Essentially, the City Council voted 5 to 4 to put the future ownership of Jones Park out for bid.

*NOTE: Hank Scarangella left the meeting at 12:50 p.m.*

### **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

- **Negotiations Pertaining to a Land Matter**

Vice Chair Feffer read the following statement into the record:

*In accord with the City Charter Art. III, §3-60(d) and the Colorado Open Meetings Act, C.R.S. § 24-6-402(4)(a and e), the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, in Open Session, is to determine whether it will hold a Closed Executive Session. The issues to be discussed involve determining positions relative to matters that may be subject to negotiations, developing strategy for negotiations and instructing negotiators regarding a land acquisition matter. The Chair shall poll the Park and Recreation Advisory Board members, and, upon consent of two-thirds of the members present, may hold a closed executive session. If consent to the closed executive session is not given, the item may be discussed in open session or withdrawn from consideration.*

After Vice Chair Feffer polled each Board member, there was a consensus by the Board to discuss "Negotiations Pertaining to a Land Matter" in a Closed Executive Session.

Vice Chair Feffer declared a Closed Executive Session at 12:15 p.m. and finished at 1:05 p.m.

The regular meeting continued with Board Business.

### **BOARD BUSINESS (Cont'd)**

- **Park Operations Tour:** In response to Board member Castle's request regarding a half day or a full day tour of Park operations, Kurt Schroeder, Manager of Park Operations and Development, said that could be scheduled.
- **Lodgers and Automobile Rental Tax (LART):** Board member Liebert said that LART recommendations were provided to City Council, adjustments were made and they are moving forward.
- Ms. Palus added that one of the adjustments was a designation of approximately \$10,000 for the Pickleball group.
- **Video for November Ballot Item 1A "Yes for Parks":** Ms. Palus said that the campaign video for Ballot Item 1A "Yes for Parks" was filmed in Garden of the Gods Park. She said that was misleading because Ballot Item 1A is for the County parks and not the City parks. Ms. Palus addressed these issues with Susan Davies, Executive Director of the Trails and Open Space Coalition, and requested that the video and the flyer be revised to reflect County park sites. The public may have a perception that the funds will go to City parks when in fact they are for County parks only.
- **Bike Maps:** In response to Board member Castle's request regarding the bike maps through the Engineering Division, staff said that the bike maps are currently being updated.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business, the Board adjourned at 1:15 p.m.