

Synopsis of NEPCO General Membership Meeting, 21 January 2023

This synopsis is intended to provide the highlights of the NEPCO General Membership meeting to all residents of NEPCO member Homeowner Associations. Full minutes & presentations at www.nepco.org.

Wildfire Preparedness Update:

Chair highlighted most of region is a high wildfire threat/risk area that figure in re homeowner's insurance. Wildfire spread and wildfire intensity were noted as important concerns. Even though an individual HOA or general area may not be in high wildfire threat area, available fuels and prevalent winds could still pose significant threat to that area. Additional point emphasized need for resident and HOA emergency preparedness, including knowing all emergency accesses in the event of evacuation notice.

Transportation and Land Use/TLUC:

Chair briefly reviewed the proposed Monument Ridge East/West I25 and Caliber (adjacent to PR High School) developments. Both Monument Ridge and Caliber have been withdrawn but are expected to be revised and eventually resubmitted.

The *sketch plan* for the proposed Flying Horse North development was approved by the County planning Commission and subsequently by County Commissioners (November 22). Resident comments have identified concerns related to water, traffic/trafficability, density. Cherokee Water District is identified as the provider, but Cherokee district boundaries are far south of Woodmen Road. Chair noted immediate need for volunteers, evidenced by a "Help Wanted" slide. **C2:** Board member described 3-fold NEPCO actions regarding a development: *official, organizational* and *issue awareness*: a) *official*/NEPCO President Letter; b) *organizational*/organize member HOA responses; and c) provide issue education/awareness information. HOA representatives and residents need and appreciate background and current information on proposed developments. **C3:** Member indicated proposed plan exists for townhouses at north end of Lake Woodmoor. **Q4/A:** question re County Master Plan update process . . .in essence the plan includes 'accepted' future developments that are subject County planning commission and BOCC approval. **Q5/A:** Higby Road equestrian hospital identified as concern in view of potential rezoning. **Q6/A:** question does NEPCO have a list of adjacent/neighboring HOAs. . .we're working this to include initiative with Monument Fire re development of a NEPCO GIS map potentially including HOAs.

Guest Speakers: [*slide presentation is available on NEPCO.org*]

John Liosatos/Transportation Director, Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments/PPACG.

Speaker provided brief biography, followed by detailed overview of PPACG. Geographically, PPACG includes El Paso, Teller and Park counties. Primary missions focus on area's air, water, roads/transportation, and the military. Community Advisory Committee/*CAC* was highlighted as it includes regular staff discussion of various transportation/road initiatives and projects. [*NOTE: NEPCO at-large Board member Harold Larson is NEPCO representative on CAC*]. Two transportation entities were discussed: Metro Planning Organization/*MPO* (required by federal statute), and Pikes Peak Rural Transportation Authority/*PPRTA*. PPRTA includes representatives from PPACG and MPO. Brief discussions outlined State Transportation Districts (NEPCO area is in Region 9) and State Highway Districts (NEPCO area is within District 2). Detailed discussion of transportation/road funding sources: federal, state, and local (e.g., gas tax, vehicle license plates, sales tax, permits, tolls, impact fees). "Fees seem to be increasingly

avored by legislature as means to avoid TABOR constraints. The 2045 Long Range Plan will revised, with PPACG's Transportation Advisory Committee/*TAC* providing technical analysis/expertise for PPACG relevant projects.

Greg Roosevelt. Speaker is a member of County Impact Fee Committee and the County Community Services Block Grant Committee. Victoria Chavez heads the Block Grant Committee and is very effective in obtaining grant funds (e.g., \$220M for County projects over the last 10 years). Funds go for direct construction projects as well as for planning projects. Speaker pointed out that county impact fees are on the developer, not the taxpayers; and impact fee dollars stay within the county.