Road Impact Fee Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

Date: March 26, 2026, 1:30 PM
Where: Remote Meeting

Members Present:

Randy Case, Thomas Kerby, Joshua Palmer, Meggan Herington, Tracey Lopez (for Nikki Simmons), Tim McConnell, Brenda Miller.

Others Present:

Victoria Chavez, Jack Ladley, Lori Seago, Gilbert LaForce, Mindy Schulz, Cory Applegate, Nicholas Bunce, Kari Parsons, Justin Kilgore, Jeffrey Hodsdon, Loren Moreland, Doug Stemple), Andrea Barlow, Drew Balsick, Marla Novak, Michael Tsogt, and Jerry Novak.

Call to Order

Mr. Case called the meeting to order at approximately **1:30 PM**. Quorum was confirmed, and introductions were made for new attendees and guests.

Agenda Approval – Vote

Mr. Kerby moved to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. McConnell seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of February 26, 2026 Meeting Minutes – Vote

Mr. Kerby moved to approve the February 26, 2026 meeting minutes. Ms. Lopez, on behalf of Ms. Simmons, seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Appeal Request – Flying Horse Foundation – Discussion and Vote

Ms. Chavez reintroduced the appeal request submitted by the Flying Horse Foundation concerning the Road Impact Fee assessed for an equestrian facility. She explained that the appeal was brought back because the applicant had not attended the February meeting

and staff wanted to ensure the applicant had an opportunity to present the request. Staff reiterated that the fee had been correctly calculated under the current Implementation Document because the proposed use falls within the **Outdoor Recreation** land use category and no ITE land use category exists specifically for equestrian facilities.

Mr. Drew Balsick presented the applicant's appeal, explaining that the proposed private, nonprofit riding arena would generate substantially fewer trips than a golf course and therefore should not be assessed under the same category. He noted that the facility would primarily serve approximately twenty horses used for therapeutic and educational purposes and argued that the traffic generated would be comparable to only a few single-family homes rather than a commercial recreational use.

Members discussed prior examples where fees had been applied only to the developed portions of large properties and explored whether a similar approach could be used for the Flying Horse property. Staff explained that the current program allows fees to be reduced if a specific area of a parcel is designated for the use and the remaining acreage is restricted from future development without further review.

Following discussion, Ms. Herington moved to recommend reducing the Road Impact Fee by applying the fee only to the **improved surfaces associated with the approved site development plan**, including the building, parking, landscaping, and other constructed improvements, with any future expansion into the remaining pasture or undeveloped portions of the property requiring additional review and Road Impact Fee consideration. Mr. Kerby seconded the motion.

Vote Result: Motion passed **6–1**. The recommendation will be forwarded to the Road Impact Fee Administrator for final determination.

Adding Schmidt Segment of Marksheffel Road to Potentially Eligible Improvements – Discussion and Vote

Ms. Andrea Barlow, representing the Schmidt property owners, presented a request to restore the remaining segment of **Marksheffel Road Extension (Vollmer Road to Black Forest Road)** as a potentially eligible Road Impact Fee improvement.

Ms. Barlow explained that this segment had historically been included in the Major Transportation Corridor Plan (MTCP) and Road Impact Fee program but was removed during the 2045 MTCP update after it was determined the roadway would ultimately become a City of Colorado Springs facility. She noted that the road will ultimately be city-owned, the development remains within unincorporated El Paso County and Road Impact

Fees are paid into the County program. She further explained that the developer will be responsible for constructing the roadway through the property and that the proposed bridge crossing Cottonwood Creek is expected to be funded separately through PPRTA. The requested change would restore the roadway as a potentially eligible improvement; any future reimbursement would still require a separate credit agreement and unit cost review.

Mr. Palmer moved to recommend adding the **Marksheffel Road Extension from Vollmer Road to Black Forest Road** back into the Road Impact Fee Program as a **Potentially Eligible Improvement**. Mr. Kerby seconded.

Vote Result: Approved unanimously.

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and Road Impact Fees – Discussion

The committee continued its discussion regarding how Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) should be treated under the Road Impact Fee Program. This item followed the February workshop and was presented as a discussion item only, with no formal action scheduled.

Representatives from Classic Homes, including Loren Moreland, Doug Stemple, and traffic consultant Jeffrey Hodsdon, presented information related to proposed attached ADUs within the Villages at Sterling Ranch development. They explained that these units are intended to improve housing affordability by providing a small rental unit (typically 500–700 square feet) attached to a primary residence. Rental income from these units can substantially improve a buyer's mortgage qualification while providing relatively little additional traffic compared to traditional detached housing. Traffic analyses prepared for the development indicated that attached ADUs increased total trip generation by only a fraction over the approved development.

Mr. Hodsdon reviewed ITE trip generation data and explained that newer ITE publications indicate smaller attached housing types and patio homes generate significantly fewer trips than traditional detached single-family homes. He presented several approaches comparing attached ADUs to duplexes, multifamily units, and small detached homes, all of which suggested relatively minor traffic increases. Representatives from Classic Homes emphasized that current Road Impact Fee calculations place an additional financial burden on affordable housing products and requested the committee consider revising the treatment of attached ADUs within the fee program.

Ms. Chavez reviewed the current Implementation Document, explaining that the adopted definitions classify attached ADUs being charged as two apartments and detached ADUs as a single family home and one apartment. She clarified that staff is required to

administer the program according to the adopted definitions and cannot substitute traffic studies prepared during the land development review process for the Road Impact Fee methodology. She also presented several examples of existing rural accessory dwelling configurations throughout unincorporated El Paso County to illustrate how the current definitions are consistently applied across the County.

Committee discussion focused on whether urban attached ADUs should be treated differently than detached accessory dwellings on large rural parcels. Mr. Ladley emphasized that the purpose of the Road Impact Fee Program is to recover transportation impacts from new development while acknowledging the committee's role in recommending policy changes where appropriate. Mr. Stemple urged the committee to consider modifying the current definitions, noting that every additional construction cost affects housing affordability and that even modest fee reductions can have meaningful impacts on homebuyers.

No formal action was taken. Staff will return the item as a future voting item after additional discussion and preparation of a proposed recommendation.

Budget and Finance Reports – Information

Due to the length of discussions, the committee did not formally review the Finance Reports. The reports were included in the meeting packet. No questions were raised.

Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

No additional comments were offered.

Items for Future Agendas

- Additional discussion on potential amendments to the Road Impact Fee Implementation Document regarding ADUs

The committee agreed to move the next meeting from **April 23** to **April 30, 2026**, to accommodate Public Works accreditation activities and committee member schedules.

Adjourn

Mr. Case adjourned the meeting at approximately **3:47 PM**.