

Meggan Herington, AICP, Executive Director
El Paso County Planning & Community Development

O: 719-520-6300
MegganHerington@elpasoco.com
2880 International Circle, Suite 110
Colorado Springs, CO 80910

Board of County Commissioners

Holly Williams, District 1
Carrie Geitner, District 2
Stan VanderWerf, District 3
Longinos Gonzalez, Jr., District 4
Cami Bremer, District 5

EL PASO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING RESULTS (UNOFFICIAL RESULTS)

Planning Commission (PC) Meeting

Thursday, June 1, 2023

El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department

2880 International Circle – Second Floor Hearing Room

Colorado Springs, Colorado

REGULAR HEARING, 9:00 A.M.

PC MEMBERS PRESENT AND VOTING: THOMAS BAILEY, JAY CARLSON, BRANDY MERRIAM, ERIC MORAES, BRYCE SCHUETTELZ, TIM TROWBRIDGE, AND CHRISTOPHER WHITNEY (Joined the meeting 5A onward).

PC MEMBERS VIRTUAL AND VOTING: NONE.

PC MEMBERS PRESENT AND NOT VOTING: NONE.

PC MEMBERS ABSENT: SARAH BRITAIN JACK, BECKY FULLER, KARA OFFNER, AND JOSHUA PATTERSON.

STAFF PRESENT: MEGGAN HERINGTON, JUSTIN KILGORE, ELIZABETH NIJKAMP, JENNIFER IRVINE, MIRANDA BENSON, AND EL PASO COUNTY ATTORNEY LORI SEAGO.

OTHERS PRESENT AND SPEAKING: NONE.

1. REPORT ITEMS

A. Planning Department. Next PC Hearing is Thursday, June 15, 2023, at 9:00 A.M.

2. CALL FOR PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE HEARING AGENDA. NONE.

3. CONSENT ITEMS

A. Adoption of Minutes of meeting held May 18, 2023.

PC ACTION: THE MINUTES WERE APPROVED AS PRESENTED BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT (6-0).

4. CALLED-UP CONSENT ITEMS. NONE.

5. REGULAR ITEMS

A. ECM231

MASTIN/PALMER

**EL PASO COUNTY ENGINEERING CRITERIA MANUAL
REVISION TO VARIOUS ENGINEERING STANDARDS
(A LEGISLATIVE ACTION BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS)**

A request by the El Paso County Department of Public Works (DPW) for approval of amendments to the El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM). The ECM was completed in 2004 and revisions were made in 2006, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2015, 2016, 2019, and 2020. The El Paso County Department of Public Works requests approval of amendments to the El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM) to provide clarification of various engineering requirements. The request also includes the ability to administratively approve amendments necessary to carry out the intent of the proposed amendments.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION & DISCUSSION

Mr. Trowbridge asked Ms. Seago for her opinion on a statement from the presentation slideshow: *"The request also includes the ability to administratively approve amendments necessary to carry out the intent of the proposed amendments."* He asked if the first use of the word amendments is correct.

Ms. Seago requested time to research.

Mr. Bailey asked if each revision would be presented individually.

Ms. Nijkamp, Deputy County Engineer, presenting in lieu of Mr. Palmer, answered that she did not plan to go through each change individually. Next time they make proposed changes, they will include a summary. Most of the changes are administrative.

Mr. Trowbridge thinks the wording should be modified on page 36 of 504, section 2.2.5.

Ms. Nijkamp explained that the applicant must go to CDOT to get CDOT's concurrence. She thinks the way it is currently worded explains to an applicant what they need to do. After discussion, she suggested modifying the sentence to read *"... CDOT concurrence shall be provided by the applicant."*

Mr. Moraes commented that the confusion comes from using the passive voice style of writing.

Mr. Trowbridge asked for an explanation of the term "safety edge" found on page 41 of 504. He asked for further clarification on paved vs. unpaved.

Ms. Nijkamp explained what a safety edge is and further explained that the shoulder portion of the asphalt changes based on the safety edge.

Mr. Carlson clarified that the amendment concerns an addition to the paved width which excludes the safety edge.

Mr. Bailey further clarified that the proposed addition is a definition of safety edge and declares that they are required. The table provides dimensions.

Ms. Nijkamp stated that is correct.

Mr. Bailey asked for clarification regarding the change proposed within Table 2-7 on page 43 of 504 regarding sidewalk width (from top back of curb when attached).

Ms. Nijkamp explained that the chart conveys how wide a sidewalk should be (5 feet). The criteria previously stated, "sidewalk width at flowline". The delta between the flowline and the top back of the curb is 6 inches, so the sidewalks could have been 4.5 feet wide. Sidewalks will now be a full 5 feet wide. This amendment was a correction to avoid confusion.

Mr. Trowbridge asked if further notation of the AASHTO Green Book was needed on page 55 of 504.

Ms. Nijkamp stated she doesn't think a specific citation is necessary. She stated the AASHTO Green Book's sole purpose is designing roads.

Ms. Seago added that she doesn't think further reference would be necessary because the ECM would then need to be amended every time the section or paragraph changes.

Mr. Bailey stated the added sentence in section 4.4.1 on page 134 of 504 seems redundant.

Ms. Nijkamp explained that the difference between the first and last sentences of that paragraph is that approval from USPS must take place prior to approval of the construction drawings. After discussion, she suggested combining the first and last sentences.

Ms. Seago recommended the proposed change read, "*The applicant shall provide USPS approval of mailbox type and location prior to approval of the construction plans.*" She addressed Mr. Trowbridge's earlier question. Page 15 of 504 of the ECM, section 1.20, lists the specific items that may be changed or corrected administratively. It also states that they shall not change the substance of the regulations. The wording of the request that will go to the BOCC does not give her concern, but the PC can add wording to their resolution like "as specifically set forth in Chapter 1 of the ECM" if they would like. The PC can also direct staff to use the term *changes and corrections* instead of *amendments* when drafting the BOCC resolution. That doesn't need to be part of the motion during this hearing, however.

NO PUBLIC COMMENT

PC ACTION: TROWBRIDGE MOVED / MORAES SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REGULAR ITEM NUMBER 5A, ECM-23-001, FOR REVISION TO VARIOUS ENGINEERING STANDARDS (A LEGISLATIVE ACTION BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS), WITH THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT TO INCLUDE THE DISCUSSED RECOMMENDATIONS, WITH NO (0) CONDITIONS OR NOTATIONS, THAT THIS ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED (7-0).

6. NON-ACTION ITEMS. NONE.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 10:28 A.M.

Minutes Prepared By: Miranda Benson