

Survey for Integrity Matters COS

Candidate Jane Northrup Glenn for Colorado Springs City Council At-Large

Janenorthrupglenn.com

The Broadmoor Land Swap was a 2016 land trade including historic parkland, Strawberry Fields, passed by a vote of the people in 1885 to be a part of North Cheyenne Canon park. The controversial land swap garnered national media attention even added to university classes across the nation. Did you support the Broadmoor Land Swap and why?

No. I do not trust private corporations or the government, but I can see both sides of the argument. I did not follow this closely enough, understanding the details, while it was being debated, so I am not comfortable taking a firm position. If I recall correctly, this controversy caused City Council to make a rule requiring a super majority for all future public land swaps or sales. I believe the new rule should have required Council to automatically refer these issues to the ballot instead.

In 2021, the City Council passed an ordinance, Parkland Development Ordinance (PLDO) that allows developers to reduce the number of acres required to develop for parkland for neighborhood developments (7.5 to 5.5 acres) and pay in lieu of developing any parks for neighborhoods they develop. Did you support this decision?

No. As I see it, the problem is not whether 7.5 or 5.5 acres is adequate parkland for a development, but rather the problem is the exchange of money between developers and the government. I'd prefer that we lower the requirement to 5.5 and remove the option to pay in lieu of. Public-private partnerships have gotten out of control, making it difficult to discern who the shot callers for the city really are.

Under the Suthers Administration, Boulder and Denver have added a \$10 million Google campus as well as Twitter, Facebook, Apple and a bevy of robotics start-ups. We have added burger joint after burger joint, a failed Olympic museum the taxpayers are paying millions to keep afloat and manufacturing and tourism jobs driving us off a tourism cliff and creating a Minimum Wage Mecca. We have a narrow tourism and retail tax base which drives up the amount each individual has to pay in taxes to attain. Do you agree with this leadership direction?

No. I don't agree with Boulder's leadership either because the last thing I want in Colorado Springs is more globalists. The Olympic Museum and Olympic City was perhaps the most ridiculous thing the city has done in my lifetime so far. We didn't need a "branding." I was the V.P. of Government Affairs for PPAR when Mayor Suthers and his posse made a failed sales pitch to the BOD for a \$10K donation in exchange for a tile of recognition behind a urinal (fact check: partially true). Colorado Springs draws people for its natural beauty and outdoor activities, and we have plenty of visitors coming to see their military family members. We never needed to focus on tourism. People here like burger joints so let them eat burgers.

What should we do to diversify our tax base?

Increase taxes on globalist corporations doing business here and any other organizations engaged in ESG practices.

Westside Watch united neighborhoods across the city concerned about fire evacuation. 2010 was our last evacuation modeling study. Westside Watch spent a year bringing in experts to show our leadership that we have life-threatening conditions due to rapid growth that exceeds our infrastructure and presented the Clearance Evacuation Time & Public Safety Ordinance which mandates the City do evacuation modeling, reports the times and maps (like what Mill Valley and others do) to residents and visitors and established standards for development. The City ignored this and passed an ordinance that does nothing to address these problems. Do you support evacuation modeling, reporting of times/maps to the public and establishing evacuation standards for development?

Yes. I think evacuation standards for developments are essential. You included several links in your question and I spent a few minutes reading through the information. I can understand why you are disappointed with City Council's response and outcome compared to your request. I think this issue needs to be revisited by the new council.

The vast majority of cities and towns in Colorado fully fund their parks systems from their General Fund (i.e. no additional tax). In Colorado Springs, the General Fund falls short, to the extent that the city has twice turned to the TOPS tax - unquestionably designed solely for the acquisition and preservation of Open Space - for relief in backlogged maintenance of parks. Do you agree that our pattern of parks funding should be redesigned such that it falls in line with that of our sister cities across Colorado?

Yes. I believe we can and should reallocate funds in the overall budget to cover maintenance of parks.

Trails and Open Space are what brings people to Colorado Springs both to visit and live. During the Suthers Administration, our ranking in Trust For Public Lands who rates cities on parks, has plummeted to 58th. The TOPS Tax is supposed to be used to acquire and protect Open Spaces. However, because of financial mismanagement, our city continues to pilfer those funds for municipal park maintenance. The new TOPS tax leaves voters with the impression that 75 cents of every dollar taxed will go to acquiring Open Space when it's really only 40.9 cents of every dollar. The majority of every tax dollar levied is going to administration, municipal park maintenance, and trails. Further, because it is a municipal ordinance instead of a charter change, the promised controls can be changed administratively. It is, in fact, why a charter change was used as leverage to try and pass the recent Water Ordinance. Integrity Matters believes that, at a minimum the language should reflect the truth. Do you support the new TOPS tax?

No. I do not support TOPS because twenty years is too long for a tax to continue without being evaluated. If what you claim can be verified, that only 40% of the tax is being used towards the original intent, I would not support TOPS for that reason as well.

City Council recently passed ReToolCOS substantially changing our land use code which allows for "Flex Zoning" and dramatically limits the ability for citizens to appeal requiring they live within 1,000 feet to 3 linear miles and gain "Privileged Standing", a term coined by Councilmember Wayne Williams, requiring residents in the 1,000 feet to 3 mile distance, to speak at a meeting/write an email or letter to gain "Privileged Standing" to Appeal a development. Do you agree with the restrictions placed on citizens' ability to appeal?

Yes. I think this restriction is reasonable. It would be unreasonable if people outside of the "Privileged Standing" zone were not able to share their thoughts at all.

Do you support "Flex Zoning"?

Yes. I have mixed feelings about this. On the one hand, I adamantly support private property rights, maximizing freedom for landowners to use their land as they see fit. And although it pains me to consider developers the same as individuals in this way, I must. On the other hand, by approving flex zoning, City Council gave some control to developers that they did not have before. I see pros and cons to flex zoning, but my gut tells me that this will accelerate the already accelerated growth in the city and I support limited growth.

When these conflicts arise, whose voice should prevail, the City or the Citizens?

The citizens. My position on this is not absolute. I'm sure there are cases that City Council would have to override the sentiment of the citizens based on law versus emotions.

It's no secret that the developers, the HBA PAC and Dark Money groups like Colorado Springs Forward who was recently fined \$1,000 by the Secretary of State for prohibited donations of \$10,000 to Commissioners & Candidates Holly Williams and Cami Bremer, pour money into elections. Of note, Colorado Springs Forward told the Secretary of State that one of the reasons for these prohibited donations was that they should have closed Colorado Springs Forward. Google seems to think this is true as well unless, of course, they are donating gigantic sums to Councilmember Wayne Williams who just received an historic donation of \$250,000 from developer-backed Colorado Springs Forward who, along with the Downtown Development Group as well as CSU and other important organizations now office in the Norwood building at 111 or 121 S. Tejon St. Do you support campaign finance limits?

Yes. I find it absurd that Colorado Springs does not have campaign contribution limits.

Do you support publicly funded elections where each candidate gets the same amount and no outside donations are allowed?

No. It makes zero sense for me and others who support limited government to have our campaigns funded by the very thing we are fighting against. Not only that, but by relying on public funding, we would only be one step away from having to comply with health, social and environmental mandates attached to the money as a condition of running for office.

The controversial Water Ordinance was passed, essentially as Norwood and the City created it, in a lickety-split 3 months, based upon murky prognostications and no thoughtful scientific process which includes the most important stakeholders and current ratepayers, the public, while the Clearance Evacuation Time-Public & Life Safety Ordinance that protects human lives was ignored after a year of meetings with world experts and our nation's top fire personnel endorsing it. Do you support the Water Ordinance that protects water resources for a single developer?

No. The water ordinance is necessary, but it was not well thought out. It seems that the decision was coerced by developers, and I find that unconscionable.

In his sales pitch for the Water Ordinance, Mayor Suthers tried to separate the rapid development of apartment infill from the annexation Water Ordinance. The Gazette reported Suthers would be adding 9,000 residences between May 202 and April 2023 in a development tsunami. Should these water limitations be applied to the current development infill in the current city limits?

Yes. Ideally, the limitations should be applied to current infill if the project has not already been approved. In other words, the limitations should apply to future infill projects.