

North College Good Neighbor Charter

Executive Summary for the Fort Collins Urban Renewal Authority Board
October 22, 2026 discussion

1 - What the Charter is intended to do

The Board has expressed a goal that North College redevelopment activities benefit the people who live along the corridor. The Good Neighbor Charter would formalize that goal by establishing a Coalition through which residents, local businesses and partners help shape decisions from planning through implementation. It would define how community leadership works alongside the FCURA beginning with 1636 North College and related superblock opportunities.

October's FCURA Board discussion seeks direction on the framework and formation of a possible Board subcommittee; full Charter review and approval is planned for December.

2 - Elements that support community led decisions

The draft charter proposes creation of a 15-member Coalition, with eight seats for residents and local small businesses. Members would help frame priorities and evaluate alternatives before choices narrow. The Coalition would have defined authority to recommend major project choices and decide specific matters when expressly delegated by the Board to the Coalition. For matters where the FCURA Board is the decision maker, the Coalition's recommendation will be recorded for the Board including minority views that dissent from the majority recommendation. The Coalition would act expressly as a bridge to the community so influence extends beyond people with the time or resources to attend meetings.

3 - Balancing community expertise and development realities

Residents bring knowledge of neighborhood needs, barriers and local opportunities. Staff, consultants and partners bring development, financing and operating expertise. The process proposed in the Charter would put both forms of knowledge on equal footing, identifying community outcomes, developing costed options, and working through tradeoffs together.

Capacity building to support the Coalition could include development and finance training, plain-language project budgets, visits to comparable projects and independent technical assistance. Compensation, interpretation, childcare and transportation would support participation.

4 – Suggested activities for Coalition

Learning before a decision: To facilitate shared vision, technical understanding, and community benefit, we would approach Coalition capacity building as a collective endeavor. For example, before reviewing a hub proposal, members could complete a short workshop on construction costs, operating budgets and funding restrictions, then visit a comparable facility to better understand both development details as well as community benefit lessons learned. Staff and residents could compare options together, examining what each costs and whom it serves.

A defined pool of funds: One recommendation included in the charter is the creation of a defined budget envelope that the Coalition is charged with overseeing as a way to advance community ownership in the redevelopment. As an example, the Board could authorize a \$50,000 envelope for a year of interim community activities, with a \$10,000 cap per project. It would set eligible uses, selection criteria, conflict rules and reporting requirements. The Coalition could select eligible projects within that authority; staff would check compliance, execute agreements and make payments. Requests beyond the limits would return to the Board.

The amounts are hypothetical. Participation support and training would also need identified funding. The Charter itself would not appropriate money or activate a delegation but would give the FCURA Board a governance structure in which to formally engage in Community-Led and Community-Informed development practices.

5 - How the participants would work together

Community: Identifies needs, tests options and evaluates results through continuing outreach managed by the NRP and FCURA staff.

Coalition: Works with FCURA and the NRP to weigh priorities and make recommendations for approval. When authorized, the Coalition exercises delegated authority, and reports back to FCURA Board on decisions and community benefit recommendations as appropriate. Further, acts as liaison to community on an ongoing basis.

FCURA staff: Coordinates the work, assesses feasibility, prepares Board actions and administers authorized contracts and funds.

NRP consultant team: Supports engagement, synthesizes findings and develops or coordinates technical options within its assigned scope. It would support Coalition deliberations and staff recommendations; approval authority would remain with the authorized decision makers.

FCURA Board: Sets direction, appoints members of Coalition, defines any delegation and retains reserved funding, property and contractual decisions. Material changes return to the Board.

6 - Examples of Coalition recommendations

These examples illustrate how the proposed framework could work. They do not establish an approved project program or grant new authority.

Example Decision	Example Coalition contribution and recommendation	Example Staff and Board role
Phase One community hub	Evaluate a shared kitchen, flexible gathering space or a phased mix. Recommend priority uses, affordability and access expectations, and an approach to phasing.	Staff tests capital and operating costs with potential partners. The Board considers project scope and funding.
Superblock master plan	Review alternatives against neighborhood priorities. Recommend a preferred mix of uses, connections and public spaces, with conditions and unresolved concerns documented.	Staff integrates technical analysis and identifies required approvals. The Board considers the recommendation within its authority.
Interim use and local opportunity	Recommend vendor space, community events or small-business support, including access criteria and measures of neighborhood benefit.	Staff evaluates eligibility and delivery. The Board authorizes resources or delegation; the Coalition acts within those limits.