

**Citizens Capital Improvement Plan Committee (CCIPC)
April 16, 2015
Draft Meeting Summary**

Attendance

Melissa Beck	Lindsay Gomez	Leanna Principe
Larry Coates	Ken Haack	Julie Rasmussen
Dan Cupit	Harriet Hall	Ron Slinger
Michelle DeLaria	Cindi Kreutzer	Janet Steinkamp
Kelly Eargle	John Malito	Bob Wilson
Nancy Ford	Kelly Mueldener	Don Wood
Michelle Glasmann	T.O. Owens	

Staff: Bryan Archer, Lorie Gillis, Bill Ray, Kim Vagher
Other: Chris Squadra
Facilitation: Heather Bergman, David Burchfield

Agreements

<i>Project</i>	<i>Resolution</i>
Parks Maintenance and Streets Facilities	Fund for \$16,000,000 with the requirement that further study and/or design emphasize total lifecycle cost efficiency
72 nd and Indiana	Fully fund for \$6,700,000
72 nd Simms to Kipling	Do not fund
72 nd Simms to Indiana	Do not fund
Bike master Plan – Ped Bridges / Underpasses	Do not fund
Bicycle / Pedestrian Overpass at Alkire St. and Union Pacific Railroad	Maintain previous decision to fund fully at \$3,500,000 and recommend a usage study to establish need before construction
Simms Street Improvements	Tabled
Gold Strike Park, Jack B. Tomlinson Park, Historic Gardens at McIlvoy Park	Fully fund for \$2,360,000
ATMs, Conduit, and Fiber Interconnect	Fully fund for \$2,250,000
Eldridge Street – W. 64 th Ave. to Ralston Creek	Fully fund for \$1,000,000
Alkire St. – W. 86 th Pkwy to W. 88 th Ave.	Do not fund
Trail Gaps	Tabled until next meeting
W. 72 nd and W. 80 th UP Railroad Grade Separation	Fund \$400,000 for feasibility study at both sites
Guardrails	Fully fund for \$250,000
Street Lights Pole Replacement – Wood Poles	Do not fund
Moore Brothers Farm and Agricultural Center	Tabled

Parks Maintenance Facility Plan Review and Discussion

City Facilities Manager Kim Vagher presented on the proposed improvements to the park maintenance facility, first reviewing the features of the current building:

- Steel structure with high bays – 38,000 square feet
- Low bay building for storage – 7,500 square feet
- Wooden house for offices
- Streets building (salt and oil storage, vehicle parking) – 18,200 square feet
- Outdoor parking for other equipment (most vehicles and equipment are parked outside year-round)
- Partially occupies Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) right-of-way, leased for \$6,000/year

While the current building is a total of 54,000 square feet, the new facility would be 58,000 square feet. Changes and improvements desired in the new facility include:

- Moving off of UPRR right-of-way (savings of \$6,000/year)
- Purchase of a small adjacent property to the northeast to be used as a quiet zone for neighbors and potential space for future expansion if needed
- Switch bay aspect to be south-facing, eliminating current issues with ice build-up on roofs and recurrent problem of ice falling onto vehicles/personnel in current orientation (This would also eliminate the problem of ice remaining un-melted in the shadow of the current structure.)
- New salt storage
- Solar panels and other structural efficiency features (e.g., daylighting)
- To be built by 2019, filling its capacity for city services by 2030

The new facility's proposed budget is based on estimation standards for "legacy" buildings, that is, buildings with a 50-year lifespan, with the knowledge that some aspects of the building (e.g., HVAC) will be gradually replaced throughout that lifespan. Rather than estimating based on square footage alone, this estimate is based on a meticulous appraisal of individual materials requirements per the design. For instance, perimeter tends to dictate costs more than square footage because of the materials required for construction (e.g., siding, windows, etc.). Multi-page documents were developed for the estimation of each material, and the estimator offered to meet with especially interested Committee members and a City representative to go over these if desired. The total budget is:

- \$16,000,000 construction cost in 2014
- \$7,200,000 in additional "soft costs" in 2014
- \$7,200,000 for escalation by 2019 construction
- Total cost: \$30,400,000
- *Note: This cost estimate is updated and more accurate than the \$21,000,000 listed on the projects spreadsheet used by the Committee.*

Participants raised clarifying questions to staff and cost estimator Chris Squadra; the following statements emerged from this exchange:

- All currently planned parks would be built out by 2044.
- The existing parks structure would be razed due to its inability to meet the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) code and earthquake standards. That area would be used for parking.
- Some sustainability features from the Indiana facility would be used at this facility as well (HVAC to last up to 30 years, solar energy, daylighting, etc.).
- The current salt dome will be converted into a streets vehicle garage (rather than storing vehicles outside all year; this will extend their lifespan).
- The UPRR land is not for sale, nor is it needed for the new facility.
- Costs of individual structures within the total facility are available in the provided documentation. The cost of the salt storage building is estimated at \$940,000, primarily due to high demand for prefabricated buildings of its kind.
- Less than 10% of this facility is office space.
- High demand for construction projects in the region was also understood to drive some of the costs for this facility.
- Cost of solar installation is not directly factored into the cost of the project, though it is covered in contingency costs that are built into the estimation.
- The new building will be built first. Operations will continue at existing structures until new buildings are ready, at which points operations will be moved and old buildings will be razed.

City Director of Finance Bryan Archer reported on savings calculations for the new facility:

- Many aspects of savings are not calculable.
- The UPRR lease is actually \$5,300/year.
- Cost of energy in the current facility is \$12,000/year. It will take 7 years to pay off solar installation for the new facility, after which they will provide a savings.

At the conclusion of staff presentations, the Committee discussed various aspects of the project.

- One issue of concern was the estimated capacity of this building (to be full by 2030) and its geographic location given the changing population distribution in the city. Participants wanted to know if this was indeed the best option available, or if alternative sites and/or splitting operations between sites had been considered.
 - Staff responded that:
 - Service to western areas of the city would likely require development of future sites. Those needs are currently covered by the Indiana facility, and there is no reliable means to predict when and where those future needs will be.
 - Available property of this size is less available in the west than might be expected.
 - There is no single parcel in the region of the old facility that could meet current needs.

- The bulk of priority roads are in the eastern part of the city.
 - Finally, splitting operations between multiple sites fails to meet a specified goal in this project, which is to improve customer service experience.
 - The estimator added:
 - Land costs of moving the facility are high and rising.
 - Selling this land would take a lot of time and money; the current structures would require extensive demolishing and reclamation to make it ready for sale, at which point the market may not be as favorable as it looks at the current moment.
 - Costs of moving operations would also be significant, both in terms of moving costs and downtime in operations.
 - Some participants responded:
 - Only southeast Arvada could provide an alternative site without “NIMBY” (“not in my backyard”) issues, but this would be even less central than the current site.
 - The site at Indiana has room for expansion, which may satisfy current concerns about adequately servicing the western area of town.
 - Other participants contested this last point, suggesting that there is little room for expansion at the Indiana facility.
- There was general agreement among participants that the old facility needed replacement. However, there were differing notions of the appropriate level at which to fund this project.
 - Some participants were concerned about the necessity of designing for such high quality in this facility, often referring to this design as a “Cadillac” option. This was paired with concern about the use of only one architectural bid. Many suggested that with a smaller budget the City would still be able to creatively find ways to meet its needs.
 - There were some concerns about reaching full capacity by 2030 and the needs associated with materials durability for 50+ years. City staff responded that:
 - Estimation of future needs was founded on the comprehensive plan and the extensive study that went into its development.
 - City departments cannot reliably estimate future needs beyond 15 years, which explains the estimated capacity maximization in 2030.
 - Meeting capacity by 2030 does not, however, imply that this facility will not retain a useful role in providing for City needs thereafter.
 - Seeking other bids might not generate a lesser estimate. This estimate is based on a comprehensive consideration of operation costs.
 - The proposed facility actually repurposes much of the existing facility as another means of reducing overall project costs.

- Some participants responded that total lifecycle cost should be a consideration in this project, noting that the current facility was originally built in 1940. Building a cheaper facility at this point might not yield total savings over time if another new building must be built due to a short lifecycle in the proposed project.

Though some suggested that further studies and/or bids would be desirable, the facilitator clarified that this Committee would not have the time or opportunity to wait for them and it needed to make a decision with the information available. The facilitator also suggested to the Committee that it would be offering recommendations to City Council, which may be more likely to be followed if they were viewed as feasible, balanced, and coherent package of projects. After some discussion, the Committee developed 3 main funding options to discuss:

- Full funding at \$23,000,000
- Partial funding at \$16,000,000
- Partial funding at \$11,000,000

Each of the lesser funding options was suggested with the inclusion of contingencies to fund the project more fully pending the generation of further study and/or bids. The group was polled on each of these options and broke up into smaller conversations over a short break. After the break, the Committee agreed that the greatest concern for funding should be in total lifecycle cost. After a short discussion of these principles, the Committee agreed to fund the project for \$16,000,000 with the requirement that further study and/or design emphasize total lifecycle cost efficiency.

72nd and Indiana

Beginning back at the top of the projects spreadsheet, the Committee discussed previously tabled projects, beginning with 72nd and Indiana. One participant related a recent experience of driving this intersection at rush hour and supported this project. Consensus to fully fund this project at \$6,700,000 came quickly.

72nd Simms to Kipling

The Committee agreed not to fund this project.

72nd Simms to Indiana

The Committee agreed not to fund this project.

Bike / Master Plan – Pedestrian Bridges / Underpasses

The Committee agreed not to fund this project.

Bicycle / Pedestrian Overpass at Alkire St. and Union Pacific Railroad

A member of the group presented an informal study of pedestrian usage at this intersection, finding it to be exceptionally low, and wished for the Committee reconsider its previous decision to fund this project. The Committee agreed that this new information suggested the need for reconsideration, but reiterated previously expressed desires not to

be overly cautious when building safety-related projects, also noting the importance of this intersection for bike routes. The Committee agreed to hold to its previous agreement to fund the project (\$3,560,000), but added a recommendation that the City do a usage or need study and make a final decision based on that study.

Simms Improvements W. 64th to W. 72nd

The Committee agreed to table this item.

Simms Improvements W. 72nd to W. 86th Parkway

The Committee agreed to table this item.

Gold Strike Park, Jack B. Tomlinson Park, Historic Gardens at McIlvoy Park

The Committee agreed that prioritizing parks in underserved areas of the city should take precedence, agreeing that some of the western parks were in lesser need of improvements. One participant suggested recommending improvements based on higher usage activities (e.g., skate parks over open green space). Another participant suggested that the Tennis Center be also included in consideration for proposed blanket parks funding. The Committee ultimately agreed to fully fund Gold Strike Park, Jack B. Tomlinson Park, and the Historic Gardens at McIlvoy Park for \$2,360,000. (Note: The group's shorthand discussion of cost at the meeting identified the combined cost for these projects as \$2,300,000.)

ATMs, Conduit, and Fiber Interconnect

Recognizing that this project would synchronize traffic lights and improve traffic patterns, the Committee agreed to fully fund this project for \$2,250,000.

Eldridge Street - W. 64th to Ralston Creek

Noting its importance for bicycle connectivity within proximity of the YMCA, the Committee agreed to fully fund this project for \$1,000,000.

Alkire St. - W 86th Parkway to W. 88th Ave.

Noting that this project would fund a sidewalk on the east side of that road but that the sidewalk was not immediately accessible from the adjacent neighborhood, the Committee agreed not to fund this project.

Trail Gaps

The Committee inquired of Melissa Beck (who sits on the Parks Advisory Committee) about prioritization criteria for trail gaps. Melissa noted that the criteria were diverse, including concerns raised by the Committee (safety, route completion, usage, surveyed resident preferences, etc.). The Committee agreed to table this item.

W. 72nd and 80th UP Railroad Grade Separation

Noting that the exact cost of these project has changed, the Committee agreed to allocate \$400,000 for feasibility studies at both 72nd and 80th.

Guardrails

Agreeing that this is an important safety project for a relatively small amount of money, the Committee agreed to fully fund this project for \$250,000.

Street Lights Pole Replacement - Wood Poles

Suggesting that this is not in fact a capital project but rather a maintenance project, the Committee agreed not to fund this project.

Moore Brothers Farm and Agricultural Center

Discussing this project, the Committee noted:

- The importance of providing educational opportunities for young people to learn about the agricultural roots of Arvada
- The commitment to the Moore brothers upon purchase that the City would maintain the facility

One participant read the project description, revealing that a plan for use of the money had not yet been developed. Accordingly, the Committee proposed allocating \$100,000 for plan development. Noting the lateness of the hour, the Committee agreed to table the Moore Brothers Farm and Agricultural Center discussion and other funding issues for the next meeting.

Next Steps and Task Groups

The Committee requested that staff provide additional information on several projects:

- The justification for the desired \$1,525,000 for the Moore Brothers project
- Further information on the Central Stores Relocation project
- Information about the County's plans for the 72nd and Simms improvements projects if the City has funding wants to pursue it
- More solid numbers/criteria information about the Trail Gaps project
- More information about the cost estimation for the UP separation projects

A few participants expressed a desire to ensure that the Arvada Center art gallery and other projects, though low on the spreadsheet, be considered. It was agreed that this would be the first project for consideration at the next meeting.

The Committee appointed the following members to serve as a funding recommendations document drafting task group:

- Michelle DeLaria
- Nancy Ford
- Bob Wilson
- Don Wood

Don Wood also agreed to draft recommendations on the CCIPC process.

Each of these task groups will provide drafts to the whole Committee for review by Monday afternoon, April 27, 2015.