

Citizen's Capital Improvement Plan Committee (CCIPC)
January 22, 2015
DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Attendance

Melissa Beck	Michelle Glasmann	Julie Rasmussen
Larry Coates	Ken Hack	
Dan Cupit	Harriet Hall	Janet Steinkamp
Michelle DeLaria	Cindi Kreutzer	
Ascenzo Di Giacomo	John Malito	Bob Wilson
Kelly Eargle	Kelly Mueldener	Don Wood
Nancy Ford	Leanna Principe	

Staff in attendance: Bryan Archer, Lorie Gillis and Bill Ray
Facilitation Team: Heather Bergman and Rose Barber

Action Item

Staff will work to prepare short summaries of each item on the unfunded project list to assist in reviewing the projects. If anyone has specific questions concerning a project on the list, they may email Bill Ray. At the next meeting, the Committee will break into small groups to review the projects and determine if any may be dismissed from consideration.

2007 CCIPC Experience

Larry Coates spoke about his experience on the 2007 CIP committee and how their group determined which projects they recommended to Council. The group in 2007 was larger than the present group, so they worked in smaller groups of 3-5 members to discuss using a list of criteria they created. This list is posted for review on the CCIPC website. The small groups would use the criteria to choose a project they wished the present to the large group. This allowed them to narrow the list of projects and examine a smaller list in a more in-depth manner. Then they worked as a large group to analyze the projects and choose which they would recommend to Council.

Questions/Answers

- *How did you determine the points for each criterion? We worked together to determine how things would be weighted. It was a bit confusing at first. The concept of points was presented by the facilitator of the 2007 group to help move forward. We agreed which categories were the most important to determine how to weight them.*
- *How were the small groups chosen? Were they picked for affiliations or at random? I don't recall, but I believe it was at random.*
- *Do you feel that the progress we have made from October to now is on par with the progress the 2007 group had made in that time? I think we are making much better progress. We are more efficient now.*
- *Do you feel that you made the right choice for the project you chose, or do you look back and think you made a mistake? The project we chose was not my personal project, but*

our goal at the time was to bring revenue into the city and that made the whole thing worthwhile. I agree with what we chose, but it just wasn't my passion.

- *Is there a list of the recommended projects from 2007 and which projects have been completed?* Yes, that list is on the website. The biggest project that has not been complete is the Ralston sidewalks. They are being slowly worked on now, but with no identified source of funding. Two road expansion projects from 2007 have not been finished.
- *Was 2007 the only other time there has been a CIP committee?* Yes.

Review of the Unfunded Projects List

Bill Ray passed out a list of unfunded projects with the amount of financing needed for each listed. The projects on the list are broken down into categories such as hospitality, transportation, etc. A full copy of the list is available on the CCIPC website. The group then discussed various projects on the list to be sure they understood them. Several projects were noted as being part of a Council Strategic Goal. Most of the projects on the list are also included in the City's Comprehensive, either because they are specifically listed in the Comp Plan or because they included by reference through other plans (i.e., the Transportation Master Plan and the Parks Master Plan). City Council recently approved an update to the plan for hospitality services and the Arvada Center, so projects included in that plan may change.

Proposals for Evaluation Criteria

At the previous meeting, members of the Committee were invited to develop their own set of evaluation criteria to propose to the group for consideration. Proposals were submitted by Michelle DeLaria, Nancy Ford, and John Malito, each of whom summarized their proposal for the group. All three sets of proposed criteria have been posted on the CCIPC website.

Michelle DeLaria

Michelle stated that her goal is to look at existing assets and prioritize projects that address unmet needs. In some areas, sidewalks are poorly kept and do not allow for pedestrians to get around easily. If people in this area can get into commercial areas without cars, there is then increased economic participation with the added benefit of a lowered need for parking. This approach has been successfully implemented in Littleton, Colorado. This approach also takes into account that there are areas of the city in which market demand is artificially limited by access; this would need to be improved to let these areas generate revenue.

Questions/Answers: Michelle DeLaria

- *How does more congestion in these areas increase my property value?* Congestion indicates that a place is popular. Ideally, a city would focus on corridor densification and making people get out of their cars. Congestion is unavoidable.
- *Is this sidewalk issue a prime example of applying these criteria?* No, it was just used it as an example of how these criteria could apply to the problems it could resolve.

Nancy Ford

Nancy shared her perspective that the criteria created by the 2007 CIP committee appeared a bit arbitrary, specifically regarding the points system. The Comprehensive Plan created by City Council with citizen input should be heavily referenced when reviewing the projects, as the goal of the Committee is to improve the city. The Comprehensive Plan should be used as a vision document to come up with a way of evaluating projects. The categories and weighting of the 2007 criteria seem subjective and might not be productive in evaluating projects. The Committee should look at projects with the Comprehensive Plan in mind as so much effort went into creating it.

Questions/Answers: Nancy Ford

Should so much weight be given to the Comprehensive Plan? Perhaps it should be used instead as a secondary check point, so that once we have selected certain projects we can see if they line up with the Comprehensive Plan. Then perhaps if things don't line up, we are seeing something the City did not see. Yes, that could work, but a lot of effort and time went into creating the Comprehensive Plan. Many citizens were involved and we are also here to prioritize what should be done with a guideline of City leadership vision, so if we ignore the Comprehensive Plan we are undermining that.

John Malito

John reported that after looking at the 2007 CIP criteria and the staff criteria, his list of criteria attempted to combine both strategies to create a simplified system for evaluating projects. It seems like the most functional way to get through some of these projects is to create a filter system that can eliminate most of the projects to create something like a "Top 50" list that can then be evaluated by a secondary set of criteria. This helps us to have a systematic approach to narrow the field so we can determine which projects move forward to be evaluated more intensely.

Questions/Answers: John Malito

- *Where do your ideas deviate from the ideas they were based on?* Quantity of citizen benefits should be higher; safety and health should be higher. It seemed as though if something was legally or voter mandated it should be ranked the highest, then the other things fall somewhere in the middle.
- *You used the points system as well. Why did you like this method?* The points seemed like a good way of showing which projects really ranked the highest.

Criteria Evaluation Discussion

The group brainstormed a general list of criteria they believed to be important. Based on the initial list, the group then worked to determine which criteria should stand alone on the list and which could be combined into other categories. Additionally, the group agreed that all criteria will be weighted equally, and projects will be evaluated for whether they meet the criteria or not rather than being assessed points for the degree to which they meet the criteria.

Evaluation Criteria (Items are listed in no particular order.)

- Replacement or improvement of existing assets (includes capital improvements of roads)
- Economic impact and return on investment (includes ability to increase revenues and bring economic benefit to the City, as well as improvement of sidewalks in/into commercial areas)
- Quality of life (includes beautification, health, wildlife habitat impact, environmental impact and sidewalks to walk dogs)
- Safety
- Service to underserved populations
- Increased connectivity (includes missing links and facilitation of non-motorized access)
- Included in a Council goal or a staff recommendation
- Included in the Comprehensive Plan

During the discussion of criteria, a possibility was presented for projects to be evaluated on the basis of whether they could generate their own funding through new approaches or sources. This was proposed as a criterion, but the group decided that instead it would be used as a secondary criterion to differentiate projects and/or make a case for good projects that do not rise to the top during the prioritization exercise.

Next Steps

The group determined that instead of evaluating all of the projects in an Excel spreadsheet before the next meeting, they would wait and try to reduce the project list first. They requested staff to create small summaries of each project so they could be better understood. The group will eliminate projects they all agree are not a priority and then use the Excel spreadsheet to further reduce the list during the next meeting.

Additional Discussion

A member of the group asked for clarification regarding the discussion of the \$12 million per year proposed to maintain and improve the condition of roads in Arvada. The member stated that there is a need for articulating a breakdown of the \$12 million into more manageable numbers and sections. The transportation projects can be broken into four groups: crack seal, chip seal, mill projects, and major reconstruction. If these numbers can be broken down, it might seem less intimidating to approve some of the capital costs because regular maintenance projects could be eliminated from consideration. Then the Committee could also recommend to Council that additional funding be allocated for regular road maintenance.

Questions/answers

- *Are crack and chip seal projects a part of the City budget?* Yes, that money is in the operations budget, so it is not part of the previous discussion.
- *True, but does any of that \$12 million go to crack seal? It may be in the plan, but it seems as though there isn't enough money for it to be done.* Note: Bill Ray is going to sit with the public works director to verify if the \$12 million includes chip and crack seal.

- *Under the unfunded projects list for transportation, will the \$12 million include any of those chip and seal projects? No.*

Next Steps

Staff will work to create short project summaries to clarify items on the unfunded project list. Anyone with specific questions may email Bill Ray. Heather Bergman will create the Excel spreadsheet with the criteria and the list of projects to be reviewed and worked on at the next meeting.