

**Citizens Capital Improvement Plan Committee (CCIPC)
February 20, 2015
Draft Meeting Summary**

Attendance

| | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Melissa Beck | Nancy Ford | Leanna Principe |
| Larry Coates | Michelle Glasmann | Ron Slinger |
| Dan Cupit | Lindsay Gomez | Janet Steinkamp |
| Michelle DeLaria | Ken Haack | Bob Wilson |
| Ascenzo DiGiacomo | Harriet Hall | Don Wood |
| Kelly Eargle | Kelly Mueldener | |

Staff: Bryan Archer, Lorie Gillis, and Bill Ray

Facilitation: Heather Bergman

Preliminary Reactions to Evaluation Results

Members of the Committee shared their initial reactions to the results that emerged from the evaluation exercise. The following comments and themes emerged.

Council Strategic Goal and Comprehensive Plan Criteria

- The Council Strategic Goal and Comprehensive Plan criteria had a significant impact on overall scores. It would be helpful to see how the project scored without those criteria included.
- Knowing which projects are in the Council Strategic Goals and Comprehensive Plan is important, but perhaps these should not be criteria with points but just additional information that is provided for each project.
- The Comprehensive Plan is an important touchstone for the Committee's work and needs to remain on the evaluation matrix.
- Without the Council Strategic Goal and Comprehensive Plan columns, only 5 projects have particularly high scores. Only a few projects have double-digit scores for multiple criteria.
- It would be helpful to have more information about the reasoning and methodology for which items were included in the Council Strategic Goals and the Comprehensive Plan. For example, what methodology did the Parks Board use to come up with the projects that ended up on the capital improvements list? Is there a list of Top 10 projects for each of the categories in the unfunded projects list (i.e., transportation, parks, facilities, hospitality, and the Arvada Center)?

Projects That Did Not Score as Some Expected

- Parks in underserved areas did not score very well. In the southeast part of Arvada, kids will have few summertime activities if there are no parks and the pool closes. This could lead to increased requirements for police response in the area.
- It is surprising that one of the three transportation projects on W. 72nd Avenue scored higher than the other two. Some people scored the Kipling to Simms project higher than the others because it is more central and it makes more sense to start at the core and expand the work out from there.

Challenges with the Criteria Application Process

- Committee members applied the criteria differently, which may have led to skewed results. Some people scored all the projects; some did not. Some people strictly scored based on their view of whether a project factually met the criteria, while others used some judgment about whether the project was good, met each criterion well, and/or met their own goals for the city. Some people included project costs in their assessments; others did not.
- It was difficult to score some projects without knowing why they would be important or valuable to others on the Committee and in the community. It would be helpful to spend some time hearing why people might want or need some of the projects on the list.
- The criteria did not allow for an assessment of whether a project could be eligible for alternative sources of funding. Some projects might get more support if people believed they could be funded in other ways.
- The criteria do not reflect a shared vision or desired future condition for Arvada. It may be useful for the Committee to develop a shared vision to guide future discussions.

Questions/Answers

- **How representative was the community engagement and participation in the Comprehensive Plan?** There was a lot of outreach to different groups, including high school students. There were more than 150 different opportunities to participate.
- **How would you describe the contents of the Comprehensive Plan process?** The Comprehensive Plan has three primary purposes. First, it is an inventory of the people, businesses, assets, land uses, and trends in the city. Second, it seeks to integrate different aspects of the government functions and services, like transportation, parks, facilities, etc. Third, it projects an idealized desired condition for the future, including future population, businesses, and land uses. *Note: The Comprehensive Plan is available on the CCIPC website for reference.*
- **How did Council come up with their strategic goals?** As they do every year, Council had a two-day retreat to develop the 6-year strategic plan for the City. They asked staff for input, and they have the benefit of the citizen survey and the Comprehensive Plan, but ultimately the goals reflect critical results that Council wants to achieve. *Note: The Council Strategic Goals are on the CCIPC website in a presentation from the October 16th meeting that outlines the process and outcomes for developing the strategic plan.*
- **How is the CIP list developed?** Based on the strategic goals that Council sets, staff prepares a 10-year plan for strategic investment, which is basically the CIP list. Over the last three years, staff included the full operations and maintenance costs of capital projects in the ten-year financial project analysis so that Council could understand the long-range implications of capital decisions made today.

Perspectives on How to Proceed

The group discussed several potential avenues for further evaluating the projects. Ideas included:

- Removing the column for Council Strategic Goals or changing from a scored criteria to just an informational item for which projects would get an X or not

- Removing the column for the Comprehensive Plan changing from a scored criteria to just an informational item for which projects would get an X or not
- Leaving in the Council Strategic Goals criteria but reducing its weight
- Leaving in the Comprehensive Plan criteria but reducing its weight
- Ranking all of the projects in the revised project list by priority
- Deleting all the projects that did not get a minimum score in the first round of scoring
- Ranking projects against each criteria (on a scale of 0 to 5, or 0 to 3)
- Combining all three 72nd Avenue projects into one rather than reviewing them separately
- Removing the 72nd Avenue projects because they are similar in type to the transportation projects removed as a result of the small group discussions at the February 5th meeting
- Add an informational column about alternative funding sources
- Add a column about proposals for reduced or partial funding of a project

A member of the group raised some questions about how projects were moved to the parking lot list and whether/how they will be considered in the future. The facilitator reported on the process that the Committee used at the February 5th meeting, which included leaving any project on the list if any member of the group wanted to keep it there for inclusion in the evaluation exercise. A member of the group proposed that Committee members who did not attend the February 5th meeting be given an opportunity to propose that projects on the parking lot list be moved back to the revised project list. The group agreed to this proposal, provided that the number of projects added back in is not high.

Next Steps

- Heather will send the parking lot list to the people who did not attend the February 5th meeting and invite them to propose a small number of projects to be moved from the parking lot to the revised project list.
- Heather will make the following changes to the evaluation matrix:
 - Change the Council Strategic Goal column to an informational column
 - Change the Comprehensive Plan column to an informational column
 - Add an informational column for write-in information related to alternative funding source, proposals for reduced or partial funding, or other funding considerations
 - Combine all three 72nd Avenue projects into one
- Heather will send the new evaluation matrix to all Committee members in Excel and PDF formats.
- Committee members will:
 - Rescore all projects in the revised list (including projects they do not support and any projects added back in from the parking lot list)
 - Score each project on each criterion on a scale from 0 to 3, using their subjective judgment
 - Send their completed evaluation matrices back to Heather in Excel or in a scanned PDF by Thursday, February 27th at 5 pm.