

**Citizens Capital Improvement Plan Committee (CCIPC)
February 5, 2015
FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

Attendance

| | | |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Melissa Beck | Ken Haack | Julia Rasmussen |
| Larry Coates | Harriet Hall | Janet Steinkamp |
| Dan Cupit | Cindi Kreutzer | Bob Wilson |
| Michelle DeLaria | Kelly Mueldener | Don Wood |
| Kelly Eargle | T.O. Owens | |
| Lindsay Gomez | Leanna Principe | |

Staff in attendance: Lorie Gillis, Bob Manwaring, and Bill Ray

Facilitation team: Heather Bergman and Rose Barber

Action Items

All members will review the revised unfunded projects list created during the February 5th meeting and evaluate each item using the criterion created at the January 22nd meeting. All completed evaluation sheets will be sent to Heather by Thursday, February 12th. Heather will then compile the results to review at the meeting on February 19th. Copies of the full unfunded project list, the revised project list, and a list of projects that are being placed in the “parking lot” will be available for discussion at the next meeting..

Street Maintenance Alternatives: Bill Ray

The group asked Bill Ray at the previous meeting to discuss how ongoing street maintenance, improvements and capital are incorporated into the unfunded projects list. Bill reported that the answer is that they are not. The discussion held previously about increasing the roads budget to achieve City Council’s goal of having 70% or more of roads rated “fair” involved going from a budget of \$5.5 million a year to \$10 million a year. Many aspects of road maintenance are paid for by the City’s operational budget rather than a capital budget, as there is no other available source of funding. Bill Ray proposed that the Committee take one of three courses of action regarding funding for non-capital, maintenance of roads:

- 1) The Committee could say that these costs are and always have been operational costs and they are therefore outside the purview of the Committee.
- 2) The Committee could embrace the concept of taking lasting care of the things we already have before we add something new and apply some or all of the capital funding to maintaining and upgrading our existing biggest asset, which is streets.
- 3) The Committee could do a combination of the two ideas above and report to Council that it is not really the Committee’s job to use this money for non-capital improvements so the Committee has recommendations about how Council and staff should go about finding additional funding to support ongoing road maintenance.

Questions/Answers:

- *Mark Bowman showed a graph in which the present budget approach results in the quality of roads going down, the Council goal was a high line on the graph, and then there was a middle line that was maybe the middle ground? Yes, the middle line was the goal if funding was increased to \$10 million a year.*
- *Please differentiate between the first and third options in your suggestions about how the Committee could proceed. In the first option, the Committee would simply leave it as something for the Council to deal with, while in the third option you would make recommendations to Council for how to fix this issue.*
- *Didn't we also identify a structural issue with how sales tax is allocated? Could we make suggestions around that idea? Yes.*

The group decided that they would like to discuss funding strategies and recommendations further and therefore rule out Option 1, above.

Small Group Discussion

The Committee broke into small groups to identify projects that can be eliminated from the criteria/evaluation exercise. Each group applied its own reasoning for how they determined which projects to remove from the list. Reasons offered included high costs, operational vs. capital expenditure, and available funding from another source. All three groups had to agree for a project to be removed. A number of projects were proposed to be removed from the list and were placed in a "parking lot" so they can be discussed later for possible additional comments or recommendations to Council. Those projects are included on the "Unfunded Projects Parking Lot List."

Discussion of Undergrounding

There were questions about what undergrounding is and what is included in that project. Bill Ray stated that Xcel energy provides the City with a budget for the purpose of putting electric lines underground. Any other lines, such as cable, would have to be undergrounded using the City budget. The line item under the heading of Transportation refers to this general cost. The line item under the heading of CCIPC Additional Projects refers specifically to undergrounding along Grandview, and has been changed to reflect this specification.

Discussion of Last Mile

Clarification about what the Last Mile project line item listed under the CCIPC Additional Projects was requested. The Last Mile project refers to the last mile of missing sidewalks and bicycle/pedestrian work remaining around the Gold Line station.

Next Steps

Everyone will review the revised unfunded projects list and rate each project according to the criterion. Finished lists will be sent to Heather by Thursday, February 12th for compilation. The final results will be reviewed at the next meeting.