

Citizens Capital Improvement Plan (CCIPC)
March 19, 2015
Draft Meeting Summary

Attendance

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

Staff: Bryan Archer, Tim Hoos, Bob Manwaring, Bill Ray, Ben Waldman

Facilitation: Heather Bergman and David Burchfield

Staff Presentation on Missing Sidewalks and TOD Bike/Ped Retrofit Projects

In response to the Committee's request at the March 5th meeting, Tim Hoos (City Engineer), Ben Waldman (Traffic Engineer), and Bob Manwaring (Director of Public Works) presented on prioritization criteria for the Missing Sidewalks and TOD Bike/Ped Retrofit projects.

- Prioritization of projects was driven by an interest in meeting goals in the Comprehensive Plan of increasing alternative modes of transportation by 10% by 2019, increasing safety, facilitating high pedestrian traffic areas, maximizing likelihood for grant funding, and ensuring constructability. Thus, per the memo to the Committee from Bill Ray, prioritization of missing sidewalk segments was based on:
 1. Safety
 2. Access to the Gold Line
 3. Proximity to a school route or major trip generator (e.g., a hospital)
 4. Roadway classification (sidewalks along arterials and major collector streets are a higher priority than sidewalks on side streets)
 5. Constructability and cost
- Various examples from the list of proposed projects were discussed in depth with map illustrations (*available on the CCIPC website*). Examples included:
 - Along Marshall Rd./Lamar St. from 51st Ave. to 60th Ave.: An important connection from Wheat Ridge into Arvada
 - Carr St. from 50th to 57th: To connect to Wheat Ridge and Clear Creek bike path
 - 60th Ave. between Tennyson and Sheridan: For connectivity in the Sheridan Gold Line Station area
- Staff clarified a number of points about project selection and implementation capacity:
 - Where roads are too narrow for parking and bike lanes, "sharrows" will be used. (Sharrows are large arrows with bikes that are painted on the surface of the street to indicate to cars that they need to share the road.)

- Prioritization considerations for businesses are included within heavy pedestrian traffic areas.
- The projects on the map are not in order of priority; rather, they are organized from West to East.
- Projected inflation for materials cost is included in project budgets.
- Staff capacity limits completion of projects to \$3-4 million/year.
- Construction capacity (including winter weather restrictions) is not the limiting factor.

Adjustments to the Expected Cost of These Projects

- Staff provided an updated cost estimate for the Missing Sidewalks project. Rather than the previously budgeted \$2.5 million per year for 10 years, staff has identified \$6.2 million in desired project funding.
- Staff believes the City can fund the RRCC Arvada Ridge Station road connection to Kipling and the Last Mile improvement projects around the Olde Town Transit Stop by other means and recommends that the CCIPC remove them from consideration for funding.
- Staff also believes that the Bike/Ped Retrofit TOD project costs can be reduced from approximately \$10M to \$6 million.

Staff Presentation on 72nd Ave. Corridor Project

- At the request of the Committee, Mr. Hoos, Mr. Waldman, and Mr. Manwaring also provided additional information about the 72nd Avenue Corridor project. The Committee recently agreed to combine the three segments of this project into a single project for the purpose of evaluation against the group's criteria; this presentation addressed the three components of the project separately.
- Funding improvements to 72nd Avenue is a City priority. Although Parts of 72nd Avenue are a Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) highway, CDOT does not have the capacity to significantly fund projects beyond its major focus areas (I-25, US 36, I-70).
- Previous grant applications for this corridor have been unsuccessful because:
 - It is not considered to be a regional asset (i.e., significantly used by non-Arvada residents).
 - The Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) will not consider a project in its "fiscally constrained" project list without assurance of a "reasonable prospect" for funding from the project proponent (in this case, the City of Arvada). Matching or over-matching funds from CIP funds (or other sources) might lessen this limitation, but the projects will likely still remain relatively uncompetitive for grants for other reasons.
- Impending developments along the corridor include willingness on the part of developers to contribute support via contribution/development of right-of-way (e.g., southeast corner of Indiana and 72nd). This makes building these projects now very appealing, as it could defray some of the costs to the City.
- The City has already invested a lot of money on environmental studies in the area. It would be good to leverage these while they are still relevant.

- At the Indiana intersection, there are various reasons that improvements to a stoplight system (rather than a roundabout) are preferable – mostly having to do with the extensive spatial requirements for a roundabout for such a high volume of traffic.
- West of the Kipling intersection, restrictions by the railroad limit the addition of new lanes across track crossings, so the only viable intersection enlargement is via an under-track tunnel.
- The Simms intersection may see some smaller improvement measures employed with or without CIP funding, but these will ultimately only be able to serve as stop-gaps until larger improvements (i.e., those identified for CIP funding) can be made.
- The City is currently maximizing its capacity regarding efficient/smart signaling and is being deterred from further improvement by the absence of fiber-optic connections between signals (which is very costly).
- The City's priority for these projects and staff's revised cost estimates are:
 1. 72nd and Indiana intersection (\$6.7 million)
 2. Kipling to Simms (\$16 million)
 3. Simms to Indiana (\$28 million)

Review of Parks CIP Funding Needs

At the last meeting, the Committee requested that Melissa Beck follow up with the Parks Advisory Committee (PAC) and Parks Department staff to get additional information about the parks priorities for CIP funding. Melissa's efforts resulted in an email from Parks Director Gordon Reusink. Melissa read this email to the group; highlights are included below. The complete email will be posted to the CCIPC website.

- The PAC identifies 3 priorities for CIP funding:
 - Playground replacement (*\$550,000 per year for 3 years*)
 - There are 58 parks in the Arvada park system.
 - The lifespan of a playground is approximately 15-20 years.
 - It costs about \$120,000 to replace a playground.
 - In the next 3 years, 14 playgrounds need to be updated and upgraded to meet the guidelines of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
 - Irrigation system replacement (*\$1 million*)
 - Typical system lifespan is 25 years.
 - It costs approximately \$50,000/acre to replace an irrigation system.
 - Irrigation system computer control unit replacement (*\$100,000/year indefinitely*); control unit lifespan is 10 years.

Following this presentation, several members of the group shared their respective views on whether and how proximity to parks and quality of parks affects home values and municipal tax revenues.

Revisiting Parking Lot for Last All for Consideration

- The facilitator led the group in a final review of parking lot projects to select those that would remain in consideration for creative or partial funding. Projects not selected would be eliminated from further consideration.

- Projects chosen to remain in consideration for creative funding strategies were:
 - Moore Brothers Farm
 - Traffic calming
 - Arvada Center (all projects)
 - Transportation projects (all)
 - Any remaining projects from the prioritized list that are not specifically identified for funding by the Committee
- Additionally, one member of the group requested that the three new parks priorities (playground ADA upgrades, irrigation, and computerized irrigation control systems) be included for further consideration.

Main Projects List Funding Discussion

- There was discussion that the prioritization criteria chosen and used by the group might have incidentally eliminated some projects that might still be considered important for other reasons. The facilitator reminded the group that the evaluation matrix was meant to be used only as a tool and that, as a group, they could determine the weight that they would give the matrix in their considerations.
- The facilitator reminded the group that, similarly, it could revisit previous decisions later (e.g., funding, prioritization) if the will of the group could support such revision.
- After some discussion of Missing Sidewalks and TOD project funding as distinct items, the group decided to fund them together at \$9.5M with the stipulation that staff take a fresh look at prioritization and develop a new list of prioritized projects that combines both the Missing Sidewalks segments and the Bike/Ped TOD project components.

Next Steps

- At the end of this meeting, one participant suggested a hard deadline for decision-making at the end of May. The group agreed to make the question of a deadline the first agenda item for the next meeting.
- Next, the group will resume with discussions of funding decisions.