

Citizens Capital Improvement Plan Committee (CCIPC)
March 5, 2015
Draft Meeting Summary

Attendance

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

Staff: Bryan Archer, Lorie Gillis, and Bill Ray

Facilitation: Heather Bergman

Group Review of Protocols

The facilitator requested guidance from the group about how they prefer she enforce assignment deadlines and group protocols regarding revisiting past decisions. Several members of the group stated that making mid- or late-week deadlines can be difficult, and it would be easier if deadlines fell on Mondays to allow for work on CCIPC assignments on the weekend. Additionally, several people requested that the facilitator send reminder emails about upcoming deadlines the Friday before future Monday deadlines. The facilitator agreed to set Monday deadlines and send reminders on Fridays. The group also agreed that the facilitator should use her discretion about when to be flexible with deadlines in order to accommodate extenuating circumstances that sometime arise in Committee members' lives.

Regarding revisiting past decisions, members of the group expressed different perspectives. Some members wanted to give people who miss meetings an opportunity to weigh in before decisions become final in order to ensure that everyone has a voice in each decision. Others stated that decision points should be closed after each meeting in order to maintain the forward momentum of the group, and that people who miss meetings should not be permitted to reopen past decisions. After some discussion, the group agreed that anyone who misses a meeting is responsible for reviewing meeting summaries and/or checking in with other Committee members to learn what happened. If someone is concerned about a decision that was made at a meeting s/he missed, s/he must reach out to the facilitator *prior to the next meeting* to share their concern and discuss how best to proceed.

Preliminary Reactions to Revised Evaluation Results

Members of the Committee shared their initial reactions to the results that emerged from the second evaluation exercise in which group members allocated up to three points for each project for each criterion. The following comments and themes emerged.

- It looks like there might be a natural cut-off at around 122 points.
- The results are not that different than they were in the first round of evaluation.
- The "replacement of existing assets" criterion seems to skew the results away from the values that have been expressed in this group.

- There are several transportation projects on the list that score high but are in areas of the city where one participant estimates that fewer than 15% of residents live.
- Some of the projects are so large that they would require all of the available funds. It may be wise for the group to pull those projects off the list and propose a bond or other funding mechanism for them.
- While development fees may seem like a funding opportunity for some transportation projects, development fees are unlikely to be available for some of the larger transportation projects due to their location in older neighborhoods. Additionally, development impact fees can impact developers' interest in building in Arvada.
- There are several errors in the revised spreadsheet. (Note: The facilitator stated that these errors are clerical in nature and will be corrected so the revised spreadsheet can be reposted.)
- Although projects like the 72nd Avenue improvements are not in high-population areas of Arvada, they are critical to getting residents and non-residents to the commercial areas of the city.
- It would be helpful to have more information about the location, feasibility, engineering, cost, and other details of these projects.
- It is unclear if having more information would change the rankings much, especially since they are not that different from the first round of rankings.

Questions/Answers

- **Could staff provide demographic information to help the Committee understand which projects affect underserved populations?** This would be very challenging as the methodology for how to define and map underserved populations is unclear.
- **Could staff provide additional detail on the projects, like engineering studies or some type of cost analysis?** Staff has some additional information on some of the projects on the list. All of the projects on the list have been reviewed by staff with the cost information rated for its "veracity." This information is available to the Committee. Additionally, staff can share the assumptions and other background information that they have for projects on the list. Since these projects are not yet certain to be built, investing substantial staff time in more analysis is not an efficient use of City resources.
- **How does the Last Mile fit in with the Missing Sidewalks project?** The sidewalk segments in the Last Mile project are included on the list of missing sidewalks identified and ranked by the Transportation Advisory Committee. The Transportation Advisory Committee revisited this list when the Gold Line project began to assess the condition of sidewalks around the Gold Line station. The Last Mile project includes more than just sidewalk completions. It also includes bike access components like ramps, sidewalk widening efforts, and other improvements needed to make multi-modal access to the transit station more viable. Dan Cupit and staff will work to get the Transportation Committee's project list and ranking to the CCIPC.
- **What happens if the City starts a project and then runs out of money in the middle of construction?** The City would not start a project unless there was enough money to complete it. Some projects are phased to ensure that there is enough money to complete a reasonable component of a larger project.

Group Discussion on Ranked Projects

A member of the group suggested that they agree to fund the top 4 projects in this ranking, because they overlap with the top 4 projects from the first evaluation exercise. Another group member pointed out that staff reported differing degrees of “veracity” for the costs of these projects. The Ralston Road Corridor project has a high veracity and already has 30% of engineering completed. The missing sidewalks effort has a medium veracity, due to the variation in costs to build sidewalks—though the average cost is \$1 million per mile, the cost can vary widely. The veracity of the Retrofit project is low. One member of the group suggested the group recommend some funding for additional studies to improve the veracity of the cost estimates for each project.

Another member of the group questioned whether there would be enough money to fund the \$30 million in costs for the top four projects due to the uncertainty of future funding availability. It is unclear whether Council will choose to pursue a bond initiative and if they do, it is uncertain whether a majority of voters will vote for it. Different members of the Committee expressed differing degrees of confidence about this. The facilitator noted that the group can make conditional funding recommendations to Council, identifying projects to fund with existing resources and then identifying which additional projects should be funded if/when additional resources become available through bonding or other strategies. A member of the group stated that the Committee should identify the funding priorities separate from individual political calculations about what Council and/or the public might do regarding bonds or other funding strategies.

To assist the group with planning, Bryan Archer clarified that there are basically two funding options—one that assumes successful bonding and one that does not. Both would use \$15 million in funds that are currently available.

Option 1: Funding through Bonding

Currently Available	\$15,000,000
Potentially Available through Future Bonding	\$55,000,000
Total Available for CCIPC to Allocate	\$70,000,000

Option 2: Funding without Bonding

Currently Available	\$15,000,000
Additional Funding through General Fund (approximately \$4.5 million/year for 6 years 2019-2024)	\$28,000,000
Total Available for CCIPC to Allocate	\$43,000,000

Several members of the group raised questions about how parks projects were identified for inclusion in the initial unfunded projects list provided to the CCIPC. Melissa Beck, who sits on the Park Advisory Committee, reported that the Park Advisory Committee did a similar prioritizing exercise for all the parks and park-related needs in the City. The highest-priority projects were included in the unfunded project list. A member of the group recalled that previous presentations to the CCIPC by City staff identified other priorities, including tennis courts, irrigation systems, playground updates, trail segments, and new neighborhood parks. The group expressed an interest in getting additional information on parks priorities and evaluation criteria in order to better understand these projects. One member of the group proposed setting aside some amount

of money for parks projects without necessarily identifying a specific project as a priority. Melissa agreed to ask the Park Advisory Committee to provide a recommendation to the CCIPC about what they would like the CCIPC to do. Staff will follow up with the Parks Department to see what additional information might be available.

Agreements and Next Steps

- The group agreed that they would like to fund the Ralston Road Corridor Long-Term Plan. They discussed allocating additional resources to the project due to the variability in costs in construction and real estate, but ultimately decided to fund it at the level requested by staff and include a note in their final report saying that the City should complete the project even if the cost exceeds the \$16.7 million requested by staff. The City should find any additional funding needed to ensure completion of this project.
- The group discussed funding the Missing Sidewalks project, which is ranked second under the new methodology. The group decided they would like to see the additional information that is available from the Transportation Advisory Committee on how they ranked the different missing sidewalk sections. The group learned that the Missing Sidewalk project cost is actually \$2.5 million per year for 10 years, as there are approximately 25 miles of missing sidewalks throughout the city. This raised the question of whether the group could allocate additional money to this project to get it completed faster. Staff reported that there are multiple constraints that would make it difficult to complete more than \$2.5 million in sidewalks per year. Dan Cupit, who sits on the Transportation Advisory Committee agreed to request a recommendation from that group for funding, including whether and how the Last Mile segments should be addressed. That group's project rankings will also be provided to the CCIPC prior to the next meeting.
- The Committee indicated that they do not have enough information about the Retrofit Projects per TOD Bike/Ped Access Plan project to make an informed decision about funding this project, which ranked third in the revised evaluation. The group requested that staff provide additional information about the separate components of this project, including their cost and purpose. Staff will provide this information to the Committee prior to the next meeting.
- The group had several questions about the fourth-ranked project, RRCC/Arvada Ridge Station Access from Kipling. Questions related primarily to the goal of the project, the location and alignment of the road, and the plan for traffic signals once the project is built. Staff agreed to provide the conceptual drawings for this project for discussion at the next meeting.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on March 19th. The first half of the meeting will be dedicated to hearing and discussing recommendations from the Park Advisory Committee and the Transportation Advisory Committee, along with a discussion with staff about the Arvada Ridge Station Access conceptual design. The Committee will use the second half of the meeting for further discussions on whether and how to fund specific projects.