

Citizen's Capital Improvement Committee
Meeting Notes
April 16, 2008

The meeting was held at the Arvada Center and began at 6:00 P.M. on April 16th, 2008.

The first topic was a recap of findings from 4/2/08 CIP meeting. Catherine Teutsch, Core Learning Matters, Inc. facilitator, presented information on a number of process changes and improvements that had been made as a result of feedback received from the April 2 CIP meeting.

Requested changes include: providing the committee more visuals such as maps of project locations; an overall high-level project ranking and the CIP's request to receive project information earlier. In addition, the CIP had requested more detailed, accurate information and stated the need for the individual scoring exercises to be completed in advance of the meetings.

The CIP also requested several changes to the Evaluation Criteria sheets: the total maximum scores were to be printed beside each criteria category and "legislative/legal/voter mandated obligation" (item A) was to be removed from the evaluation criteria sheet.

Several changes to the overall meeting structure were also requested: answers to all questions identified during the Gallery Walk portion of the process were to be answered before the Small Group Scoring activity. Finally, the results of the Post-it note votes were to be shared by staff after the averages are calculated.

Victoria Runkle, Arvada Director of Finance, presented findings from the 2007 Citizen's Survey, a portion of which captured Arvada citizens' opinions about the importance of specific capital improvement projects.

The next agenda item was the individual completion of the "CIP Committee Overall Project Ranking Exercise" form which Victoria Runkle collected. Victoria stated that the scores would be aggregated and provided to the CIP in advance of the May 7th meeting via e-mail.

Bob Manwaring presented an overview of the all New Capacity Projects that were under consideration for the April 16th meeting. Following his presentation, the CIP broke into five small groups and completed the Benefits, Concerns and Questions exercise. Each small group was tasked with primary focus on two projects. Results of the exercise were captured by the small group leader on flip chart paper, then posted adjacent to flip chart information the City staff provided. The city-provided information included maps of the project sites as well as the completed project evaluation criteria forms that had been completed staff-provided information.

The process provided the opportunity for input on each project from every individual during the Gallery Walk exercise. The five small groups circulated to each project to add benefits, concerns and questions to the flip chart.

Bob Manwaring addressed the questions and concerns that were raised during the Gallery Walk exercise.

The CIP elected to skip the final agenda items (individual review and scoring amendment; averaging these into a group score reported to the larger group by a Post-it note vote). The group instead decided to continue the meeting for ½ hour past the 8:00 adjournment time in order to hear more information from staff. The decision was made for individual CIP members to complete the scoring at home and to send the evaluation criteria forms to Victoria Runkle in advance of the next meeting. Victoria agreed to average the group scores and provide results at the next meeting.