

CITIZENS' ADVISORY BUDGET COMMITTEE (CABC)

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: May 4, 2021 Time: 6:30PM Location: WebEx (Video-conference platform)
 Next Meeting: June 1, 2021 Time: 6:30PM Location: WebEx (Video-conference platform)

MISSION STATEMENT: *The mission of the Citizens' Advisory Budget Committee (CABC) is to study all phases of the budget of the City of Aurora and to make recommendations to City Council in regard to any and all budget matters.*

The CABC accomplishes the mission by examining and evaluating needs and priorities as they relate to the budget and by making recommendations for action to the City Council.

ATTENDANCE

Name		Name		Name		Name	
Mustafa Abdullah	A	Danielle Lammon	P	JulieMarie Shepherd Macklin	P	COA Staff	
Candace Bailey	A	Brian Matisse	E	Chesca Smotherman	P	Greg Hays	
Sunny Banka	P	Omar Montgomery	P	Katrice Traylor	E	Cindy Colip	
Tikneshia L. Beauford	P	George Peck	P	Craig Upston	P	Lynne Center	
Reno Carollo	P	Joshua Reddell	P	Michael Westerberg	P	Matthew Kozakowski	
Kevin Cox	E	David Rich	P	Dustin Zvonek	P	Tom McMinim	
Danielle Jurinsky	P	Jonathan Scott	P			Victor Rachael	
Idris Keith	P	Don Seven	A			Elly Watson	

Key: P=Present; E=Excused; A=Absent; R=Resigned; *New Member

HANDOUTS

(Emailed to committee)

CABC May Agenda (<i>Sent May 3, 2021 via email</i>)
April 2021 Meeting Minutes (<i>Sent May 3, 2021 via email</i>)

MEETING MINUTES

1. Call to Order	Michael Westerberg (Chair) called the meeting to order at 6:34pm.	
2. Roll Call/ Establishment of Quorum	Roll call was taken by Secretary JulieMarie Shepherd Macklin and a quorum was present.	
3. Approval of April Agenda	<p>Chair Westerberg entertained a motion to approve the May agenda as presented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • George Peck moved to approve the amended agenda as presented and Craig Upston seconded. The motion carried unanimously. 	<p>Motion Carried Yes: Unanimous No: 0 Abstain: 0</p>
4. Public Works Transportation Discussion	<p>Greg welcomed Cindy Colip, Public Works Department Director, and her team for a transportation funding overview.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission Statement: <i>Effectively promote and maintain a high level of economic welfare and quality of life in aurora through the planning, design, construction, inspection, review, approval, and maintenance of Aurora's transportation and drainage infrastructure.</i> <p>Sources of funding for transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are in general fund, while capital projects fund (via a transfer from the general fund) is where projects reside. • The fund is comprised of dollars from: material building use tax and equipment use tax and 4% of all other revenues get sent to capital revenue fund. This is roughly 80% of any given year's revenue. Other sources: capital impact fees, transportation impact fee (this is an upcoming conversation to discuss with council about restructuring these fees), and some small dollars from Adam's County. • Examples of <i>annual appropriations</i>: street asphalt overlay (some in house), street reconstruction, chip/slurry/crack seal, concrete repair (curbs/sidewalks), bridge maintenance, traffic signal maintain/component replacement, signal inspection and repair. 	

- Other programs that receive annual appropriations: misc. street improvements, traffic signal construction, Bicycle Aurora Master Plan implementation, TOD First/Last Mile Bike and ped improvements, traffic calming improvements
- One time projects: concept design, E470 loan repayment (Hogan Parkway), DRCOG transportation improvement program (these are generally with federal matches). The federal funds have totaled nearly \$40m since 2014.
- Example of other capital fund uses: building security projects, building repair fund, allocation of staff time to capital and facilities projects

Transportation Priorities (funded, partially funded, and unfunded priorities)

- **Funded Priorities**
 - Annual Appropriations: misc. streets: \$1.4m (this hasn't increased in 4 years). This is the only discretionary line item in the budget for street projects and these dollars are used as immediate needs come to staff attention. Can also be used to fill funding gaps when budgets fall short of final project costs (price escalation)
 - One-time funding allocations: grant matches (leveraged funding) such as DRCOG with state and federal grants (these typically require 20% minimum local match)
 - 8 current projects totaling \$80m (example I-70/Piccadilly project)
 - Transportation Priority Projects
 - 28 infill projects: \$30m total project costs with \$6.4m in remaining 5-year plan
 - Cost Share Partnerships: one example: *South Aurora Regional Improvement Authority* (a quasi-governmental entity formed to manage mill levy projects)
 - Current master plan
 - 9 projects
 - \$62m total costs
 - Initial Bond: December 2018 for \$10.4m

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partially Funded Priorities/Shortfalls <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Traffic infrastructure (traffic signal construction and neighborhood calming program). The current appropriation covers just over one traffic signal construction – not nearly sufficient to address the aging infrastructure, new standards/requirements, and new needs ○ Bridge Maintenance/Replacement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual appropriation is \$50k – used primary for grant leveraging ▪ Estimated Program Needs: \$19m immediate replacement needs with \$1.25m in reoccurring program budget needs to maintain and consistently monitor the 92 bridges in the city total ▪ Deferred streets maintenance \$18.5m annual deficit ▪ Total deferred maintenance need from 2008-2021 is likely closer to \$43m. This can be first traced back the to explosion of growth when lots of new roads were added to the city infrastructure. We’re starting to see this again with the increase in building (for instance Aurora Highlands, Adonia, etc.) These periods of growth were happening without major changes (increases) to the transportation budget. Additionally, the <i>pavement condition index</i> is skewed with the high number of new roads, giving an inflated picture of road health that doesn’t really reflect the true need of road maintenance in the city. ▪ Paving cycle in current years vs desired years <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arterial streets 29/15 • Collector streets 17/20 • Residential streets 61/25 • Unfunded Priorities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Capital Improvement Master Plan (CIMP)– started in 2019 and focused on 10-year projected needs: \$900m of unfunded transportation capital projects 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Since this initial plan, the dept has continued to prioritize projects and the condensed list is at \$500m over 31 projects. ○ Neighborhood Street Light Program (in response to frequent resident requests for improved lighting). However there are not consistent dollars allocated for this work. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Question: is the residential lighting issue more about crime and safety vs. public works? Response: it is a combination of both. There is a partnership with APD for lighting documented issue areas (with consistent crime) <p>Potential Future Funding (options being considered by city leaders)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIMP process continues to identify prioritization • Some dollars coming from the latest round of federal dollars • Evaluating annual funding • Trying to tell the story in the wider community and explaining the CIMP efforts <p>Questions from the floor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recent state and federal legislation changes – how will this impact local and will the City see dollars from it? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This is all still evolving – unclear yet, but the City is closely watching it ○ Often the dollars that do end up trickling down to the city level are highly restricted and have to be used for specified projects. • How can community members provide feedback and share ideas? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is a community engagement plan in the works to help message the needs (e.g. the CIMP list) and collect feedback to gauge support 	
5. Approval of April Minutes	Chair Westerberg entertained a motion to approve the April minutes as presented. Dave Rich requested an amendment on page 7 to reflect the joint chairing of the Departmental Review Subcommittee. Dave Rich is chairing the Fire component of the department review and Chesca Smotherman will be chairing the Police section.	Motion Carried Yes: 14 No: 0 Abstain: 2

	<p>Sunny Banka moved to approve the minutes as amended. Westerberg seconded the motion. The motion carried 14-0-2 (two abstentions from CABC members excused at the April meeting).</p>	
<p>6. Revenue and Budget Updates</p>	<p>Greg Hays presented the following updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March sales tax performance – 13% increase represents another strong month • While \$700K is from the marketplace facilitator fees, overall, one-time monies are actually down for March, so the <i>increase is more reflective of strong sales tax</i> (tech, furniture, building materials, liquor) • Still looks like we will outperform Leeds projections – right now, upwards of \$19m for 2022. <p>Questions from the floor for Greg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can this uptick be attributed to anything (e.g. “revenge spending”)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In general, maybe an increase in consumer confidence and people with money to spend. For instance, they have entertainment dollars that might normally be spent going to a show or the baseball game. Since these are still somewhat limited, people might be opting to purchase “things” instead of experiences. Also there may be an overlap with spending up-tick and latest round of stimulus checks showing up. • Will the marketplace facilitator dollars likely be a consistent source of revenue or is this more a one-time source of money? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Likely to be on-going, as every month it has far out-performed projections. Initial projections were \$700k for the year and in reality since this has come online, it’s been closer to \$700k per month. • Do marijuana dollars go into the general fund? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In the past, this has not been the case and these dollars have been used to fund specific council projects (rec centers, etc.). However it looks like this will become an on-going revenue stream so this may be revisited (does it become part of the overall general fund?) 	

7. Housekeeping	<p>Chair Westerberg asked for input from the CABC regarding upcoming speakers. There are plans to invite the Police Chief – should the Fire Chief also be invited as a speaker to help inform the overall department review efforts?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Might also be helpful to review the past subcommittee report that last conducted a department review for fire. • Question: where is Dispatch? From a budget standpoint, it is its own department (Public Safety Communications). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Can this department be included as well since some of the challenges historically have been around integration/collaboration between the three (dispatch, police, and fire) • Greg will coordinate guest speaker invitations for the June meeting. <p>A. Future 2021 Meeting Dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 1st • July 6th (Subcommittee set-aside time as needed - No official full CABC meeting) • July 27th and 28th (tentative) • August 3rd • September 7th • October 5th • November 9th • December 7th <p>B. Future to-do's: nothing further brought forward from the floor.</p>	
8. Meeting Adjourned	Chair Westerberg asked for any further questions or comments. George Peck moved to adjourn the meeting and Reno Carollo seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Hearing no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 8:29pm.	Yes: unanimous No: 0 Abstain: 0




May 4, 2021