

## Subcommittee Breakout Sessions - Minutes

### Subcommittee: Safe and Healthy Neighborhoods

**Details:** 4/24/2025, The Denver Foundation, 2:15pm-4:15pm

**City Facilitator:** Jackson Brockway, Department of Finance



### Members in attendance

- Monica Martinez
- Barb Archer
- Yoel Ghebremeskel
- Mike Somma
- Amanda Sawyer
- Serena Gonzales-Gutierrez (virtual)
- Nita Gonzalez

### City Staff in Attendance

- Zarah Levy (virtual)
- Megan Dodge
- Owen Brigner
- Jenny Olson
- Jackson Brockway
- Emily Marcus
- Aric Thompson (virtual)
- Jamison Brown
- Troy Morelli
- Emily Ochoa (virtual)
- Evan Dryer (virtual)
- Nicole Monroe

**Not in attendance:** Frankie Lawrence, Vernon Jones Jr., Steve Foster

Members of the public were in attendance.

### Agenda with Meeting Minutes

- I. [Welcome/Introductions](#)
  - II. [Follow Ups from 4/17 Session](#)
    - a. [Evaluation rubric \(equity evaluation review & Office of Social Equity & Innovation \(OSEI\) statement\)](#)
    - b. [Partial Funding](#)
- Jackson and Emily M. review rubric with overview and how it can be used
    - 1-5 rating on each of the evaluation criteria topics, with 5 being highest score possible: community needs and benefits, equity, economic impact, health & safety impacts, and project readiness/feasibility.
  - Jackson reviews OSEI mission and vision statements, equity strategies, and 2025 goals
    - Equity map will be sent out as a resource to the subcommittee
  - Partial Funding – reminder for subcommittee members to focus on project merit and not on cost estimate and partial funding math. Partial funding has been provided for tranche lists to help with project readiness aspect only

- Three main areas of project completion: programming, design, and construction.
  - Readiness ranking can be more formulaic with regards to project delivery cycle.
  - Example: Denver Animal Shelter has received programming and design support funding for 2025 and is anticipated to complete design in 2025: from a project readiness perspective, that means Denver Animal Shelter will not need funding for programming and design, so, theoretically, construction could begin in 2026. However, the partial funding it has will not fully fund design – they will need more.
  - Example: Safety Evidence Storage: Design is complete and now needing construction funding
- Sawyer asked for clarification on phasing options and how to consider projects with different potential phasing, especially if funding has already been allocated and how that plays into readiness
  - Phasing is a financial question, not a project merit question.
  - If the opportunity to phase a project makes it easier to get going, you can apply potential phasing into the ‘readiness’ criteria. The executive committee will focus on funding of projects
- Reminder that the main focus of the subcommittee is the merit of the project and to prioritize/tier based on project merit alone for the priorities of the community and projects

### III. Tranche A/B Project Discussion and Review with SMEs

- Discussed the process of community idea intake: read and reviewed all community ideas and eligible ideas turned into project scope, description, estimates, etc. These were then turned into project summaries and subcommittee tranche lists
- This subcommittee is also looking at some projects that are not traditionally safety but have neighborhood safety aspects, such as lighting
- Sawyer discussed how if a project already has partial funding that means the project is more likely to get done from a city perspective and wants to understand how to think about how projects will be tiered differently or prioritized based on that.
  - Nicole urged the subcommittee to think about the community impacted by projects and funding – if something already has funding associated with it, how will that impact the community apart from the funding
  - Further clarification about who actually will benefit from the projects – will there be limited community benefit to limited populations? Will it be widespread benefit?
- Zarah clarified that if projects or ideas were brought up at a specific community-meeting table, it may not be presented in that subcommittee – the projects will be in the tranche and subcommittee where they best fit, not where they were suggested

### Project Discussion

- Harvey Park Lighting
  - Overview: improve overall lighting in the park with scalability and phasing; currently conceptual idea so design/construction will need to happen first prior to construction, though this will all occur in the 6-yr bond timeframe
  - Discussion on this project being in Safe & Healthy Neighborhoods subcommittee vs. Parks subcommittee – project’s intent/purpose of lighting is safety benefits
  - Discussion on language in summary overview with regards to Harvey Park specifically versus “various parks” throughout Denver – the language is programmatic and starts out more broad prior to being specific (Harvey Park

- lighting); language potentially be applied to other lighting projects and to focus on Harvey Park for this project, not broader park lighting needs
  - Clarification on how the project can be applied to the evaluation criteria rubric
  - Nicole discusses secondary prevention efforts, such as with gun violence, gangs, bullying and how some acts of violence can be impacted based on lighting – such as where lighting is prioritized, there will be a positive impact to the community regarding safety and that where lighting is prioritized it helps mitigate crime, especially opportunistic crime
  - Cannot immediately propose this scope on a broader project of park lighting – need to focus on Harvey Park lighting specifically
  - Evaluation rubric criteria discussion:
    - Economic impact: 3-4; health/safety: 5; project readiness/feasibility based on timelines: 5
  - Initial tiering, subject to change: Tier 3: no votes, Tier 2: no votes, Tier 1: unanimous
- DFD19
  - Overview: HVAC, bathroom remodel for male/female, replace apparatus garage doors, modernize
  - DFD19 covers significant area of East Denver and Glendale – very much a community asset for residents due to the large surface area it covers
  - Mike mentions that DFD19 has both engine company (water on fires) and truck company (open buildings, extricate people) – not all departments have both and these cover even more area because it has both – the importance of fixing the garage doors and not allowing them to deteriorate or break
  - Question on staffing at DFD19 – 8 individuals 24/7 and 2 women at DFD19 with minimal requests for transfers due to facilities
  - Evaluation rubric criteria discussion:
    - Community needs and benefits 4-5 – significant impact on city, huge service area, fire trucks are always needed
    - Equity 4-5: not an equity neighborhood but an equitable aspect for female firefighters
    - Economic impact: 3 due to temporary construction jobs but fewer long-term impacts
    - Health/safety: 5
    - Project readiness: conceptual only but not new construction and retrofitting/rehab, 4-5
  - Initial tiering, subject to change: Tier 3: no votes, Tier 2: no votes, Tier 1: unanimous
- DPD4 Expansion
  - Overview: Provide new two-story station – old will be demolished once new is completed
  - Police stations have been in bonds previously, examples: Montbello, DPD6; DPD4 is the last of the stations to be renovated
  - Dodge explains DPD4 needs: DPD4 does not have a community resource room currently, and it is included in the renovation plans, there is limited space for detective bureaus, interview rooms, need for gender-neutral areas with changing gender demographic in police force and this project will be more reflective of the police department and community (locker rooms, restrooms, etc.).

- Newer facilities has thought for victims, especially with regards to interviews, inclusivity, privacy, and larger lobbies
  - Lot is already purchased for this project
  - Nicole talks about how DPD4 is not chosen as a host location for trainings due to negative feedback and lack of space
  - Evaluation rubric criteria discussion:
    - Community needs/benefits: 5
    - Equity discussion: 5
      - Victims do not have privacy, it is not a trauma informed space (ex: child custody exchanges are often completed in the public and small lobby)
      - Not a secure environment for transport of those under arrest or moving facilities
      - Geographic discussion and population served: D6 has historically had negative impacts
    - Economic impact: 3-4 – enhance city’s reputation to rebuild something new to be reflective of community and have community rooms for non-police, public business
    - Readiness: 2-3: lot is purchased, 6-year timeframe doable with project mapping
  - Initial tiering, subject to change: Tier 3: no votes, Tier 2: no votes, Tier 1: unanimous

#### Animal Shelter

- Overview: DDPHE project for renovation of animal shelter, dog kennel expansion, remodeled vet clinic, community room, cat housing, wildlife housing and evidence, crate cleaning area, and more
- Jenny clarifies that the partial funding attributed to this project is for a smaller version of the robust concept plan and scaling will impact the partial funding
  - Project scope has multiple phased options and can stepstone the project but it will only get partway there and leave things on the table
  - No parking is included
- Jenny discussed pre-to-post pandemic animal shelter stats, including that in 2023 there are 30% more animals in the shelter than pre-pandemic, owner surrenders increased over 90%, euthanasia increased 70% in 2023 compared to 2019, animal protection field service requests increased 33% in 2023 vs. 2019, intake rose 44% compared to 2019 – overall, significant upward trend on all fronts
- Discussion on animals versus human community needs and how animals have a huge impact on human wellbeing
  - Relinquishments, overcrowding, capacity at shelters
- Clarification on partial funding for this project with regards to design: when implementing long-term plans, sometimes design is funded to assist on the readiness aspect and to better understand potential phasing and the whole scope of the project
- Tiering and further discussion on hold until next meeting

#### IV. “First Pass” Tiering survey process and next steps

- Facilitator will create online survey using the rubric and each project from the tranches to send out to the subcommittee members.

- This will be used as a “first pass”, anonymous survey to see where subcommittee members are landing on each project and will be a starting point for scoring and thought processes
- Action item for subcommittee members: Fill out survey prior to next meeting

V. **Next Meeting: Thursday, May 1, 2:15pm – 4:15pm at the Webb Building, Room 4G4**

- Public asked about accessing the teams link to participate virtually, when minutes will be available on the website, if AI notetaking is available, will the rubric be made public, and when will the tranche lists be available online. DOF to follow-up.

**Action Items**

- Jackson to send out equity map and survey
- Subcommittee members complete survey prior to next meeting