



Meeting Minutes

Subcommittee	Safe & Healthy Neighborhoods
Facilitator	Jackson Brockway
Date	April 17, 2025
Time	2:15pm-4:15pm
Location	Denver Botanic Gardens, Freyer Newman, Classroom 1 (1085 York Street, Denver)

Attendees:

Frankie Lawrence	<input type="checkbox"/>
Nita Gonzales	<input type="checkbox"/>
Monica Martinez	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Barb Archer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Yoel Ghebremeskel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Steve Foster	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Vernon Jones Jr.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Murphy Robinson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mike Somma	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Council Member Amanda Sawyer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Council Member Serena Gonzales-Guitierrez	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

City/Council Staff:

Zarah Levy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Megan Dodge	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Owen Brigner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Jenni Olson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Emily Marcus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Aric Thompson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Rodrigo Acevedo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Armando Saldate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



	☒
Jamison Brown	☒
Troy Morelli	☒

Agenda Items:

a. Welcome/Introductions

- i. New member on Safe & Healthy Neighborhoods subcommittee Nita Gonzalez

b. DOS Agency presentation: Armando Saldate, Executive Director, Department of Safety

- i. Discussion on CPTED – Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design; certification with this in order to have environmental design to mitigate crime, break-ins, graffiti, etc. Environmental design can sometimes help as much as an officer, esp. in highly loitered areas, just making something less desirable
 - 1. This can be requested anywhere; examples include trim bushes to avoid break-ins and hiding, add in lighting (esp. in crime-ridden neighborhoods), fencing, preventative cameras
 - 2. A detailed written report will be provided
 - 3. Discussion on who pays for CPTED, ARPA investment, etc.
- ii. Monica asked about how bond dollars could potentially be used for CPTED or if cannot be; finance needs to answer this
- iii. Murphy asked about how to activate bond dollars in the community as well as getting “back to the basics” of public safety, such as infrastructure. The police admin building is outdated, the training facilities for all 3 major departments is outdated, and in order to recruit talent, the outdated facilities make an impact. He asked Armando to discuss the public safety complex with regards to the bond.
- iv. Armando discussed how the investment in buildings and individual academies hasn’t been prioritized, including police headquarters: the sixth floor needs refurbishing, cannot attract talented people to the city because of outdated facilities, a multi-use training facility and environment would increase potential candidates



- v. DSD chief discussed how sharing the Roslyn facility with DFD feels unsafe due to the location being primarily transportation based and safety of that
- vi. DPD Chief Dodge discussed that the limited recruitment numbers for police academy – especially with the current push for diversity – is being hindered by the facilities. She emphasized that a new training facility would allow for inclusivity from the ground-level up and that technology could be used as a force multiplier without adding officers
- vii. Evidence is currently in the old jail for long-term case storage and needs a more permanent long-term solution (plus it's at capacity)
- viii. DFD Morelli discussed that with the push for more inclusivity the firehouses have no privacy for females. There was also discussion around fire apparatuses and trucks with pushing current rigs to end of life. Discussion on current burn building not being functional for training
- ix. Councilmember Sawyer and DOF clarified that there is 2025 budget set aside for the new burn building and is fully funded
- x. The combined training facility on the 6-year CIP Plan for \$130m is an estimate from 2020

c. Review evaluation criteria

- i. Jackson walked through the binder, evaluation criteria, and what the subcommittees are being asked to do
 - 1. Currently Tranche A lists are in the binder and will have 2 more tranche lists with projects going forward – rolling process
 - 2. Resources available: Vibrant Bond website & 6-year CIP on website
- ii. Review of the community surveys, community meetings, and submitted ideas – how those are reviewed and moved forward into the process
- iii. Councilmember Gonzales-Gutierrez started discussion on how to hold fellow subcommittee members accountable to evaluation criteria and suggested having the chair and/or facilitator step in if values are being ignored or people are not being held accountable. Everyone agreed on this.



- iv. Evaluation criteria is consistent across the subcommittees and subcommittee members need to focus on the merit of projects in general, in a non-biased manner, and on an individual project level
 - v. Monica asked for discussion and clarification on 6-yr CIP and how the 6-yr CIP plan interacts with the Bond
 - 1. Jackson clarified that agency-specific plans for the 6-yr CIP came from majority community feedback – there is great alignment with 6-yr CIP and bond community responses
 - 2. Sawyer had additional clarification with regards to 6-yr CIP: if something is on the 6-yr CIP but not moving forward in the subcommittee what does that mean for the 6-yr CIP project?
 - a. Some projects are partially funded in the 6-yr CIP already
 - b. Request for projects on 6-yr CIP in subcommittee tranche list that are already funded to be called out
 - vi. Scorecard for subcommittee projects and scoring areas will generally be kept at high/medium/low for 1/2/3 tiering categories – tiering exercise not ranking against projects – focus on merit and not limited to how many projects can go in each category
- d. Ongoing cost estimate refinement**
- i. City employees provided quick summary on delivering capital projects: conceptual design/programming study; actual design (architectural design, up to 12 months); actual construction
 - 1. Example: Animal Shelter is currently in design, which is why there is partial funding for that portion. There is no funding for that project after that though
 - 2. Example: PAB could be completed in the 6-yr bond timeframe but only in a programming study high-level aspect
 - ii. Jenni discussed how cost estimates were created by having in-house estimates first then AECOM filled out project cost worksheets (PCWs for working with City and County of Denver, which includes contingencies); once AECOM's estimates are completed they are reviewed by the city and those estimated dollars are on the sheets the subcommittee reviews.



- iii. Projects are escalated based on the project start date; bond projects are assumed with a start date in the middle of the bond timeline

e. Discuss process for reviewing Tranche A Project Lists

- i. Discuss project “tiering approach”
- ii. Review Tranche A project lists
- iii. Discussion on tiering approach with no set number of projects that can be in each tier
- iv. Sawyer requested that there be discussion on why each project is important and what is important
- v. Further clarification that the evaluation throughout the process is on merit of projects alone – not based on ranking against projects
- vi. PAB discussion
 - 1. Chief Dodge explained the need for this from a public and accessibility perspective, especially with regards to the sixth floor because everyone who comes into the PAB needs to feel more welcome. Examples of those that come into PAB: victims to talk to detectives, children, fingerprinting, TCW registrations, victim advocacy unit, sex offender registry, evidence release and processing
 - 2. Barbara explained that there is a lot of public access to the 24-hour public building with a multitude of services that would be impacted by technological updates and resources
- vii. Steve questioned why this building being retrofitted and upgraded as opposed to a new land/new building
 - 1. Dodge responded by discussing how this current building is in a desirable location and plaza due to being close to the City and County Building, Crime Lab, courtrooms, etc. The location is pivotal.
 - 2. Jenni also explained that if there is not already land or a building identified, the project will not likely be completed in the 6-yr timeframe and be executed
- viii. Question with regards to site visits to see locations – this can be arranged; Chief Dodge also offered to take photos and videos to present to the subcommittee



- ix. Request for 1-5 scoring criteria for the projects in this subcommittee. This evaluation criteria matrix will be based on high/medium/low and will provide a grading matrix/rubric for scoring.
 1. Clarification that projects need to be evaluated on a project-by-project basis without all tranche projects provided yet (rolling basis). All future tranches and projects will have similar summary sheets
- x. If there is a project adjacent to a project in this subcommittee but is in another subcommittee or needs to be discussed elsewhere, how does that occur? Facilitators meet weekly to discuss meetings and these types of items.

Action Items:

1. City employees will provide a list out partially funded items in the Tranche lists going forward
2. City employees will create and provide a grading matrix/rubric for the subcommittee members to evaluate projects on

Additional Notes:

- Next Meeting: Thursday, April 24th, 2:15pm – 4:15pm