#### Town Of Nederland NEDERLAND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY NEDERLAND COMMUNITY CENTER 750 Hwy 72 Nederland, CO 80466 Multi-purpose Room

September 19, 2012 at 6:30 pm

### <u>AGENDA</u>

#### A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

#### C. PUBLIC COMMENT

#### D. EXECUTIVE SESSION

- 1. Personnel issues within the DDA
- 2. Negotiation matters related to Ned Peds project

#### E.. CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. Approval of August 14, 2012 Revised Regular Meeting Minutes
- 2. Approval of September 5, 2012 Regular Meeting Minutes
- 3. Approval of Treasurer's Regular Meeting report for September 15, 2012

#### E. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- 1. Executive Director report Paul Turnburke
- 2. DAT Ned Peds project report Pat Everson

#### F. ACTION ITEMS

1. Consideration to hire a Project Manager for the Nedpeds project for the design portion only.

2. Consideration to hire a Sustainability Consultant for the Nedpeds project Design Team – with an attachment of the OPR

3. Consideration of proposal(s) to hire a consultant to revamp the website.

#### G. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Attending the Downtown Colorado Inc. (DCI) Conference in Golden – Ron will share with the board what he learned about a new state statute allowing for a "Go Cup" District.

2. Attending the PROSAB Gateway Park Planning meeting – Donna Sue will give an update.

H. OTHER BUSINESS (NEW)

#### G. ADJOURNMENT

The NDDA Board encourages citizen participation. Public hearings and the "unscheduled citizens" agenda item allow an opportunity to address the Board. Discussion is limited to 3 minutes and please address your comments to the Board. Thank you for your cooperation.

The NDDA Board may take action on any item included on this agenda, regardless of the heading under which such item appears. Discussion items may become action items if the Board determines that deferring final action on an item to a subsequent meeting is unnecessary or unwarranted and that taking immediate action does not compromise any third-party's rights.

The NDDA Board of Trustees meeting packets and agendas are prepared by Friday before the Tuesday meetings and are available on the NDDA website, <u>www.neddda.org</u>. Copies of the agendas and meeting packet are available at no cost via email from <u>www.info@neddda.org</u>. The information is reviewed and studied by the Board members, eliminating lengthy discussions to gain basic understanding. Short discussion on agenda items does not reflect lack of thought or analysis.

#### Nederland Downtown Development District - Minutes to the Meeting August 14, 2012

- A. Call to Order meeting called to order at 6:59PM
- B. Members present: Ron Mitchell, Pat Everson, Katrina Harms, Donna Kirkpatrick, Mary Ann Rodak. Members absent: Annette Croughwell and Will Guercio Also present: Paul Turnburke, Eva Forberger
- C. Public Comment none
- D. Consent Agenda:
  - 1. meeting minutes approved as corrected on #4
  - 2. Treasurer's report. Discussion was held regarding how the warrants are written and when and then how they are approved. Eva brings them forward to us when they are not a budgeted item. Pat inquired as to how the contingency fund worked, and she explained it was our fund set aside for unexpected items to be covered with. She also said there is an invoice from Loris and Associates that will come forward at the next meeting. Eva also explained that the payment on the tractor for town resulted in a \$5K increase in our non TIF funds for the year, due to a calculation error. She explained how we get monthly accounting of funds for TIF. The loan from the town was structured and completed whereby we paid off the Mutual of Omaha bank loan that was set as a balloon payment note and was looming in the near future. All is now resolved and we will save some monies by borrowing from the Town of Nederland.
  - 3. Approval of Warrants Pat made the motion to accept and pay the warrants. All approved, and motion passed.
- E. Informational items

1. Ron Mitchell made a brief report on the DCI conference that he attended. He intends to write up a report in the future to share what he learned. Putting in simply terms however Ron said if you operate the DDA openly and honestly you should be able to do anything you want within the DDA statute.

2. Executive Director Report – Paul reported that the TOPO and boundary survey on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street would be done soon. They will mark everything with paint and will answer questions by the residents as they come up. They will also be doing the elevations as best as possible. A spot elevation will indicate those that are below street level. The RFP's for phase 2 are due on Friday at 4PM. Paul feels we may not have gotten a good response as we do not know where or who advertise the RFP. It should have gone out on the Epurchasing website but was apparently not done by the town. Paul said that CDOT was willing to give us an extension should we need one. He said the town advertised the way they knew best. Paul said he and Alisha reviewed 30-40 possible prospects and Paul created a list of 25-30 that direct invites were sent to.

3. Gift Certificate drawing was made and 3 winners selected. Paul will contact the winners as soon as possible.

4. DAT report – Pat gave her report. She said we received a memo from the mayor that we should not anticipate any more money from DRCOG for the design phase of the project. We currently will only have the original \$78K. She wants to send out a memo to the DAT that we must move forward with sustainability and go as far as we can with that money. We made an effort but did not meet the 8/15 deadline that was firm to have the engineering schematic of our project in process.

#### F. Action Items

1.Consideration of rescheduling of meeting dates - A brief discussion was held as to the possible dates we can reschedule our regular meetings to. It was decided to try for the first Wednesday of the month.

2. Consideration of Board member participation in the Comprehensive Plan Update – Is this something that the board members want to participate in? We could form small focus groups in the DDA district and meet with small groups of people and ask questions of them as to what they would want to see come out of the Town's Comp Plan update. Four board members expressed an interest in helping out in the process: Pat, Ron, Katrina and Donna. Mary Ann feels she has no time for this other than attending the once a month meeting.

Consideration of the Adopt a Planter/flower Task Force – Donna explained that she was following up on procedure to make the appointment formal for her to head up this Task Force. Pat made a motion to form a Adopt and planter/flower task force to be headed up by Donna Kirkpatrick and including Eva Forberger and other members of the board and community. Ron seconded and the motion passed unanimously.
Consideration of Communications Task Force responsibilities and strategies – and 5. Consideration of the Communications Task Force writing a column for the mtn. ear newspaper – these two were basically the same and discussed together. Per Katrina the Communications Task Force will create a strategy that lays out the framework for website, social media and the newspaper. It will provide to the public who they can connect with. The clerical staff will post the meeting minutes and project updates for the community to access for information.

Pat stated that Katrina has volunteered to be the board member in charge of this. She wants to get to the point where someone else can do these tasks. They will also write a once a month new column for the DDA. We do not know what this will mean for Jennifer who currently does the website posting, but this can be decided later. A motion was made for the board to approve the proposal of the Communications Task Force to create and implement a communications strategy on behalf of the board. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

5. September 5, 2012 will be our next meeting. Meeting adjourned at 8;20 PM

#### Town Of Nederland NEDERLAND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY NEDERLAND COMMUNITY CENTER 750 Hwy 72 Nederland, CO 80466 Multi-Purpose Room

September 5, 2012 at 7:00PM

#### **Regular Meeting Minutes**

#### A. CALL TO ORDER

#### **B. ROLL CALL**

Members Present: Pat Everson, Katrina Harms, Donna Kirkpatrick, Mary Ann Rodak Will Guercio arrived at 7:14 pm and Ron Mitchell arrived at 7:18 pm Absent: Eva Forberger Also present: Paul Turnburke, Executive Director

#### C. PUBLIC COMMENT – none.

#### D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approval of August 14, 2012 Regular Meeting Minutes Motion by Katrina and seconded by Mary Ann, the minutes were approved unanimously.

2. Revision of Minutes motioned at 8:50pm by Ron Mitchell – seconded by Pat Everson.

Roll taken and minutes approved with revisions – 5 votes for and 1 Mary Ann abstained due to a temporary absence.

#### **E. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

#### 1. Finance Task Report - Pat Everson

Pat briefly discussed points to her written report and added that she found out other information today to report. In her notes regarding designing the website – Eva Forberger suggested that the DDA may want to issue an RFP.

Addressing the DRCOG grant, Donna and Pat voiced concern that even though the IGA was approved by the BOT on 7/17/12, it was not signed and submitted to the proper

entities at CDOT until 9/4/12. Eva assured Pat on 9/5/12 that it was signed and sent by 9/4/12. Pat stated that there would be a 2-3 week lag time for CDOT approval and was concerned about acceptance of the IGA before proceeding with any work. There was a short discussion about the desire to be more proactive about checking on dates. There was consensus that clarification from Eva is needed. Discussion continued about the IGA with the town and the DDA. Pat inquired how we stand both financially and procedurally. Pat described the obstacles apparent in Phase 1 vs. Phase 2 of the sidewalk project. Mary Ann wanted to know how to deal with these last minute obstacles. Ron stated that he felt as though the DDA was doing the right thing with surveying. Regarding the IGA with the town, Paul stated he would get clarification from Alisha Reis, on the project manager's role, DDA's role, and the flow of money between both entities. Discussion was held about the Meeting Schedule for Budget Process and both Pat and Paul urged everyone to attend the 9/19/12 DDA Finance Task Force meeting as well as stressing the importance of the 10/3 DDA Workshop meeting to provide final input prior to the public hearing.

#### 2. Executive Director Report - Paul Turnburke

In addition to his written report, Paul updated the Board on the final invoice amounts for outside vendors – both for web and print items. He submitted the "Metro-Vision" document that specifies DRCOG regional goals that Nederland agreed to and also indicated that he was conferencing with consultants for the Gateway Park plans. Paul offered to meet with Board members outside of the regularly scheduled meetings.

#### 3. Ned Peds DAT Report - Pat Everson

Pat spoke to assure the Board that she couldn't ask for a better team and was very encouraged by the interview with Huitt-Zollars. She submitted a copy of their presentation in booklet form and a printout of their PowerPoint presentation. This company was selected unanimously by the selection committee. The selection committee advised a sustainability consultant be hired.

#### F. ACTION ITEMS

# 1. Consideration the hiring Sue Churches as Board Secretary, and approval of her job description

After introductions of each Board member were made, motion to approve hiring Sue was made by Pat, seconded by Katrina and approved unanimously. Job title was determined to be Secretary of the DDA Board. A motion to approve the secretarial job description with Pat's addition regarding archiving, was made by Pat and seconded by Katrina, and also approved unanimously.

**2.** Consideration of changing the date and time for our regular meetings. A motion to schedule the Nederland DDA regular meeting date to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday of every month at 6:30 pm in the Multi-Purpose room of the Nederland Community Center was made by Pat and seconded by Mary Ann and passed unanimously.

# 3. Consideration and authorization for investigating the leasing of office space

There was some debate as to whether to enter into a contract with the Cohen Law building that lies within the district or share the Senior's room adjacent to Paul's office in the Community Center. Donna wanted to move away from the Community Center, and Katrina wanted the Board to look at other options and not commit until the cost of the Senior space was determined. The first motion put forth by Pat and seconded by Donna Sue was to proceed with exploring renting space from Mark Cohen, with potential approval by the Board. After more discussion, Ron put forth another motion to work with Pat as a committee, authorized to look at options and proceed to seek a rental contract for office space within the district. Seconded by Pat, this revised motion passed unanimously.

# 4. Consideration of returning the money given to the Adopt-A-Planter program

Paul began the discussion with his understanding of the \$300 contribution by Michael McBurnie to the Adopt-A-Planter program. The Board members discussed whether to return the funds or to acknowledge them in some public manner. There was some concern expressed by Donna Sue over lack of communication and called for Paul to step down as Executive Director. It was her understanding that she had signed up to head the program next year. Ron stated that although many things have been somewhat neglected – his goal was to look ahead to solutions on how to handle donations next year. Both Pat and Mary Ann wanted to know what the expectation for next year's acceptance of funds would be due to the donor's tax deduction requirement. There was also another donation by an anonymous donor in the amount of \$100 – and Paul offered to find out who the second donor was. A motion was put forth by Ron that a letter of thanks and acknowledgement of receipt of funds be drafted by Paul with the offer to refund this year's donation or put the monies donated towards next year's program was seconded by Mary Ann. Another motion was put forth by Ron to personally deliver a letter of thanks to both Michael McBurnie and the \$100 Donor, acknowledging their donation and giving them the choice of a refund or waiting until next year with a program in place commitment by Donna Sue. This motion was seconded by Pat and a roll call vote was taken. All votes approved passage.

# 5. Consideration of obtaining a cell phone so the NDDA can have a telephone number

Pat initiated discussion regarding the need for a primary phone line for the Nederland DDA. Will Guerico advised that an 800# with a message service would meet the Boards needs and he offered to research the specifics of obtaining the 800# and message service by the next meeting of the DDA. (9/19) Pat put forth the motion, seconded by Mary Ann, and the motion passed unanimously.

#### **G. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

# 1. Discussion of hiring a Sustainability Consultant to advise the NDDA board on Sustainability portions of the projects and specifically the Ned Peds project.

Pat introduced this as a discussion item and that members of the Nederland Board of Trustees have asked the DDA to hire a sustainability consultant and to introduce an RFP. She asked the DDA Board for direction based on the information provided by the RFP prepared by Mayor Pro Tem Kevin Mueller. Pat remained unsure whether this consultant would be on call or available to work on other projects. Ron agreed with Pat that there were lots of variables, and wanted to stress the importance of an Executive Session to talk with each Board member providing a mechanism in the negotiations as how to allocate funds for this consultant. Pat wanted to clarify funding and Mary Ann and Will both felt that the town should provide half the cost of the consultant, and Katrina agreed with the added need for a scope of work with costs identified. The Board discussed that if the DDA handles the RFP, that perhaps the town might consider sharing the cost. After a bit more discussion, a motion by Ron included the need to turn this from a Discussion Item to an Action Item, contingent on 1/ finishing Exhibits A and B in the RFP, 2/ determining a scope of work and the associated costs, 3/ submitting an attachment for legal review by the town attorney, 4/ subject to approval by the Nederland Board of Trustees and 5/ with consideration of responses only if achievable within the budget. Seconded by Mary Ann, this revised motion passed unanimously.

#### H. OTHER BUSINESS (NEW)

#### 1. Web Items

Katrina had other business related to the DDA website. Both the domain name and hosting are due to expire the 20th of September. Katrina motioned to allow moving the platform for ease of editing, that she register the domain and hosting through Planet Mind (a local company) at a cost that will not exceed \$150, and that she submit a

proposal for acceptance of time reimbursement. This motion was seconded by Mary Ann, and Paul offered to locate the RFP submitted for the town's website. A roll call vote was taken and unanimous votes approved passage.

#### 2. Executive Session

Ron requested an Executive Session be held after the next regular meeting (9/19/12). He stated that the subjects of the meeting would include legal matters, contractor negotiations and personnel issues. Pat offered to send Sue a form regarding Executive Sessions.

#### G. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn was made by Mary Ann seconded by all and approved unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 8:59pm.



### **MEMORANDUM**

To:	NDDA Board
From:	Eva Forberger, Treasurer Town of Nederland
cc:	Alisha Reis, Town Administrator
Date:	September 15, 2012
Re:	Treasurer's Report

Year to date, the DDA has received 91% and 97% of general tax revenue and TIF revenue, respectively.

Approximately \$4k has been spent on NEDPEDs, \$2k for Flagstaff Surveying and \$2k for project management. A total of \$97k has been put aside for design services and project management for 2012. For the 2012 snow season, Public Works spent approximately \$2k on snow removal and sweeping. Additional funds may be needed, depending on snowfall for the remainder of the year. The total spent on flowers includes \$800 in maintenance from the Town and \$2,444 for Chris Smith who purchased and planted the flowers.

#### TOWN OF NEDERLAND DDA FINANCIAL REPORT

AUGUST 2012     ACTUALS     % OF     FORECAST     FORECAST     BUDGET     PRIOR YEAR     VS. PRIOR VEAR       BEGINNING FUND BALANCE     70,335     70,335     122,589     96,859     VAR     %       MON TIF FUNDING     70,335     122,589     96,859     VAR     %       TAXES     24,427     91%     2,296     26,723     26,723     27,516     (793)     -3%       * INTERGOVERNMENTAL     66,677     53%     59,990     126,667     -     8,000     118,667     14839       * LOAN PROCEEDS     117,000     100%     -     117,000     -     2,258     (1,758)     -78%       NTEREST     220     63%     130     350     -     714     (364)     -51%       TOTAL REVENUE     208,815     271,240     26,723     38,488     PERSONNEL     13,545     67%     6,715     20,260     7,630     19,528     732     4%       LEGAL FEES     6,044     76%     1,956     8,000     3,000     11,121		Y	EAR TO DAT	E			YEAR		
AUGUST 2012     ACTUALS     FORECAST     REMAINING     FORECAST     BUDGET     PRIOR YEAR     YEAR       BEGINNING FUND BALANCE     70,335     122,589     96,859     VAR     %       NON THE FUNDING     TAXES     24,427     91%     2,296     26,723     26,723     27,516     (793) -3%       * INTERGOVERNMENTAL     66,677     53%     59,990     126,667     -     8,000     118,667     14839       * LOAN PROCEEDS     117,000     100%     -     117,000     -     2,258     (1,758)     -78%       MISCELLANEOUS     491     98%     9     500     -     2,258     (1,354)     -51%       TOTAL REVENUE     208,815     271,240     26,723     38,488     -	Preliminary and Unaudited	2012			2012	2012	2011		
KON TIE FUNDING       TAXES     24,427     91%     2,296     26,723     26,723     27,516     (793)     -3%       * INTERGOVERNMENTAL     66,677     53%     59,990     126,667     -     8,000     118,667     14839       * LOAN PROCEEDS     117,000     100%     -     117,000     -     2,258     (1,758)     -78%       INTEREST     220     63%     130     350     -     714     (364)     -51%       TOTAL REVENUE     208,815     271,240     26,723     38,488     -       PERSONNEL     13,545     67%     6,715     20,260     7,630     19,528     732     4%       LEGAL FEES     6,044     76%     1,956     8,000     3,000     11,121     (3,121)     -28%       TREASURER'S FEE (TAXES)     1,859     93%     141     2,000     -     1,981     19     1%       * CAPITAL OUTLAYS     4,412     5%     92,900     97,312     66,612     30,700     46%	AUGUST 2012	ACTUALS			FORECAST	BUDGET	PRIOR YEAR		
TAXES   24,427   91%   2.296   26,723   26,723   27,516   (793)   -3%     * INTERGOVERMENTAL   66,677   53%   59,990   126,667   -   8,000   118,667   14839     * LOAN PROCEEDS   117,000   100%   -   117,000   -   2,258   (1,758)   78%     INTEREST   220   63%   130   350   -   714   (364)   51%     TOTAL REVENUE   208,815   Z71,240   26,723   38,488     PERSONNEL   13,545   67%   6,715   20,260   7,630   19,528   732   4%     LEGAL FEES   6,047   1,956   8,000   3,000   11,121   (3,121)   -28%     TREASURERS FEE (TAXES)   1,859   93%   141   2,000   -   1,981   19   1%     ACCOUNTING FEE   750   43%   1,000   1,750   3,178   (1,428)   45%     * CAPITAL OUTLAYS   4,412   5%   92,900   97,312   66,612   30,700   46%     * CAPITAL OUTLAYS   4,94	<b>BEGINNING FUND BALANCE</b>	70,335			70,335	122,589	96,859	VAR	%
* INTERGOVERNMENTAL   66,677   53%   59,990   126,667   -   8,000   118,667   14839     * LOAN PROCEEDS   117,000   100%   -   117,000   -   2,258   (1,758)   78%     MISCELLANEOUS   491   98%   9   500   -   2,258   (1,758)   78%     INTEREST   220   63%   130   350   -   714   (364)   -51%     TOTAL REVENUE   208,815   200   7,630   19,528   732   4%     LEGAL FEES   6,044   76%   6,715   20,260   7,630   19,528   732   4%     LEGAL FEES   6,044   76%   6,715   20,260   7,630   19,528   732   4%     COUNTING FEE   750   43%   1,000   1,750   3,178   (1,428)   45%     * CAPITAL OUTLAYS   4,412   5%   92,900   97,312   66,612   30,700   46%     PROSAB GRANT   0%   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,000   5,873   (1,873)   32%	NON TIF FUNDING	I							
* LOAN PROCEEDS   117,000   100%   -   117,000     MISCELLANEOUS   491   98%   9   500   -   2,258   (1,758)   -78%     INTEREST   220   63%   130   350   -   714   (364)   -51%     TOTAL REVENUE   208,815   220   63%   130   350   -   714   (364)   -51%     TOTAL REVENUE   208,815   67%   6,715   20,260   7,630   19,528   732   4%     LEGAL FEES   6,044   76%   1,956   8,000   3,000   11,121   (3,121)   -28%     TREASURER'S FEE (TAXES)   1,859   93%   141   2,000   -   1,981   19   1%     ACCOUNTING FEE   750   43%   1,000   1,750   3,178   (1,428)   45%     * CAPITAL OUTLAYS   4,412   5%   92,900   97,312   66,612   30,700   46%     PROSAB GRANT   0%   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,0373   25,733   1,739, 32%	TAXES	24,427	91%	2,296	26,723	26,723	27,516	(793)	-3%
MISCELLANEOUS INTEREST     491     98%     9     500     -     2,258     (1,758)     -78%       TOTAL REVENUE     208,815     271,240     26,723     38,488       PERSONNEL     13,545     67%     6,715     20,260     7,630     19,528     732     4%       LEGAL FEES     6,044     76%     1,956     8,000     3,000     11,121     (3,121)     -28%       TREASURER'S FEE (TAXES)     1,859     93%     141     2,000     -     1,981     19     1%       ACCOUNTING FEE     750     43%     1,000     1,750     3,178     (1,428)     -45%       * CAPITAL OUTLAYS     4,412     5%     9,2900     97,312     66,12     30,700     46%       PROSAB GRANT     0%     1,000     1,000     10,000     360     5,733     (1,873)     -32%       FLOWERS/PROJECTS     3,397     94%     2.29     3,625     4,441     (816)     -18%       OTHER     649     26%     1,851     2,500 <td>* INTERGOVERNMENTAL</td> <td>66,677</td> <td>53%</td> <td>59,990</td> <td>126,667</td> <td>-</td> <td>8,000</td> <td>118,667</td> <td>1483%</td>	* INTERGOVERNMENTAL	66,677	53%	59,990	126,667	-	8,000	118,667	1483%
INTEREST     220     63%     130     350     -     714     (364)     -51%       TOTAL REVENUE     208,815     271,240     26,723     38,488       PERSONNEL     13,545     67%     6,715     20,260     7,630     19,528     732     4%       LEGAL FEES     6,044     76%     1,956     8,000     3,000     11,121     (3,121)     -28%       TREASURERS FEE (TAXES)     1,859     93%     141     2,000     -     1,981     19     1%       ACCOUNTING FEE     750     43%     1,000     1,750     3,178     (1,428)     -45%       * CAPITAL OUTLAYS     4,412     5%     92,900     97,312     66,612     30,700     46%       PROSAB GRANT     0%     1,000     1,000     1,000     1,000     1,000     5,873     (1,873)     -32%       FLOWERS/PROJECTS     3,397     94%     229     3,625     4,441     (816)     -18%       OTHER     649     26%     1,851     2	* LOAN PROCEEDS	117,000	100%	-	117,000				
TOTAL REVENUE     208,815     271,240     26,723     38,488       PERSONNEL     13,545     67%     6,715     20,260     7,630     19,528     732     4%       LEGAL FEES     6,044     76%     1,956     8,000     3,000     11,121     (3,121)     -28%       TREASURER'S FEE (TAXES)     1,859     93%     141     2,000     -     1,981     19     1%       ACCOUNTING FEE     750     43%     1,000     1,750     3,178     (1,428)     -45%       * CAPITAL OUTLAYS     4,412     5%     92,900     97,312     66,612     30,700     46%       PROSAB GRANT     0%     1,000     1,000     1,000     1,000     5,873     (1,873)     -32%       FLOWERSPROJECTS     3,397     94%     2.29     3,625     4,441     (816)     -18%       OTHER     649     26%     1,851     2,500     525     8,293     (5,793)     -70%       TOTAL EXPENDITURES     32,613     140,447     11,155	MISCELLANEOUS	491	98%	9	500	-	2,258	(1,758)	-78%
PERSONNEL   13,545   67%   6,715   20,260   7,630   19,528   732   4%     LEGAL FEES   6,044   76%   1,956   8,000   3,000   11,121   (3,121)   -28%     TREASURERS FEE (TAXES)   1,859   93%   141   2,000   -   1,981   19   1%     ACCOUNTING FEE   750   43%   1,000   1,750   3,178   (1,428)   -45%     * CAPITAL OUTLAYS   4,412   5%   92,900   97,312   66,612   30,700   46%     PROSAB GRANT   0%   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,873   -32%     FLOWERS/PROJECTS   3,397   94%   2,29   3,625   4,441   (816)   -18%     OTHER   649   26%   1,851   2,500   525   8,293   (5,793)   -70%     TIF FUNDING   T   11,155   121,026   140,447   11,155   121,026   47,400   48,399   124,083   256%     * DEBT SERVICE   118,870   69%   53,613   172,482   47,400   48,	INTEREST	220	63%	130	350	-	714	(364)	-51%
LEGAL FEES   6,044   76%   1,956   8,000   3,000   11,121   (3,121)   -28%     TREASURER'S FEE (TAXES)   1,859   93%   141   2,000   -   1,981   19   1%     ACCOUNTING FEE   750   43%   1,000   1,750   3,178   (1,428)   45%     * CAPITAL OUTLAYS   4,412   5%   92,900   97,312   66,612   30,700   46%     PROSAB GRANT   0%   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,873   -32%     FLOWERS/PROJECTS   3,397   94%   229   3,625   4,441   (816)   -18%     OTHER   649   26%   1,851   2,500   525   8,293   (5,793)   -70%     TOTAL EXPENDITURES   32,613   140,447   11,155   121,026   101,929   104,413   (2,484)   -2%     * DEBT SERVICE   118,870   69%   53,613   172,482   47,400   48,399   124,083   256%     ENDING FUND BALANCE   226,324   130,575   192,686   70,335   124,083	TOTAL REVENUE	208,815			271,240	26,723	38,488		
LEGAL FEES   6,044   76%   1,956   8,000   3,000   11,121   (3,121)   -28%     TREASURER'S FEE (TAXES)   1,859   93%   141   2,000   -   1,981   19   1%     ACCOUNTING FEE   750   43%   1,000   1,750   3,178   (1,428)   45%     * CAPITAL OUTLAYS   4,412   5%   92,900   97,312   66,612   30,700   46%     PROSAB GRANT   0%   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,873)   -32%     FLOWERS/PROJECTS   3,397   94%   229   3,625   4,441   (816)   -18%     OTHER   649   26%   1,851   2,500   525   8,293   (5,793)   -70%     TOTAL EXPENDITURES   32,613   I40,447   11,155   121,026   I   I   -2%     * DEBT SERVICE   98,657   97%   3,272   101,929   101,413   (2,484)   -2%     * DEBT SERVICE   118,870   69%   53,613   172,482   47,400   48,399   124,083   256%									
TREASURER'S FEE (TAXES)   1,859   93%   141   2,000   -   1,981   19   1%     ACCOUNTING FEE   750   43%   1,000   1,750   3,178   (1,428)   -45%     * CAPITAL OUTLAYS   4,412   5%   92,900   97,312   66,612   30,700   46%     PROSAB GRANT   0%   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,873   -3,2%   1,873   -32%   1,873   -32%   1,873   -32%   -	PERSONNEL	13,545	67%	6,715	20,260	7,630	19,528	732	4%
ACCOUNTING FEE   750   43%   1,000   1,750   3,178   (1,428) -45%     * CAPITAL OUTLAYS   4,412   5%   92,900   97,312   66,612   30,700   46%     PROSAB GRANT   0%   1,000   <	LEGAL FEES	6,044	76%	1,956	8,000	3,000	11,121	(3,121)	-28%
* CAPITAL OUTLAYS   4,412   5%   92,900   97,312   66,612   30,700   46%     PROSAB GRANT   0%   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,000   1,000   5,873   (1,873)   -32%     SIDEWALK MAINTENACE   1,958   49%   2,042   4,000   5,873   (1,873)   -32%     FLOWERS/PROJECTS   3,397   94%   229   3,625   4,441   (816)   -18%     OTHER   649   26%   1,851   2,500   525   8,293   (5,793)   -70%     TOTAL EXPENDITURES   32,613   I   140,447   11,155   121,026   IIII   IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	TREASURER'S FEE (TAXES)	1,859	93%	141	2,000	-	1,981	19	1%
PROSAB GRANT   0%   1,000   1,000     SIDEWALK MAINTENACE   1,958   49%   2,042   4,000   5,873   (1,873)   -32%     FLOWERS/PROJECTS   3,397   94%   229   3,625   4,441   (816)   -18%     OTHER   649   26%   1,851   2,500   525   8,293   (5,793)   -70%     TOTAL EXPENDITURES   32,613   I140,447   11,155   121,026   IIII   IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	ACCOUNTING FEE	750	43%	1,000	1,750		3,178	(1,428)	-45%
SIDEWALK MAINTENACE   1,958   49%   2,042   4,000   5,873   (1,873)   -32%     FLOWERS/PROJECTS   3,397   94%   229   3,625   4,441   (816)   -18%     OTHER   649   26%   1,851   2,500   525   8,293   (5,793)   -70%     TOTAL EXPENDITURES   32,613	* CAPITAL OUTLAYS	4,412	5%	92,900	97,312		66,612	30,700	46%
FLOWERS/PROJECTS   3,397   94%   229   3,625   4,441   (816) -18%     OTHER   649   26%   1,851   2,500   525   8,293   (5,793) -70%     TOTAL EXPENDITURES   32,613   I40,447   11,155   121,026   Image: constant of the second seco	PROSAB GRANT		0%	1,000	1,000				
OTHER   649   26%   1,851   2,500   525   8,293   (5,793)   -70%     TOTAL EXPENDITURES   32,613   Image: colored color	SIDEWALK MAINTENACE	1,958	49%	2,042	4,000		5,873	(1,873)	-32%
TOTAL EXPENDITURES   32,613   140,447   11,155   121,026     TIF FUNDING   98,657   97%   3,272   101,929   101,929   104,413   (2,484)   -2%     * DEBT SERVICE   118,870   69%   53,613   172,482   47,400   48,399   124,083   256%     ENDING FUND BALANCE   226,324   130,575   192,686   70,335	FLOWERS/PROJECTS	3,397	94%	229	3,625		4,441	(816)	-18%
TIF FUNDING   98,657   97%   3,272   101,929   104,413   (2,484)   -2%     * DEBT SERVICE   118,870   69%   53,613   172,482   47,400   48,399   124,083   256%     ENDING FUND BALANCE   226,324   53,613   130,575   192,686   70,335	OTHER	649	26%	1,851	2,500	525	8,293	(5,793)	-70%
TIF REVENUE   98,657   97%   3,272   101,929   101,929   104,413   (2,484)   -2%     * DEBT SERVICE   118,870   69%   53,613   172,482   47,400   48,399   124,083   256%     ENDING FUND BALANCE   226,324   Image: Mail Control of the second seco	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	32,613			140,447	11,155	121,026		
* DEBT SERVICE   118,870   69%   53,613   172,482   47,400   48,399   124,083   256%     ENDING FUND BALANCE   226,324   130,575   192,686   70,335	TIF FUNDING								
ENDING FUND BALANCE     226,324     130,575     192,686     70,335	TIF REVENUE	98,657	97%	3,272	101,929	101,929	104,413	(2,484)	-2%
	* DEBT SERVICE	118,870	69%	53,613	172,482	47,400	48,399	124,083	256%
	ENDING FUND BALANCE	226,324			130,575	192,686	70,335		
NON TIF FUNDS BALANCE 56,216 10,807 (51,750) (119,986)	NON TIF FUNDS BALANCE	56,216			10,807	(51,750)	(119,986)		
TIF FUNDS REMAINING     170,108     119,768     244,436     190,321	TIF FUNDS REMAINING	170,108			119,768	244,436	190,321		

\* See Details below

#### TOWN OF NEDERLAND DDA FINANCIAL REPORT

	YEAR TO DATE		FULL YEAR			
	2012		2012	2012	2011	
<u>AUGUST 2012</u>	ACTUALS		FORECAST			
<u>Capital Outlays</u> NEDPEDs Sidewalks Phase 1 <b>Total</b>	4,100 312 <b>4,412</b>		97,000 312 <b>97,312</b>			
<u>Loan Proceeds</u> NEDPEDs Sidewalks Ph 1/Sidewalk Maint/Flowers	37,000 80,000		37,000 80,000			
Total	117,000		117,000			
<u>Intergovernmental</u> CDOT CDOT Phase 1 <b>Total</b>	66,667 <b>66,667</b>		60,000 66,667 <b>126,667</b>			
<u>Debt Service</u> Mutual of Omaha Loans Tractor Payments Sidewalk Phase 1 Old Costs NedPeds Refinanced Loan	22,386 3,265 80,223 7,463 5,533		22,386 4,897 80,224 37,308 27,667			
Total	<b>118,870</b>		172,482			

#### TOWN OF NEDERLAND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

#### WARRANTS FOR SEPTEMBER 19 2012

Date	Number VENDOR	AM	OUNT	DESCRIPTION
10-Sep	26621 Flagstaff Surveying	\$	2,100.00	DDA: Survey work related to NEDPEDS
10-Sep	26627 Mountain Design	\$	7.98	DDA printing
10-Sep	26628 The Mountain Ear	\$	24.40	DDA advertising
10-Sep	26629 Jennifer Murphy	\$	100.00	DDA website
15-Sep	1221 Town of Nederland	\$	1,000.00	DDA PROSAB Matching grant for Parks & Rec Master Plan
	Total Non Payroll Warrants	\$	3,232.38	

#### fNEDERLAND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY DIRECTORS' REPORT September 19, 2012

#### 1. Time Reporting

The following is a breakout of my time related to the NED PED project and basic administrative tasks. Since August 31, my time breakout is as follows (as of September 15):

NED PED time	12.5 hrs (33%)
Administrative time	24.5 hrs (66%)
Total time	37.0 hrs (100%)

2. Some of the tasks I worked on were:

secured assistance from EPA for biomimicry workshop and technical assistance for Ned Ped project revised the OPR (Owner's Project Requirements) for NedPed project continued training Sue in administrative tasks coordinated with CDOT rep re: NedPed

Sue is continuing to get up to speed with administrative tasks. Her attention to detail and quick response time make it a pleasure to work with her. As anticipated, there is a learning curve associated with this job, but she is learning very quickly. She has spent 34.5 hours on the job as of 9/13.

### Nedpeds Design Advisory Team September 19, 2012

The Negotiating committee for the Design Advisory Team met with Huitt-Zullars, Inc on Monday September 10, 2012. We advised them of how we wanted to have the project quoted.

The first part would be the scope of work as identified in the DRCOG grant including storm water management. The second part would be an identification of various tasks as specified by the committee. These included identifying the various spur routes by name and purpose.

Huitt-Zullars, Inc indicated that they would have their quote back to us by Thursday Sept 13, 2012 at the latest. It was the hope of the negotiating team that we would be able to meet on Friday Sept 14, 2012 to review the proposal. However, one member, Ron Mitchell would not be able to attend due to a conflict with the DCI convention.

Our goal as a negotiating team was to get a proposal ready for a special meeting of the NDDA board on Monday 9/17. It has also been placed on the BoT Agenda for Tuesday 9/18. One possibility, if it is not ready by Monday, would be for BoT to approve subject review and consent of the NDDA board at our regular meeting of 9/19/2012.

At this writing, the special NDDA meeting has been scheduled due to the public notice requirements, but may have to be cancelled.

Also at this writing, we do not know the amount of the quote, which can go before the Finance Task Force at 5:00 on Wednesday and brought to the NDDA board on 9/19.

#### AGENDA INFORMATION MEMORANDUM NEDERLAND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY MEETING DATE: September 19, 2012 INITIATED BY: DAT/ Finance - Pat Everson

INFORMATION: ACTION: x OR DISCUSSION:

<u>AGENDA ITEM:</u> Consideration to hire a Project Manager for the Nedpeds project for the design portion only.

<u>SUMMARY:</u> In discussion with the Town Administrator, she has asked that we hire a professional project manager for the design portion of the Nedpeds project.. With the amount of work that is generated at this time for the construction of the new Waste Water Treatment Plant, and the agreement that she made with the Board of Trustees at the May 1, 2012, advising them that due to the timing of the Nedpeds project, the Town would have to hire a project manager to oversee the design process, she is asking that we hire a manager at this time.

The Design Advisory Team will work with the Town to prepare the proper RFP and will co-ordinate the work with Town Staff to release and interview the applicants. The Mayor Pro-Temp and the Selection committee for the Design Firm have been asked and agreed to work together to identify the scope of work for the new position.

It is felt by the Town that because of the level of expertise required for this project, in particular sustainability, we will derive the most benefit by hiring a project manager with some background in sustainability.

Another hope would be, that we would be able to find someone with both Sustainability and project management background to combine the positions.

At this time, the Town is asking that we approve a Project Manager for Nedpeds, with the work of finding that person or firm the responsibility of the DAT.

<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>: Agree to move forward with the RFQ to obtain a Project Manager for the Nedpeds Project.

<u>FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>: Our Treasurer has estimated that a Project Manger would be in the neighborhood of at least \$25/\$35 per hour. We should consider an Independent Contract for this position based on an hourly rate. The person would set his or her own hours to complete the Design of the Project. They would be required to attend meetings and oversee the CDOT and Town requirements for the project.

Funding for this request would come from an additional loan request against our TIF Funding and must be approved by the BoT.

We can use whatever remains of the Project Co-ordinator budget to be applied for the new Project manager, the remaining amount would be somewhere around \$4000, depending on when we hired the new project manager.

These figures will be finalized when the Finance Task Force, DAT and our Treasurer complete a new design budget based on the figures quoted by Huitt-Zollars, Inc.

#### AGENDA INFORMATION MEMORANDUM NEDERLAND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY MEETING DATE: September 19, 2012 INITIATED BY: DAT/ Finance - Pat Everson

INFORMATION: ACTION: x OR DISCUSSION:

<u>AGENDA ITEM:</u> Consideration to hire a Sustainability Consultant for the Nedpeds project Design Team.

<u>SUMMARY:</u> It has been agreed that the Town would be issuing the RFQ (presented at our last meeting). Only one Exhibit was contemplated by Kevin, the Owners Project Requirements. This would be under the direction and control of Design Advisory Team and lead by Mayor Pro-Temp Kevin Mueller.

This places responsibility in one location. The entity responsible for acquiring the design must be responsible for utilizing the recommendations of the sustainability coordinator (where applicable) and must also be responsible for assuring that the consultants were utilized to their maximum potential. This is done by bringing together a synergistic design team (under separate contracts to the owner) that addresses the community's concerns by providing an integrated design that satisfies the OPR. Having one "owner" makes this easier.

ATTACHMENTS: Owner's Project Requirements

<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>: Agree to move forward with the RFQ to obtain assistance with Sustainability for the project

<u>FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>: A tentative budget of \$12,000 - \$18,000 with a cap of no more than \$20,000. This amount would be put into our budget for the Nedpeds project and additional funding could be obtained by requesting an additional loan from our TIF Funding for Design for the project.



## TOWN OF NEDERLAND OWNER'S PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

### Nederland Pedestrian Enhancement Design (NedPeds) and Nederland Pedestrian Transportation and Storm Water Management Improvement Project

Nederland, Colorado

September 7, 2012

Location:

Nederland, Colorado

#### Construction:

The project is to be a 'Design-Bid-Build' construction process.

#### LEED Goals:

Meet the basic tenets of LEED per Town Resolution 2004-06 (willing to accept score of Three Stars of The Sustainable Sites Initiative)

#### Introduction:

The goal of the Owner's Project Requirements (OPR) is to understand the project goals for the Owner as it relates to sustainable, high performance design. The OPR also helps influence design decisions in the design team by conveying the desires and interests of the Owner. This is achieved through an outline of specific questions and general questions about community needs and sustainability goals and practices.

This document should be completed in the Pre-Design Phase of a project. After completion, the document should be distributed throughout the design team to increase understanding of the Owner's goals and interests.

The OPR should be updated to include any changes to the Owner's project goals at the end of design and construction.

#### **Project Description:**

# Need Statement created June 2012 by the Design Advisory Team of the Nederland Downtown Development Authority:

The Town of Nederland has come to recognize that healthy ecosystems provide essential services that sustain life and therefore understands the importance of placing the preservation, protection or enhancement of ecosystem services at the top of the community's priority list.

Additionally, the Town of Nederland recognizes the impact land development and management practices can have on ecosystem services.

Following is a list of ecosystem services that can be preserved, protected or enhanced through the use of sustainable land development and management practices.

- 1. Air and water cleansing:
  - Removing and reducing pollutants in air and water.
  - Habitat functions
  - Providing refuge and reproduction habitat to plants and animals, thereby contributing to conservation of biological and genetic diversity and evolutionary process
- 2. Water supply and regulation:
  - Storing and providing water within watersheds and aquifers
  - Waste decomposition and treatment
  - Breaking down wastes and recycling nutrients
- 3. Erosion and sediment control:
  - Retaining soil within an ecosystem, preventing damage from erosion and siltation
- 4. Human health and well-being benefits:
  - Enhancing physical, mental and social well-being as a result of interaction with nature
- 5. Hazard mitigation:
  - Reducing vulnerability to damage from flooding, storm surge, wildfire and drought
  - Food and renewable non-food products
  - Producing food, fuel, energy, medicine or other products for human use
- 6. Pollination:
  - Providing pollinator species for reproduction of crops and other plants
- 7. Cultural benefits:
  - Enhancing cultural, educational, aesthetics and spiritual experiences as a result of interaction with nature

The importance of ecosystem services were not considered in traditional land use development and management practices within the Town of Nederland. This has resulted in a loss of ecosystem functionality including stormwater management, erosion and sedimentation control.

Additionally, the Town has also come to recognize the ecological benefits of increasing the use of non-motorized transportation in Town and throughout our region.

The Town of Nederland has committed to becoming a sustainable community and has committed to move forward in a sustainable manner.

Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations or other communities from meeting their needs.

#### Background

A need for safe pedestrian/biking trails was established by PROSAB and SAB that would allow the inhabitants to safely and easily walk/bike between from the East to the west end of town.

The Central and South end of Town have been connected by a sidewalk built in 2009. The East to West connectivity is hampered by lack of defined non-motorized paths and increasing traffic due to development.

Several storms last summer also showed that since recent development on the North Beaver Creek meadow there had been a dramatic increase in the velocity of the water in North Beaver Creek causing damage to property further downstream. The lower portion of 2nd Street to the East is dirt while the upper section to the West that contains the Library is paved. The impact of impervious surfaces on watersheds is well documented and the Town of Nederland is a living example of these negative impacts.

Further development projects on 2nd Street have been unable to obtain accurate elevations for connecting sidewalks and handicap ramps, making some of them unusable. Open drainage ditches on each side of the street make crossing the street impractical for some residences and walking down the street is equally impractical for some residences due to many large pot holes that reappear after each large rain event. Children and young people going to the Family and Teen Center from other areas of Town must use the center of the street for walking due to large drainage ditches on either side of the road, forcing them to walk in the middle of the street with and between cars. The need for safe pedestrian and bicycling paths is becoming more acute as some of the vacant land in the area is developed bring more traffic and more parked cars.

#### The Need for Connectivity:

Using 2nd Street to connect the Post Office to library allows people living on second street non-motorized access to both locations safely. Many children and families live on 2nd Street and the street has become hazardous with increased vehicle traffic from the mixed use and commercial sections, as well as from the deteriorating conditions of the road surface.

The Nederland Board of Trustees adopted Sustainability Resolution 2011-21 which helps direct community projects. The deteriorating conditions of the road are unsustainable for the future due to erosion, instability, and continued maintenance.

In promoting a healthy community, Nederland strives to encourage alternative modes of transportation. The need for this is to encourage a healthier lifestyle decreasing obesity which is a problem nationwide. Colorado's obesity rate is the lowest in the country for adults, but the obesity in children is rising rapidly from 3rd in the country to 23rd in 2011. This is due in

part to a decrease in physical activity and more passive indoor activities. In order to lower this rate further, healthy cities have adopted multi-model forms of transportation. The proposed east/west pedestrian/biking path will fulfill this purpose.

The need for controlling storm water in the mountains is greater than in lower elevations due to the severity of the storms and the spring runoff. The water from even higher elevations needs to be safely directed to collection points for use by cities in other parts of the state. Debris and hazardous materials need to be filtered along the run off corridors to ensure clean and healthy drinking water downstream.

This project will address two major issues for the Nederland community – A walkable community, and a reduction in flooding from storm water runoff. Managing storm water and transportation are inherently tied through the civil engineering process.

Improvements to the community's non-motorized transportation system that also address storm water management needs.

This project will address two major issues for the Nederland community in it's quest to becoming sustainable.

#### 1. Improved non-motorized circulation:

Reducing our dependence on traditional non-renewable forms of transportation is a small but important step in becoming a sustainable community. Developing a non-motorized circulation system that allow community members to walk or bike to local destinations and to region transportation portals results in cleaner air, healthier community members and a greater sense of community.

In order to improve non-motorized transportation, we must first understand how well our existing non-motorized transportation system functions, then determine where and how improvements should be made in order to be successful.

# 2. Improved watershed functionality through focused improvements in storm water management systems:

The transportation goals create the need for dry areas, and consequently, storm water management.

Developing and maintaining a high functioning storm water management system allows for safe transportation, and protects private property from damage, but also helps to retain and restore the watersheds natural ecosystem functionality. Preserving, protecting, enhancing and learning from healthy ecosystems are an essential part of becoming a sustainable community.

In order to effectively address storm water in our developed areas, the Town would like to understand how the water shed reacts naturally to storm water, then develop solutions for managing storm water that work with the natural systems, as opposed to the traditional methods of working against the natural systems. This may in turn, drive creative solutions to the non-motorized transportation system.

Therefore, tasks related to the inherent synergies of addressing non-motorized transportation and storm water management are:

- Development of a Need Statement regarding non-motorized transportation and storm water management, including an explanation of the inherent synergies benefited by the chosen pathway route, with respect to existing traffic issues, and existing storm water management issues along the same corridor.
- Participation in EPA-sponsored Biomimicry workshop to determine focus of design objectives.
- Assessment of existing conditions regarding non-motorized transportation and storm water management.
- Voluntary compliance with EPA Municipal Separate Storm Sewer (MS 4) Standards.
- Development of measurable parameters that help our community determine functionality of our non-motorized transportation and storm water management systems.
- Development of design documents that result in improved non-motorized transportation and storm water management.

#### Funding Related Requirements:

The Town currently has funding available through the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) that requires the following requirements which were listed in the original application for Phase II Sidewalks, submitted in Oct, 2010 by NDDA Executive Director Paul Turnburke;

- 1. The project will provide an 8 ft multi-use path for use by pedestrians and bicycles from East Street to Jackson Street connecting the Post Office with the Nederland Public Library and the RTD Park n Ride.
- 2. The path will connect to existing sidewalks and grade separation of North Beaver Creek.
- 3. The project will also include 20 bicycle racks (10 will be covered parking) and improved bus stops.
- 4. The bus stops will be improved by adding paving (currently the bus stops are dirt areas) and by providing a covered area at one stop.
- 5. The project will also include curb and gutter, curb ramps and crosswalk markings.

The Town intends to utilize this funding to focus on areas that offer the greatest potential for improvement to our non-motorized transportation system while at the same time addressing issues in our storm water management system.

Community Related Requirements:

- Coordination of several open community workshops geared toward understanding/documenting 'needs' vs. 'wants' regarding non-motorized transportation and storm water management. This task should be designed to encourage/improve our community's social interactions.
- Protection of Town's rural and rustic character
- Protection of the environment through improved habitat and ecosystem functionality
- Utilization of local resources and labor while identifying opportunities for development of localized economy
- Identification of opportunities for this project to further improve our communities social interactions
- Incorporated educational opportunities throughout the project
  - Critical assessment of each decision for opportunities to achieve the following:
  - Reduce and eventually eliminate our dependence on fossil fuels and heavy metals
  - Reduce and eventually eliminate our dependence on man-made chemicals that persist in nature.
  - Reduce and eventually eliminate the destruction of nature.

#### Project Schedule and Budget (Owner):

The expected completion of this project is \_\_\_\_\_ of 20\_\_\_\_.

The total construction budget for the project is (\$)\_\_\_\_\_.

Future expansion goals:

Flexibility needs:

Schedule of operation:

Sustainability Goals and Objectives (Design Team):

Top 5 goals for sustainability and energy efficiency (energy, water, materials, etc.):

Energy goals:	
Water goals:	
Material goals:	
Other:	

Other:

#### Green Technologies and Systems (Design Team):

Top 5 green system or technologies that you want to consider for this project:

1.	Incorporated Biomimicry Principles
2.	
3	

#### Other Requirements (Owner):

Community requirements: Reduce environmental impact through material selection and construction waste recycling

Aesthetic requirements:
Security requirements:
Accessibility requirements:
Communication requirements:
Constructability requirements:
Health and hygiene requirements:
Capacity requirements:

Efficiency and Sustainability Goals and Practices:

Warranty Requirements:

Measure of Success in terms of Sustainability (Owner):

1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

#### AGENDA INFORMATION MEMORANDUM NEDERLAND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY MEETING DATE: September 14, 2012

#### **INITIATED BY: Paul Turnburke**

#### INFORMATION: ACTION: X OR DISCUSSION:

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>: Consideration of proposal(s) to hire a consultant to revamp the website.

<u>SUMMARY</u>: At our meeting on July 10, the NDDA board approved the creation of a Communications Task Force headed by Katrina Harms. On August 14, the NDDA board approved the Communications Task Force proposal to create and implement a communications strategy on behalf of the board.

At our last meeting (9/5) the board approved moving the website hosting to Planet Mind as it was due to expire on 9/20 and Katrina indicated that she would submit a proposal for her time spent in relocating the website.

A notice was posted on the NDDA website and on the NedHeads Facebook site advertising for proposals to update the website with proposals due by Tuesday 9/18. Katrina has prepared a proposal and any proposals received by the 18<sup>th</sup> will be presented at our meeting.

In order to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest if a decision is made to accept Katrina's proposal, it is important that a disclosure be made to the board regarding her work and that she not participate in the decision to hire her. She would also need to file a disclosure form with the Colorado Secretary of State.

<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>; A decision needs to be made as to how to proceed. A few options:

- 1. Approve Katrina's proposal
- 2. Re-advertise and consider at next meeting

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS: Cost of proposal

#### AGENDA INFORMATION MEMORANDUM NEDERLAND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY MEETING DATE: Wednesday 9.19.12 INITIATED BY: Ron Mitchell

INFORMATION: ACTION: OR DISCUSSION: x

AGENDA ITEM: "Go Cup" District

<u>SUMMARY</u>: Attending the Downtown Colorado Inc. (DCI) Conference in Golden – Ron will share with the board what he learned about a new state statute allowing for a "Go Cup" District.

<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>: Further research has yielded the following – if you are interested in the legalities of Go Cups - known as Common Consumption Areas: http://www.colorado.gov/cs/Satellite/Rev-Liquor/LIQ/1251596856625 Licensing in general: <u>http://www.colorado.gov/cs/Satellite/Rev-Liquor/LIQ/1210583310948</u>

And there was some press about it in Greeley: http://www.ncbr.com/article/20120604/NEWS/120609980/-1/INDUSTRY23

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS: None at this point