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ABSTRACT OF THE CAPSTONE
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The city of Fountain Colorado, like many cities across the nation, has experienced ongoing challenges with balancing roadway infrastructure and maintenance needs with sufficient funding mechanisms, and project prioritization. The Fountain Roadway Focus Group was created to discuss these challenges and to brainstorm ideas to help the city bridge these gaps and to recommend solutions. The focus group is comprised of four citizens, and with the support of several city staff members, has been able to put into action several key recommendations within four primary areas to help mitigate the city’s systemic roadway challenges. The four areas the focus group took for action during the project period were the streets department staffing, funding, roadway prioritizations, and community engagement. The Fountain streets department and the Fountain City Council wanted to enlist the unbiased input from a group of citizen volunteers to offer an objective and transparent approach to combating these challenges. On November 14, 2017, the focus group chair presented the group’s vision and progress to the Fountain city council during their regularly scheduled meeting (City of Fountain, 2017). The council was very supportive and appreciative of the group’s efforts thus far are were encouraged
that the group intended to champion the Moving Fountain Forward Transportation Sales Tax renewal initiative in 2019.
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Introduction

The City of Fountain, CO is located 14 miles south of Colorado Springs and is home to the largest military base in the state; the Fort Carson Army post. Fountain has a citizen population of just under 30,000 people which has increased by nearly fifty percent over the past fifteen years (City of Fountain, 2017). The city includes 110 miles of roadways which have come under increased usage due to the rapid growth, causing the city to steadily fall behind on roadway infrastructure and repairs, and stretch their $47,000 annual roadway maintenance budget. The current state of the roads within the city limits are considered moderate to poor and would require more than $1.5 million in repairs. In 2008, the city passed a ten year, .75%, sales tax increase which allocates an additional $350,000 for roadway resurfacing, but the budget and the tax allocations do not come near to what is actually needed to fund all the roadway work necessary (City of Fountain, 2008). In addition to funding, some additional challenges facing the city in repairing the roadways are rising construction costs, a small city roadway staff, and a lack of city owned equipment.

The City of Fountain Roadway Improvement project is structured around a small focus group comprised of four citizens and three city staff members including the Deputy City Manager, the Street Superintendent, and the Management Assistant (Appendix D, p. 39). The primary objective of the roadway focus group is to explore options for improving the city’s roadways and strategies for funding the work needed. The focus group reviewed the street department’s current practices and brainstormed new ideas for repairing the roadways and improving the infrastructure (Appendix D, p. 40). One of the most critical needs of the city is funding, so one of the focus group’s areas of concentration is extending the 2008 Moving Fountain Forward Transportation Sales Tax initiative that is due to sunset in 2019 (City of
Fountain, 2008). The city leadership, anticipating this outcome, sought to lend additional transparency and credibility to this funding option by having it researched, discussed, and supported by a group of citizens. My role, as the Focus Group Chair, is to lead the focus group, to record and research options presented by the group, and to present the group’s findings to the Fountain City Council.
Literature Review

Challenges with modern roadways

Roadway infrastructure and maintenance challenges are not just a local issue; all levels of government are facing these challenges due to increasing demands for more roadways to better mitigate growing traffic flows across the nation. Driving automobiles has become the primary mode of transportation for virtually all activity in the United States (U.S.), stretching U.S. roadways to more than four million miles (DeRobertis & Lee, 2017, p. 45). The American Public Works Association reported in 2015 that there are 254 million registered vehicles traveling 3 trillion miles on the over 4 million miles of roadways across the U.S. and an estimated 32% of all the major roadways are rated as in poor to mediocre condition (APWA, 2015). The United States, once ranked as a global leader in roadway infrastructure, has dropped to 16th in ranking (Deye, 2015, p.6).

Cities across the nation are faced with increasingly congested roadways and are attempting to combat the issue by laying more streets. In order to keep pace with the demands for more roadway arterials, funding sources in many communities have been allocated towards new construction, while funding for crucial preventive maintenance and repairs has trended downward (Christian & Newton, 1999. P. 445). Roadway infrastructure impacts are evaluated in terms of the roadway user costs (RUC) and the value of time costs (VOT) and are calculated based on the amount of time and lost revenues that occur due to inefficient, ineffective, roadways, roadway congestion, detours, and construction delays (Goodrum, Wan, & Fenouil, 2009, p. 125). While funding is a major component in meeting roadway maintenance and repair demands, efficient roadway maintenance techniques and reliable long-lasting roadway products also play a valuable part in getting the most from roadway improvement dollars. The APWA
estimates that for every $1 spent on timely roadway maintenance an additional $6-$14 is saved from more costly repairs or roadway replacements (APWA, 2015). Committing resources to a timely and effective roadway maintenance program saves local, state, and federal tax dollars.

Successful roadway maintenance programs start with the construction of good roads set upon a solid base. A typical roadway construction method used to lay a new road starts by applying a hot, warm, or cold mixed asphalt product over a prepared base or subbase (Vidal, Moliner, Martinez, & Rubio, 2013). Once the asphalt layer is in place forces such as high traffic volume, heavy truck loads, and temperature variations, can distress the road creating surface cracks (Dinegdae, Onifade, Jelagin, & Birgisson, 2015). Besides weight and wear, another enemy of roadways is water. Once water seeps into surface cracks it can cause the cracks to enlarge or degrade the subbase leading to instability, further cracking, and potholing. Cracks of less than one inch can generally be repaired by a topical sealant, however; once cracks widen, more extensive repairs such as pothole filling, mastic filling, or roadway removal and replacement may be necessary.

Modern developments in roadway construction and improved roadway materials may offer cost savings in maintenance and repairs. Russian engineers have tested roadway bases created from fragmented cement-concrete grids as a mean to strengthen roadways and prevent cracking (Sannikov, Kuyukov, & Kubasov 2016). Improvements in crack fill technologies such as fuel resistant rubberized crack sealants, which can be applied quickly cold and are highly flexible, offer the possibility of longer lasting topical repairs, shorter repair times, decreased heat emissions, and improved work environments for roadway workers (Public Works, 2017). Manufactured, fibrereinforced polymer (FRP) technology provides a stronger, but lighter, alternative to steel, and holds promise in lowering roadway costs and increasing efficiencies
(Public Works, 2017). The use of reclaimed or recycle asphalt in roadway repairs and replacement also creates opportunities for considerable cost savings and reductions in environmental impact (Oner & Sengoz, 2015).

Funding

Finding the funding necessary to meet roadway infrastructure and maintenance demands is one of the greatest budgetary challenges for municipalities across the nation. Highway networks are the most expansive and expensive publicly owned transportation infrastructure consuming “59 percent of public spending” at federal, state and local levels (Northern University Transportation Center, 2017, p. 12). In the State of Colorado, revenues from fuel taxes have been utilized to offset construction and maintenance cost for public roadways, however; as vehicle fuel economy has increased, fuel tax revenues have decreased (Colorado Municipality, 2016, p. 21). In 1991 fuel tax revenues collected $125.70 per Coloradoan; in 2015 that amount decreased to $68.94 per Coloradan, without any decrease in the fuel tax rate (Colorado Municipality, 2016, p. 21). As federal, state, and local tax dollars are stretched, there are fewer dollars available for roadway infrastructure, creating a need for an alternative financing mechanism, beyond tax and spend, to be explored and utilized.

One alternative method for securing public funds for infrastructure projects that has risen in popularity is public-private-partnerships (P3s) (Northern University Transportation Center, 2017, p. 13). P3s provide a long-term, performance based, financial mechanism to supplement public sector projects where there is not sufficient public sector financial resources available (Deye, 2015). P3 funding mechanisms involve private sector capital financing for infrastructure improvements in exchange for a reliable revenue source upon project completion such as tolls or
other income streams and opportunities for the private sector (Northern University Transportation Center, 2017, p. 12). There were 40 major P3 projects completed in the U.S. between 2005 – 2015 with a transactional value of $39 billion (Deye, 2015, p. 7).

Tax incremental financing (TIF) is another alternative revenue method which is typically used to fund improvements to blighted or underdeveloped areas identified as subject properties for urban renewal. Initial capital funding for TIF projects is generally in the form of bonds or private sector investments and is paid back by collecting the property tax increases in the designated area above the baseline value prior to the project improvements (Baldwin, 2016). TIF designated areas can serve as an incentive for real estate developers to invest in areas where they otherwise would not have been interested in investing in (Greenbaum & Landers, 2014, p. 670). TIF is regarded as a self-financing tool that creates revenues for projects without affecting government revenues (Greenbaum & Landers, 2014, p. 656). TIF has also served as a funding mechanism for financing infrastructure projects.

Financial challenges for communities across the state of Colorado are not just in collecting the funds needed, but also being able to retain the funds collected due to restrictions imposed by the Colorado Tax Payer Bill of Rights (TABOR). TABOR is a part of the Colorado State constitution and limits the amount of tax revenue Colorado municipalities may collect. TABOR also requires any tax revenues collected over the established TABOR limit be refunded back to the taxpayers and requires all tax reallocations, tax increases, or TABOR surplus tax retentions to be approved by voters (Harman & Walker, 2015, p. 2). The revenue restrictions passed by Colorado TABOR are among the strictest tax expenditure limitations (TEL) in the nation (Martell & Teske, 2079, p. 673). In addition to tax revenue limitations, the ratchet-down effects of TABOR further limit a city’s ability to rebound from budget cuts after economic down
turns. During economic down turns when budget cuts have to be made, TABOR makes those budgetary cuts permanent (Hartman & Walker, 2015, p. 8). When the economy starts to rebound, and cities have the opportunity to regain the lost revenues, it has to first be put before the voters; which is often times perceived by voters as a tax increase rather than a return to previous revenue levels (Harman & Walker, 2015, p. 8). The ratchet down effects of TABOR does not allow for year-over-year revenue averaging, or allow cities to set aside revenue surpluses in a rainy day fund to better prepare for unexpected economic down turns (Harman & Walker, 2015, p. 9). The TABOR ratchet-back effect does allow for budget limits to be reset at the actual spending from the previous year as long as the amount is less than the TABOR limit (City of Fountain, 2016, p. p. 3). TABOR laws have steered municipalities towards privatization and smaller governments (Martell & Teske, 2007, p. 681). Municipalities can put forth ballot initiatives that request that TABOR surpluses be retained rather than refunded. Retaining TABOR surpluses, a method known as de-Bruc ing, has been proven as a successful alternative to increasing revenues without raising taxes.

Increasing revenue, or in the case of TABOR, requesting the permission of voters to retain revenue surpluses, hinges in many ways on citizen engagement and informing voters on the full scope of the financial issues. Many governments are turning to social media (SM) platforms to reach citizens where they are (Bonson, Royo & Ratkai, 2017, p. 322). A 2016 study by Pew Research showed that 67% of U.S. adults use Facebook; 16% use Twitter, 20% use LinkedIn and 48% use YouTube (Gottfried & Shearer, 2016, p. 4). Social media platforms provide a widely accessible outlet for ongoing bi-directional, free-flowing, conversations between voters and their government leaders (Bonson, Royo & Ratkai, 2017, p. 324). Using data push strategies across several social media platforms to send out vital information to voters,
along with data pulling strategies for citizens to share information and give feedback, increase diversities of thought, enhance transparencies and accountability in government, and inspire greater trust and confidence in government (Bonson, Royo & Ratkai, 2017, p. 321).

Municipalities need citizens to get more involved in ways that are most comfortable and convenient for them so that they can make better informed decisions about ballot incentives. Educating and informing citizens empowers collaboration and citizen mobilization (Bonson, Royo & Ratkai, 2017, p. 322).

Fountain Roadway Focus Group

The city of Fountain, CO is facing all of the issues listed above. The city does not currently have the financial resources needed to increase arterials to better mitigate growing traffic demands; they cannot afford to make critical repairs to existing roads; and they cannot afford a comprehensive maintenance program without additional revenue resources. Some roads in Fountain are in such a fragile state that snow plows can no longer clear snow for fear of uprooting the entire road, while other paved roads will have to revert back to dirt and gravel unless crucial repairs are made. Fountain voters have a finicky appetite for additional tax and spend strategies, so alternative funding mechanisms must be explored. The vision of the Fountain Roadway Focus Group is to promote alternative ideas to the Fountain City Council for increasing efficiencies or redirecting current revenues towards roadway’s infrastructure and maintenance.

The opportunities identified by the focus group include a restructuring of the streets department collateral duties, increasing the roadway department staff by 1.5 full-time equivalents (FTE), solidifying a more comprehensive roadway maintenance plan, negotiating
contributions from the county Waste Management group towards improving roads leading to the county land fill facility, requiring developers to assume more roadway construction cost for streets leading into their development, increasing the city’s use of social media platforms to better educate and engage voters, and an extension and modification of the 2008 Move Fountain Forward Transportation Sales Tax which is due to sunset in 2019. The opportunities identified by the focus group will be presented to the Fountain City Council on November 14, 2017.
Staffing and Efficiency

At the start of this project the city of Fountain had a streets staff comprised of five full-time and three part-time employees; so the equivalent of 6.5 full-time equivalents (FTE). The part-time staff members were allowed to work no more than twenty-nine hours per week. The size of the roadway staff presented some significant challenges and restricted the amount of work that could be accomplished each week. With a team of 6.5 FTEs, the streets team could not be divided and was limited to working on one single roadway job at a time (Appendix D, p. 43). When accommodations for vacations and sick days were factored in, the streets team was able to be in full production an average of 3 days each week. In addition to performing the duties necessary for street maintenance and repairs, the streets crew was also responsible for additional duties such as drainage work, sidewalk work, mowing, weed mitigation, and snow removal in the winter months (Appendix D, p. 43).

Upon review of the various tasks that the small streets department was responsible for the focus group was in immediate support of requesting the approval of the Fountain city council to promote the three part-time employees to full-time, bringing the total number of full-time street crew members to eight (Appendix D, p. 43). On October 10, 2017, the Fountain City Council unanimously approved Resolution No. 17-047, authorizing the promotion of the three part-time employee to full-time effective November 1, 2017 through the end of 2017 (Fountain City Council, 2017). The addition of the full-time staff members will allow the Street Superintendent to divide the crew to work on more than one project at a time. The expansion of the staff will also allow for trained and experienced snow plow drivers twenty-four hours per day during the winter months. The focus group also voiced their support of maintaining these three fulltime employees though the 2018 fiscal year.
While expanding the street staff through the end of the year is a major win for the overall efficiency and production of the department, another concern the roadway focus group identified was the overly broad scope of duties that the street crews were responsible for, especially those which occur during the asphalt season (Appendix D, p. 43). Given that the asphalt season in Colorado runs during the spring and summer months, having to divide the roadway crew’s valuable time between mowing, weed mitigation, and sidewalk work during the asphalt season has a negative impact on their overall production. The focus group has recognized the need to realign or outsource some of the work which coincides with the asphalt season so that the street crews can focus exclusively on street work (Appendix D, p. 43).

Currently the city of Fountain divides the mowing and weed mitigation duties with the parks department, who hires seasonal help for maintaining the city parks. The focus group identified an opportunity to increase the street crew’s overall efficiency by allocating all mowing and weed mitigation for the city to the parks department. The Deputy City Manager and the Streets Superintendent took this request to the city council and the reallocation of duties was approved. The city council also approved outsourcing all of the city’s sidewalk repairs thru the end of 2017. The streets department opted to maintain the drainage duties since proper drainage has a huge impact on streets (Appendix D, p. 43). Alleviating the mowing, weeding, and sidewalk, collateral duties has freed the streets department crews to work more efficiently and allows them to prioritize street and drainage work during the asphalt season.
Maintenance and Funding

Many cities across the United States find that funding for roadway work presents an ongoing challenge, and the City of Fountain, CO is no exception. The city has historically underfunded and under prioritized street maintenance to the detriment of the city’s roadway infrastructures. According to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, “every $1 spent to keep a road in good condition avoids $6-$14 needed later to rebuild the same road once it has deteriorated significantly” (Smart Growth America, 2011, p. 5).

For several years the standard method utilized for all street maintenance was to add a 2 inch asphalt overlay on top of the street, regardless of the street condition. The Fountain Street Superintendent reported to the focus group that a two-inch asphalt overlay cost approximately $9.50 per square yard to install and when properly applied, it can last an average of ten to fifteen years (Appendix D, p. 54). While a 2 inch overlay can be an effective method of preventive maintenance to keep a street from deteriorating, it is not an effective method for streets that have suffered major defects or have an inadequate base beneath the asphalt. When the 2 inch asphalt overlay method is applied to a deteriorated street or on top of an inadequate base, the existing damage will quickly reflect up through the new asphalt within one to two years, sometimes less. The largely homogenized and underfunded maintenance program caused streets throughout the city to deteriorate to the point that many are now in need of a major repairs or a full depth reclamation and replacement.

The city streets budget is currently $47,000 per year with an additional $350,000 per year allocated towards resurfacing, which is funded through a transportation sales tax. The American Road and Transportation Builders Association estimates the average cost to lay a new road at $2
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million per mile, or more depending on the location, type of road, and terrain (ARTBA, 2017). Given the extensive cost of road replacement, the city must utilize less expensive methods to preserve streets that can be saved in order to prevent continued damage. The city has recently starting utilizing a cape seal process that is expected to last for up to five years at a cost pf $5.25 per square yard (Appendix D, p. 54). While the cape seal technique will not be sufficient for the most extensively damaged street, it is a more effective preservation product to prevent further damage to salvageable streets. An estimate for using the cape seal method to preserve the seven highest priority streets in the city would cost over $840 thousand (Appendix D, p. 54).

The focus group met with the city Financial Director and gained valuable insights into the city maintenance budget and the vital importance of the revenues that the transportation sales tax provides through the 2008 Moving Fountain Forward Transportation Sales tax increase (Appendix D, p. 53). The Moving Fountain Forward Transportation Tax involved a ten year .75 percent sales tax increase passed in 2008 which sunsets in 2019 (City of Fountain, 2008). The .75% sales tax is divided into three categories including, .35% towards capital improvement projects, .25% towards the transit system, and .15% towards street resurfacing (City of Fountain, 2008). The resurfacing portion is capped at $350,000 per year and along with the transit portion does not expire (Appendix D, p. 53). While $350,000 per year towards resurfacing is extremely helpful to the streets department, it does not come close to covering the actual needs of the city.
Prioritizing Roadway Projects

Roadway prioritization is crucial to the strategic planning of the Streets Department. The current Streets Superintendent reported that street prioritization in recent years has been directed towards the areas of the city where the citizens complained the most (Appendix D, p. 49). Directing resources based on citizen complaints is not an equitable solution and lacked proper planning. The Focus group worked towards creating a more equitable plan which directed roadway work towards areas of greatest concern across the entire city (Appendix D, p. 52).

The focus’s group’s first step in devising a more equitable strategy was in dividing the city into three roadway zones (Appendix D, p. 51). The Streets Superintendent worked closely with the City Engineer to create a roadway prioritization map which divided the city based on area, population, and future growth (Appendix E). The focus group used this map to identify streets of the greatest concern, paying close attention to equity within all three areas (Appendix D, p. 52). The future use of the roadway zones will be to dig deeper into each zone and to prioritize street projects most equitably across the three areas. In 2018, the focus group intends to invite two residents from each of the three zones to join the group to ensure that each zone has an equal voice in future roadway plans.

Within one working session the focus group was able to identify seven of the highest priority street across the city (Appendix D, p. 52). The selection excluded streets that were already under negotiations with other partners for repairs, such as the utility department, and the county land fill. The estimated costs of repairing the seven priority streets was broken down into three possible maintenance methods including cape seal, chip seal, and two-inch over lay (Appendix D, p. 54). The cost of the work ranges from $452,774 for the least expensive method to $1,520,874 for the more costly method (Appendix D, p. 54). The cost to repair just these
seven high priority streets would consume one to three times the current annual budget for street maintenance and overlay combined, which highlights the need for additional funding for the streets department.

**Seven Priority Streets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance to prevent failure</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Sq. Yards</th>
<th>Cape Seal</th>
<th>Chip Seal</th>
<th>Two Inch Overlay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost per Square Yard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 7 Years</td>
<td>$5.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 5 Years</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 yrs. good base/poor base 1-2 years</td>
<td>$9.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Life Span</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Road / Ermel to Circle C</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4,373</td>
<td>$22,958.25</td>
<td>$13,119.00</td>
<td>$41,543.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Road / Circle C to Falling Star</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9,777</td>
<td>$51,329.25</td>
<td>$29,331.00</td>
<td>$92,881.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Road / Falling Star to Old Pueblo Road</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21,333</td>
<td>$111,998.25</td>
<td>$63,999.00</td>
<td>$202,663.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;S Ft Mesa to Silver Glen</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>$71,400.00</td>
<td>$40,800.00</td>
<td>$129,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;S Ft Silver Glen to Link</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12,844</td>
<td>$67,431.00</td>
<td>$38,532.00</td>
<td>$122,018.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Creek / Mesa to Brocket</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17,333</td>
<td>$90,998.25</td>
<td>$51,999.00</td>
<td>$164,663.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Creek / Brocket to Wythe</td>
<td>2,685</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17,900</td>
<td>$93,975.00</td>
<td>$53,700.00</td>
<td>$170,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson Blvd</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10,880</td>
<td>$57,120.00</td>
<td>$32,640.00</td>
<td>$103,360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Camp / Ohio to Countryside</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7,233</td>
<td>$37,973.25</td>
<td>$21,699.00</td>
<td>$68,713.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Camp / Countryside to Link</td>
<td>4,870</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19,480</td>
<td>$102,270.00</td>
<td>$58,440.00</td>
<td>$185,060.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comanche</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13,751</td>
<td>$72,192.75</td>
<td>$13,751.00</td>
<td>$130,634.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Bow</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11,588</td>
<td>$60,837.00</td>
<td>$34,764.00</td>
<td>$110,868.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>34,755</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>160,092</td>
<td>$840,483.00</td>
<td>$452,774.00</td>
<td>$1,520,874.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1  
Source, City of Fountain, Streets Superintendent, Robert McDonald, 2017

The focus group identified two additional mechanisms for repairing some of the major arterials within the city. For years, the county landfill located just outside the Fountain City limits has used several major city arterials within the Fountain city limits to transport their trucks to and from the landfill location free of charge. The intense weight of the full trucks has caused major damage to one of the city’s most frequently traveled streets. The focus group discussed the possibility of charging the county facility a fee per square foot for the use of the city streets (Appendix D, p. 45). When the city approached the county facility with the idea of charging them, they threatened litigation. In response, on September, 26, 2017, the Fountain City Council approved Resolution 17-045, amending the current designated truck route to exclude several major city arterials effective October 1, 2017 (City of Fountain, 2017).
The county land fill representatives, recognizing that the city was standing firm in their right to remove the streets from the trucking route, were prompted into negotiations with the city. The outcome of the negotiations resulted in the county facility agreeing to replace several major sections of two city arterials up to the standards necessary to accommodate the heavy truck traffic. The estimated costs of repairing these streets is $7 to $10 million and will be completed in phases over a period of a few years (Appendix D, p. 51). A specific timeline has not yet been established, but the county facility has already invested $230K into the planning phase of the project.

The second opportunity discussed for street repairs was requiring development companies to take on greater responsibilities for repairing streets leading up to their new developments (Appendix D, p. 45). Historically, the city has only required developers to maintain the entrance to the new development, but the focus group recommended that future negotiations with development companies include extending their street responsibilities. So far the city has negotiated street repairs with two housing development companies, represented by the bright green line on the Link Corridor Improvement Map, see appendix, G.
Community Engagement

Community engagement was an area that the Roadway Focus Group recognized as an important component to the overall success of the group's objectives (Appendix D, p. 45). Educating and engaging voters on the progress of current projects and the funding mechanisms necessary to push the projects forward is crucial to gaining voter buy in and support for future funding requests. Community engagement must involve a variety of communication channels including face-to-face meetings such as town hall meetings, as well as information through the city’s website and other social media platforms.

At the start of the focus group project the City of Fountain’s website was out of date and did not include any specialized sections for informing the citizen about the progress of roadway projects underway. Fortunately, however; the city hired a new Community Engagement Manager just weeks prior to the start of this project. The Community Engagement Manager was quickly on board with creating a new information sharing strategy which included launching a fresh new city website, consolidating numerous city Facebook pages into one official city Facebook page, and creating a new city Twitter account. The launch of the city’s website on October 11, 2017 included photos of one of the projects that the streets department was working on, which quickly generated several comments from citizens regarding concerns they had with other streets in the city. The Focus group will capitalize on the newly established information campaign to push information out to the citizen on current street projects and future roadway strategies (Appendix D, p. 55). The new city website also includes survey capabilities that the streets department will use to capture feedback from the community on current and future projects and a designated link for the Moving Fountain Forward projects which will offer updates on projects and funding (https://www.fountaincolorado.org).
In addition to the website and social media platforms, the focus group has committed to hosting monthly town hall meetings starting the first quarter of 2018 to offer updates on the capital improvement projects as well as panels for people to ask the Focus Group and city staff member’s questions (Appendix D, p. 55). The group will also start actively promoting the importance of renewing the Moving Fountain Forward Transportation Tax in order to keep Fountain moving forward with roadway maintenance and improvement projects.
Results

Over the four month project period the Fountain Roadway Focus Group has concentrated in four primary areas of the streets department, staffing, funding, equitable prioritization and community engagement. Items taken for action in each of the four areas of concentration over the project period have been the promotion of three part-time streets employees to full-time, a recommendation by the city finance director to increase the streets department annual maintenance budget from $47,000 to $100,000, the creation of three roadway priority zones to help prioritize roadway projects more equitably across the city, and upgrades to the city’s social media platforms to better highlight street project progress and to elicit community feedback.

The Roadway Focus group has also committed to starting a community outreach and education campaign starting the first quarter of 2018 (Appendix D, p. 55). Focus group members will partner with city staff members to lead educational town hall meetings across the city in order to offer updates and insights into roadway projects and funding efforts (Appendix D, p. 55). In addition to town hall meetings the focus group will partner with the City Community Engagement Manager to better utilize the city’s new website, Facebook page and Twitter to send information out to voters and use survey questions to pull information in from the voters (Appendix D, p. 55). In 2018, the focus group will include two citizens from each of the three roadway priority zones to join the focus group to ensure that every area of the city has a citizen’s voice in prioritizing projects equitably (Appendix D, p. 50).

The progress that the roadway focus group has made during the four month project period has been surprising and encouraging. The commitment and immediate response that the city
staff and the Fountain City Council has taken to the focus group’s ideas and input has been nothing short of remarkable.
Summary

The Fountain Roadway Focus Group was created to assist the City of Fountain Streets Department and the Fountain City Council on exploring options to improve the condition of the streets across the city. The focus group is comprised of four citizens and three city staff members who meet at least once per month to explore options for improving the state of the roadways and to discuss options for funding the work needed. Challenges facing the city include rapid growth, limited funding, and a small streets staff. The rapid growth over the past fifteen years has increased demands for additional arterials and has taken a toll on the quality of the existing streets. The city’s approach to street maintenance had become outdated and insufficient to keep the streets in repair and to prevent additional deterioration. The city has historically underfunded and under staffed the street department which has led to costly short cuts.

The four initial areas the focus group decided to work on are staffing, funding, project prioritization, and community engagement. At the beginning of this project the city streets staff was comprised of five full-time employees and three part-time employees. The small staff restricted the department to working on one protect at a time. In addition to street work, the city also required the small streets staff to be responsible for additional collateral duties such as mowing, weed mitigation, sidewalk repairs, and drainage work. Stretching the small crew across so many duties was ineffective and inefficient. The focus group supported the streets superintendent’s recommendations to outsource some of the collateral duties, and to promote the three part-time streets department employees to full-time. On October 10, 2017 the Fountain City Council approved Resolution 17-047 promoting the three part-time street employees to full-time through December 31, 2017. (City of Fountain, 2017). The recommendation to outsource the mowing, weed mitigation, and sidewalk work is also being discussed.
The city street budget has been historically underfunded with an annual maintenance budget of $47,000 per year. In 2008, the city was successful in passing a ten year transportation sales tax which allocated an additional $350,000 per year to be utilized for street resurfacing. While the resurfacing funds is a tremendous help, it still falls short of what the city actually needs to make the repairs needed and to keep the current arterials in sustainable good repair. Another element of the 2008 transportation sales tax initiative included funds allocated for several specific capital improvement projects including railroad crossing horn quiet zones, intersections improvements, traffic calming, and American with Disabilities sidewalk corner ramps (City of Fountain, 2008). By year nine into the ten year transportation sales tax, many of the capital improvement projects had not been completed. Gaining voter support in renewing the 2008 transportation sales tax will hinge on completing the capital improvement projects promised in 2008.

The capital improvement projects were significantly delayed due to the tax initiative limitations regarding borrowing and requiring that the city have all the cash needed before being allowed to start the projects. The economic recession in 2008 slowed the city’s ability to collect the funds needed to start the projects for several years which has had a negative effect on tax payer’s perceptions and has resulted in an increase in the overall costs of the projects. The city now has the funds necessary to start the projects and is working feverishly to get most of the projects completed before the transportation sales tax sunsets in 2019. The focus group recognizes how critical renewing the transportation sales tax is to the future of the city and has volunteered to champion this effort though community outreach and education activities.

The focus group recognized that prioritizing roadway projects across the city needed to be done using a more systematic and equitable method. The street department superintendent
commented that the current method for prioritizing street projects was to focus on areas that could potentially cause a public safety hazard, and then to focus on areas where the city has received the most citizen complaints. While focusing on areas that could present any potential for public safety concerns must remain the highest priority, other priorities need to be made more equitably. The first step in creating a more systematic and equitable method for road way prioritization was in creating a roadway zone map which divided the city into three zones. The map was divided based on area, population and future growth. High priority streets were identified within each of the three zones to ensure that the city was focusing on the entire city rather than on just a few areas. The focus group was able to identify seven street projects across the city paying close attention to ensuring that each zone was represented equally. In 2018, the focus group intends to invite two citizens from each of the three zones to join the group so that each zone will continue to have an equal voice in future roadway projects.

The final area of concentration was in community engagement. The focus group recognized that greater efforts needed to be made in updating and educating the community on what was going on in the streets department. Community engagement needed to include an increased presence on the city’s website as well an inclusion in information being pushed out though the city’s Facebook page and Twitter messages. The focus group worked with the city Community Engagement Manager to increase the visibility of the streets projects currently underway, and to gain additional community feedback through surveys offered on the city’s website. The city also created signs for display at each of the street project work sites which identify the work as being funded through the Moving Fountain Forward Transportation Sales Tax.
The attention that the focus group has been able to bring towards the work and challenges of the street department has played a significant role in the changes that have been suggested and the changes that have already been put in place within the four months since the group began. The support and openness to change that the city has demonstrated offers a great deal of hope for ongoing changes in the future. Following the November 12, 2017 city council presentation, city council members and city staff employees expressed their deep appreciation for the time and effort that has been put forth by the focus group members thus far. The four areas of concentration were supported and the group’s intention to champion the Moving Fountain Forward Transportation Sales Tax renewal initiative in 2019 was very much appreciated by the city council.

The city council was in agreement that community engagement will play a significant role in any future tax initiatives and they strongly encourage the groups planned partnership with the Community Engagement Manager on creating a unified and branded campaign to ensure that a consistent message is being sent out to the community throughout all available delivery channels. The Roadway Focus group intends to stay intact for years to come in order to ensure that the streets department continues to be a priority in city planning and budgeting. With the continued efforts of the focus group, and the hard work of the city the streets department, the streets and infrastructure across the City of Fountain will continue to improve.
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Appendix A: IRB Approval Letter

Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval Letter

Application Number: 07-2017-091
Application Title: City of Fountain, Colorado, Roadway Infrastructure Project

August 4, 2017

Dear Jennifer Herzberg,

The APUS IRB has reviewed and approved the above application.

Date of IRB approval: 08/04/2017
Date of IRB approval expiration: 08/03/2018

The approval is valid for one calendar year from the date of approval. Should your research using human subjects extend beyond the time covered by this approval, you will need to submit an extension request form to the IRB.

Changes in the research (e.g., recruitment process, advertisements) or informed consent process must be approved by the IRB before they are implemented. Please submit a protocol amendment form to do so.

It is the responsibility of the investigators to report to the IRB any serious, unexpected, and related adverse events and potential unanticipated problems related to risks to subjects and others using the unanticipated problems notification.

Please direct any question to apus-irb@apus.edu. The forms mentioned above are available on our IRB Application page; listed under downloadable documents.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Douglas, PhD
IRB Chair
Appendix B: Focus Group Questions

To: American Public University System (APUS)
   Institutional Review Board

From: Jennifer A. Herzberg, MPA Student 4437223

Date: July 10, 2017

Subject: Focus Group Questions for Capstone Creative Thesis Project PADM697

Professor: Christi Scott Bartman, MPA, JD, PhD

The primary objective of the focus group is to explore options for improving the state the roadways in Fountain, Colorado and how to fund the work needed. The initial questions listed below will be used to start the conversation and to generate other options and ideas. The group will; however, stay focused around the same general objective.

The research questions posed will include:
1. Identify the current state of the roadways in Fountain, CO?
2. Explore how the city’s roadways came to be in the current state.
3. What financial, staffing, and equipment, resources are needed for the necessary roadway repairs, replacements, and ongoing maintenance?
4. Quantify any deficient between the roadway repairs needed and the resources currently available.
5. Are there new, more cost effective, road way repair technologies available?
6. What alternate financial resources or new income generating strategies are available?
7. What have other cities in the state done to improve and maintain their roadways and what funding mechanism were utilized?
8. How much income has the 2008 Move Fountain Forward Tax initiative generated for roadway projects and what is the current state of the projects promised?
9. How would a new funding mechanism or strategy that required addition tax dollars from the public or the reallocation of current tax dollars be best communicated to the community?
Appendix C: Recruitment Email

7/11/2017 Gmail - City of Fountain Roadways Focus Group

Jennifer Herzberg <amberjeni@gmail.com>

City of Fountain Roadways Focus Group
1 message

Todd Evans <TEvans@fountaincolorado.org>       Tue, Jul 11, 2017 at 5:22 PM
To: Jennifer Herzberg <amberjeni@gmail.com>, Richard Applegate
<applegate@fountaincolorado.org>, "dcouch@c.com" <dcouch@c.com>
Cc: Robert McDonald <RMcdonald@fountaincolorado.org>, Rosa McCormick
/rosa@fountaincolorado.org>, Scott Trainor <strainor@fountaincolorado.org>

All,

We appreciate your interest in volunteering for our Roadways Focus Group.

Please see the below explanation of specifics that Jennifer Herzberg will be completing for her Master’s program:

The primary objective of the City of Fountain Colorado Roadway Project focus group is to explore options for improving the state the roadways in Fountain, Colorado and how to fund the work needed. The focus group will be led by Masters of Public Administration Candidate, Jennifer Herzberg. Data presented will be analyzed by the group, compared and contrasted with statistics in other communities facing similar issues, and weighed against current and alternative funding sources.

The initial research questions posed will include:

1. Identify the current state of the roadways in Fountain, CO?

2. Explore how the city’s roadways came to be in the current state.

3. What financial, staffing, and equipment, resources are needed for the necessary roadway repairs, replacements, and ongoing maintenance?

4. Quantify any deficient between the roadway repairs needed and the resources currently available.

5. Are there new, more cost effective, roadway repair technologies available?

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=6a8c671aeb&jiver=aeJ0gTCi24.cn&ga=1&ei=aAa5g34qK4x4QoZf547tAw&pli=1&search=inbox&th=15d33f0c4f590e1a
Appendix D: Roadway Focus Group Meeting Notes

Focus Group Meeting; August 17, 2017

- The focus group reviewed and signed consent forms and returned them to the group Chair, Jennifer Herzberg. All focus group participants present at the meeting consented to participate in the focus group and to be identified.

Present at the 8-17-2017 meeting were:

1. Jennifer Herzberg – Chair
2. Richard Applegate – Member
3. Robert McDonald – City Liaison
4. Todd Evans – City Liaison

Current State of the Streets

- After some brief introductions the group discussed the current state of the streets. Robert McDonald advised the group that many of the roads across the city were not originally constructed with a proper base causing streets to severely crack and pothole. The primary method for repairing the fractured streets has been to lay a two inch asphalt overlay over the damaged road. A thin asphalt overlay repair is not an appropriate fix for all roads, and when applied on roads with inadequate bases, the fractures quickly reflect through the new asphalt. Unless major rework is done, some roads in Fountain will have to degrade back to dirt and gravel.

- Todd Evans reported to the group that the 2016 GASB report on Fountain streets does not accurately reflect the current state of the streets in Fountain. Robert is currently working on a new roadway assessment.

- The group discussed the proper construction of a road base. A road base will generally need to be dug out to about three feet, filled with a concrete mixture and thoroughly compacted. Hot asphalt measuring 350-240 degrees will then be poured and pressed on top of the prepared road base. An asphalt road laid on top of a properly-structured base can last for long periods of time given proper and ongoing preventive maintenance.

- Robert reported that many streets in Fountain have been in such a state of neglect and disrepair that a maintenance approach is no longer a viable option. Many roads will need to undergo a full depth reclamation and replacement.

- Some roads are in such a fragile state that snow plows can no longer clear the roads for fear that the plow will rip out what is left of the road, while storm waters are washing
other streets into the gutters. The fragile state of some streets and the inability of snow plows to clear the roads ways creates a public safety hazard.

- The average cost to lay a new road is approximately $1 million to $1.2 million per mile depending on the condition of the soil and other factors.

**Roadway Resources, Equipment, Staffing and Budget**

- The team discussed the current roadway maintenance and resurfacing budget as well as the staffing situation. The city has allocated $47,000 for roadway maintenance and $350,000 for resurfacing. The $350,000 is derived from a portion of the 2008 Moving Fountain Forward Transportation Sales Tax (City of Fountain, 2008). The current budget is not sufficient to maintain the current streets or to replace the streets which are already beyond repair.

- The group reviewed the state of the roadway department’s equipment. The roadway department was able to purchase a new mastic machine for repairing roadway cracks of up to 3 inches. So far this year, the roadway department has spent approximately $43,000 on mastic material and has laid 72,000 pounds of mastic fill. The mastic machine cost $60,000; and was paid for out of the city’s general fund; however, the roadway department sold an unused street sweeper machine for $32,000 recapturing over half the cost of the mastic machine. The city currently has a crack seal machine that can repair cracks of up to one inch.

**Roadway Maintenance Program**

- A consensus of current literature highlights the need for cities to develop a comprehensive, ongoing maintenance programs in order to keep roadways in good condition. The American Public Works Association estimates that for every $1 a city spends on maintenance they save $6 - $14 on extensive repairs.

- Robert reported that the city has not had a proper roadway maintenance plan in place for many years. He is working on constructing a comprehensive plan which will utilize more appropriate maintenance methods including the use of a chip slurry seal that can protect a road for 5 – 7 years.

- Robert reported that the season for asphalt work is limited to weather and temperatures of above 40 degrees, so roadway crews must make the very best of the short asphalt season. The roadways crews collateral duties such as mowing, weed removal, drainage pond work and sidewalk work take crews away from roadway work during this crucial season. Robert recommends that the seasonal landscaping parks crews be extended to taking care of all mowing and weeds throughout the city.
In addition to a roadway plan the city is also in need of a comprehensive storm water control plan. Todd pointed out that since the city has stopped using ground water, there is more water seeping up and effecting roads.

Utility Dig Outs

Todd shared with the group that when the utility department needs to remove a section of a city road in order to make repairs or installations, the reconstruction of the section of road is contracted out. Todd recommends that the roadway group be involved in any removal or reconstruction of any city street so that they are assured that the new section has been properly installed.

Focus Group Initial Questions

The group reviewed the initial nine questions proposed by the Chair, Jennifer Herzberg. The consensus of the group was that the roadway issues have stemmed primarily from a historical pattern of inadequate roadway repairs, the absence of a comprehensive roadway maintenance program, an anemic roadway staff, under budgeting, and the burden of additional collateral duties.

1. Identify the current state of the roadways in Fountain, CO?
   a. The group discussed that the state of many roads in Fountain are very poor with some in need of total replacement.

2. Explore how the city’s roadways came to be in the current state.
   a. A lack of a comprehensive roadway maintenance plan, inadequate repair techniques, small staffing, and limited budgeting.

3. What financial, staffing, and equipment, resources are needed for the necessary roadway repairs, replacements, and ongoing maintenance?
   a. The city’s current roadway staff is comprised of 5 full time and 3 part time employees which equates to an average of three full days of work completed each week.
   b. The roadway department needs 8-10 full time employs dedicated exclusively to roadway projects to better manage the work needed. The average cost per FTE is $66,000; $25,000 of which is in benefits.

4. Quantify any deficiency between the roadway repairs needed and the resources currently available.
   a. The streets department is under staffed, underfunded, and burdened with collateral duties other than street repairs and maintenance. The current budget is based on inadequate repairs techniques and is well short of what is needed for proper repairs, necessary street replacements and ongoing maintenance.

5. Are there new, more cost effective, roadway repair technologies available?
   a. The streets department is making use of the best products and technologies suited for the Colorado environment and weather.

6. What alternate financial resources or new income generating strategies are available?
a. Alternative revenue options discussed were the renewal of the Move Fountain Forward Transportation Sales Tax with a greater percentage allocated toward roadwork and street replacements, charging the county land fill facility fees for using Fountain streets, and requiring developers to assume more responsibility for roadways leading up to their development.

7. What have other cities in the state done to improve and maintain their roadways and what funding mechanism were utilized? Most cities in need of additional roadway funds are utilizing tax increases and grants. Robert is currently researching potential grant opportunities. Todd also mentioned the limitations that The Taxpayer Bill of Rights (TABOR) rules have on cities reclaiming their original budgets after the 2008 recession.

8. How much income has the 2008 Move Fountain Forward Tax initiative generated for roadway projects and what is the current state of the projects promised? The MFF fund currently holds about $7 million; some funds have already been spent towards capital improvement projects. There is also an opportunity for $800,000 in grant funds for the Indiana project. Brandi Williams has been working on completing the capital construction projects promised in the Move Fountain Forward roadway tax and will provide an update to the group.

9. How would a new funding mechanism or strategy that required addition tax dollars from the public or the reallocation of current tax dollars be best communicated to the community? Educating the public on the roadway systems and what is need to remedy them, informing the public on the MFF projects completed; especially the railroad quite zone projects, increasing community engagement through social media, hosting public forums, and deploying citizen surveys.

Information Respectfully Requested for the Next Meeting

1. A status report on the Move Fountain Forward capital improvement projects; especially the rail road quite zone projects
2. An updated revenue sheet for Move Fountain Forward
3. Update on county dump negotiations
4. Jennifer will look further into TABOR rules and what it means to de-Bruce from TABOR

Next Meetings:

1. September 14, 2017
2. September 28, 2017
3. October 19, 2017
4. November 9, 2017
Focus Group Meeting Notes; September 14, 2017

Present at the 9-14-2017 meeting were:

1. Jennifer Herzberg – Chair
2. Darrell Couch – Member
3. Richard Applegate – Member
4. Bryan Johnson - Member
5. Rosa McCormick - Coordinator
6. Robert McDonald – City Liaison
7. Todd Evans – City Liaison

Updates from the City

- Deputy City Manager, Todd Evans, gave the group an update on the progress of the ten capital improvement projects associated with the Moving Fountain Forward Transportation Sales Tax

Further Discussion / Updates on Preliminary Ideas

- Restructuring of the current collateral duties for the Fountain Roadway Department.
  - The group discussed contracting out mowing and weeding for the city streets and parks
  - The group discussed contracting out sidewalk work
  - The city has started paying a private hauler $25 per hour to take care of some of the city’s more urgent roadway dumping complaints
  - Discussion is ongoing regarding the feasibility of contracting out drainage work

- Increasing the roadway staff by changing 3 part time positions to full time.
  - The Roadway department currently has 3 part time employees who work up to 29 hours per week (with no benefits).
  - The suggestion has been made to increase the 3 part time positions to full time; this would bring the total roadway staff to 8 full time employees.
  - A budget proposal has been made to increase the roadway maintenance budget from 47K to 100K
  - The Roadway crews worked overtime to clear all current city pothole complaint tickets
Member, Richard Applegate suggested checking with Pike Peak Community College to recruit interns from their new construction training program; it is the first of its kind in the nation.


- **Solidifying a more comprehensive roadway maintenance plan.**

  - Numerous studies demonstrate that the key to keeping roadways in good condition hinges on establishing and appropriately funding a comprehensive maintenance program.

  - The roadway department has already spent $80K (of it $48K budget) this year just on mastic material; the additional funds have been coming from the city’s general fund to supplement the costs.

  - **Quote “Expansion vs. repair: State transportation funding priorities between 2004 and 2008, states spent $37.9 billion annually on repair and expansion of roads and highways. Of these funds, 57% went to road widening and new road construction – just 1.3% of roads, 43% went to preservation of existing roads, which make up 98.7% of the system (Smart Growth America, 2011, p.6)”**

  - **Quote “According to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, every $1 spent to keep a road in good condition avoids $6-$14 needed later to rebuild the same road once it has deteriorated significantly” (Smart Growth America, 2011, p. 5).**

  - The going average cost to replace a road is about $1 million – $1.2 million per mile.

  - Jennifer asked which city streets would degrade to dirt & gravel without intervention and which streets can no longer be cleared by snow plows? This information will be provided at a later date; once the roadway department has more time to reevaluate the roads.

  - Bob will share the maintenance program he has been working on with the group
❖ Charging the county land fill facility a fee for using Fountain streets.
   o Todd shared a study that estimated that 1 full garbage truck has the impact of 1500 – 4000 cars on a road.
   o A visual assessment showed 163 trucks used C&S Road during an 8 hour period and 411 trucks used Link Road.
   o Fountain Mesa, Link, and C & S will be removed from the city truck route effective October 1st.
   o Removing these roads will add an estimated 15 miles each way for garbage trucks traveling to and from the county land fill facility.
   o There is a haulers meeting scheduled for Wednesday, September 19th, at 2PM, in the city council chambers.
   o The country land fill facility estimates that the facility will be in operation for another 40 years
   o One option mentioned was the possibility of annexing the land fill facility and then charging each truck a fee per cubic yard of materials dumped.
   o Another option discussed was for the city to contract one single garbage collection company to service the entire city.

❖ Requiring developers to assume more roadway construction costs for streets leading into their new developments.
   o This will be an ongoing discussion with developers; Oakwood and Aspen View home developers have been advised to bring a roadway plan to the table

❖ Increasing the city's use of social media platforms to better educate and engage voters
   ▪ Quote: "Many governments are turning to social media (SM) platforms to reach citizens where they are (Bonson, Royo & Ratkai, 2017, p. 322). A 2016 study by Pew Research showed that 67% of U.S. adults use Facebook; 16% use Twitter, 20% use LinkedIn and 48% use YouTube (Gottfried & Shearer, 2016, p. 4). Social media platforms provide a widely accessible outlet for ongoing bi-directional, free-flowing."
conversations between voters and their government leaders (Bonson, Royo & Ratkai, 2017, p. 324). Using data push strategies across several social media platforms to send out vital information to voters, along with data pulling strategies for citizens to share information and give feedback, increase diversities of thought, enhance transparencies and accountability in government, and inspire greater trust and confidence in government (Bonson, Royo & Ratkai, 2017, p. 321). Municipalities need citizens to get more involved in ways that are most comfortable and convenient for them so that they can make better informed decisions about ballot incentives. Educating and informing citizens empowers collaboration and citizen mobilization (Bonson, Royo & Ratkai, 2017, p. 322). “ (An excerpt from my literature review)

- The Roadway Dept. has started posting signs on roadway maintenance project sites to draw more attention to the projects funded by the Moving Fountain Forward Transportation Sales projects.
- Todd shared with the group that the city is currently discussing taking before & after project photos by a drone and creating a 2 minute video for the city website to better inform voters about city projects.
- The group decided to extend an invitation to John Trylch to further discuss his plans for increasing community engagement and how that might play a part in roadway projects & possible future tax initiatives.

- **Extension of the Moving Fountain Forward Transportation Sales Tax**
  - Bryan Johnson shared that he had worked alongside Fountain City Manager, Scott Trainer, on the Moving Fountain Forward Tax initiative and that the tax initiative passed by a very small margin. A key to their success was getting out into the community to educate voters on what the Moving Fountain Forward Transportation Sales Tax was all about.
  - Jennifer has a meeting scheduled with City Finance Director, Don Yucuis on Monday, September 25th at 2PM to discuss this further and will bring her notes back to the group.
 **Request a de-Brucking** of the Tax Payer Bill of Rights (TABOR) tax revenues collected above the established TABOR limit, and redirecting the surplus towards roadway repairs and improvements instead of refunding the surpluses back to the taxpayers as required by TABOR.

  o Jennifer has a meeting scheduled with City Finance Director, Don Yucuis on Monday, September 25th at 2PM to discuss this further and will bring her notes back to the group.

 **Pikes Peak Rural Transportation Authority.**

  o The group briefly discussed some of the pros and cons of joining the Pikes Peak Rural Transportations Authority (PPRTA).
  o The cost to join is 1% of the city sales taxes in exchange for one capital improvement project every 5 years
  o The consensus of the group was that the cost may be too high for the benefit.
  o [http://pprta.com/](http://pprta.com/)

**Important Next Step:**

 The group has been tasked to create some specific criteria for prioritizing roadway projects. Please be thinking about this in preparation for our next meeting. I have attached a few articles that I have found so far.

**Additional Attachments to email:**

- Repair Priorities: Transportation spending strategies to save taxpayer dollars and improve roads by Smart Growth America and Taxpayers for Common Sense
- Pavement Preservation guidelines by Connecticut Department of Transportation
- Pavement Preservation (When, Where, and How) by US DOT
- State of Good Repair Prioritization by the Virginian Dept. of Transportation
Focus Group Meeting Notes; September 28, 2017

Present at the 9-28-2017 meeting were:

1. Jennifer Herzberg – Chair
2. Darrell Couch – Member
3. Richard Applegate – Member
4. Bryan Johnson - Member
5. Robert McDonald – City Liaison
6. Todd Evans – City Liaison

Updates from the City

❖ Deputy City Manager, Todd Evans, gave the group an update on the city’s progress with negotiations with the county land fill company, Waste Management. Conceptual meetings are taking place for a Link Road Corridor Improvement Plan. C&S and Fountain Mesa Road have been removed from the truck route effective October 1st; however, City Council granted Waste Management a 60-90 day stay on the removal of Link Road.

❖ Todd advised the group of ongoing conversations with the utility department regarding a possible partnership in assisting with repairing roads that have had multiple utility dig outs.

❖ Todd advised the group that the city is considering hiring a marketing company to produce a 2 minute videos for the city’s website. The city also has a pilot who has volunteered to take aerial photos by drone to showcase the progress made on the various capital improvement projects.

❖ Street Superintendent, Robert (Bob) McDonald, reported that poles have been ordered for the intersection of C&S Road and Fountain Mesa Road. The intersection has an estimated completion date of February or March and striping on Fountain Mesa is schedule for Monday (10/02) weather permitting. Once the intersection is completed, analysts will evaluate the best timing for the lights.

❖ Bob shared that without intervention, there may be roads around the city that will not be able to be cleared with snow plows this winter due to the advanced deterioration of the roads. A list of these roads will be provided at a later date.

❖ Bob reported that he is exploring the use of geotextile, double chip sealing for extending the life of road repairs, as well as some options using cold-mix asphalt.

Updates from the Chair

❖ Jennifer Herzberg met with the city Finance Director, Don Yucuis to review TABOR and the Moving Fountain Forward (MFF) Transportation Sales Tax. Don provided some
great insights into the Tax Payer Bill of Rights (TABOR) in that the city has some liberty in their interpretation and execution of TABOR. The TABOR limit is calculated at the local level and reviewed by the annual auditing firm.

- In 2013, (2C / De-Tabor) the city passed a ballot measure which allowed the city to automatically omit economic development projects from the TABOR calculation *(Vote Stat.: Yes: 2,054 / No: 1,462)*. The city has the liberty to define what they consider to be economic development projects, so a broad definition is used to include all new sales tax generating businesses. In short, the city is already taking advantage of a great deal of the sales tax revenues without having to request a de-Brucing from the voters. The only real benefit at this point to de-Brucing would be removing the need to do any TABOR calculations at all, which would make the budgeting and planning processes more efficient.

- Don shared that it would be most helpful to the city for the MFF Transportation Sales Tax to be renewed; however, with some modifications to the restrictions, such as not tying the income to specific projects and allowing borrowing if necessary.

- Don also shared the breakdown of the Moving Fountain Forward .75 % sales tax increase.
  - .35% goes towards capital improvement projects
  - .15% towards resurfacing (this does not sunset)
  - .25% towards the transit system (this does not sunset)
  - If MMF is not renewed the sales tax would be reduced from 3.75% to 3.40%

- Don shared that he will be recommending additional staffing in the 2018 budget for the streets department, as well as an increase in the annual roadway maintenance budget.

- Jennifer met with the city’s Community Engagement Manager, John Trylch. Community engagement will be key to educating and gaining the support of voters towards any ballot initiative where the word tax is used (or even referenced). John has already taken several steps towards extending the city’s reach beyond print and utilizing more digital platforms. So far a new city Facebook page has been launched, a new Twitter account has been established, and a new website is due to launch on October 11th. John has offered to do an initial Twitter messages describing what the roadway focus group is doing and then launching a full information campaign to include print, Facebook and the website.

**Budgeting & Prioritizing For Future Road Repairs**

- Robert advised the group that his current prioritization strategy is to focus on the city’s major thoroughfares and keeping those which can be repaired maintained. Robert mentioned that residential areas are a secondary consideration at this point unless there is risk to public safety or property.
The group was in agreement that a renewal of the MFF Transportation Sales Tax will be crucial for maintaining the current momentum on road repairs and ongoing maintenance.

Todd recommended that the group sketch out a budget using projections of $100,000 for roadway maintenance and $400,000 for resurfacing.

The group gave much discussion around the topic of prioritizing roadway work. Robert recommended dividing the city into three areas and then diving deeper into prioritizing project within each area.

Todd recommended expanding the Focus Group to include a couple of residents from each of the three zones to ensure that every area has equal representation and a voice in roadway priorities.

The group recognizes that educating the community through several delivery channels will be essential in increasing community engagement and gaining voter support for any tax request.

**Important Next Step & Meeting Updates:**

- The group agreed to add one additional meeting on Thursday, October 5th
  - October 5th, October 19th; November 9th
- **Todd & Robert:** Will work on an initial layout for the city divisions

**Additional Attachment to email:**

- Assessment of Surface Treatment with Textiles for Pavement Rehabilitation & Maintenance (2009)
Focus Group Meeting Notes; October 5, 2017

Present at the 10-05-2017 meeting were:

1. Jennifer Herzberg – Chair
2. Darrell Couch – Member
3. Richard Applegate – Member
4. Robert McDonald – City Liaison
5. Todd Evans – City Liaison
6. Rosa McCormick – Coordinator

Updates from the City

- Deputy City Manager, Todd Evans reported that during the October 24th city council special budgeting session a request was made for the 3 part-time roadways staff members to be upgraded to full-time effective November 1st. Having the 3 part-timers upgraded to fulltime will allow roadways crews to be divided into two groups to cover more projects simultaneously, and will provide qualified roadway personnel 24 hours a day for snow removal.

- Todd updated the group on the ongoing negotiations with the county land fill facility on establishing which segments of Link Road they will assist the city in repairing. The sections currently under negotiation are Squirrel Creek to Link, and Link to Marksheffel. The roads will be constructed to accommodate for heavy vehicles, similar to the grade level of I-25, and is projected to cost $7-$10 million.

- Street Superintendent, Robert (Bob) McDonald presented a Roadway Zones map that he completed with the assistance of City Engineer, Brandy Williams. The zoning map divides the city into three roadway zones based on natural boundaries, population, and future growth.

- Bob also reported to the group that snow plow drivers will be scouting out their routes starting next week to identify any hazardous roadway conditions. Bob shared that his goal is to patch any hazardous areas so that no streets will be deemed as too unfit to be snow plowed this winter. Bob stated that he may purchase about 4.5 tons of cold mix asphalt that he can heat locally and lay down hot.

- Management Assistant, Rosa McCormick share a listing of all streets in the city with pavement ratings. The ratings are a bit outdated and will be reevaluated. Rosa will look into the possibility of resorting the listing by the newly established roadway zones and report this back to the group. Rosa also reported that she and Bob will be attending a roadway conference in Denver.
City of Fountain Roadway Zones, Road Way Prioritizing & Budget

- The new Fountain Roadway Zone map divides the city equitable based on area, population and projected future growth. Todd led the group through a white board exercise to get a start on project prioritization; excluding roads that are already under negotiations for repairs by the county dump or by the utility department.

- Each focus group member worked independently with the zone map to identify the streets of the most concern, then the group’s individual selections were combined to identify common streets.

  - The list of top priorities were:
    1. Link Road from Ermel Road South (Zone 3)
    2. C & S Road from Fountain Mesa to Link Road (Zone 2)
    3. Cross Creek from Fountain Mesa and East (Zone 2)
    4. Carson & Allegra area (Zone 1)
    5. Jimmy Camp Road from Ohio to Link (Zone 3)
    6. Comanche Village Drive From Fountain Mesa to 85 (Zone 3)
    7. Medicine Bow (Zone 1)

  - For the record, this activity took 20 minutes.

- The $470,000 projected budget could be allocated based on the list of priorities; with the understanding that not all project may be afforded within the same year.

- One ask from the city council will be to allow the Street Superintendent to continue to work with the City Finance Director, Don Yucis on purchasing mastic materials and to have modifications to the roadway budget considered during scheduled budgeting updates.

Next Meetings:
- October 19th
- November 9th
- Presentation to city council, November 14th
- December Meeting (To Be Determined)

Additional Attachment to email:
- White Board Photo
- Emergency Snow & Ice Procedures (from Todd)
- Maps with priority roads marked
Focus Group Meeting Minutes: October 19, 2017

Meeting Attendees

5. Jennifer Herzberg – Chair  
6. Richard Applegate – Member  
7. Darrell Couch – Member  
8. Robert McDonald – City Liaison  
9. Todd Evans – City Liaison  
10. Rosa McCormick – Coordinator

I. Special Guest: Don Yucuis

Jennifer has asked Don to address two specific questions for the group.

1.) How much money has been spent on mastic supplies so far this year, and with the support of the Fountain city council, would this type of outside budget spending be feasible through 2018?

   Don reviewed three financial reports with the team and shared that the streets department has spent $66,294 on mastic materials so far this year, which is $19,294 over the $47,000 budget. Fortunately, due to favorable sales tax revenues, the city has been able to absorb the extra costs and have allowed Bob’s group to continue the purchase of additional mastic material as needed in order to keep the work going through the asphalt season.

2.) From your perspective, how important is the renewal of the Moving Fountain Forward, Transportation Sales Tax to the ongoing improvement of the city streets?

   Don shared the Street Resurfacing Fund report to demonstrate historical cost associated with resurfacing efforts since 2012. Don reminded the group that the resurfacing portion and the transit portion of the Moving Fountain Forward Transportation Sales Tax does not expire. If the transportation sales tax is not renewed the city’s sales tax would not return to the pre 2009 3.0%, but would drop from 3.75% to 3.40%.

   The .75% increase was allocated into three buckets:
   
   ➢ .35% towards the ten capital improvement projects
   ➢ .25% towards transit – does not expire
   ➢ .15% towards resurfacing ($350,000 per year) – does not expire

   Don shared how important the Moving Fountain Forward Transportation Sales Tax has been to the city in getting the city back on track with roadway maintenance and infrastructure improvements. In order to keep this work going a renewal of the transportation tax is recommended. Since the original tax language prohibited any lending options, the city was required to save all the tax revenues first before starting any of the projects. The delay in starting these projects had a negative impact on citizen perception and ended up costing the city 40% - 50% more in construction costs. Don suggested the idea of allowing a lending option in a renewal request, with required project updates, be considered.
II. Updates from the City

- Bob shared a Roadway Street Priority list showing the maintenance costs to prevent failure of the seven high priority streets by method.

### Seven Priority Streets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance to prevent failure</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Sq. Yards</th>
<th>Cape Seal</th>
<th>Chip Seal</th>
<th>Two Inch Overlay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 7 Years</td>
<td>Up to 5 Years</td>
<td>10-15 yrs. good base / poor base 1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Life Span</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.25</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Square Yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,958.25</td>
<td>$13,119.00</td>
<td>$41,543.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Road / Ermel to Circle C</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4,373</td>
<td>$51,329.25</td>
<td>$29,331.00</td>
<td>$92,881.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Road / Circle C to Falling Star</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9,777</td>
<td>$111,998.25</td>
<td>$63,999.00</td>
<td>$202,663.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Road / Falling Star to Old Pueblo Road</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21,333</td>
<td>$71,400.00</td>
<td>$40,800.00</td>
<td>$129,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Road / Circle C to Link</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12,844</td>
<td>$67,431.00</td>
<td>$38,532.00</td>
<td>$122,018.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Creek / Mesa to Brocket</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17,333</td>
<td>$90,998.25</td>
<td>$51,999.00</td>
<td>$164,663.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Creek / Brocket to Wythe</td>
<td>2,685</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17,900</td>
<td>$93,975.00</td>
<td>$53,700.00</td>
<td>$170,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson Blvd</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10,880</td>
<td>$57,120.00</td>
<td>$32,640.00</td>
<td>$103,360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmp Camp / Ohio to Countryside</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7,233</td>
<td>$37,973.25</td>
<td>$21,699.00</td>
<td>$68,713.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmp Camp / Countryside to Link</td>
<td>4,870</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19,480</td>
<td>$102,270.00</td>
<td>$58,440.00</td>
<td>$185,060.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comanche</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13,751</td>
<td>$72,192.75</td>
<td>$13,751.00</td>
<td>$130,634.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Bow</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11,588</td>
<td>$60,837.00</td>
<td>$34,764.00</td>
<td>$110,686.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>34,755</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>160,092</td>
<td>$840,483.00</td>
<td>$452,774.00</td>
<td>$1,520,874.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source, City of Fountain, Streets Superintendent, Robert McDonald, 2017

- Todd gave the group updates on the costs associated with the quite zone projects. The costs required from BNSF for signaling requirement were $600K, for the Duckwood project rocketing that total project cost to over $1.1 million. With the increased railroad costs the Ohio project is projected to cost over $4 to $5 million. The increased costs combined with additional complications will likely prevent the Indiana quite zone project from being completed before 2019.

- The group discussed options for additional capital improvement tax revenues being left over without the Indiana project getting started. The estimated fund balance would be around $2 million.
  - One option presented was to allocate the funds towards a around-a-about project on Jimmy Camp road.
  - An additional option was, if the transportation tax was renewed, to allocate the first $1.5 million towards completing the Indiana project.

- III. Review City Council Presentation- 1st Rough Draft

- The group reviewed Jennifer’s first draft of the city council power point presentation and provided feedback. Jennifer will bring a second draft to the November 9th meeting.

IV. Participant Feedback / Open Forum
FOCUS GROUP MEETING; NOVEMBER 9, 2017

Present at the 11-09-2017 Meeting were:
11. Jennifer Herzberg – Chair
12. Richard Applegate – Member
13. Darrell Couch – Member
14. Robert McDonald – Street Superintendent
15. John Trylch – Community Engagement Manager

I. Updates from the City

- Robert (Bob) McDonald reported that due to favorable weather hot mix asphalt may continue into mid-December
- Bob reported that the city maintenance backlogs have been cleared of aged ticket
- Bob reported that he may be purchasing a used plate compactor for the backhoe, which can be used to compact material of up to 2 feet at a time, depending on the material; the cost is about $2500 and will be shared with the sanitation and water departments

II. Review Presentation, 2nd Draft

- The group reviewed the 2nd draft of the city council presentation

III. Special Guest, Community Engagement Manager, John Trylch

- Community engagement Manager, John Trylch, updated the group on the Moving Fountain Forward information campaign which will include a video, project worksite signs, and the utilization of several digital tools
- John shared that the Moving Fountain Forward campaign will be branded to ensure a consistent message is delivered throughout all channels
- The kickoff for the information campaign will be the video launch. A draft of the video may be available by the end of November

IV. Outreach Strategies for 1ST Quarter 2018

- Community outreach efforts will follow the video launch and information campaign, outreach efforts will be coordinated with John to ensure that all channels are sending a consistent message.
Appendix E: Roadway Zone Map
Appendix F: Roadway Zone Map with Priority Streets
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Appendix H: City Council Report

Roadway Focus Group Update 11-14-2017

PURPOSE:
The primary objective of the Roadway Focus Group is to explore options for repairing and maintaining the roadway infrastructure in the city.

Focus Group Members:
1. Jennifer Herzberg - Chair
2. Richard Applegate
3. Darrell Couch
4. Bryan Johnson

City Staff:
1. Robert McDonald
2. Todd Evans
3. Rosa McCormick

THE INITIAL 9 QUESTIONS

1. Identify the current state of the roadways in Fountain, CO?
   • The group discussed that the state of many roads in Fountain are very poor with some in need of total replacement.

2. Explore how the city’s roadways came to be in the current state.
   • The absence of a comprehensive roadway maintenance plan, homogeneous repair techniques, small streets staff, and limited budgeting.

3. What financial, staffing, and equipment, resources are needed for the necessary roadway repairs, replacements, and ongoing maintenance?
   • At the start of this project the city’s roadway staff was comprised of 5 full time and 3 part time employees which equated to an average of three full days of work accomplished each week.
   • The roadway department would work more effectively with 8-10 full time employs dedicated exclusively to roadway projects to better manage the work needed. The average cost per FTE is $66,000; $25,000 of which is in benefits.
   • The Focus group was very happy to see the 3 part time street positions upgraded to full time through the end of 2017, bringing the total streets crew to 8 full time.
   • The focus group supports keeping these position full time through 2018

4. Quantify any deficiency between the roadway repairs needed and the resources currently available.
   • The streets department faces challenges with staffing, funding, and balancing collateral duties alongside performing street work.
5. Are there new, more cost effective, road way repair technologies available?
   - The streets department is currently making use of the best products and technologies suited for the Colorado environment and weather.

6. What alternate financial resources or new income generating strategies are available?
   - Alternative revenue options discussed were the renewal of the Move Fountain Forward Transportation Sales Tax with a greater percentage allocated toward roadwork and street replacements
   - Negotiating a partnership with the county land fill facility
   - Requiring developers to assume greater responsibilities for roadways leading up to their development

7. What have other cities in the state done to improve and maintain their roadways and what funding mechanism were utilized?
   - Most cities in need of additional roadway funds are utilizing tax increases and grants.
   - Streets Superintendent, Robert McDonald, is currently researching potential grant opportunities.

8. How much income has the 2008 Move Fountain Forward Tax initiative generated for roadway projects and what is the current state of the projects promised?
   - The MFF fund currently holds about $7 million; some funds have already been spent towards capital improvement projects.
   - There is also an opportunity for $800,000 in grant funds for the Indiana project.
   - City Engineer, Brandi Williams, has been working diligently on completing the capital improvement projects promised in the Move Fountain Forward roadway tax and will provide an updates for the group.

9. How would a new funding mechanism or strategy that required addition tax dollars from the public or the reallocation of current tax dollars be best communicated to the community?
   - Educating the public on the roadway systems and what is need to remedy them
   - Informing the public on the MFF projects completed; especially the railroad quite zone projects
   - Increasing community engagement through social media, hosting public forums, and citizen surveys.

4 PRIMARY AREAS OF FOCUS
1. Staffing
2. Funding
3. Prioritizing Roadway Projects
4. Community Engagement
STAFFING

- The Focus group was very happy to see the 3 part time street positions upgraded to full time through the end of the year, bringing the total streets crew to 8 full time. The focus group supports keeping these position full time through 2018

- **Collateral Duties**
  - Keeping the street staff focused on streets & drainage work
  - Outsourcing mowing, weed mitigation, and the 50/50 sidewalk replacement program into 2018

FUNDING

- Current maintenance budget $47,000 with a resurfacing budget from the Transportation sales tax $350,000
- Increasing the maintenance budget from $47,000 to $100,000

- **Renewing the Moving Fountain Forward Transportation Sales Tax**
  - Proposed modifications to allocate tax dollars towards areas rather than to specific projects and allow for borrowing if necessary
  - Required annual project updates provided to voters
  - The Focus Group is willing to promote this initiative through community outreach & education events starting 1st quarter 2018; including town hall meetings, panel discussion in close partnership with the city Community Engagement Manager

- **Mastic Materials**
  - Continue to allow the Street Superintendent to work with the City Finance Director, on purchasing mastic materials as needed

- **Budget Reviews**
  - Consider modifications to the roadway budget, during scheduled budgeting updates

- **County Landfill**
  - Ongoing negotiations with the county Waste Connections Landfill on assisting with road repairs; including significant upgrades to Squirrel Creek & sections of Link Road from Squirrel Creek to C&S / Marksheffel

- **Developers**
  - Requiring greater roadway responsibilities from new developers for streets leading up to their new development to be determined by the city engineer

PRIORITIZING PROJECTS

- Newly Established Roadway Zones
  - To ensure that every area of the city has equal representation and a voice in roadway priorities
  - The zones were divided based on natural boundaries, population and future growth
  - Expand the focus group to include two representatives from each of the 3 roadway zones
Seven Priority Areas Identified

1. Link Road / Ermel to Circle C
   - Link Road / Circle C to Falling Star
   - Link Road / Falling Star to Old Pueblo Road
2. C&S Ftn Mesa to Silver Glen
   - C&S Ftn Silver Glen to Link
3. Cross Creek / Mesa to Brocket
   - Cross Creek / Brocket to Wythe
4. Carson Blvd
5. Jimmy Camp / Ohio to Countryside
   - Jimmy Camp / Countryside to Link
6. Comanche
7. Medicine Bow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance to prevent failure</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Sq. Yards</th>
<th>Cape Seal</th>
<th>Chip Seal</th>
<th>Two Inch Overlay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Life Span</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 7 Years</td>
<td>Up to 5 Years</td>
<td>10-15 yrs. good base / poor base 1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Square Yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Road / Ermel to Circle C</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4,373</td>
<td>$22,958.25</td>
<td>$13,119.00</td>
<td>$41,543.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Road / Circle C to Falling Star</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9,777</td>
<td>$51,329.25</td>
<td>$29,331.00</td>
<td>$92,881.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Road / Falling Star to Old Pueblo Road</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21,333</td>
<td>$111,998.25</td>
<td>$63,999.00</td>
<td>$202,663.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;S Ftn Mesa to Silver Glen</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>$71,400.00</td>
<td>$40,800.00</td>
<td>$129,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;S Ftn Silver Glen to Link</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12,844</td>
<td>$67,431.00</td>
<td>$38,532.00</td>
<td>$122,018.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Creek / Mesa to Brocket</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17,333</td>
<td>$90,998.25</td>
<td>$51,999.00</td>
<td>$164,663.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Creek / Brocket to Wythe</td>
<td>2,685</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17,900</td>
<td>$93,975.00</td>
<td>$53,700.00</td>
<td>$170,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson Blvd</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10,880</td>
<td>$57,120.00</td>
<td>$32,640.00</td>
<td>$103,360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Camp / Ohio to Countryside</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7,233</td>
<td>$37,973.25</td>
<td>$21,699.00</td>
<td>$68,713.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Camp / Countryside to Link</td>
<td>4,870</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19,480</td>
<td>$102,270.00</td>
<td>$58,440.00</td>
<td>$185,060.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comanche</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13,751</td>
<td>$72,192.75</td>
<td>$37,751.00</td>
<td>$130,634.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Bow</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11,588</td>
<td>$60,837.00</td>
<td>$34,764.00</td>
<td>$110,086.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>34,755</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>160,092</td>
<td>$840,483.00</td>
<td>$452,774.00</td>
<td>$1,520,874.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- Working closely with the Community Engagement Manager on presenting a consistent message; utilizing all available communication tools
- Moving Fountain Forward Project Signs
- Town hall meetings starting 1st quarter 2018
Appendix I: City Council Presentation

Roadway Focus Group Update

• The primary objective of the City of Fountain Roadway focus group is to explore options for improving the condition of streets in Fountain, and explore options for funding the work needed.

The 11-14-2017 Fountain city council agenda and audio recording can be retrieved from https://www.fountaincolorado.org/cms/one.aspx?pageId=8304440