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Title 32 Metropolitan Districts

• Quasi- municipal corporations and political subdivisions of the state

• Independent governmental entities subject to most of the same statutes that govern other local governments
  • Open Meetings Law
  • Open Records Act
Overview of Generally What Districts Are Organized to Do:

- Finance Construction of Public Improvements (Water, Sewer, Street, Parks, Transportation, etc.)
- Operate and Maintain Public Improvements
- Enforce covenants (in place of or together with an HOA)
- Help one developer (sometimes a few) to meet development objectives
What the Community Coordinating District No. 1 Was Organized to Do:

• Establish a platform for communication among stakeholders to develop objectives that are shared that can be implemented through identified resources.

• Maintain and facilitate the communication through a local government that is accessible, transparent and accountable which allows for a broader network of participation.

• Has no power to tax and no power to issue debt.
• CCMD No. 1 has public meetings, public records, public financial statements, etc.

• CCMD No. 1 provides for continuity for the stakeholder conversations as leadership changes at the Neighborhood Associations, the City and the Service Providers in the stakeholder groups.
Who Serves on the CCMD No. 1 Board

• Amy Harmon – Property Owner
• Eric Crotty – Architect/ District Volunteer
• Jorgen Jensen– Realtor / District Volunteer
• Currently vacant – Service Provider
• Currently vacant – Property Owner/ Service Provider

• Ex-Office Board Members
  • Gordan Roberts
  • Bennie Milliner
  • Karen Good
Access to the stakeholders to the City staff at the CCMD No. 1 Board meetings and Community Meetings

- Who attends CCMD No. 1 Meetings
  - Board Meetings
  - Community Workshops
Access to the City to the many different stakeholders through CCMD No. 1 Board Meetings and Community Meetings

List of Stakeholders

• City of Denver
• Council District #9
  Councilwoman: Judy Montero
• Council District #8
  Councilman: Albus Brooks
• Dept. of Community Planning and Development
• Arts & Venues Denver
• Department of Heath and Human Services
• Department of Parks and Recreation
• Denver Police Department
• Department of Public Works
• Denver’s Road Home
• Ballpark Neighborhood Association
• City Parks Alliance
• Curtis Park Neighbors
• Denver Biennial of the Americas
• Denver Rescue Mission
• Redline Gallery
• St. Francis Center
• Engage 8
• Wonderbound
• Five Points Business Improvement District
• Denver Shared Spaces
Attendees:

• Ballpark Neighborhood Association
• Curtis Park Neighborhood Association
• City Park Alliance
• Denver Biennial of the Americas
• Police Foundation
• Redline
• Denver Police/ District 6
• Denver Rescue Mission
• Denver Street Outreach Collaborative
• Chase Park Grants
• Ballet Nouveau
• City Attorney
• Denver Police Homeless Outreach
• University of Denver Institute of Ethics
• St. Francis Center
Denver Parks and Recreation
CCMD No. 1

• Need for additional parks, open space, programming.
• Safety needs of residents and community were escalating.
• Perpetual community conversations resulted in recommendation that was not implementable.
Triangle Park – Before
Little Boxcar Park - Before
Safety statistics in area

Crime within a 1,000 feet of Triangle Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Crime</th>
<th>Before Renovation</th>
<th>After Renovation</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offense - Forcible</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>-30.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The benefits of working with CCMD No. 1.

- CCMD No. 1 Supports the but doesn’t drive the conversation.
- Stakeholder Meetings on Triangle Park identify the need to begin improvements.
- The Triangle Park scope defined and implemented
Project implementation

• The Triangle Park scope and implementation

• Little Boxcar scope and implementation

• Unique solutions

• Urban settings

• Integrated into community
Little Boxcar Park - After
Triangle Park - After
Building on the experience of the Triangle Park Project

Welton Glenarm Place
Exploring in Stakeholder meetings the benefits of street vacation, parcel assemblage, support of non-profits, affordable housing, care units, establishment of trails and public spaces, including programming spaces to connect the proposed redevelopment with the surrounding neighborhood.
Proposed Project Concepts

- Public Parking Garage
- Retain Church in the middle of the Development
- Integrate trails and park spaces
- Support for Non-Profit Users
- Support for Workplace housing
- Programming of Public Spaces
Financing of Public Improvements - Revenues

- Additional property tax levy imposed by new metropolitan district.
- Additional “sales tax” imposed as Public Improvement Fee (“PIF”) by covenant on the property.
- Property tax increment collected through Urban Renewal Authority.
- Sales tax increment shared by a City through Urban Renewal Authority or other method.
- Other Revenues: Lodging tax/PIF, parking revenues, use tax, fees, etc.
Financing of Public Improvements - Debt Structure

• Timing of Issuance relative to credit quality of pledged revenues

• Risk allocation among stakeholders
  • developer
  • Bondholder
  • municipality

• Debt Features
  • Interest Rate
  • Projected Debt Service Coverage Ratio
  • Debt Service Reserves
  • Amortization