CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN GUIDE



A tool for Michigan communities looking to establish a capital improvements plan



INTRODUCTION

The Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) guide is a tool for Michigan communities looking to establish a capital improvements plan, a requirement of the Michigan Planning Enabling Act¹ for all cities and villages and some townships. For more information about the benefits of capital improvement planning, please reference the Michigan Association of Planning's article². In addition, Michigan State University Extension has a useful checklist³ for the adoption of a CIP.

The first part of this guide describes a recommended process for drafting a capital improvements plan. Following information on the CIP process, sample language for the content of a CIP is included. Every community has different needs and capacities so the process and document should be tailored to fit your community's requirements. This guide recommends methods that have been successful in other communities; however, as long as the community meets the intent of long term, collaborative, fiscal planning as outlined in the act, this RRC best practice⁴ is being met.

 $^{^1}www.legislature.mi.gov/(S(eo2fxv55gbt3ldvqvk4f1af2))/documents/mcl/pdf/mcl-33-2008-IV.pdf$

 $^{^2\} www.planning mi.org/downloads/capital_improvements_program.pdf$

³ www.lu.msue.msu.edu/pamphlet/bclsam/pamphlet1J%20CIP.pdf

⁴ www.michiganadvantage.org/cm/files/redevelopment_ready_communities/rrc-best-practices.pdf

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Process flowchart	3
Step One: Identify process and roles	4
Step Two: Kickoff meeting	6
Step Three: Complete project application forms	7
Step Four: Project scoring	8
Step Five: Rank projects and draft CIP	9
Sample language	
Sample introduction language	10
Sample CIP process language	
Sample CIP policy language	13
Sample program funding language	14
Project summary section	17
Appendix	19
Project application form	
Project application form example	25
Score sheet	26
Score sheet example	27



PROCESS FLOWCHART

Kickoff meeting (opportunity for public involvement)



Department heads complete project application forms



Policy group scores all project application forms



Administrative team ranks projects based on priority for community and available funding and drafts capital improvements plan



Planning commission reviews and gives final edits to administrative team (opportunity for public involvement)



Planning Commission adopts the capital improvements plan



Governing body adopts the capital improvements plan



Governing body adopts the municipal budget

STEP ONE Identify process and roles

The first step in the creation of the capital improvement plan is to identify the best process for your community. Creating a flowchart of the steps helps participants to visualize the process. The pictured flowchart is an example of a process that has worked in many Michigan communities. Your community may decide to alter the process to fit your needs and time lines.

Next, your community should identify participants. The following are roles to be identified:

Project lead

Although the planning commission is charged with the task of completing the capital improvements plan in the act⁵, one person should be identified as the project lead. This is the person responsible for organizing the different department heads, mediating conflict and organizing the drafting of the capital improvements plan to present to the planning commission. This project lead could be anyone from a planning commissioner, the manager or supervisor, or a consultant but most often falls upon to the planning director. It is important that this task be supported by the manager or supervisor and mayor as the process requires collaboration between most department heads, the planning commission and the governing body.

Policy group

The policy group is made up of department heads relevant to the capital improvements program and other important representatives. At a minimum, the capital improvements of the municipal roads, sewers and parks should be included. Many communities include the capital improvements of police and fire as well. The department heads will fill out a project application form for each requested in their department project that will occur in the next six years. Once all project application forms are completed by all department heads, the policy group will rank all applications using a score sheet. It is recommended that two planning commissioners and one elected official serve as part of this group. The community must involve the planning commission and governing body throughout the process. The following individuals or roles should be represented in the policy group:

Director of Planning and Development

Recreation Director

Municipal Treasurer

Municipal Clerk

Director of Public Services

Director of Finance

Police Chief (if police department capital improvements are being included in the CIP)

Fire Chief (if fire department capital improvements are being included in the CIP)

Governing Body Representative (if possible)

Planning Commission Representatives (two if possible)



Administrative team

This group is responsible for final scoring of the project requests and crafting the capital improvements plan to present to the planning commission. Most often, the administrative group consists of the manager or supervisor, the director of community and economic development and the director of finance. If all of these positions do not exist in the community, look for a team that fully understands the goals and direction of growth in the community, the priorities for spending in the community and the community's finances.

Planning commission

The planning commission is given responsibility by the act⁶ to adopt the capital improvements plan after the adoption of the master plan unless exempted by charter, thus should be involved throughout the process for seamless adoption. It is recommended that at least two commissioners are involved with the process from start to finish. The planning commission should fully understand the value and process of the capital improvements program. A training session may need to be held before the process begins if a capital improvements program is new to the community. Once the draft is complete, the planning commission should hold a working session open to the public to review the CIP draft and give the project lead and administrative team final edits. After these edits have been incorporated, the planning commission will adopt the CIP in an open meeting.

Governing body

The governing body should use the capital improvements plan to aid in the adoption of the municipal budget. This is most effective when the governing body fully understands the benefits and process of the CIP. It is recommended that one elected official be a part of the CIP process from start to finish. The governing body is expected to adopt the CIP after the planning commission adopts it, but before the budget is adopted. If the planning commission is exempted by charter from preparing and adopting the capital improvements plan, the task falls to the governing body.





Once all roles have been identified, the administrative team hosts a kickoff meeting to explain the reasons and benefits of a capital improvements program and everyone's role in the process. The project lead organizes this meeting and both the administrative team and policy group in their entirety should be present. The kickoff meeting may be an opportunity for public involvement by allowing any member of the community to observe. This would allow for the public to understand what the CIP is and how they can become involved.

It is helpful to reference Article IV of the Michigan Planning enabling Act (P.A 33 of 2008) for the legal foundation of the capital improvements plan.

If a six year projection seems daunting to your community as the CIP is developed for the first time, you may decide to draft a CIP that covers two or three years. A shorter time period will allow you to establish an effective and thorough process which will enable your community to add on to the projection the following year. Although beneficial for establishing the process, a capital improvements plan that projects less than six years still does not meet the requirements of the law or RRC best practice.

The enabling act states, "The capital improvements program shall show those public structures and improvements in the general order of their priority, that in the (planning) commission's judgment will be needed or desirable and can be undertaken within the ensuing 6-year period"



STEP THREE

Complete project application forms

The capital improvements projects will be identified by completing project application forms. Each department head will fill out a project application form for each project to occur in the next six years. Each identified capital improvement should have a separate project application form filled out. For example, if the parks and recreation department is requesting trail improvements in three different parks, three different project application forms need to be filled out. After the completion of all project applications, policy group members receive a copy of all project application forms, then rank them based off of the scoring criteria developed by the project lead. At the end of the kickoff meeting, the department heads should have a thorough understanding and be ready to support the community's chosen CIP process, project application forms and be ready to identify next steps.

It is important that the project lead give the department heads enough time to complete this project as the process can be overwhelming, especially for the first time. It is important that the project application form be filled out in its entirety. This will allow all projects to be evaluated with the same information.



The actual form will look different depending on the capacity of the community. The project lead should develop an ID mechanism to be attached to each project application request. For example, all capital improvements being requested by the police department would begin with "P" (P-001, P-002, etc.). The ID mechanism will be useful when writing the capital improvements plan in referencing specific projects in the project summary section discussed in part two of this guide.



After the department heads identify and complete the project application forms for all capital improvements that will occur in the next six years, each member of the policy group receives one copy of every project application form submitted along with the appropriate amount of score sheets.

The three basic questions that should be answered when ranking projects are:

- Is the project legal?
- Is the project a high priority for the community?
- Is the project contained in the master plan or the parks and recreation plan?

Appendix B contains a sample of a more complex score sheet. The length and intensity of the score sheet is dependent on the capacity and goals of the community. Each member for the policy group will score and then rank the projects and submit the score sheets to the administrative team.

STEP FIVE Rank projects and draft the CIP

The administrative team will ultimately draft the capital improvements plan based on the priority of the projects for the city and available funds. The length of the plan will depend on the amount of projects, the years projected out and the capacity of the community. It is important for the administrative team to work closely with the planning commission and governing body as they will be ultimately adopting it.



The next section of this guide contains sample language to use in the CIP

It is recommended the administrative team presents a draft CIP to the planning commission during a working session. This session allows the planning commission to give input and feedback and hear public comment before it is finally adopted. Once the planning commission adopts the CIP, the plan then goes to the governing body for adoption.

SAMPLE LANGUAGE

This section provides sample CIP language your community may use in the drafting of a capital improvements plan.

SAMPLE INTRODUCTION LANGUAGE

A Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) is a multi-year planning instrument used to identify needs and financing sources for public infrastructure improvements. The purpose of a CIP is to facilitate the orderly planning of infrastructure improvements; to maintain, preserve, and protect the community of Anywhere's existing infrastructure system; and to provide for the acquisition or scheduled replacement of equipment to ensure the efficient delivery of services to the community. The CIP is also utilized to ensure that capital improvements are fiscally sound and consistent with the goals and policies of the governing body and the residents of the community.

A comprehensive CIP is an essential tool for the planning and development of the social, physical, and economic wellbeing of the community. This process is a necessary step in an organized effort to strengthen the quality of public facilities and services; provide a framework for the realization of community goals and objectives; and provide a sound basis on which to build a healthy and vibrant community.

The CIP informs Anywhere residents and stakeholders on how the municipality plans to address significant capital needs over the next six years. The CIP provides visual representations of the community's needs including maps that detail the timing, sequence, and location of capital projects. The CIP can also influence growth because infrastructure can impact development patterns.

Some of the many benefits that the CIP provides for the residents and stakeholders include:

- Optimize the uses of revenue
- Focus attention on community goals, needs, and capabilities
- Guide future growth and development
- Encourage efficient government
- Improve intergovernmental and regional cooperation
- Help maintain a sound and stable financial program
- Enhance opportunities for the participation in federal and/or state grant programs

The projects identified in the CIP represent the community's plan to serve residents and anticipate the needs of a dynamic community. Projects are guided by various development plans and policies established by the planning commission, governing body, and administration.

Plans and policies include:

Master land use plan Redevelopment plan Downtown development plan Corridor improvement plan Recreation plan Transportation plan Non-motorized transportation plan Goals and objectives of council Administrative policies



Mission statement

Preparation of the CIP is done under the authority of the Michigan Planning Enabling Act (PA 33 of 2008). The goal of the CIP should be to implement the master plan and to assist in the community's financial planning.

The CIP is dynamic. Each year all projects included within the CIP are reviewed, a call for new projects is made, and adjustments are made to existing projects arising from changes in the amount of funding required, conditions, or time line. A new year of programming is also added each year to replace the year funded in the annual operating budget.

The CIP program should continue to develop over time by adding features to gradually improve quality and sophistication. Greater attention shall be devoted to provide more detailed information about individual project requests, program planning, fiscal analysis, fiscal policies, and developing debt strategy.

CIP and the budget process

The CIP plays a significant role in the implementation of a master plan by providing the link between planning and budgeting for capital projects. The CIP process precedes the budget process and is used to develop the capital project portion of the annual budget. Approval of the CIP by the planning commission does not mean that they grant final approval of all projects contained within the plan. Rather by approving the CIP, the planning commission acknowledges that these projects represent a reasonable interpretation of the upcoming needs for the community and that projects contained in the first year of the plan are suitable for inclusion in the upcoming budget.

Priority rankings do not necessarily correspond to funding sequence. For example, a road-widening project which is ranked lower than a park project may be funded before the park project because the road project has access to a restricted revenue source, whereas a park project may have to compete for funding from other revenue sources. A project's funding depends upon a number of factors — not only its merit, but also its location, cost, funding source, and logistics.

The community of Anywhere should strive to maximize resources by maintaining a balance between operating and capital budgets. A continuous relationship exists between the CIP and the annual budget. A direct link can be seen between the two documents, as there should be in a strategic planning environment. Budget appropriations lapse at the end of the fiscal year as the operating budget is funded with recurring annual revenues such as taxes, licenses, fines, user fees, and interest income.



SAMPLE CIP PROCESS LANGUAGE

Capital Improvements Plan Policy group: reviews the policy, develops the project rating and weighting criteria, rates and weights project applications, reviews funding options, and presents the recommendation to the Administrative Group.

Director of Planning and Development

Recreation Director

Municipal Treasurer

Municipal Clerk

Director of Public Services

Director of Finance

Police Chief

Fire Chief

Governing Body Representative

Planning Commission Representative (2)

Administrative group: clarifies any issues, finalizes the ratings and brings the CIP draft forward at the planning commission workshop and presents the CIP at the planning commission public hearing.

Community Manager

Director of CED

Director of Finance

Planning commission: works with the policy group during the plan development, conducts workshops (if necessary), reviews the policy group's recommendation, receives public input, conducts public hearings, adopts the plan, and requests the governing body to consider incorporating funding for the first year projects into the budget plan.

Governing body: encouraged to use the CIP as a tool in the adoption of the annual budget process in accordance with the governing body goals and objectives.

Residents: encouraged to participate in plan development by working with various boards and commissions at the planning commission workshops, the planning commission public hearings, and at the governing body's budget workshops and public hearings. As always, communication is open between residents, governing body representatives, planning commission representatives, and staff.



SAMPLE CIP POLICY LANGUAGE

As used in the community of Anywhere Capital Improvements Program, a capital improvements project is defined as a major, nonrecurring expenditure that includes one or more of the following:

- 1. Any construction of a new facility (i.e., a public building, water/sanitary sewer mains, storm sewers, major/local roadways, recreational facilities), an addition to, or extension of such a facility, provided that the cost is \$10,000 or more and that the improvement will have a useful life of three years or more.
- 2. Any nonrecurring rehabilitation of all or a part of a building, its grounds, a facility, or equipment, provided that the cost is \$10,000 or more and the improvement will have a useful life of three years or more.
- 3. Any purchase or replacement of major equipment to support community programs provided that the cost is \$10,000 or more and will be coded to a capital asset account.
- 4. Any planning, feasibility, engineering, or design study related to an individual capital improvements project or to a program that is implemented through individual capital improvements projects provided that the cost is \$10,000 or more and will have a useful life of three years or more.
- 5. Any planning, feasibility, engineering, or design study costing \$25,000 or more that is not part of an individual capital improvements project or a program that is implemented through individual capital improvements projects.
- 6. Any acquisition of land for a public purpose that is not part of an individual capital improvements project or a program that is implemented through individual capital improvements projects provided that the cost is \$25,000 or more.



SAMPLE PROGRAM FUNDING LANGUAGE

Because the capital improvements projects involve the outlay of substantial funds, numerous sources are necessary to provide financing over the life of the project. Most capital funding sources are earmarked for specific purposes and cannot be transferred from one capital program to another. For example, funds raised by the community of Anywhere's park maintenance and repair millage must be used for the purposes that were stated when the voters approved the millage. The CIP has to be prepared with some projections as to the amount of money available. The following is a summary of the funding sources for projects included in the capital improvements program.

Enterprise (reserve) funds

In enterprise financing, funds are accumulated in advance for capital requirements. Enterprise funds not only pay for capital improvements, but also for the day-to-day operations of community services and the debt payment on revenue bonds. The community can set levels for capital projects; however, increases in capital expenditures for water mains, for example, could result in increased rates. Enterprise fund dollars can only be used on projects related to that particular enterprise fund, i.e., only water system funds can only be used on water system funds.



Bonds

When the community of Anywhere sells bonds, purchasers are, in effect, lending the community money. The money is repaid, with interest, from taxes or fees over the years. The logic behind issuing bonds (or "floating a bond issue") for capital projects is that the citizens who benefit from the capital improvements over a period of time should help the community pay for them. Anywhere issues bonds in two forms

General Obligation (G.O.) bonds

Perhaps the most flexible of all capital funding sources, G.O. bonds can be used for the design or construction of any capital project. These bonds are financed through property taxes. In financing through this method, the taxing power of the community is pledged to pay interest and principal to retire the debt. Voter approval is required if the community wants to increase the taxes that it levies and the amount is included in Anywhere's state-imposed debt limits. To minimize the need for property tax increases, the community makes every effort to coordinate new bond issues with the retirement of previous bonds. G.O. bonds are authorized by a variety of state statutes

Revenue bonds

Revenue bonds are sold for projects that produce revenues, such as water and sewer system projects. Revenue bonds depend on user charges and other project-related income to cover their costs. Unlike G.O. bonds, revenue bonds are not included in the community state-imposed debt limits because the full faith and credit of the community back them. Revenue bonds are authorized by Public Act of 1933, the Revenue Bond Act.

Weight and gas tax

Based on a formula set by the State of Michigan, the community of Anywhere receives a portion of the tax placed on motor fuel and highway usage in the state. The restrictions placed on the expenditure of these funds insure that they will be spent on transportation-related projects or operations and services. These are commonly called Act 51 funds.

Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

TIF is a municipal financing tool that can be used to renovate or redevelop declining areas while improving their tax base. TIF applies the increase in various state and local taxes that result from a redevelopment project to pay for project-related public improvements. For purposes of financing activities within the community of Anywhere's downtown district, the Downtown Development Authority adopted a 30-year TIF plan in 1982. Public Act 281 of 1986, the Local Development Finance Authority Act and Public Act 450 of 1980, the Tax Increment Financing Act authorizes TIF.

Millages

The property tax is a millage that is one of the most important sources of community revenue. The property tax rate is stated in mills (one dollar per \$1,000 of valuation). This rate is applied to a property's net value, following the application of all exemptions and a 50 percent equalization ratio. Millages are voter-approved taxes that are specifically earmarked for a particular purpose. For example, the parks maintenance and repair millage helps support parks and recreation capital projects. The community is authorized to utilize millages under Public Act 279 of 1909, the Home Rule Cities Act.



Federal and state funds

The federal and state governments make funds available to communities through numerous grants and aid programs. Some funds are tied directly to a specific program. The community has discretion (within certain guidelines) over the expenditure of others. For the most part, the community has no direct control over the amount of money received under these programs.

Special assessments

Capital improvements that benefit particular properties, rather than the community as a whole, may be financed more equitably by special assessment, i.e., by those who directly benefit. Local improvements often financed by this method include new street improvements (including pavement, curb and gutter, sidewalks, etc.), sanitary and storm sewers, and water mains.

Developer contributions

Sometimes capital improvements are required to serve new development. Where funding is not available for the community to construct the improvements, developers may agree to voluntarily contribute their share or to install the facilities themselves so the development can go ahead.

PROJECT SUMMARY SECTION

The project summaries can be scaled to address the needs, capacity and circumstances for each community. The project summary section is sub-divided by department, and should include a capital improvement summary for each project and why the project was selected. The following is encouraged to be included for each capital improvement project:

Description of the project CIP ID #

Time line for completion

Cost

Source of funding

What plan or community goal the project ties to

APPENDIX

The project application form (pages 20-24) and score sheet (page 26) are included for your use. There are also examples of how the form (page 25) and score sheet (page 27) could be filled out.

Section 1A	
Project title:	Department:
Prepared by:	Date prepared:
CIP ID#:	Anticipated start date:
Section 1B Project description: Provide a brief (1–2) paragraph descri	otion of the project
Section 1C Planning context: Is the project part of an adopted progra NO YES (must identify):	
Must list the adopted program or policy, and how this projection	
Section 1D Planning context: Is the community legally obligated to pe ☐ NO	rform this service?
□YES	
Please describe the community's legal obligation:	

Section 1E Project time line: Estimated project beginning and ending dates. Be sure to include any work being done in prior years, including studies or other planning:
Section 1F Coordination: Please identify if this project is dependent upon one or more other CIP projects and please describe what the relationship is:
Section 1G Project priority: low, medium, high
Priority within department: Priority community-wide:
Section 2A Prior approval: Is this project included in the 2013 adopted or prior year's budget? Has this project been approved by any board, commission or governing body? YES: Please check all appropriate box(es) Governing body Planning Commission 2013 budget Prior year budget:
□NO

Section 2B Total estimated cost: in 2013 dollars: \$	
List all funding options available for this project:	
Recommended funding option(s) to be used? (i.e.: operating	ng revenues, fund balance, bond issue, etc.)
Section 2C Basis of cost estimate: Please check one of the following: Cost of comparable facility/equipment Cost estimate from engineer/architect Rule of thumb indicator/unit cost Preliminary estimate Ball park "guesstimate"	
Section 3A Equipment: Department:	
Section 3B Form of acquisition: Please check one of the following Purchase Rental/lease Number of units requested: Estimated service life (years):	

Section 3C

(Include Return on Investment section if the administration team and department heads have time to complete. Forgoing this section will save time.)

DIRECT COSTS	PER UNIT (\$)	TOTAL COST (\$)
Purchase price or annual rent /lease		
Plus: installation or related charges		
Plus: annual operational costs		
Less: annual operational savings		
Less: trade-in, salvage value, discount		
Net purchase cost/annual rent		

-						2	
•	Δ		tı	\cap	n	3	11
J	$\overline{}$	◡	u	$\mathbf{\circ}$	ш	•	$\boldsymbol{\smile}$

Purpose of expenditure: Please check appropriate box(es)
Scheduled replacement
Replace worn-out equipment
Expanded service life
☐ Increased safety
Present equipment obsolete
Reduce personnel time
☐ New operation
☐ Improved service to community, procedures, etc.
Other:

Section 3E

Replaced items(s): Attach a separate sheet if necessary

ITEM	MAKE	AGE	PRIOR YEAR'S MAINTENANCE	PRIOR YEAR'S RENTAL COST
			\$	\$
			\$	\$
			\$	\$
			\$	\$
			\$	\$
			\$	\$
			\$	\$

23

City share Total city

Total

2017

2016

2015

↔ ↔ ↔ ↔ ↔ ₩ ↔ ↔ ↔

\$ ↔ ↔ ↔ ↔ ↔ ↔ ↔

\$ \$ ↔ ↔ \$ \$ ↔ \$

\$ ↔ ₩ ↔ ↔

↔

\$ 8

↔ ↔

₩

Project title:

Date:

CIP ID#:

	Cost before
Project construction	2011
Preliminary engineering	\$
Right-of-Way services	\$
Land acquisition (ROW)	\$
Geotechnical engineering	\$
Construction	\$
Construction engineering	\$
Other construction costs	\$
Equipment/vehicle purchase	\$
Total project construction	\$

Project construction	Cost before 2011	Budget 2011	Budget 2012	Budget 2013	2014	
reliminary engineering	\$	↔	\$	\$	\$	
Right-of-Way services	\$	\$	\$	₩	\$	
and acquisition (ROW)	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	l
Seotechnical engineering	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	l
Sonstruction	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	l .
Sonstruction engineering	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
Other construction costs	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	l
equipment/vehicle purchase	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	l .
otal project construction	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
						ı

Future net operating costs/savings	Cost before 2011	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Est. staffing impact	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Est. operational impact	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Est. maintenance impact	₩	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Est. other impact	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Total operating impact	\$	∨	₩	\$	₩	\$	\$	\$	₩.
Project grand total	↔	₩	↔	∨	↔	∨	↔	\$	↔

City share Total city

S ↔ \$ ↔ \$

* Note:

^{*} Coordinate with:

Project application form EXAMPLE

Date: April 26, 2013

Project title: Sample Project #1

CIP ID#: CIP-01

Project construction	Cost before 2011
Preliminary engineering	- \$
Right-of-Way services	- \$
Land acquisition (ROW)	- \$
Geotechnical engineering	- \$
Construction	- \$
Construction engineering	- \$
Other construction costs	- \$
Equipment/vehicle purchase	- \$
Total project construction	- \$

city	0(00
Total city	\$50,000	-\$	-\$	-\$	- \$	-\$	-\$	- \$	\$50,000
City share	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Total	\$50,000	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	\$50,000
2017	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	- \$
2016	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	- \$
2015	\$50,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$50,000
2014	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	- \$
Budget 2013	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	- \$
Budget 2012	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	- \$
Budget 2011	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	- \$

Future net operating costs/savings	Cost before 2011	2011
Est. staffing impact	- \$	\$
Est. operational impact	- \$	\$
Est. maintenance impact	- \$	\$
Est. other impact	- \$	\$
Total operating impact	- \$	l \$

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	City share	City share Total city
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	100%	- \$
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	100%	-\$
₩.	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	100%	-\$
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	100%	- \$
l ⊗	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	۱ ۵	- \$	- \$		ا ج
l S	I S	l S	l S	-\$ 000'05\$	l S	l ⇔	\$50,000		\$50,000

ا ک

Project grand total

* Note:

^{*} Coordinate with:

Rater name: range score Weight point 1. Contributes to health, safety and welfare Eliminates a known hazard (accident history) Eliminates a potential hazard Materially contributes Minimally contributes No impact Project needed to comply with local, state or federal law Yes No 3. Project conforms to adopted program, policy or plan Project is consistent with adopted city council policy or plan Project is consistent with administrative policy No policy/plan in place 4. Project remediates an existing or projected deficiency Completely remedy problem Partially remedy problem Partially remedy problem S. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility Now facility More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Medium High Medium	2014–2019 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT NI	EEDS AS	SESSME	NT FORM	
Rater name: Score Rater Tota Point	Project name:		Project #:		
Rater name: range score Weight point 1. Contributes to health, safety and welfare Eliminates a known hazard (accident history) Eliminates a potential hazard Materially contributes Minimally contributes No impact Project needed to comply with local, state or federal law Yes No 3. Project conforms to adopted program, policy or plan Project is consistent with adopted city council policy or plan Project is consistent with administrative policy No policy/plan in place 4. Project remediates an existing or projected deficiency Completely remedy problem Partially remedy problem Partially remedy problem S. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility Now facility More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Medium High Medium	Department:		Total score	e:	
Eliminates a known hazard (accident history) Eliminates a potential hazard Materially contributes Minimally contributes No impact 2. Project needed to comply with local, state or federal law Yes No 3. Project conforms to adopted program, policy or plan Project is consistent with adopted city council policy or plan Project is consistent with administrative policy No policy/plan in place 4. Project remediates an existing or projected deficiency Completely remedy problem Partially remedy problem No 5. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility Now facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wice Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium	Rater name:			Weight	Total points
Eliminates a potential hazard Materially contributes Minimally contributes No impact Project needed to comply with local, state or federal law Yes No 3. Project conforms to adopted program, policy or plan Project is consistent with adopted city council policy or plan Project is consistent with adopted city council policy or plan Project is consistent with administrative policy No policy/plan in place 4. Project remediates an existing or projected deficiency Completely remedy problem Partially remedy problem No 5. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility New facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium	1. Contributes to health, safety and welfare				
Materially contributes Minimally contributes No impact 2. Project needed to comply with local, state or federal law Yes No 3. Project conforms to adopted program, policy or plan Project is consistent with adopted city council policy or plan Project is consistent with administrative policy No policy/plan in place 4. Project meediates an existing or projected deficiency Completely remedy problem Partially remedy problem No 5. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility New facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium	Eliminates a known hazard (accident history)				
Minimally contributes No impact 2. Project needed to comply with local, state or federal law Yes No 3. Project conforms to adopted program, policy or plan Project is consistent with adopted city council policy or plan Project is consistent with administrative policy No policy/plan in place 4. Project remediates an existing or projected deficiency Completely remedy problem Partially remedy problem Partially remedy problem No 5. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility New facility New facility New facility More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium	Eliminates a potential hazard				
No impact 2. Project needed to comply with local, state or federal law Yes No No 3. Project conforms to adopted program, policy or plan Project is consistent with adopted city council policy or plan Project is consistent with administrative policy No policy/plan in place 4. Project remediates an existing or projected deficiency Completely remedy problem Partially remedy problem Partially remedy problem So No 5. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility New facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium Medium High Medium	Materially contributes				
2. Project needed to comply with local, state or federal law Yes No 3. Project conforms to adopted program, policy or plan Project is consistent with adopted city council policy or plan Project is consistent with administrative policy No policy/plan in place 4. Project remediates an existing or projected deficiency Completely remedy problem Partially remedy problem No 5. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility New facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium	Minimally contributes				
Yes No 3. Project conforms to adopted program, policy or plan Project is consistent with adopted city council policy or plan Project is consistent with administrative policy No policy/plan in place 4. Project remediates an existing or projected deficiency Completely remedy problem Partially remedy problem Partially remedy problem No 5. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility New facility More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium	No impact				
No 3. Project conforms to adopted program, policy or plan Project is consistent with adopted city council policy or plan Project is consistent with administrative policy No policy/plan in place 4. Project remediates an existing or projected deficiency Completely remedy problem Partially remedy problem No 5. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility New facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium	2. Project needed to comply with local, state or federal law				
3. Project conforms to adopted program, policy or plan Project is consistent with adopted city council policy or plan Project is consistent with administrative policy No policy/plan in place 4. Project remediates an existing or projected deficiency Completely remedy problem Partially remedy problem No 5. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility New facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium High Medium	Yes				
Project is consistent with adopted city council policy or plan Project is consistent with administrative policy No policy/plan in place 4. Project remediates an existing or projected deficiency Completely remedy problem Partially remedy problem No 5. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility New facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium High Medium	No				
Project is consistent with administrative policy No policy/plan in place 4. Project remediates an existing or projected deficiency Completely remedy problem Partially remedy problem No 5. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility New facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 11–20 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium	3. Project conforms to adopted program, policy or plan	•			
No policy/plan in place 4. Project remediates an existing or projected deficiency Completely remedy problem Partially remedy problem No 5. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility New facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium					
4. Project remediates an existing or projected deficiency Completely remedy problem Partially remedy problem No 5. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility New facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium High Medium High Medium High Medium High Medium	Project is consistent with administrative policy				
Completely remedy problem Partially remedy problem No 5. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility New facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium	No policy/plan in place				
Partially remedy problem No 5. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility New facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium High Medium High Medium	4. Project remediates an existing or projected deficiency				
Partially remedy problem No 5. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility New facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium High Medium High Medium					
No 5. Will project upgrade facilities? Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility New facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium					
Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility New facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium					
Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility Replaces existing facility New facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium	5. Will project upgrade facilities?				
Replaces existing facility New facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium					
New facility 6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium High Medium					
6. Contributes to long-term needs of community More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium					
More than 30 years 21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium High Medium	6. Contributes to long-term needs of community				
21–30 years 11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium					
11–20 years 4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium					
4–10 years 3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium					
3 years or less 7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium					
7. Service area of project Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium					
Regional City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium					
City-wide Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium					
Several neighborhoods One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium					
One neighborhood or less 8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium	•				
8. Department priority High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium			1		
High Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium					
Medium Low 9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium					
9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium			1		
9. Project delivers level of service desired by community High Medium			1		
High Medium	·				
Medium					
	-		-		
Low			-		

Project name:		Project #:		
		Total score		
Department:	C		:: 	Total
Rater name:	Score range	Rater score	Weight	points
1. Contributes to health, safety and welfare				
Eliminates a known hazard (accident history)	5			
Eliminates a potential hazard	4			
Materially contributes	3		5	
Minimally contributes	1			
No impact	0			
2. Project needed to comply with local, state or federal law				
Yes	5		F	
No	0		5	
3. Project conforms to adopted program, policy or plan				
Project is consistent with adopted city council policy or plan	5			
Project is consistent with administrative policy	3		4	
No policy/plan in place	0			
4. Project remediates an existing or projected deficiency				
Completely remedy problem	5			
Partially remedy problem	3		3	
No	0			
5. Will project upgrade facilities?		1		
Rehabilitates/upgrades existing facility	5			
Replaces existing facility	3		3	
New facility	1			
6. Contributes to long-term needs of community		•		
More than 30 years	5			
21–30 years	4			
11–20 years	3		2	
4–10 years	2			
3 years or less	1			
7. Service area of project	l .		'	
Regional	5			
City-wide	4	1		
Several neighborhoods	3	1	2	
One neighborhood or less	1	1		
8. Department priority				
High	5			
Medium	3	-	2	
Low	1	1	_	
Project delivers level of service desired by community	<u> </u>			
High	5			
Medium	3	1	2	
Low	1	1	_	

3540-160202 Low 1