

**Subject:** CIP CAC Special Session

**Date:** July 15, 2015 – 6-7:30 p.m.

---

1. Call to Order (6 p.m.)
2. Co-chairs Report (6-6:05 p.m.)
3. Input: Capital Improvement Program/Project Criteria (6:05-7:25 p.m.)
  - a. Review of CIP Project Criteria
    - i. Do you agree/disagree with the list of criteria and definitions?
      1. Public input: utilize 2013 QCI List; distribute to CIP CAC for recommendations; prioritize in plan document
      2. Benefit to community-immediate and future
      3. Population, business impacts
      4. Alternative #2 seems like an extra effort
      5. Funding: mash-up/combine
      6. Cost of project-order of magnitude
      7. Prior city council commitment: we have council changes every two years; concrete measurement
    - ii. Do you have additions/deletions?
      1. Geographically diverse should be deleted: downplay north versus south; we are one city
      2. Geographically diverse should be included
      3. Define geographically diverse more clearly; replace with population impacted and business impacted
      4. Add operational ROI/payback period
      5. Add regulatory mandate (Yes/no; ex. EPA requirements)

## MINUTES CONTINUED

---

6. Add window of opportunity
- iii. Do you agree/disagree with the weight assigned to each criterion?
  1. City council goal alignment
    - a. Med/High 20
  2. Priority in plan documents
    - a. Med 20
  3. 2K eligible
    - a. Low/Med 5-10
  4. Economic development ROI (define: primary=employment; secondary = retail/restaurant)
    - a. Med/High 15/20
  5. Deferred maintenance (include obsolete)
    - a. Low/Med/High 10-15
  6. Combine grant funding and funding source (0, 2, 3 or Y/N, points for grants)
    - a. Low 5-10
  7. Geographically diverse-Replace with impacted populations and businesses
    - a. Low/Med 5-10 or 5/15
    - b. Business impacts–use number of employees?
  8. Benefit to community-addresses geographic diversity; how do we measure? Short-term versus long-term weighting?
    - a. Yes/No
  9. Public input-already prioritized certain projects in 2013 QCI; most master plans have public input as well



## MINUTES CONTINUED

---

- a. Yes/No
- 10. Operational ROI/Payback Period
  - a. Low/Med/High
- 11. Regulatory Mandate
  - a. High
- 12. Window of Opportunity
  - a. Low/Med
- 4. Next Steps (7:25-7:30 p.m.)
  - a. July 16-31: Staff will revise CIP criteria and project list based on input from CIP CAC
  - b. Aug. 10: Five-year CIP review with city council and initial decisions on 2016 projects
  - c. Aug. 19: Show CIP CAC outcome at CIP CAC meeting
  - d. Aug. 24: City council budget retreat/Final review of five-year CIP
  - e. Q4: Adoption of five-year CIP as part of 2016 budget approval
- 5. Adjourn

