



Capital Improvements & Preservation Plan (CIPP)

Evaluation Criteria

Purpose

- Present draft evaluation criteria for consideration and feedback
 - Prioritization of program categories
 - Prioritization of projects
- Highlight input from capital improvement program citizen advisory committee
- Schedule and next steps



Why Create a Five Year CIPP

- Budget certainty and predictability for projects
- Advances strategic goals and initiatives
- Systemic, programmatic approach to plan and manage city's project portfolio
- Sustainable approach to implement needed investments with available resources
- Communication tool for public and partners



Adopted 2016 CIPP Philosophy

- Focus on completing significant, existing project commitments
 - 2K Bond projects
 - Existing projects
 - Advance multi-year projects previously identified as a council priority
- More conservative approach to funding CIPP projects
- Establish a policy on how best to fund long-term capital maintenance needs



2017 Council Retreat

- Priority outcomes guide evaluation criteria for capital projects
- Support for “maintain what have” – long-term capital replacement
- Need to fund “regulatory bucket” of capital projects (signals, etc.)
- Engage citizen advisory committee and staff to provide recommendations for council consideration



Framework for Five Year Plan

- **Traditional Capital Projects**
 - New parks, recreation amenities, roads & facilities
 - Variety of funding sources, including general fund
- **Operational Capital Projects**
 - Signals, bridge replacement, warning towers, sidewalk connections, drainage/water quality, park/road enhancements, studies
 - General fund transfer + variety of fees
- **Preservation Capital Projects**
 - Long-term asset maintenance/replacement of roads, flatwork, parks, and golf assets
 - Set annual funding amounts (percentage or dollar) to improve budget/project certainty
 - Facilities, fleet and information technology long-term capital projects will adopt a similar approach, but funded through internal service funds, not CIPP



Priority within the framework

- Traditional Projects
- Operational Projects
- Preservation Projects



Draft Evaluation Criteria

- **Traditional Projects**

- Six priority outcome areas
- Regulatory mandate
- Safety benefit
- Community benefit
- State of Good Repair

- **Operational Projects**

- Six priority outcome areas
- Criteria by category
- Relative priority of operational project categories

- **Preservation Projects**

- Remaining life expectancy
- Condition (good, fair, poor)



Draft Evaluation Criteria: Operational Projects

- Signals
 - Meets warrants (y/n)
 - Safety (# of crashes)
 - Traffic Volumes
- Bridges
 - Structurally deficient
 - Functionally obsolete
- Emergency Management
 - Based on population growth and coverage map
- Sidewalk Connectivity
 - ADA compliance
 - Last mile connections
- Drainage/Water Quality
 - Needed for development
 - Third-party funding
- Park/Recreation Enhancements
 - Grasp analysis?
- Studies
 - Best practice?



Priority within council outcomes

- Location of choice for primary employers
- Safe, multi-modal travel network
- Financial compliance and stability
- Location of choice for primary employers
- Safe, multi-modal travel network
- Active living and healthy lifestyles for all
- Fair and impartial administration of justice residents
- Active living and healthy lifestyles for all
- Financial compliance and stability residents
- Fair and impartial administration of justice
- Sense of historic and cultural significance
- Sense of historic and cultural significance



Relative priority of operational categories

- Drainage/Water Quality
- Bridges
- Emergency Management
- Traffic Signals
- Sidewalk Connectivity
- Parks/Recreation Enhancements
- Studies



Weighted Evaluation Criteria: Traditional Projects

Scoring Topic	Criteria	Points
Prior Funding Commitment	Yes/No	10 points/0 points
Priority Outcome Area	Yes/No	10 points/ 0 points
<i>Priority Area One</i>	<i>Points based on order</i>	<i>20 points</i>
<i>Priority Area Two</i>		<i>17 points</i>
<i>Priority Area Three</i>		<i>14 points</i>
<i>Priority Area Four</i>		<i>11 points</i>
<i>Priority Area Five</i>		<i>8 points</i>
<i>Priority Area Six</i>		<i>5 points</i>
Community Benefit	Citywide/Specific area	20 points / 10 points
Regulatory Mandate	Yes/No	20 points / 0 points
State of Good Repair	Yes/No	10 points/0 points
Safety Benefit	High, Moderate, Low, None	10 /8 /6 /4 points
	Total	100 points total

Weighted Evaluation Criteria: Operational Projects

Scoring Topic	Criteria	Points
Prior Funding Commitment	Yes/No	10 points/0 points
Priority Outcome Area	Yes/No	10 points/ 0 points
<i>Priority Relativity 1-6</i>	<i>Points based on order</i>	20/17/14/11/8/5 points
Regulatory Mandate	Yes/No	20 points / 0 points
Safety Benefit	High, Moderate, Low, None	10 /8 /6 /4 points
Categorical Priority (1-7)	Points Based on Order	20/17/14/11/8/5/2
State of Good Repair	Yes/No	10 points/0 points
	Total	100 points total



Policy Considerations

- Need to create additional, consistent revenue streams for CIPP
- Relative priority of CIPP to operations and service levels



2018 – 2022 Submittals

CIPP Summary By Project Type	
Traditional	\$168,943,600
Operational	\$22,490,521
Preservation	\$16,952,500
Total	\$208,386,621
CIPP Summary By Department	
Community Development	\$250,000
Traditional	\$0
Operational	\$250,000
Preservation	\$0
Parks, Recreation & Golf Department	\$5,257,500
Traditional	\$1,270,000
Operational	\$435,000
Preservation	\$3,552,500
Police Department	\$345,521
Traditional	\$0
Operational	\$345,521
Preservation	\$0
Public Works Department	\$202,533,600
Traditional	\$167,673,600
Operational	\$21,460,000
Preservation	\$13,400,000



Next Steps

- July 17: city council presentation
- End of July: CIPCAC/Staff scoring
- August: initial prioritization results, finalize five year plan at budget retreat
- 2017+: CIPCAC transition
- 2017+: CIPP plan document, program structure, project management manual, etc.

