

2006 – 2010

## CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

CITY OF MARSHFIELD, WISCONSIN



### **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE**

Michael Meyers, Mayor

Tom Buttke, Council President

Jerry Bennington Sr., Chairman, Finance, Budget, and Personnel Committee

Mike Feirer, Chairman, Board of Public Works

Gerald Nelson, Plan Commission

Michael Brehm, City Administrator

Keith Strey, Finance Director

Dan Knoeck, Director of Public Works

Ed Englehart, Parks and Recreation Director

Joseph Pacovsky, Utility Manager

Amber Miller, Director of Planning and Economic Development

Karl Zimmermann, Citizen member

May 1, 2006

To the Honorable Mayor Meyers,  
Members of the Common Council, and  
Members of the Plan Commission

RE: 2006 - 2010 CIP Program

I am pleased to present the adopted 2006-2010 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) of the City of Marshfield for your review and consideration. The CIP is one of the most important planning documents you will have for consideration. It is a five-year master plan recommending the development of facilities, infrastructure and other capital expenditures that contribute to our community's quality of life. This planning document reflects numerous hours by the city's CIP Administrative Committee in analyzing, prioritizing, and scheduling capital projects to be completed over a 5-year planning period.

### **Overview**

The CIP process is authorized by the Common Council per city Policy #1.210 (included in the following pages). As stated above, the CIP is a planning tool, and not an appropriation or budget document. Although the CIP has no legal significance, it is a vital link or connection between the city's 1994 comprehensive plan, all subsidiary plans with a 10-15 year planning horizon, and the annual budget process. The CIP is a critical process because it helps ensure the timely renewal and extension of the city's physical plant; control over the city's long-term debt in relation to the city's financial capacity; and coordinated capital development.

### **Funding Sources**

The city finances its 5-year CIP from a number of funding sources, including:

**Operating funds** generated from current year tax levies (and primarily budgeted in the city's General Fund);

**Special assessments** levied against certain properties to defray part or all of a specific improvement determined to primarily benefit those properties;

**Borrowed funds** generated from instruments of long-term debt, such as notes or bonds;

**Room tax** funds available from 50% of the first 4% and 30% of the next 2% of the revenue generated from the city's 6% hotel/motel tax;

**Wastewater Utility (fees and debt)** generated immediately from Utility users and immediately applied to specific capital projects or generated from Utility users over a period of years to retire long-term debt issued in behalf of the Utility;

**Non-Local revenue** received from the State of Wisconsin, one or more Federal agencies, or other political jurisdictions;

**Cemetery Perpetual Care funds** from deposits made by individuals for future maintenance of their grave sites; and

**Donations/Private funds** from the Wildwood Park Zoological Society and other civic and cultural organizations as well as individuals within the community.

## **Financial Planning**

The CIP Administrative Committee diligently worked to prepare a balanced and affordable 5-year capital improvement plan that would meet the city's most critical needs. The goals established by the Committee were two-fold: 1) to ensure that city debt complied with the provisions of city Debt Policy #4.900; and 2) to have a stable tax-rate for both long-term debt and operating funds combined. To accomplish this, the Committee approved borrowing only \$2,000,000 per year for the years 2006-2010 inclusive. However, at their March 21<sup>st</sup> meeting, the Committee amended their goals for debt to include borrowing an additional \$235,738 in 2008 and borrowing an additional \$700,265 in 2009. The additional monies will be used entirely to fund project FD-K-5800 – Second Fire Station. This decision was based on the fact that this is a nonrecurring capital expenditure and that the city has the debt capacity to do this. The Committee also approved increasing the tax levy by only 2.5% annually using the approved 2006 operating fund requirements for the base year. **Schedule F** compares the CIP Committee's approved borrowing amounts and operating funds to their recommended amounts. It shows that the goals have been exceeded for operating funds by \$1,716 as amended. **Schedule D, Column 9**, shows the impact on the city's tax rate for both borrowed and operating funds. The rate is relatively stable.

The planned issuance of long-term debt during the program planning years of 2007 through 2010 is also identified in the summary sheet **Sources of Revenue Summary** and is limited to the following projects:

### **2007:**

- ? South Central Avenue Reconstruction – 2<sup>nd</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> (\$75,000);
- ? West 5<sup>th</sup> Street Reconstruction – Oak to Adams (\$256,000);
- ? Yellowstone Industrial Park (\$755,000);
- ? Vine Avenue Reconstruction – 17<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> (\$240,000);
- ? 29<sup>th</sup> Street & Veterans Pkwy – Traffic Signals (74,000);
- ? New Sidewalk – 2007 Paving Project & Orders (\$48,000);
- ? Lincoln Avenue & Spencer Street – Watermain (\$160,000);
- ? Vine Avenue Storm Sewer – Mill Creek to 17<sup>th</sup> (\$242,000);
- ? West 5<sup>th</sup> Street Storm Sewer – Oak to Adams (\$150,000).

### **2008:**

- ? South Central Avenue Reconstruction – 2<sup>nd</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> (\$75,000);
- ? 8<sup>th</sup> Street Reconstruction – Felker to Washington (\$277,838);
- ? Yellowstone Industrial Park (\$1,055,000);
- ? Western St. – St. Joseph to Wood – Street Reconstruction (\$150,000);
- ? North Central Ave. Signal Progression (\$65,000);
- ? New Sidewalk – 2008 Paving Projects & Orders (\$52,700);
- ? Second Fire Station (\$247,200);
- ? Wildwood Park parking lots (\$60,000);
- ? 8<sup>th</sup> Street Storm Sewer – Felker to Washington (\$53,000);
- ? Fairgrounds Stormwater Collection & Detention (\$200,000).

### **2009:**

- ? Cemetery Mausoleum Project (\$93,515);
- ? Yellowstone Dr. – Galvin to East City Limits (\$1,695,000);
- ? Second Fire Station (\$732,250);
- ? 7<sup>th</sup> – Central to Chestnut – Storm Sewer (\$27,500);
- ? Spruce Ave. – 5<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> – Storm Sewer w/Paving (\$152,000).

### **2010:**

- ? Lincoln Ave – 8th to 14th – Reconstruction (\$79,150);
- ? West 13th Street – Central to Chestnut Reconstruction (\$120,000);
- ? Felker Ave – 25th to Tremmel Ct. – Street Opening (\$187,000);
- ? Felker Ave – 25th to Tremmel Ct. – Watermain (\$101,000);
- ? New Sidewalk – 2010 Paving Projects & Orders (\$18,800);
- ? Second Fire Station (\$848,050);
- ? Wildwood Zoo – New Bear Exhibit Building (\$150,000);
- ? Lincoln Ave – 8th to 14th – Storm Sewer (\$366,000);
- ? Colonial/Laird Easement – Storm Sewer (\$46,000);
- ? 13th Street – Central to Chestnut – Storm Sewer (\$27,000);
- ? Felker Ave – 25th to Tremmel Ct. – Storm Sewer (\$57,000).

The City of Marshfield is statutorily limited to borrowing no more than an amount equaling 5% of its equalized valuation. The city's current equalized valuation is \$1,179,819,200, and our statutory debt limitation is \$58,990,960. As of December 31, 2005, the city's amount of outstanding debt totals \$24,351,815 or 41.3% of the city's allowable maximum capacity. The city has \$34,638,145 of its statutory debt borrowing capacity left to use for these types of projects. The 2006 debt issues put the City of Marshfield over city Policy #4.900 limits by \$30,626. The Common Council approved exceeding this policy to take advantage of debt refinancing opportunities available. There are four criteria under the city's debt policy. The CIP Committee has met three of these four criteria, but the net per capital debt capacity has been exceeded primarily for two reasons: as stated earlier, the Common Council's approval of the issuance of debt refinancing, and a reduction in the city's population by approximately 1,000. Debt issuance was capped by the Committee at \$2,000,000 for each of the years 2006, 2007, and 2010. \$2,235,738 and \$2,700,265 were the amounts approved for borrowing by the

CIP Committee for the years 2008 and 2009 respectively. Therefore, under city Policy #4.900 limits, issuance of long-term debt for 2006 – 2010 is not an available option unless the Common Council again approves exceeding their policy.

The adopted 2006 - 2010 CIP continues to aggressively address the need for expanded outdoor recreational facilities which includes Joe and Bernadine Weber Nature Park (\$130,000); new Bear Exhibit at the Wildwood Zoo (\$690,000); and the Wildwood Station – McMillan Marsh Trail (\$810,000). The City's portion of the Wildwood Station – McMillan Marsh Trail is \$152,000 and for the new Bear Exhibit it is \$150,000.

Continued emphasis is also given to improving the city's transportation system - with particular attention to correcting deficiencies and maintaining arterial and collector streets that carry relatively high traffic volumes (\$4,459,000). This includes the Galvin Avenue shoulder widening – Becker to McMillan (\$704,000); complete reconstruction of Yellowstone Drive – Galvin to East City Limits (\$1,695,000); reconstruction of Lincoln Ave – 8<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> is scheduled for 2010 (\$180,000; a portion of this project will be eligible for state aids estimated at \$560,000); and \$550,000 is scheduled for W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street – Oak to Adams in 2007.

The adopted 2006-2010 CIP also includes \$1,810,000 for Yellowstone Industrial Park \$755,000 in 2007 and \$1,055,000 in 2008. There was an additional \$1,075,000 originally shown in 2010 which was moved to Non-Year with the expectation that this money will be scheduled for 2011. Amended TIF laws have extended the period for capturing eligible expenditures, thus giving the city some flexibility in scheduling this project. The plan also includes \$2,114,079 for the asphalt street surfacing program.

The adopted 2006-2010 CIP includes some additional facilities enhancements to the University of Wisconsin Center - Marshfield/Wood County campus (\$1,093,000). The City's share of the funding, totaling \$546,500 will come from long-term debt and operating funds and will be equally matched by Wood County (subject to Board approval). The adopted CIP also includes \$1,135,000 in 2006 for a new general aviation building to be financed by borrowed (\$163,000), operating funds (\$2,000), and non-local funds (\$970,000). There is also \$1,913,000 included for a new second fire station to be funded by borrowing and operating funds. City-wide sanitary sewer lining is also included (\$1,680,398) to be funded by Wastewater debt and user fees. Also included in this CIP is \$52,000 for a Storm Water Pollutant Loading Model and \$660,000 for Storm Water Quality Improvements.

There are several significant projects that were requested this year but removed and placed in either the non-year or deleted category by the CIP Committee. Although all the projects are certainly worthy, the primary reason that these projects were removed is their cost in consideration of available funding.

## **Summary**

Perhaps the greatest value of the CIP process is the significant public discussion and dialogue that is generated well in advance of the actual initiation or construction of projects. The CIP is the primary means for advancing projects on to the City's public agenda, and I appreciate the work of so many people who make the process work. As you utilize this planning document in your decision-making processes, I invite your questions and comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael F. Brehm  
City Administrator

## 4. COMMUNITY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

### 4.A. COMMUNITY GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

1. Marshfield should encourage growth and development in a planned and coordinated manner.
2. Encourage development that is compatible with neighboring land uses.
3. Encourage new development to locate in areas which can be efficiently and economically served by existing and planned streets and public utilities.
4. Discourage the location of industries or other commercial uses in predominantly residential neighborhoods.
5. Avoid continuing the pattern of extended strip commercial development along primary arterial corridors.
6. Revitalize the downtown central business district.
7. Maintain downtown as the center for civic and government activities.
8. Encourage cultural activities in the downtown area.

### 4.B. EXTRATERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT

1. Coordinate City planning with adjoining towns.
2. Discourage unplanned sprawl at the periphery of the City.
3. Preserve farmland and other open space in the rural areas around Marshfield.

### 4.C. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

1. Identify additional land for industrial development.
2. Encourage industries and nonretail businesses to locate in planned industrial or business parks.
3. Provide locations for professional offices, "white collar" industries, and high technology industry.
4. Attract higher technology and higher value-added industries.
5. Maintain Marshfield as the retail and distribution center for its service area.

#### 4.D. HOUSING

1. Expand the supply of middle income family housing in the community, particularly moderately priced single-family homes.
2. Provide sites for additional multifamily housing.
3. Rehabilitate blighted or deteriorating housing stock, particularly in the older neighborhoods near downtown.
4. Encourage the development of identifiable and distinct residential neighborhoods.
5. Upgrade the quality of housing, particularly lower and middle income multifamily housing.
6. Provide adequate streets, sidewalks, parks, and other public amenities in neighborhoods with high concentrations of multifamily housing.

#### 4.E. COMMUNITY APPEARANCE

1. Beautify the entrances into the community.
2. Control billboards and other forms of garish or excessively large signage.
3. Screen and/or buffer unsightly outdoor equipment, material, and vehicle storage areas from view from public right-of-ways.
4. Maintain both commercial and residential property.
5. Encourage more extensive floral, shrub, and tree planting in both the public right-of-way and on private property.
6. Encourage neighboring properties to plan and design both buildings and sites to achieve a coordinated and harmonious appearance with respect to their neighbors.

#### 4.F. PUBLIC SERVICES

1. Improve the municipal water supply and sanitary sewer system.
2. Coordinate the location of public utilities and facilities with projected growth and development.

3. Future growth should be directed, through annexation and zoning policies, to areas where it is efficient and cost-effective to provide public services.
4. New development should be expected to pay the full cost of municipal services, so that the existing taxpayers are not burdened with inequitable taxes or service costs.
5. New development proposals should be evaluated on the basis of their fiscal impact and their impact on service levels elsewhere in the community.

#### 4.G. TRANSPORTATION

1. Provide efficient access for out-of-town visitors and patients to Marshfield Clinic and St. Joseph's Hospital.
2. Provide better traffic circulation within the City.
3. Reduce truck traffic and congestion on Central Avenue.
4. Develop a rational system of collector streets providing direct access from each neighborhood to arterial streets.
5. Provide safe pedestrian circulation throughout the City, especially between residential neighborhoods and schools.
6. Provide ample downtown parking.
7. Promote a four-lane highway linking Marshfield with the Stevens Point-Wisconsin Rapids area and the Highway 29 Corridor, which is scheduled to become the primary east-west corridor across north central Wisconsin.
8. Promote better intercity bus and airline service.

#### 4.H. PARKS AND OUTDOOR RECREATION

1. Provide neighborhood parks and playgrounds within safe walking distance of all residential neighborhoods.
2. Provide and upgrade community and special use parks.
3. Provide additional bicycle routes.
4. Preserve natural drainageways and wetlands in greenways.



# CITY OF MARSHFIELD, WISCONSIN POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

- 1 COMMON COUNCIL
- 2 ADMINISTRATIVE
- 3 PERSONNEL
- 4 FINANCIAL
- 5 PUBLIC WORKS
- 6 PARKS AND RECREATION

**CHAPTER:** Community Planning  
**SUBJECT:** Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Development  
**POLICY NUMBER:** 1.210  
**PAGES:** 5  
**APPROVAL DATE:** January 11, 2000

*Matthew Tolberg*

**DEPARTMENTS OF PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY:** Mayor's Office; City Administrator's Office; Director of Public Works' office

## I. Policy statement

The purpose of the capital improvement program is to provide an authoritative decision-making process for the evaluation, selection, and multi-year scheduling of public physical improvements based on a projection of available fiscal resources and the community's priorities. The objectives of the program are to a) ensure the timely renewal and extension of the City's physical plant; b) serve as the linkage in the City's planning for physical development between the City's comprehensive plan and all subsidiary plans with a 10-15 year horizon and the annual budget process with a one-year horizon; c) maintain control over the City's long-term debt in relation to the City's financial capacity; and d) ensure coordinated capital development.

## II. Definitions

The following definitions shall apply:

- A. **Capital Improvement Project:** Property acquisition, construction, or a major improvement to an existing facility or property of a nonrecurring nature with a minimum life span of at least five (5) years. A capital improvement may be financed by current, borrowed, or grant funds, or any combination of these or other sources. Vehicles and equipment are specifically excluded from this definition and from the CIP process. No project projected to cost less than \$5,000 will be considered a "capital improvement project" or considered as part of the process described in this policy.
- B. **Capital Improvement Program:** A comprehensive schedule of approved capital improvement projects. The program shall be for a five-year period. The program shall be annually revised and projected one year to allow for changed conditions and circumstances.

- C. Capital Budget: The capital budget includes those projects scheduled for activity and funding in the next budget year. The capital budget shall be presented annually by the City Administrator to the Common Council, in conjunction with the normal budget process, for consideration and adoption. The source of financing for each capital project in the budget shall be identified.
- D. CIP Administrative Committee: The CIP Administrative Committee consists of the following members: Mayor; Council President; Chairman, Board of Public Works; Chairman, Finance, Budget, and Personnel Committee; Aldermanic representative to the Plan Commission; City Administrator; Director of Public Works; Finance Director; Parks and Recreation Director; Director of Planning and Economic Development; Utility Manager, Marshfield Electric and Water Department; and a citizen at large. The Mayor shall convene the CIP Administrative Committee annually, and shall chair all committee meetings.

### III. Process

- A. Establishment of the administrative structure and policy framework for the capital improvement program and capital budget system

PURPOSE: To establish the mechanism to translate the goals and objectives of the City's comprehensive plan and subsidiary plans into a more immediate, near-term achievable plan and schedule

RESPONSIBLE PERSON/GROUP: The Common Council

- B. Analysis of available and acceptable funding levels for projects in the capital improvement program.

PURPOSE: To relate funding levels to the City's financial capacity and to ensure that the City's debt service costs do not exceed its ability to pay

RESPONSIBLE PERSON/GROUP: The Finance Director; the City Administrator

- C. Submission of project requests covering the five-year period by the department/division directors on Capital Improvement Program Project Request Forms, including a full description and justification of the project, its operating cost implications, proposed funding source(s), and other pertinent information.

PURPOSE: To establish a full list of known potential projects so that the review and analysis of the projects by the CIP Administrative Committee can commence.

RESPONSIBLE PERSON/GROUP: Department/division directors with responsibility for capital facilities

- D. Preparation of preliminary, phased 5-year physical facility development plans for each of the physical facility categories listed below, based on an inventory of existing facilities and estimates of demand.

PURPOSE: To provide a preliminary proposal upon which discussions, hearings, and input from non-committee members can be requested.

RESPONSIBLE PERSON/GROUP: The directors of the various departments/divisions and the CIP Administrative Committee

- E. Preparation of the recommended five-year capital program. Projects selected for initiation and/or completion in the immediate five-year horizon will constitute the recommended five-year capital improvement program.

PURPOSE: To translate the board goals expressed in the original 1990 Comprehensive Plan as revised in 1994 and other subsidiary plans into reality; to present a single set of recommendations to the Plan Commission and Common Council

RESPONSIBLE PERSON/GROUP: CIP Administrative Committee

- F. Presentation of the proposed five-year capital improvement program to the Plan Commission for consideration and recommendation, and to the Common Council for consideration and final adoption.

PURPOSE: To gain the formal approval of the City's governing body regarding the City's development plans in the ensuing five-year period.

RESPONSIBLE PERSON/GROUP: CIP Administrative Committee; Plan Commission; Common Council

- G. Publication of the adopted Capital Improvement Program (CIP) in document form, suitable for distribution to members of Common Council, Plan Commission, citizens and citizen groups, developers, and other governmental organizations

PURPOSE: To disseminate the City's plans to affected parties so that they can be utilized in developing personal, business, or corporate plans.

RESPONSIBLE PERSON/GROUP: City staff, under the direction of the City Administrator

#### IV. Schedule

The schedule for each year's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) process shall be as follows:

- A. Project request forms - issued by the City Administrator no later than December 15
- B. Analysis of available and acceptable funding levels by the Finance Director presented to the CIP Administrative Committee no later than January 15
- C. Departmental submission of project request forms no later than February 15
- D. Preliminary review of project requests by the CIP Administrative Committee no later than March 1
- E. Final review and presentation of a recommended five-year CIP to the Plan Commission and Common Council no later than April 1
- F. Final consideration and adoption of the CIP by the Common Council no later than April 30
- G. Publication and distribution of the adopted CIP no later than May 31

#### V. Project Categories

The categories for capital projects may change over time with changes in public policy emphasis. At this time, all projects shall be categorized into one of the following fourteen areas:

- A. Street - Principal Arterial
- B. Street - Minor Arterial
- C. Street - Collector
- D. Street - Residential/Neighborhood
- E. Intersections
- F. Traffic Control
- G. Storm Sewer - Trunk
- H. Storm Sewer - Collector
- I. Greenways/Conservancy
- J. Sanitary Sewer
- K. Public Buildings
- L. Parks
- M. Wastewater Utility
- N. Miscellaneous/other

#### VI. Evaluation Criteria

In addition to meeting the definition for consideration as a capital project, projects shall be reviewed against the following standards:

- A. Cost in consideration of available funding
- B. Compatibility with the original 1990 Comprehensive Plan as revised in 1994 as well as other adopted subsidiary plans

- C. Project Benefits in relation to costs:
  - 1. Projects directly affecting the health and safety of citizens shall have priority over all other projects
  - 2. Projects accruing benefits to a larger number of citizens shall have priority over projects benefiting a smaller number of citizens
- D. Project operating costs - Projects will be evaluated on the basis of additions and/or savings to the City's operating costs
- E. Economic Development Impact - Projects will be evaluated on the basis of their overall impact on the City's economic base, including the likelihood that the project will spur other private and public sector development, create new jobs or assist in retaining current jobs, or otherwise positively impact the City's economic base
- F. Project Readiness - Projects will be evaluated on the ability to move the project expeditiously to completion

Project Category		<u>Description and Location:</u>
Department		
Project Title		Council District:
Project Number		Companion Project(s):
Priority:		Assessable Project – (Y/N): Term:      Years
Purpose and Justification:		
Operating Cost Implication:		

PROJECT COST DETAIL (THOUSAND DOLLARS)							
Category	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Total	Funding Sources
DESIGN							
RIGHT OF WAY							
CONSTRUCTION							
OTHER							
TOTAL							
Assessable Cost:							