

2008 – 2012

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

CITY OF MARSHFIELD, WISCONSIN



CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

Michael Meyers, Mayor
Don Krueger, Council President
Tom Buttke, Chairman, Finance, Budget, and Personnel Committee
Ed Wagner, Chairman, Board of Public Works
Trish Siegler, Plan Commission
Karl Zimmermann, Citizen Member
Dave Korth, Plan Commission Member

April 21, 2008

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

RE: 2008 - 2012 CIP Program

On behalf of the CIP Administrative Committee, I am pleased to present the adopted 2008-2012 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) of the City of Marshfield for your review and reference. 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 and staff 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 2007 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;

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

TIF District Taxes generated from the incremental values on property within a defined geographic area.

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 the following amounts:

2008	\$1,779,000
2009	2,700,265
2010	2,500,000
2011	2,500,000
2012	2,500,000

The Committee also approved increasing the tax levy by only 2.5% annually using the requested 2007 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 \$76,679 and for borrowing by \$331,250. **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 2009 through 2012 is also identified in the summary sheet **Sources of Revenue Summary** and is limited to the following projects:

2009:

- ◆ Lincoln Ave – 8th to 14th – Reconstruction (\$946,000)
- ◆ Yellowstone Industrial Park (\$83,000)
- ◆ Balsam Ave – Kalsched to Upham – Reconstruction (\$110,000)
- ◆ Veterans Parkway Traffic Signals – Battery Backup (\$75,000)
- ◆ Lincoln Ave – 8th to 14th – New Sidewalk (\$72,000)
- ◆ E. 21st Street – Washington to Aspen – Water Main (\$46,000)

- ◆ Second Fire Station (\$812,000)
- ◆ Lincoln Ave – 8th to 14th – Storm Sewer (\$336,000)
- ◆ Fairgrounds Detention Basin – Wet Pond Conversion (\$66,000)
- ◆ E. 2nd Street – Maple to Vine – Storm Sewer (\$94,000)

2010:

- ◆ Cemetery Mausoleum Project (\$101,515)
- ◆ E. 29th (Yellowstone) – Galvin to East to USDA Lab (\$913,000)
- ◆ E. 29th Street – Galvin to USDA Lab – Sanitary (\$30,000)
- ◆ E. 29th Street – Galvin to USDA Lab – Water Main (\$13,000)
- ◆ Second Fire Station (\$1,119,000)
- ◆ E. 29th Street – Galvin to USDA Lab – Storm Sewer (\$255,000)
- ◆ Felker – Tremmel Ct. to 24th & 24th – Storm Sewer (\$58,000)

2011:

- ◆ Arnold St. – Chestnut to St. Joseph - Reconstruction (\$651,000)
- ◆ 7th – Central to Chestnut – Reconstruction (\$125,000)
- ◆ West 13th Street – Central to Chestnut - Reconstruction (\$120,000)
- ◆ Spruce Ave – 5th to 7th – Reconstruction (\$162,000)
- ◆ E. 21st St. – Washington to Aspen – Street Opening (320,000)
- ◆ Alley Reconstruction – Central/Chestnut & 2nd/3rd (\$59,000)
- ◆ North Central Ave. Signal Progression (\$65,000)
- ◆ Arnold St. – Chestnut to St. Joseph – Water Services (\$18,000)
- ◆ E. 21st Street – Washington to Aspen – Sidewalk (\$59,000)
- ◆ E. 21st Street – Washington to Aspen – Water Main (\$32,000)
- ◆ Fire Station – Remodeling (\$233,000)
- ◆ Long Range Planning for Library and Senior Center (\$108,000)
- ◆ 7th – Central to Chestnut – Storm Sewer (\$27,000)
- ◆ Spruce Ave – 5th to 7th – Storm Sewer w/Paving (\$152,000)
- ◆ Hume Ave. & Veterans Pkwy – New Wet Detention Basin (\$145,000)
- ◆ Hume Ave & 29th Street – New Wet Detention Basin (\$31,000)
- ◆ 13th Street – Central to Chestnut – Storm Sewer (\$27,000)
- ◆ Arnold St. – Chestnut to St. Joseph – Storm Sewer (\$217,000)
- ◆ E. 21st Street – Washington to Aspen – Storm Sewer (\$97,000)
- ◆ Phase II – Library Remodeling – HVAC & Lighting (\$10,000)

2012:

- ◆ Yellowstone Industrial Park (\$1,121,000)
- ◆ E. 29th St – Butternut to Vets Pkwy – New Sidewalk (\$128,000)
- ◆ Fire Station - Remodeling (\$260,000)
- ◆ East 4th Street Trail (\$355,000)
- ◆ 8th St. & Veterans Pkwy – New Wet Detention Basin (\$250,000)
- ◆ Hume Ave & 29th Street – New Wet Detention Basin (\$330,000)
- ◆ Braem Park – New Wet Detention Basin No. 1 (\$200,000)
- ◆ Fairgrounds Storm Water Collection & Detention (\$100,000)

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 \$1,282,775,200, and our statutory debt limitation is \$64,138,760. As of December 31, 2007, the city's amount of outstanding debt totals \$24,335,000 or 37.9% of the city's allowable maximum capacity. The city has \$39,803,760 of its statutory debt borrowing capacity left to use for these types of projects. The 2008 debt issue, completed in December 2007, keeps the City of Marshfield over city Policy #4.900 limits by \$1,119,800 for 2007 only. The Common Council initially approved exceeding these policy limits in 2003 to take advantage of debt refinancing opportunities. If the 2008 debt issue included in the 2007 year-end balance is removed, the amount is under the policy limits by \$735,200. The current projected 2008 year-end balance of \$21,016,461 is an estimated \$2,198,739 below policy limits. Debt issuance was approved by the Committee at \$2,500,000 for each of the years 2010, 2011, and 2012. \$1,799,000 and \$2,700,265 were the amounts approved for borrowing by the CIP Committee for the years 2008 and 2009 respectively.

The adopted 2008 - 2012 CIP continues to aggressively address the need for expanded outdoor recreational facilities which includes the Wildwood Station – McMillan Marsh Trail (\$982,000); the new Bear Exhibit at the Wildwood Zoo (\$590,000); Griese Park Development (\$148,000); the Adler Road Trail (\$117,000); the Wildwood Zoo restrooms and Ludwig Building Renovation (\$160,000); the Galvin Ave. Connector Trail (\$72,000); and the E. 4th Street Trail (\$355,000). The city's portion of the Wildwood Station – McMillan Marsh Trail is \$195,000 and for the new Bear Exhibit it is \$90,000.

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. These projects include \$946,000 for Lincoln Ave. reconstruction, 8th to 14 Streets, in 2010; \$651,000 for Arnold Street reconstruction, Chestnut to St. Joseph, in 2011; \$913,000 for complete reconstruction of Yellowstone Drive, Galvin to east of the USDA laboratory in 2009; and \$2,525,000 for S. Central Avenue reconstruction, 2nd to 21st Street, in 2010.

The adopted 2008-2012 CIP also includes \$1,452,000 for Yellowstone Industrial Park; \$248,000 in 2008, \$83,000 in 2009 and \$1,121,000 in 2012. 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 \$2,696,000 for the asphalt street surfacing program, an increase of \$516,000 over last year's adopted CIP plan.

The adopted 2008-2012 CIP includes some additional facilities enhancements to the University of Wisconsin Center - Marshfield/Wood County campus (\$985,000). The city's share of the funding, totaling \$492,500, 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 \$300,000 in 2010 for the Airport Snow Removal Equipment Building to be financed by operating funds (\$15,000) and non-local funds (\$285,000). There is also \$2,599,000 included for a new second fire station to be funded by borrowing and operating funds and \$493,000 to remodel the existing fire station. City-wide sanitary sewer lining is also included (\$1,787,000) to be funded by Wastewater debt and user fees. Also included in this CIP is \$3,201,000 for Storm Water Quality Improvements, a \$2,376,000 increase over last year's adopted CIP plan.

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

3 Planning Goals

Goals describe the specific vision for Marshfield. These goals should be considered “guiding principles” for the plan, clearly outlining what the plan seeks to accomplish. Realistic goals provide the framework for the development of attainable policies and actions.

Quality of Life

1. Maintain and enhance all of Marshfield’s quality of life advantages, including those in the arts, community events, outdoor recreation, education, historic and cultural heritage, social opportunities, and small-town livability. Promote the City by emphasizing these advantages, coupled with superior healthcare and Marshfield’s low cost of living.
2. Maintain public safety as a key component of Marshfield’s livability. This includes police, fire, and rescue services.
3. Promote design that is both functional and attractive, recognizing that a community’s character contributes to its quality of life. Design should include the incorporation of green space, the preservation of natural features, and provisions for other details and amenities.
4. Continue Marshfield’s tradition of compact and connected development patterns that promote community interaction.
5. Identify and enhance the appeal of Marshfield as a place to live and work with various demographic groups, particularly young singles, families, and the elderly, as well as various ethnic cultures.

Community Growth and Development

1. Manage growth to ensure development and redevelopment occurs in a planned and coordinated manner.
2. Define the uses, forms, and intensities of new developments that are needed and compatible within the community and its neighborhoods. Utilize available tools to ensure development meets these benchmarks.
3. Locate growth where it can be efficiently and economically served by existing and planned streets and public utilities.
4. Continue downtown improvement efforts and maintain this area as the City’s center for cultural, civic, and government activities.
5. Identify areas for preserved open space and protect natural drainage ways and wetlands from development.

Intergovernmental Planning and Development

1. Identify cooperative solutions for regional development issues that impact the entire Marshfield community, including areas outside the City’s boundaries.
2. Work cooperatively with surrounding governments to protect sensitive environmental features and productive farmland in areas where development is not planned.
3. Manage growth in the Marshfield’s three mile planning area. Utilize intergovernmental agreements, extraterritorial controls, and other cooperative efforts to achieve this.

Economic Development

1. Ensure the City of Marshfield remains the economic hub for the local trade area by determining locations, possible incentives, and working relationships necessary for City economic growth.
2. Diversify the City’s employment base and attract additional “higher-technology” industries to Marshfield.
3. Participate in efforts to support economic development throughout the Wood, Marathon, and Portage County “Ruro-Plex.”
4. Maintain an adequate supply of land for industrial development.
5. Organize future commercial and business growth in planned activity centers, rather than on scattered sites or highway strips. Promote this to avoid poor traffic circulation and community character concerns.
6. Promote the redevelopment of vacant commercial properties.

Housing & Neighborhoods

1. Promote the creation of distinct neighborhoods - not just “cookie-cutter” subdivisions.
2. Allow for a range of housing types and styles that provide desirable and attainable housing options for all that live and work in Marshfield.
3. Provide adequate streets, sidewalks, parks, and other public amenities in neighborhoods.
4. Expand the supply of middle-income family housing in the community, including moderately priced single-family homes.
5. Identify strategies to maintain and improve the quality of the City’s housing stock.
6. Identify target areas for neighborhood rehabilitation and develop strategies to rehabilitate blighted or deteriorating housing.
7. Utilize existing senior housing resources and monitor the need for additional programs and housing options.

Community Appearance

1. Coordinate public and private efforts to beautify the entrances into the community.
2. Promote quality architectural and landscape design.
3. Enforce signage regulations and consider other controls that limit billboards and promote the creation of well-designed signs.
4. Screen and/or buffer unsightly outdoor equipment, materials, and vehicle storage areas from public view from streets and other right-of-ways.
5. Develop strategies that encourage the maintenance of commercial and residential properties.
6. Identify the desirable aspects of Marshfield's historic neighborhoods and take efforts to maintain this character.
7. Require infill development to be compatible with the size, scale, intensity, and character of the remaining neighborhood.

Public Services

1. Coordinate future development and redevelopment projects with the availability of existing or planned public utilities and facilities.
2. Direct future growth to areas where it is efficient and cost-effective to provide public services. Consider municipal water supply, sanitary sewer, schools, fire, police, rescue, and related services.
3. Protect property owners from inequitable taxes or service costs resulting from new development. Unless an incentive program has been formally agreed to, development should pay for the cost of municipal services or improvements resulting from the project.
4. Evaluate new development proposals on the basis of their fiscal impact and their impact on service levels elsewhere in the community.

Transportation

1. Maintain efficient access for out-of-town visitors and patients to the Marshfield Clinic and St. Joseph's Hospital.
2. Provide safe and efficient traffic circulation serving all modes of transportation in the City.
3. Reduce truck traffic and congestion on Central Avenue and plan other truck routes to serve the community.
4. Maintain a rational hierarchy of streets serving all aspects of the community. Utilize low volume local streets, collector streets, and arterials to provide circulation between neighborhoods and the community.
5. Provide safe pedestrian and bicycle circulation throughout the City, especially between residential neighborhoods, parks, and schools.
6. Provide convenient and attractive downtown parking for vehicles and bicycles. Identify solutions that address the needs of resident, customer, and employee parking.

7. Promote four-lane highway access to Interstate highways and urban centers.
8. Promote better air and inter/intra-city bus and taxi service for residents and businesses.

Parks and Outdoor Recreation

1. Continue maintenance and care of existing park and recreation facilities and resources.
2. Provide neighborhood parks and playgrounds within safe walking distance of all residential neighborhoods.
3. Promote public and private partnerships in the development and maintenance of community parks and special use facilities (sports facilities, aquatic centers, zoos, etc.).
4. Continue to improve the connectivity of the Marshfield bicycle system by planning for additional routes.
5. Provide for increased year-round usage of Fair Park.



CITY OF MARSHFIELD, WISCONSIN POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

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

CHAPTER: Financial

SUBJECT: Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Development

POLICY NUMBER: 4.330

PAGES: 8

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 27, 1990

REVISION DATE: January 11, 2000, December 12, 2006, and February 12, 2008

PERMANENT DELETION DATE:

APPROVED BY: Mayor Michael D. Meyers

DEPARTMENTS OF PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY: Mayor; City Administrator; Director of Public Works, Finance and Planning & Economic Development

Special Notes: This policy/procedure manual does not in any way constitute an employment contract and the City of Marshfield reserves the right to amend this manual at any time subject only to approval by the Common Council.

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 \$10,000 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. The capital budget and the CIP plan shall only include those project costs or portions thereof, that the City is responsible for funding. This would include grant proceeds received on a reimbursement basis, but would not include non-local funding for which the City does not need to front the money.
- D. **CIP Administrative Committee:** The CIP Administrative Committee consists of the following members: The Mayor; 4 Aldermen, elected by the Aldermen at the first meeting in January; a non-elected official of the Plan Commission; and a citizen at large. The Mayor shall convene the CIP Administrative Committee annually, vote only in the case of a tie, 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 broad goals expressed in the City's most current Comprehensive Plan and other subsidiary plans into reality; to present a single set of recommendations to the Plan Commission, Board of Public Works, and Common Council.

RESPONSIBLE PERSON/GROUP: CIP Administrative Committee

- F. Presentation of the proposed five-year capital improvement program to the Plan Commission and Board of Public Works 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; Board of Public Works; 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. Departmental submission of project request forms no later than February 15
- C. Analysis of available and acceptable funding levels by the Finance Director presented to the CIP Administrative Committee no later than March 1
- 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
- H. The CIP Administrative Committee will meet on Monday and Wednesday from 6pm - 8pm so as to provide for public input and observation.

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. Project Prioritization

As part of the project submittal process, department/division heads shall identify project priorities to help determine which projects are recommended for inclusion in the five-year CIP.

The following matrix system shall be used to establish a priority for each project. The system ranks projects in two separate categories and then, through the use of the matrix, ranks the projects as either Level 1 (highest), Level 2 (medium) or Level 3 (lowest) priority.

The initial measure of the project's priority is first established using the following factors:

HIGH

- Project is mandated by local, State or Federal regulations
- Project is a high priority of the Common Council, based on the most current Comprehensive Plan or other subsidiary plans
- Project prevents irreparable damage to existing facilities
- Project leverages local funding with other non-local funding sources
- Project finishes a partially completed project

MEDIUM

- Project maintains existing service levels
- Project results in increased efficiency
- Project reduces operational costs
- Project significantly reduces losses in revenue or provides for significant increased revenues

LOW

- Project provides an expanded level of service or new public facility
- Project is deferrable

Four project criteria are then evaluated to help separate projects with a greater "need", like Health & Safety issues as compared to new projects that might be more "desired" than "needed". The four project criteria are summarized as follows:

HEALTH/SAFETY

- Capital projects that protect the health and safety of the City, its residents, visitors and

employees

MAINTENANCE/REPLACEMENT

- Capital projects that provide for the maintenance of existing systems and equipment

EXPANSION OF EXISTING PROGRAMS

- Capital projects which enhance the existing systems and programs allowing for expansion of services

NEW PROGRAM

- Capital projects that allow new programs and services

After each project is rated on the priority criteria and project criteria identified above, the project is placed on the grid of the matrix and the rating is determined to be a Level 1, Level 2 or Level 3.

Prioritization Matrix

CRITERIA		PRIORITY		
		HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
Health/ Safety/ Welfare	1	I	I	II
Maintenance/ Replacement	2	I	II	II
Expansion of Existing Program	3	II	II	III
New Program	4	II	III	III

Note: Prioritization Matrix and description adapted from South Hampton County, VA.

Level 1 projects are those projects that have a high priority and are included in the health/ safety or maintenance/replacement categories or of medium priority and in the health/ safety criteria.

Level 3 projects are those projects that have a medium priority and are included in the new program criteria or projects in the low priority and in the expansion of an existing program or new program criteria.

All other projects that are in other combinations of priority and project criteria in the matrix are identified as Level 2 projects.

All projects shall be reviewed and scored using the project priority and project criteria ratings to establish a project rating.

VII. CIP Administrative Committee Evaluation Criteria

Projects shall be reviewed by the CIP Administrative Committee against the following standards:

- A. Project rating as established by department/division Head.
- B. Cost in consideration of available funding, including non-local funding opportunities.
- C. Compatibility with the City's most current Comprehensive Plan as well as other adopted subsidiary plans
- D. 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
- E. Project operating costs - Projects will be evaluated on the basis of additions and/or savings to the City's operating costs
- F. 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
- G. Project Readiness - Projects will be evaluated on the ability to move the project expeditiously to completion
- H. Provide a balance of capital expenditures among the various service sectors.

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 OF DOLLARS)								
Category	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	Total	Funding Sources	
DESIGN								
RIGHT OF WAY								
CONSTRUCTION								
OTHER								
TOTAL								
Assessable Cost:								