

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
City of Missoula CIP Project Request Form FY 2013-2017

Program Category:	Project Title:		11 Project #	12 Project #	13 Project #
Street Improvements	Neighborhood Infrastructure Street Improvements		S-20	S-20	S-17

Description and justification of project and funding sources:

Several neighborhoods have undertaken infrastructure studies to enhance safety and neighborhood access. Public wWorks Department will generate project lists from these plans for implementation. Some plan examples include: Franklin to Fort Infrastructure Plan, Johnson Street sidewalks, Emma Dickinson Infrastructure Plan, River Road curbs and sidewalks.

Phase I was completed in Fiscal Year 2010. This phase consisted of part of the Franklin to the Fort Infrastructure Plan priority one area, which included Johnson between 11th and 3rd and between North and Mount, as well as 14th between Johnson and Eaton. Approximately 23 households received approval for CDBG grants for this phase.

Lolo Street west of the bridge to Duncan Drive and Van Buren Street from Vine to Elm are part of the Rattlesnake Transportation Plan and are separate CIP items.

Is this equipment prioritized on an equipment replacement schedule?

Yes

No

NA

X

Are there any site requirements:

How is this project going to be funded:							Funded in Prior Years
Funding Source	Accounting Code	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	
Assessments Street Division in Kind			200,000 40,000	200,000 40,000			550,000 20,000 30,000 110,000
		-	240,000	240,000	-	-	710,000

How is this project going to be spent:

How is this project going to be spent:							Spent in Prior Years
Budgeted Funds	Accounting Code	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	
A. Land Cost			192,000	192,000			
B. Construction Cost			19,200	19,200			
C. Contingencies (10% of B)			28,800	28,800			
D. Design & Engineering (15% of B)							
E. Percent for Art (1% of B)							
F. Equipment Costs							
G. Other		-	240,000	240,000	-	-	-

Does this project have any additional impact on the operating budget:

Does this project have any additional impact on the operating budget:							Spent in Prior Years
Expense Object	Accounting Code	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	
Personnel							
Supplies							
Purchased Services							
Fixed Charges							
Capital Outlay							
Debt Service		-	-	-	-	-	-

Description of additional operating budget impact:

Responsible Person:	Responsible Department:	Date Submitted to Finance	Today's Date and Time	Preparer's Initials	Total Score
Doug Harby	Public works	3/2/2012	4/20/2012 14:34	JSM	45

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Project Rating

(See C.I.P. Instructions For Explanation of Criteria)

Program Category:	Project Title:				13 Project #	
Street Improvements	Neighborhood Infrastructure Street Improvements					
Qualitative Analysis		Yes	No	Comments		
1. Is the project necessary to meet federal, state, or local legal requirements? This criterion includes projects mandated by Court Order to meet requirements of law or other requirements. Of special concern is that the project be accessible to the handicapped.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
2. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contractual requirement? This criterion includes Federal or State grants which require local participation. Indicate the Grant name and number in the comment column.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
3. Is this project urgently required? Will delay result in curtailment of an essential service? This statement should be checked "Yes" only if an emergency is clearly indicated; otherwise, answer "No". If "Yes", be sure to give full justification.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
4. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or public safety? This criterion should be answered "No" unless public health and/or safety can be shown to be an urgent or critical factor.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Quantitative Analysis		Raw Score Range	Comments		Weight	Total Score
5. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?		(0-3) 3	No general fund support required. Sidewalk assessments will spread costs to the benefited neighborhood.		5	15
6. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its maximum effectiveness?		(0-3) 1			4	4
7. Does the project conserve energy, cultural or natural resources, or reduce pollution?		(0-3) 2	Sidewalk/pedestrian facilities encourage and accommodate non-motorized travel.		3	6
8. Does the project improve or expand upon essential City services where such services are recognized and accepted as being necessary and effective?		(0-2) 2	Sidewalk/pedestrian facilities encourage and accommodate non-motorized travel.		4	8
9. Does the project specifically relate to the City's strategic planning priorities or other plans?		(0-3) 3	Meets City goals for livability as defined in neighborhood comprehensive infrastructure plans.		4	12
Total Score						45