

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Policies and Procedures Related to the City of Modesto's Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

I. Purpose

The 10-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) strives to reflect the goals and policies established by the General Plan by systematically planning, scheduling, managing, monitoring and financing capital projects to ensure cost-effectiveness and conformity with established policies and adopted Specific Plans. The CIP guides the funding and construction of all public improvements constructed by the City, including roads, wastewater treatment facilities and lines, water lines, and parks. The CIP reflects a balance between capital replacement projects that repair, replace or enhance existing facilities, equipment or infrastructure and capital facility projects that significantly expand or add to the City's existing fixed assets. Attention should be given to utilize available resources and grants in a manner that legitimately maximizes the city's capacity to complete the capital improvements described above.

II. Capital Improvement Program Task Force

The General Plan calls for the creation of an organization-wide method for identifying and ranking CIPs for proposed inclusion in the annual CIP and to guide the City's applications for regional, state, federal, or other funds. Initiated in fiscal year 2008-2009, the Capital Improvement Program Task Force (CIP Task Force) was fully implemented during the fiscal year 2009-2010 CIP process. This new approach incorporates a CIP Task Force that is broader in scope and purpose and includes interdepartmental representation. Additional opportunity for the City Council and the community to participate in the CIP process promotes its importance and relevance to daily life.

Each CIP Task Force member participates in the evaluation and prioritization of projects and each member has equal voting weight. The process is designed to promote open dialogue and consensus building. Preapproved evaluation criteria and protocol guide the CIP Task Force through the prioritization process.

The General Plan outlines the following criteria by which the organization-wide method for identifying and ranking capital improvement projects should be structured:

1. Establish an objective rating system that includes criteria that are appropriate for each facility type (bridges, roadways, traffic signals, pedestrian, drainage, water, sewer, parks, libraries, fire, police, etc.).

2. Ensure projects conform to community plans and Infrastructure Financing Plans (IFP) and incorporate community-level priorities identified in each of the plans in the ranking process.
3. Develop broad-based regional financing options for regional-serving capital projects.
4. Assign “high priority” preference to projects located within existing and potential Specific Plan Areas that are also located within communities not meeting General Plan-identified public facilities guidelines or acceptable levels of service for the type of facility or service being considered. This is followed by preference to projects in areas generally located outside existing and potential Specific Plan Area locations, as previously described, in areas that are not meeting public facilities guidelines or acceptable levels of service as identified in the General Plan for the type of facility or service being considered.
5. Include in the ranking process preference for funding of new or expanded public facilities and services which can address needs in multiple areas.
6. Coordinate with other public, private, and not-for-profit entities to include areas with existing needs as a major criterion for allocating resources for new or expanded infrastructure, facilities, or amenities.

A. Objectives:

1. Develop a credible process for identifying top priority projects.
2. Use a coordinated approach to linking CIP projects with other planning efforts and community goals.
3. Engage staff, elected officials and citizens in the process of developing and administering the CIP to garner greater community support and attention.

B. Membership¹:

The CIP Task Force consists of the following members:

Association	Appointment Period	Appointee
Councilmember		Brad Hawn
Planning Commission	7/1/2009 – 6/30/2011	Chris Tyler
Citizen Member	7/1/2009 – 6/30/2011	Ron Jeske
StanCOG Citizen Advisory Member	7/1/2009 – 6/30/2011	Dennis Wilson
Manufacturer's Council	7/1/2010 – 6/30/2012	Designee
Chairperson, Land Use & Transportation Modesto Chamber of Commerce	7/1/2010 – 6/30/2012	Designee
City of Modesto Staff	Director of Public Works (or designee) Director of Utility Planning & Projects (or designee) Director of Community & Economic Development (or designee) Director of Parks, Recreation & Neighborhoods (or designee) Director Representing Public Safety (Police Chief, Fire Chief or designee) Director of Finance (or designee)	

¹ Approved by the City Council on August 4, 2010 (Resolution No. 2010-318)

C. Evaluation Criteria

Seven evaluation criteria have been developed for project evaluation. Every project is evaluated against all seven criteria and assigned points on a scale of -5 to +5. This ensures the most objective process possible and leads to consistent decision making.

1. Public Health, Safety and Other Mandates

- Does the project improve or specifically address a health, safety or other regulatory mandate in the community?
- Does the project specifically address a legal requirement or abate a potential health or safety crisis?

2. Supports Stated Community Goals and Policies

- Does the project help implement policies in the General Plan, Strategic Plan, or other adopted plan?
- Is the project a part of or consistent with an articulated, acceptable mid, short or long-range program or departmental strategic plan?
- Does the request implement some or all of the recommendations of a previous study?
- Has the project been specifically identified by the public in previous community forums, surveys, etc.?
- Has the project consistently been included in previous capital improvement programs?

3. Capital Fiscal Impact

- Does the project have a positive impact on the General Fund budget?
- Does the project bring in additional outside funds or grants in some proportion?
- Is the project realistic from a financial standpoint? (Consider direct costs, as well as ongoing and additional costs such as those to provide temporary services during implementation of the project.)
- Are funds already dedicated or available for the project?
- Will funding the project now result in a significant savings or economies of scale?

4. Promotes Economic Development

- Does the project facilitate a job producing development?
- Does the project facilitate development that will provide positive revenue enhancement to the City?
- Does the project help prevent revenue leakage?

5. Operation and Maintenance Fiscal Impact

- Does the project have a positive impact on the City's Operating and Maintenance (O&M) budget?
- Is the project an efficiency improvement project?
- Is the project a low-maintenance project?
- Does the City have the ability (staff, funds, etc.) to support the project in O&M?

6. Impact on Service Levels

- Does the project bring the service up to a desired level?
- Does the project improve service levels?

7. Relationship to Other Projects/Coordination

- Does the project coordinate well with other projects underway?
- Can the project be effectively coordinated with other projects (for instance, water and/or sewer line repairs done in conjunction with road work?)
- Will all prerequisite projects be complete before this project is scheduled?
- Is the project timely or does it provide a critical window of opportunity?
- Is the project planned to create minimal disruption or inconvenience to the public?
- Is the project the best use of funding for the fund category (as ranked by sponsoring department)?

D. Criteria Weights

The CIP Task Force determined that certain criteria are worthy of greater emphasis. In the evaluation process, this is accomplished by creating “weighting points” that are assigned to each of the seven criteria. These weighting points are automatically calculated as the CIP Task Force scores each project.

Criteria	Weighting Points
Public Health and Safety Mandates	95
Community Goals	85
Promotes Economic Development	85
Capital Fiscal Impact	75
Operation and Maintenance Fiscal Impact	75
Impact on Service Levels	65
Relationship to Other Projects/Coordination	65

E. Final Project Scoring

Projects should first be grouped into categories based on their project location. Using the evaluation criteria and weights above, the CIP Task Force will score each project. Some of the projects may not be scored by the Task Force because they are under a legal or regulatory mandate to be completed. Because the City is already obligated to complete these projects expeditiously, scoring them would serve no purpose.

All project rankings have been added to the project detail sheets. The scores range from 0 to 3000. Projects ranked the highest by the CIP Task Force will have a priority code of 3000. For each project ranked by the CIP Task Force, its corresponding priority score can be found below the project title of the project detail sheets.

The CIP Task Force will review and prioritize all existing capital projects to assure consistency with the City’s General Plan and the City’s vision statement. A recommendation will then be made to the Planning Commission.

III. Budgeting Process

A. Budgeting Process – Generally

Section 65401 of the Government Code and Section 10-1.102 of the Modesto Municipal Code, requires the Planning Commission to review all new capital projects to determine if they conform with the City’s adopted Modesto Urban Area General Plan. Existing CIPs will be reviewed quarterly by the CIP Task

Force. This review will utilize not only financial information to identify project progress and completion timelines but also project status updates from Project Managers. This will be integrated into the budget proforma review process. The CIP budget will be organized into the same functional groupings used for the operating programs.

Based on the recommendation from the CIP Task Force, the City of Modesto Planning Commission will review for General Plan conformity and will forward a final recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will then review the final CIP recommendation and approve the funding of new projects and the re-appropriation of funds for existing projects as part of the annual CIP budget cycle.

B. Budgeting Policies

1. Project costs are appropriated only when the required revenues are available.
2. For projects financed with grant monies, the grant award must be accepted by the City Council. (Note: a copy of the final grant award must be provided to the Finance Department.)
3. For projects financed with debt, it can be considered for inclusion in the CIP but the appropriation will not be released until the financing has been completed.
4. Budget actions involving any Federal, State, or grant funded CIPs are restrained by the conditions of the funding award.
5. Project costs will be included in the CIP in phases, i.e. projects that are not bid-ready will reflect appropriations only through the design phase.
6. Appropriations needed for the construction phase are based on the bid awarded at the time the appropriation(s) for construction, contingency and construction management costs are requested.
7. Projects to be closed will be identified by the Project Managers and submitted by the appropriate Department Director through the Finance Director to the City Manager for closure. The City Manager has the final authority to close the projects using the CIP Closure Form. The reasons for closing a project may include Project Completion, delays due to unanticipated costs or events and change in City Council direction.

8. All new CIPs must be submitted to the CIP Task Force for consideration and review before they are presented to the City Council for appropriation approval.

C. Requirements to Qualify as a CIP

1. A "Project" description and cost estimate should include all phases, from environmental assessment and right of way acquisition through construction, regardless of whether or not all funding will be available within the current fiscal year budgeting cycle.
2. Typically, the cost of a Project should be \$100,000 or greater over the life of the Project. Also, a CIP will have a useful life of five or more years. Exceptions to this threshold may be approved by the CIP Task Force.
3. Project revenues and expenditures must be clearly identified and balanced.
4. Projects must have identifiable timelines that include periodic milestones.
5. While (1) maintenance costs to increase the life of the City's infrastructure, (2) replacement costs for infrastructure and (3) set-aside reserve amounts to create future funding for a project are not considered a "Project"; they are included in the CIP budget. . Examples include pavement maintenance, water system downstream improvements and accumulation of funds for the Pelandale-99 interchange.
6. Certain purchases and installation of fixed assets may also be included in the CIP budget plan.
7. Every capital project will have a Project Manager who will prepare the project proposal, ensure that required phases are completed on schedule, authorize all project expenditures, ensure that all regulations and laws are observed, and periodically report project status to the CIP Task Force. The Project Manager ensures that projects comply with the requirements imposed by the guidelines controlling the various revenue sources that are used to finance capital project costs. The Project Manager shall also coordinate project accounting with the Finance Department.

D. Primary-Secondary Project Relationships

The City Council previously approved grouping similar projects together in a “primary-secondary” relationship. An example would be replacement of upgrade of traffic signals at different intersection throughout the City. “Traffic Signals” would be the primary” project and individual “secondary” projects would then be identified when either construction or construction design on each specific intersection begins. The primary project description must include a description of each of the secondary projects related to it. The primary project was designed to serve as the budgetary control device for both the primary and secondary components. Currently, the City Manager has the authority to move funding from one secondary project to another secondary project, as long as the overall primary project appropriation level does not change. This approach was designed to allow for greater flexibility and efficiency when programming multiple projects of the same type.

With the creation and empowerment of the CIP Task Force, the primary-secondary project budgeting relationship creates difficulty for the CIP Task Force in reviewing and ranking projects. The stand-alone budgeting method is more effective in that it allows the CIP Task Force to review and rank a specific “project” rather than being tasked to review and rank a primary account that may contain several secondary projects.

For utility funds, the primary-secondary budgeting relationships may be used for existing and new CIPs.

For all non-utility funds, the existing primary-secondary budgeting relationships may remain as currently budgeted, but the total revenues may not exceed the total appropriations. (For example, if there are three secondary accounts and their collective budgets are \$100,000; the revenue of the primary account may not exceed \$100,000.) All new non-utility fund CIPs should be budgeted using the stand-alone budgeting method.

E. Project Status Reports

Project milestones will be listed as objectives in the CIP program narratives to facilitate project tracking. Status reports for all CIPs should be provided to the CIP Task Force on a quarterly basis and then referred to the City Council for informational purposes. The format and content of the report will be coordinated between the CIP Task Force Administrator and the Finance Department.