

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

Program Category:	Project Title:	11 Project #	12 Project #	13 Project #
Wastewater Facilities	Hybrid Poplar Tree Effluent Land Application Project Expansion	WW-04	WW-04	WW-03

Description and justification of project and funding sources:

In 2009 The City Wastewater Division planted 1.6 acres of hybrid poplar trees at the wastewater treatment facility for land application of treated wastewater effluent. This pilot project was started to investigate alternate methods of effluent disposal to reduce phosphorus and nitrogen loading to the Clark Fork River. Land application of treated effluent was chosen because it was deemed a lower cost alternative to expanding the treatment facility to meet future regulatory requirements for phosphorus and nitrogen loading to the Clark Fork River and to meet future growth of sewer service. As the 1.6 acre pilot project has been successful, the City intends to expand the project to 130 leased acres from the Clouse family. This property is located approximately 1/2 mile west of the wastewater treatment facility. The City will provide only pumping to the Clouse property and will enter into an agreement with Hybrid Energy Group to provide investment in setting up the irrigation system and cultivate the trees. The project is contingent on approval from the Montana Department Environmental Quality. It is likely the MDEQ will approve this project. The hybrid poplar trees will be harvested in 8 to 12 years and will provide an income producing product and create a carbon offset to the WWTP operation.

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:

Funding Source	Accounting Code	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	Funded in Prior Years
Sewer Development Fund		450,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	10,000
		450,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	10,000

How is this project going to be spent:

Budgeted Funds	Accounting Code	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	Spent in Prior Years
A. Land Cost		450,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	
B. Construction Cost							
C. Contingencies (10% of B)							
D. Design & Engineering (15% of B)							
E. Percent for Art (1% of B)							
F. Equipment Costs							
G. Other							
		450,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	-

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

Expense Object	Accounting Code	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	Spent in Prior Years
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

Starr Sullivan

Public Works

3/9/2012

4/20/2012 14:39

JSM

49

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM					
Project Rating					
(See C.I.P. Instructions For Explanation of Criteria)					
Program Category:	Project Title:			13 Project #	
Wastewater Facilities	Hybrid Poplar Tree Effluent Land Application Project Expansion			WW-03	
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.			X	This project will help meet regulatory requirements for phosphorus and nitrogen loading to the Clark Fork River.	
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.			X		
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.			X		
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.					
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	Land application of wastewater effluent is less expensive than expanding a wastewater treatment facility.		5	15
6. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its maximum effectiveness?	(0-3) 2	We anticipate far more stringent discharge limits for phosphorus and nitrogen within 5 years		4	8
7. Does the project conserve energy, cultural or natural resources, or reduce pollution?	(0-3) 2	Expands wastewater treatment capabilities, off sets the City's carbon footprint and the hybrid poplars can be used as bio-fuel.		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	Expands wastewater treatment capabilities.		4	8
9. Does the project specifically relate to the City's strategic planning priorities or other plans?	(0-3) 3	Provides environmentally sound pollution control and follows recommendation outlined in the City's Wastewater Facility Plan.		4	12
Total Score					49