

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
City of Missoula CIP Project Request Form FY 2010-2014

Program Category:		Project Title:		07 Project #	08 Project #	09 Project #	10 Project #
Wastewater Facilities		Rattlesnake Neighborhood Wastewater Collection System		WW-05	WW-02	WW-15	WW-01
Description and justification of project and funding sources: Portions of central and upper Rattlesnake Valley are served by onsite septic systems that contaminate ground waters and impact Rattlesnake Creek and Missoula Aquifer water quality. These areas ranked as a priority for installation of wastewater collection systems. SIDs were created for over 157 housing units in the Central Valley since 2000. Completion of the Rattlesnake sewer collection system will be funded by a combination of SID assessments, State and Federal grants, and City sewer utility funds. Portions of the project completed to-date, including 157 properties in sub-SIDs: FY2003 - Preliminary design was completed FY2004 - Gilbert Street property owners petitioned to create SID 533 (completed 2006) FY2005 - Lincolnwood property owners petitioned to create SID 534 and 536 (completed 2006) Construction on the sewer to serve the remaining 320 properties is planned for 2010.							
Is this equipment prioritized on an equipment replacement schedule?					Yes	No	NA
							X
Are there any site requirements:							
REVENUE	How is this project going to be funded:						
	Funding Source	Accounting Code	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14
	Sewer cash support		141,033				
	SID Assessments		2,069,000				
	Economic Stimulus (SRF)		750,000				
	Grant Funds TSEP		500,000				
	Grant Funds DNRC		70,000				
	Grant Funds EPA STAG		482,100				
		4,012,133	-	-	-	-	1,381,000
EXPENSE	How is this project going to be spent:						
	Budgeted Funds	Accounting Code	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14
	A. Land Cost						
	B. Construction Cost		3,016,401				-
	C. Contingencies (10% of B)		301,640	-	-	-	-
	D. Design & Engineering (15% of B)		452,460	-	-	-	-
	E. Percent for Art (1% of B)						
	F. Equipment Costs						
G. Other		241,632					
		4,012,133	-	-	-	-	-
OPERATING BUDGET COSTS	Does this project have any additional impact on the operating budget:						
	Expense Object	Accounting Code	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14
	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
Steve King		Public Works	03/25/2009	06/03/2009 15:23		CJK	44

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Project Rating

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

Program Category:	Project Title:						10 Project #
Wastewater Facilities	Rattlesnake Neighborhood Wastewater Collection System						WW-01

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	
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 Economic Stimulus (SRF)	X	2069000 750000	This project has grants that are time sensitive - DNRC Grant, TSEP Grant and EPA Stag Grant.
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.		3096880 X	This area ranks number five in the Missoula Valley Water Quality District's Unsewered Area Study. This is the only high priority area remaining in the City.

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	This SID would be matched for 50% revenue bond matching and is subsidized by grants	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) 3	Protection of the sole source aquifer.	3	9
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		4	8
9. Does the project specifically relate to the City's strategic planning priorities or other plans?	(0-3) 2	The project enhances community livability by protecting the environment. The project has been identified in the updated Wastewater Facility Plan.	4	8

Total Score	44
--------------------	-----------