

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**  
**City of Missoula CIP Project Request Form FY 2014-2018**

Program Category:	Project Title:		12 Project #	13 Project #	14 Project #
Street Improvements	Neighborhood Infrastructure Street Improvements		S-20	S-17	S-17

**Description and justification of project and funding sources:**

Several neighborhoods have undertaken infrastructure studies to enhance safety and neighborhood access. Neighborhoods 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:						
Funding Source	Accounting Code	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18
Assessments			200,000			
Street Division in Kind			40,000			
Special Road District Subsidy			400,000			
Special Road District Ramps			60,000			
		-	700,000	-	-	-
						710,000

**How is this project going to be spent:**

How is this project going to be spent:						
Budgeted Funds	Accounting Code	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18
A. Land Cost						
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						
		-	700,000	-	-	-
						-

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

Does this project have any additional impact on the operating budget:						
Expense Object	Accounting Code	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18
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	Development Services		4/16/2013 4:59	JSM	45

## **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

## Project Rating

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

Program Category:	Project Title:					14 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.			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 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.			X				
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 benefitted 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