

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
City of Missoula CIP Project Request Form FY 2017-2021

| Program Category: | Project Title: | 15 Project # | 16 Project # | 17 Project # |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Street Improvements | Van Buren Street Reconstruction | S-14 | S-13 | S-09 |

Description and justification of project and funding sources:

Van Buren Street was vetted publicly and ranked as a number one priority as part of the Rattlesnake Valley Transportation Summit Study. Improvements will consist of new curbs, sidewalks, drainage, pavement and utility reconstruction. Neighborhood gateway treatments, lighting and landscaping will be considered. This is a two vehicular lane cost estimate.

Funding: 1) Street Division in kind for asphalt and drainage; 2) Assessments to area property owners (will include sidewalk subsidy program); City Street Division provides in-kind labor and equipment to meet budget.
 Work will be completed in three phases. Phase I & II have been completed. Phase III is currently being designed.

| | | | |
|---|-----|----|----|
| Is this equipment prioritized on an equipment replacement schedule? | Yes | No | NA |
| | | | X |
| Is there ongoing Operating and/or Maintenance costs upon completion of project? | Yes | No | NA |
| | | | X |

Are there any site requirements:

| REVENUE | How is this project going to be funded: | | | | | | | Funded in Prior Years |
|------------------------|---|-----------------|---------|------|------|------|------|-----------------------|
| | Funding Source | Accounting Code | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 | FY21 | |
| | Assessments | | 60,000 | | | | | 88,000 |
| | Street Division in Kind | | 111,000 | | | | | 452,810 |
| | Transportation Impact Fees | | 84,000 | | | | | 181,937 |
| EXPENSE | Road District 1 sw subsidy | | 90,000 | | | | | 164,000 |
| | | | 345,000 | - | - | - | - | 886,747 |
| | How is this project going to be spent: | | | | | | | Spent in Prior Years |
| | Budgeted Funds | Accounting Code | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 | FY21 | |
| | A. Land Cost | | 20,000 | | | | | |
| OPERATING BUDGET COSTS | B. Construction Cost | | 260,800 | | | | | 110,000 |
| | C. Contingencies (10% of B) | | 26,080 | | | | | |
| | D. Design & Engineering (15% of B) | | 38,120 | | | | | 1,000 |
| | E. Percent for Art (1% of B) | | | | | | | |
| | F. Equipment Costs | | | | | | | |
| | G. Other | | | | | | | |
| | | | 345,000 | - | - | - | - | 111,000 |

| OPERATING BUDGET COSTS | Does this project have any additional impact on the operating budget: | | | | | | | Spent in Prior Years |
|------------------------|---|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|----------------------|
| | Expense Object | Accounting Code | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 | FY21 | |
| | 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 | 3/25/2016 | 4/20/16 12:41 | KMG | 33 |

| CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------|----------|-------------|
| Project Rating | | | | | |
| (See C.I.P. Instructions For Explanation of Criteria) | | | | | |
| Program Category: | Project Title: | | | | |
| Street Improvements | Van Buren Street Reconstruction | | | | S-09 |
| Qualitative Analysis | | Yes | No | Comments | |
| 1. Is the project necessary to meet 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. | | | | | |
| | | | FY16 | | |
| | | | 60000 111000 85000 | | |
| 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 | | |
| | | | FY16 | | |
| 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) 2 | Assessments to property owner provides about 80% of project costs. | | 5 | 10 |
| 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) 1 | | | 3 | 3 |
| 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 | Project was one of the highest priorities in the Rattlesnake Valley identified through public input for reconstruction. | | 4 | 8 |
| 9. Does the project specifically relate to the City's strategic planning priorities or other plans? | (0-3) 2 | Livability has been a strategic goal of the City in the past. | | 4 | 8 |
| Total Score | | | | | 33 |