

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
City of Missoula CIP Project Request Form FY 2012-2016

Program Category:	Project Title:	10 Project #	11 Project #	12 Project #
Wastewater Facilities	Eko Compost Land Purchase			WW-02

Description and justification of project and funding sources:

An opportunity is present to purchase 34 acres adjacent to the City's wastewater treatment facility 1.5 million dollars. The property is currently owned by Eko Compost and is being operated as a composting facility using the biosolids generated at the wastewater treatment facility. **This purchase does not include Eko Compost's business franchise.** This purchase will give the City control of the property to ensure continued use as a composting operation for the beneficial reuse and the most cost effective method to dispose of biosolids generated at the wastewater treatment facility. Eko Compost will continue to operate a composting facility on the site but if Eko Compost ceased it's business operation at the site the City could contract with another contract composting operation or operated as a composting facility itself and prevent any other use of the site. Payments will made to Eko Compost over a 5 year period. Eko Compost will lease the property back from the City for \$45,000 per year.

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	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	Funded in Prior Years
Sewer Development Fee Fund		518,094	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	
		518,094	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	-

How is this project going to be spent:

Budgeted Funds	Accounting Code	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	Spent in Prior Years
A. Land Cost		300,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	
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							
		300,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	-

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

Expense Object	Accounting Code	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	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

3/18/2011

4/29/2011 14:06

JSM

52

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM					
Project Rating					
(See C.I.P. Instructions For Explanation of Criteria)					
Program Category:	Project Title:				12 Project #
Wastewater Facilities	Eko Compost Land Purchase				WW-02
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	The property is currently for sale. If the City does not purchase the property maybe sold to another party.		
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	Alternate disposal of the biosolids generated at the wastewater treatment facility will likely have no beneficial reuse and will be much more expensive.		5	15
6. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its maximum effectiveness?	(0-3) 2	The property is currently for sale. If the City does not purchase the property maybe sold to another party.		4	8
7. Does the project conserve energy, cultural or natural resources, or reduce pollution?	(0-3) 3	Alternate disposal of the biosolids generated at the wastewater treatment facility will likely have no beneficial reuse, will be much more expensive and require more energy use. Additionally, the compost operation accepts and beneficially reuses green waste generated in the City. This green waste would other wise be sent to the landfill.		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	Keeping this site operating as a composting facility benefits the City.		4	8
9. Does the project specifically relate to the City's strategic planning priorities or other plans?	(0-3) 3	Provides sustained environmentally sound disposal of biosolids and green waste.		4	12
Total Score				52	