

Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

Scoring Criteria



Agenda

- Current CIP Scoring Criteria
- Proposed CIP Scoring Criteria
- Comparison of Current vs. Proposed CIP Scoring Criteria
- Next Steps



Current CIP Scoring Criteria

☐ **Town's Critical Objectives (40%)**

1. Increase in public health (20)
2. Increase in public safety (20)
3. Identified in General Plan (20)
4. Consistent with vision statement (15)
5. Consistent with annual work plan (15)
6. Specific request of the Town Council (10)

☐ **Community / Citizen Benefits, Environmental and Aesthetics (20%)**

1. Stabilize or improve neighborhoods (20)
2. Improve quality of life for residents (20)
3. Improves community appearance (20)
4. Improves recreational / cultural opportunities (20)
5. Improve environmental protection effort (15)
6. Assists in elimination of slum and blight conditions (5)

☐ **Costs (30%)**

1. Cost sharing / grant / outside funding (20)
2. Source of higher revenue (20)
3. Maintain, replace or expand an existing asset (20)
4. Lower operating cost (15)
5. Lower future capital cost (15)
6. Implication of deferring the project (10)

☐ **Distributional Effects (10%)**

1. Town wide improvement (20)
2. Benefits large portion of Town (20)
3. Investment made by the Town in the last five years (20)
4. Investment made by the Town to meet legal obligation (20)
5. Project that has the support of another community or agency (10)
6. Inter-jurisdictional benefit will be achieved (10)

(weight)



Proposed CIP Scoring Criteria

☐ High (Point Range: 7 to 10)

- Protects health & safety of the Town
- Federal, State, or contractual mandate
- Leverage Federal, State, or other funding sources
- Planned or ongoing project coordination of private or public improvements by others
- Prevents irreparable damage to existing facilities

☐ Low (Point Range: 1 to 3)

- Provides an expanded level of service
- Deferrable (funding availability, non-urgent)

☐ Medium (Point Range: 4 to 6)

- Results in increased efficiency
- Maintains existing service levels
- Preserves or enhances existing facilities
- Reduces operational costs



Comparison of CIP Scoring Criteria Current vs. Proposed

☐ Current

- 4 categories
- 24 criteria
- Weighted categories (40%, 30%, 20%, 10%)
- Variable weights per criteria (range: 5 to 20 each)
- Criteria not clearly defined or understood
- Scoring susceptible to bias or skewed results
- Project scoring done as a committee, not individually

☐ Proposed

- 3 categories
- 11 criteria
- Non-weighted categories
- Non-weighted criteria
- Scoring bias is minimized
- Project scoring done independently by each committee member to develop a consensus score



Comparison of CIP Scoring Criteria Current vs. Proposed

Example: Tatum Blvd & McDonald Dr Intersection Improvement (2005)

Background

\$1,800,000 Federally funded, CMAQ

\$450,000 Town funded

Intersection improvement

ADOT administered construction



Comparison of CIP Scoring Criteria Current vs. Proposed

Example: Tatum Blvd & McDonald Dr Intersection Improvement

☐ Current

- Ranked #9 out of 42 projects (based on cumulative points)
- Project scoring done as a committee, not individually
- Ranking would place project in year 1 or year 2 of the 5-year program

☐ Proposed

- High, committee consensus score of 8
- Met 3 of the 5 criteria in 'high' category
 - Protects health & safety of the Town
 - Leverage Federal, State, or other funding sources
 - Planned or ongoing project coordination of private or public improvements by others
 - Prevents irreparable damage to existing facilities
 - Federal, state, or contractual mandate
- Ranking would place project in year 1 or year 2 of the 5-year program



Next Steps

- March 14, 2019 CIP Scoring Criteria – Council direction
- March 28, 2019 CIP 5-Year Program Draft – Council direction
- April 2019 CIP 5-Year Program Draft
- May 2019 – Council meeting, if needed
- June 2019 – Budget adopted by Council





CIP Scoring Criteria

Questions and Discussion

