



## Legislation Text

---

**File #:** 19-106, **Version:** 1

---

**TO:** Mayor Bien-Willner and Town Council Members

**FROM:** Brian Dalke, Interim Town Manager  
Paul Mood, Town Engineer  
Jason Harris, Capital Projects Administrator

**DATE:** March 14, 2019

**DEPARTMENT:** Engineering

**AGENDA TITLE:**  
Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Scoring Criteria

**RECOMMENDATION:**  
Request Town Council's feedback and direction regarding new CIP scoring criteria to be used for the CIP 5-Year Program.

**SUMMARY STATEMENT:**  
In 2018, Town Council requested staff to review the CIP process and to provide recommendations for improvement. On December 19, 2018, an initial meeting was held among all department directors and the interim Town Manager to review the current and future capital projects. From this meeting, actions were taken to re-evaluate the CIP process and to form an evaluation committee consisting of one member from each department, except Courts, who chose not to participate based on the types of capital projects being considered over the next five to ten years.

The CIP evaluation committee is made up of nine Town staff members consisting of seven voting members: Interim Town Manager, Chief Financial Officer, Chief of Information Technology, Chief of Police Department, Public Works Director, Town Engineer, and the Community Development Director. The remaining two staff members are non-voting technical advisors: Deputy Town Manager and Capital Projects Administrator.

In early 2019, a series of meetings were held among the evaluation committee to develop scoring criteria that is more clearly defined than the existing scoring process. The committee reviewed criteria used by other agencies and developed scoring criteria that would be most relevant to the Town. The new scoring criteria consists of three categories (High, Medium, Low), and eleven criteria.

To validate the new scoring criteria, the Tatum Blvd and McDonald Dr Intersection Realignment project completed in 2005 was evaluated under the current scoring criteria, as well as, the proposed criteria. Under the current process, the project ranked 9 out of 42 projects considered in FY19. Note: all 42 projects were not evaluated, only the 2005 project was scored and its rank determined based

on the cumulative points scored. From this exercise, it was agreed upon by the evaluation committee the 2005 project scored high enough and most likely would have been programmed in year one or year two of the five-year program, if the project was being considered for the current five-year program.

Under the new or proposed scoring criteria, the 2005 project received a committee consensus score of 8, which fell into the “high” priority category (point range: 7 to 10). Justification for the project being included in the high category is because the project met three of the five criteria. More information about the 2005 project and the comparison between the current and proposed CIP scoring criteria can be seen in the attached presentation.

Overall, the new scoring method promotes individuals’ thoughts, ideas, and meaningful dialogue among each department. The evaluation committee used this new method to score forty projects being considered in the upcoming 5-Year Capital Improvement Program and found the results to be superior over the current scoring method.

**BUDGETARY IMPACT:**

There is no budgetary impact associated with this item.

**ATTACHMENT(S):**

Presentation