

CLIC

Capital Long-Range Improvement Committee

2005 Capital Guidelines

CITY GOALS

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

CLIC RATING FORM

CITY GOALS

The Adopted Minneapolis City Goals and Expectations and the policies of the City of Minneapolis' Comprehensive Plan will be used by the Capital Long-Range Improvement Committee (CLIC) in the evaluation of capital requests and in developing recommendations for the City's 2006-2010 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The eight City Goals are:

1. Build communities where all people feel safe and trust the City's public safety professionals and systems.
2. Maintain the physical infrastructure to ensure a healthy, vital and safe City.
3. Deliver consistently high quality City services at a good value to our taxpayers.
4. Create an environment that maximizes economic development opportunities within Minneapolis by focusing on the City's physical and human assets.
5. Foster the development and preservation of a mix of quality housing types that is available, affordable, meets current needs, and promotes future growth.
6. Preserve and enhance our natural and historic environment and promote a clean, sustainable Minneapolis.
7. Promote public, community and private partnerships to address disparities and to support strong, healthy families and communities.
8. Strengthen City government management and enhance community engagement.

For details about Minneapolis City Goals & Expectations, see hyperlink below. To activate link, hold down Ctrl key and click on the link.

<http://www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/council/goals/>

City of Minneapolis' Comprehensive Plan

The City of Minneapolis' Comprehensive Plan provides guidance to elected officials, city staff, businesses, neighborhoods and other constituents. This document outlines the details of the City's vision, by focusing on the physical, social and economic attributes of the city and is used by elected officials to ensure that decisions contribute to and not detract from achievement of the City's vision. The plan can be found on the City's web site at the following address:

<http://www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/citywork/planning/planpubs/mplsplan/index.html>

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The following evaluation system *adopted by the City Council and Mayor* will be used by CLIC as the basis for evaluating all requests for capital improvements. This system shall be uniformly applied in evaluating and rating all capital improvement requests submitted for each year of the five year plan.

The Evaluation System has three sections as follows:

	Point Allocation
I. PROJECT PRIORITY	100
II. CONTRIBUTION TO CITY GOALS OPERATING COST CONSIDERATIONS	70 -25 to +25
III. QUALITATIVE CRITERIA	105
Total Possible Points	<hr style="width: 100%;"/> 300

I. PROJECT PRIORITY

Project Priority provides preferential evaluation based on the following attributes:

1. Capital projects defined in terms of **Level of Need** - 0 to 60 points.
2. Capital projects currently in the **Adopted Five Year Capital Improvement Program** - 0 to 30 points.
3. Coordinated planning and prioritized funding for an **Integrated Project** – 10 points.

Level of Need Definitions - The level of need is the primary criteria defining a capital request’s priority. Requests are determined to be *critical, significant, important* or *desirable* for delivering municipal services.

Critical - Describes a capital proposal as indispensable and demanding attention due to an immediate need or public endangerment if not corrected. Few projects can qualify for this high an evaluation. Failure to fund a critical project generally would result in suspension of a municipal service to minimize risk to the public.

Point Range 51 - 60

Significant - Describes a capital proposal deemed to have a high priority in addressing a need or service as previously indicated by policymakers and/or submitting agency priority rankings. This designation may also pertain to a proposal that is an integral and/or inseparable part of achieving completeness of a larger improvement or series of improvements.

Point Range 41 - 50

Important - Describes a capital proposal addressing a pressing need that can be evaluated as a standalone project. Proposals may be considered “important” if they are required to maintain an expected standard of service, achieve equity in service delivery or increase efficiency in providing public services. Failure to fund an “important” proposal would mean some level of service is still possible.

Point Range 21 - 40

Desirable - Describes a capital proposal that would provide increased public benefits, enhancement of municipal services or other upgrading of public infrastructure. Failure to fund a “desirable” project would not immediately impair current municipal services.

Point Range 0 - 20

Adopted Five Year Capital Improvement Program

Is the project currently funded in the adopted 2005-2009 Capital Improvement Program?

Point Allocation -

- Identified for funding as a 2006 project30
- Identified for funding as a 2007-2009 project.....20
- New proposal for 2010 funding.....10
- New proposal for 2005-2008, not in the current Five Year Plan 0

Integrated Project - 10 points

The intent of this category is to encourage joint project planning and funding efforts with other City Departments, Independent Boards, Commissions, other Governmental Units or private developments.

Awarded to capital requests meeting **both** of the following criteria:

- Integral part of a multi-faceted or multi-jurisdictional project or an inseparable part of a larger improvement or series of improvements; and
- Completion of the whole multi-faceted project would be jeopardized if this project is not funded.

II. CONTRIBUTION TO CITY GOALS

Contribution to City Goals is defined as the extent to which capital improvement proposals contribute to achieving the City’s Goals and the detailed expectations applicable to each. In addition, projects must support the policies of the City of Minneapolis’ Comprehensive Plan as cited in this document, as well as help to ensure the overall maintenance and improvement of the City’s infrastructure systems.

Capital improvement proposals will be evaluated for their overall ability to:

- achieve City goals and support the policies of the City of Minneapolis’ Comprehensive Plan
- ensure maintenance of the City’s infrastructure systems and equitable delivery of municipal services
- encourage coordinated planning efforts with project partners and the community

Point ranges for meeting the above objectives will be as follows:

Strong Contribution	46 - 70
Moderate Contribution	16 - 45
Little or No Contribution	0 - 15

Operating Cost Considerations will be analyzed in evaluating all capital requests. Emphasis will be placed on whether the request will maintain or reduce current operating and maintenance costs or would add to or create new operating or maintenance costs. Accuracy and completeness of information provided to operating cost questions and ability to demonstrate progress made with resources provided in prior years will be factored into points allocated for this major category. Operating cost implications should also be discussed at the CLIC Presentations. Points for this category will range from minus 25 to plus 25.

III. QUALITATIVE CRITERIA

Qualitative Criteria provide for evaluation of proposals related to the seven attributes described below. Evaluators should allocate points in this area using the definitions described below as well as by considering the impact these areas have in helping to achieve City Goals. Each of these criteria will be used to score proposals within a point range from 0 to 15. It is likely that most capital requests will not receive points for all attributes.

1. **Neighborhood Livability & Community Life** -- Extent proposal serves to preserve or improve the quality, safety and security of neighborhoods in order to retain and attract residents and engage community members. Consideration shall be given to proposals that are included in an NRP neighborhood action plan approved by the City Council and/or proposals that include NRP as a funding source.

Intent: to reward proposals that demonstrate potential to enhance the quality of life and public safety in neighborhoods and the community at large and to reward proposals in approved NRP Neighborhood Actions Plans or that include NRP funds.

2. **Public Benefit** -- Extent proposal directly benefits a portion of the City's population by provision of certain services or facilities.

Intent: to award points based on the percentage of the city's population (382,618) that will benefit.

3. **Capital Cost & Customer Service Delivery** -- Extent proposal delivers consistently high quality City services at a good value to taxpayers and that City infrastructure investment is appropriately sized for effective service delivery.

Intent: to reward proposals that improve the quality, cost effectiveness and equity of municipal services delivered to all residents.

4. **Environmental Quality** -- Extent proposal would preserve or improve the quality of the urban environment, including visual and other sensory attributes as well as natural resources.

Intent: to reward proposals contributing positively to the city's physical environment and/or conservation of natural resources.

5. **Collaboration & Leveraging Public/Private Investment** -- Extent proposal reflects collaboration between two or more public or public-private organizations to more effectively and efficiently attain common goals and for which costs can be met with non-City funds or generate private investment in the City.

Intent: to reward proposals that represent collaborative efforts with multiple project partners and possibly conserve municipal funds through generating public and/or private investment in the City.

6. **Effect on Tax Base and/or Job Creation** -- Extent proposal can be expected to preserve or increase the City's tax base and serve as a catalyst for job creation by the private sector.

Intent: to reward proposals that may have a positive effect on property values and thus have the potential of preserving or expanding the City's tax base and supporting job-intensive industries that provide living-wage jobs, especially for hard to employ populations.

7. **Intellectual & Cultural Implications** – Extent proposal would strengthen or expand educational, cultural, architectural or historic opportunities.

Intent: to reward proposals contributing to the City's intellectual and cultural growth, including promotion of historical preservation or architectural significance.

CLIC RATING FORM

Project ID Number						
	Points					
Project Priority:						
Level of Need						
Critical	51-60					
Significant	41-50					
Important	21-40					
Desirable	0-20					
In Adopted Five Year Plan						
2006	30					
2007-2009	20					
2010	10					
New for 2006-2009	0					
Integrated Project	10					
Sub-Total Project Priority						
Contribution to City Goals:						
Strong Contribution	46 - 70					
Moderate Contribution	16 – 45					
Little or No Contribution	0 - 15					
Operating Costs:	-25 to +25					
Sub-Total Goals & Operating Costs						
Qualitative Criteria:						
Neighborhood Livability & Community Life	0 – 15					
Public Benefit	0 – 15					
Capital Cost/Customer Service Delivery	0 – 15					
Environmental Quality	0 – 15					
Collaboration & Leveraging	0 – 15					
Effect on Tax Base & Job Creation	0 – 15					
Intellectual & Cultural Implications	0 – 15					
Sub-Total Qualitative Criteria						
Total Rating Points	300 Possible					