



GUIDANCE FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM CRITERIA

The City's 2018-2023 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) review is based on a scoring matrix designed to fairly assess a diverse range City projects from nine City departments. The following criteria provide a quantitative approach to evaluating each project based on the City's obligations and broader priorities.

This scoring matrix employs a weighting factor to emphasizing the importance of each criterion.

1. Department Priority - Completed by CIP Steering Committee

[Weighting factor: 5; Scale: 5(high)-1(low)] - This number represents the relative importance of the project reported by the individual departments. There is no consistent reporting of department priority, so this required discernment by Steering Committee members.

2. Urgent Project - Completed by CIP Steering Committee

[Weighting factor: 10; Scale: 1(Yes)-0(No)] - This is treated as a Yes/No response. The functional question is, "Does this have to happen within the next 5 years?"

3. Health and Safety Improvements - Completed by CIP Steering Committee

[Weighting factor: 8; Scale: 1(Yes)-0(No)] - This, again, is a Yes/No test. The question is whether the proposed project provides important improvements to the health and safety of its users.

4. Contractually or Legally Required - Completed by CIP Steering Committee

[Weighting factor: 10; Scale: 2(Yes, imperative), 1(Yes, discretionary), 0(No)] - This is an important scoring factor to determine the relative need of the project to meet legal mandates. Examples include: ADA accessibility would score as, "Yes, imperative," while building repairs may score as, "Yes, discretionary."

5. Maintains Existing Level of Community Services - Completed by CIP Steering Committee

[Weighting factor: 4; Scale: 5(high)-1(low), 0(No)] - This score answers the question, "Does this project directly impact maintaining existing community services?" This score ranges from 0(no value to existing services) to 5 (critically important to existing services).

6. Defined Project Scope - Completed by CIP Steering Committee

[Weighting factor: 3; Scale: 5(high)-1(low)] - If the project is poorly defined, then it would be a lower score. A well-defined project demonstrates good preparation and better understanding of project costs.

7. Conformance with Community Goals or Other Projects - Completed by CIP Steering Committee

[Weighting factor: 6; Scale: 1(Yes)-0(No)] - This Yes/No evaluation helps identify the projects that are not totally consistent with the rest of the projects of the CIP or the desired direction of the City's overall goals.

8. Project Consistency with the Master Plan - Completed by the Planning Board

[Weighting factor: 10; Scale: 2(Highly Consistent), 1(Generally Consistent), 0(Inconsistent)] - This has a 'high value' weighting factor because it reflects the fundamental purpose of the CIP as a method of implementing the Master Plan through capital projects. The Planning Board reviewed each project relative to the Master Plan: 'Highly Consistent' - the project is identified in the Plan or integral to a goal; 'Generally Consistent' - the project supports the vision and spirit of the Plan; 'Inconsistent' - the project is contrary to the vision and spirit of the Plan.