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March 30, 2017

Honorable Mayor Domenic J. Sarno, Members of the City Council, and Residents:
This transmittal letter provides an overview of planning and budgeting for the City's five year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), spanning Fiscal Years 2018-2022. The CIP reflects a comprehensive process, builds upon priorities established by the current Administration, and provides a detailed view of capital needs within the City of Springfield. Currently, the City is in need of over $\$ 850.1$ million in capital improvement spending. The highest priority projects total $\$ 461.6$ million which support economic development, improvements to public safety facilities, and continued upgrades in our schools.

In recent years, the City has made a concerted effort to address its capital needs by restructuring debt for the purposes of increasing its capacity for future debt issuances. On February 7, 2017, the City issued $\$ 44.3$ million in debt for numerous capital improvement projects. The City again sold bonds in March 2017 for Union Station and to refinance bonds from 2007 in order to save money over the next six years. The City has been strategic in leveraging funds from outside sources for capital projects in order to ensure the most cost effective use of City funds. The City worked collaboratively with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency (MEMA), and the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) to maximize revenues for schools, facilities and infrastructure improvements. The City will continue to strategically use federal, state, private and City funding as we make decisions about capital improvement projects.

The City has made great strides in completing its highest priority projects. In FY17 the City completed several projects including the creation of the John J. Shea Bright Nights Technical Training Facility in Forest Park, the purchase of vehicles for DPW, improvements to the City hall boiler plant, a feasibility study for the East Forest Park Library, as well as many emergency repairs around the City. A list of projects completed in FY17 is shown below:

| FISCAL YEAR 2017 COMPLETED PROJECTS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PROJECT SUMMARY | OUTSIDE FUNDING | $\begin{gathered} \text { CITY } \\ \text { CONTRIBUTION } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL <br> PROJECT COST | FUNDING SOURCES |
| CENTRAL LIBRARY ASSESSMENT \& FAÇADE STABILIZATION | - | 155,105 | 155,105 | PAY-GO |
| CITY HALL BOILER PLANT IMPROVEMENTS | - | 1,758,000 | 1,758,000 | CITY BOND, PAY-GO |
| CITY HALL HORSE SHOE PARKING LOT REPAIR | - | 161,203 | 161,203 | CH90, PAYGO, DPW GF |
| DPW - ENTERPRISE VEHICLE REPLACEMENT | - | 923,925 | 923,925 | CITY BOND |
| DPW MILL RIVER PROJECT - DESIGN WORK | - | 173,700 | 173,700 | PAY-GO |
| EAST FOREST PARK LIBRARY FEASIBILITY STUDY | 50,000 | 29,000 | 79,000 | STATE GRANT, PAY-GO |
| FIRE RADIO UPGRADES | - | 205,141 | 205,141 | PAY-GO |
| MSBA SOI - FEASIBILITY \& SCHEMATIC DESIGN <br> ZANETTI/ BALLIET E./ BALLIET M./KENSINGTON/ LYNCH/ KILEY | - | 368,985 | 368,985 | PAY-GO |
| POLICE CRIME SCENE SCANNER | - | 113,345 | 113,345 | PD CAPITAL, PAY-GO |
| POLICE HQ PARKING LOT LIGHTS AND REPAVING | - | 127,567 | 127,567 | PAY-GO, PD PAY-GO |
| RUTH ELIZABETH PARK DESIGN | - | 50,000 | 50,000 | PAY-GO |
| JOHN J. SHEA BRIGHT NIGHTS TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY | 1,290,000 | 1,725,250 | 3,015,250 | FEDERAL GRANT, CITY BOND |
| UNION STATION | 87,600,000 | 5,400,000 | 93,000,000 | FEDERAL, STATE, LOCAL |
| TOTAL | 88,940,000 | 11,191,220 | 100,131,220 |  |

By leveraging federal and state revenues, the City will continue to work on or begin projects that help promote economic development, revitalization, infrastructure improvements, and housing throughout
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Springfield. Construction has begun on multiple projects that will provide valuable services to the community, as seen below:

| CURRENTLY IN PROGRESS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PROJECT SUMMARY | OUTSIDE <br> FUNDING | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { CITY } \\ \text { CONTRIBUTION } \end{array}$ | TOTAL PROJECT COST | FUNDING SOURCES |
| BALLIET PARK RENOVATION | 200,000 | 400,000 | 600,000 | STATE GRANT, PAY-GO |
| BONDI'S ISLAND LANDFILL CLOSURE | 2,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 7,000,000 | CITY BOND, ENTERPRISE FUND |
| BRIGHTWOOD SCHOOL FEASIBILITY STUDY | - | - | 1,000,000 | CITY BOND |
| BRUNTON/STEM/WALSH/PUBLIC DAY - MSBA | 7,204,577 | 1,898,966 | 9,103,543 | MSBA, CITY BOND |
| CENTRAL LIBRARY - PHASE I | - | 3,957,898 | 3,957,898 | UNEXPENDED BOND PROCEEDS |
| CULINARY AND NUTRITION CENTER - PHASE I | 5,000,000 | 7,000,000 | 12,000,000 | USDA, GRANTS, CITY BOND |
| DEMOLITIONS |  | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | CITY BOND |
| ESCO II | - | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 | FY15 CITY BOND |
| FIRE VOCAL ALERT SYSTEM | - | 400,000 | 400,000 | UNEXPENDED BOND PROCEEDS |
| FOREST PARK TENNIS COURTS | - | 440,780 | 440,780 | PAY-GO |
| GUNNERY SGT. SULLIVAN PARK | 400,000 | 250,000 | 650,000 | STATE GRANT, PAY-GO |
| HYDROPOWER AT WATERSHOPS DAM | 5,050,000 | 1,000,000 | 6,050,000 | NDRC, CITY BOND |
| JOHN F. KENNEDY MIDDLE - WINDOWS \& DOORS | 2,157,422 | 2,330,281 | 4,487,703 | UNEXPENDED BOND PROCEEDS |
| KENSINGTON ELEMENTARY - WINDOWS \& DOORS | 733,697 | 489,131 | 1,222,828 | MSBA, CITY BOND |
| LOWER VAN HORN RESERVOIR DAM | 2,000,000 | 400,000 | 2,400,000 | GRANT, STATE, PAY-GO |
| PAUL J. FENTON SAFETY ANNEX - 50 EAST STREET | 2,890,464 | 9,053,120 | 11,943,584 | FEMA, CITY BOND |
| PEARL STREET FEASIBILITY STUDY | - | 259,108 | 259,108 | PD CAPITAL, PAY-GO |
| POLICE VEHICLE REPLACEMENT | - | 1,125,000 | 1,125,000 | CITY BOND |
| RAYMOND A. JORDAN SENIOR CENTER | 7,608,496 | 4,391,504 | 12,000,000 | FEMA, CITY BOND |
| SCHOOL CAPITAL PROJECTS | - | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | UNEXPENDED BOND PROCEEDS |
| SOUTH END COMMUNITY CENTER (SECC) | 6,000,000 | 4,292,500 | 10,292,500 | FEMA, CITY BOND |
| TOTAL | 41,244,656 | 57,688,289 | 99,932,944 |  |

Furthermore, some important projects that are anticipated to begin in FY18 include the feasibility study and schematic design for DeBerry Elementary School, renovations to the MSBA Statement of Interest schools Zanetti, Balliet Middle, Thomas Balliet, Kensington, Kiley, and Lynch, improvements to Riverfront Park, the renovation of Stearns Square and in preparation for the MGM Casino opening, a revitalization of the City's downtown streets and sidewalks.

| SCHEDULED TO BEGIN IN FISCAL YEAR 2018 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PROJECT SUMMARY | OUTSIDE FUNDING | $\begin{gathered} \text { CITY } \\ \text { CONTRIBUTION } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL <br> PROJECT COST | FUNDING SOURCES |
| BRIGHTWOOD SCHOOL REPLACEMENT | 12,500,000 | 22,500,000 | 35,000,000 | *ESTIMATE - <br> PENDING MSBA ACCEPTANCE |
| DEBERRY SCHOOL FEASIBILITY STUDY | - | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | CITY BOND |
| DOWNTOWN REFRESH | - | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | TBD |
| EAST FOREST PARK LIBRARY | 5,889,517 | 3,609,704 | 9,499,221 | TBD, PENDING SUBMITTED GRANT |
| JAIME ULLOA PARK | 250,000 | 250,000 | 500,000 | STATE GRANT, CDBG, PAY-GO |
| MARY LYNCH PARK | 600,000 | 150,000 | 750,000 | STATE GRANT, CDBG, PAY-GO |
| MSBA SOI SCHOOLS - ZANETTI/ BALLIET E./ BALLIET M./ KENSINGTON/ LYNCH/ KILEY | 18,825,762 | 4,706,441 | 23,532,203 | *ESTIMATE - <br> PENDING MSBA ACCEPTANCE |
| RIVERFRONT PARK | 1,000,000 | - | 1,000,000 | COMMUNITY AGREEMENT |
| STEARNS SQUARE RENOVATION | - | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | TBD |
| TOTAL | 39,065,279 | 36,716,145 | 75,781,424 |  |

In January 2017, Standard \& Poor's (S\&P) affirmed the City's AA- credit rating with a stable outlook which continues to be the highest rating in the City's recorded history; steadily improving from its Arating five years ago. This recent credit rating review focuses on the City's strong institutional core by highlighting Springfield's "management, with "strong" financial policies and practices, adequate budgetary performance, and strong budgetary flexibility." Additionally, the City received a reaffirmed credit rating of A2 with a stable outlook by Moody's in January 2017. Looking back almost ten years ago, the City had a Baa3 credit rating, junk bond status. These rating improvements are a testament to
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how well the City has made it through the economic downturn and made appropriate decisions to keep the budget balanced. Moody's credited Springfield's stabilized financial position to its status as the regional economic center of Western Massachusetts, having satisfactory reserves, as well as demonstrating conservative fiscal management and an adherence to formal financial policies.

The City will continue to look for ways to leverage funding to maximize its use of taxpayer dollars. I look forward to your feedback and to working with City Departments on these important projects.

Sincerely,


Timothy J. Plante
Chief Administrative and Financial Officer

## Capital Plan Overview

The City of Springfield's $\$ 850.1$ million five-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is updated annually for the acquisition, renovation or construction, of new or existing facilities and infrastructure. The Capital Plan is the City's investment roadmap for the next five years and is strategically implemented to address the Mayor's five essential priorities for sustaining a vibrant community; public safety, education, economic vitality, healthy neighborhoods, and fiscal and operational excellence. All of these efforts are directed toward achieving the City's mission: To provide a high quality of life for residents, businesses, and visitors.

In Fiscal Year 2016, the Capital Committee made changes to the project rating criteria in order to better reflect the Mayor's five essential priorities. The eight criteria include: project funding, service to the public, legal obligations, operational impact, coordination with other projects, perception of need and the addition of economic development and resiliency (see Appendix C).

The CIP document details major spending for construction and equipment projects over the next five years, providing policymakers the opportunity to finance projects, coordinate City needs, and plan for future risks and demands. A capital project, according to the financial ordinances section 4.44.050 (A) of the City of Springfield, is "... a facility, object or asset costing more than $\$ 25,000$ with an estimated useful life of ten years or more."

The City develops and presents a Capital Improvement Plan to City Council every year. Projects in the capital plan are based on a quantitative analysis of project need and merit. The capital budget represents the funding for the overall estimated cost of projects. Projects in the annual budget represent the City's most immediate investment priorities and have the highest return on investment for the taxpayers of Springfield. The goal of the CIP is to create a logical, data-driven, comprehensive, integrated, and transparent capital investment strategy that addresses infrastructure, roads, sidewalks, parks, land, buildings, equipment, technology, fleet, and other capital asset needs.

The administration oversees all aspects of the CIP with multiple City departments playing an integral role in its development. The Office of Management and Budget oversees the financial aspects of each capital project and maintains a record of expenses for each project. The City's Capital Asset Construction Department (DCAC) is responsible for management and oversight of construction, major renovation, and repair projects involving existing City assets. The Planning and Economic Development Department manages new development or redevelopment projects. The Facilities Department also plays an integral role in capital projects by providing routine maintenance, repair and renovations to the City's facilities. Lastly, the Department of Public Works is responsible for the repair and maintenance of City roadways and sidewalks, a key piece to the City's infrastructure.

Projects that are included in the CIP are not guaranteed for funding as the Plan is a reflection of the needs within the City. Due to the fact that the scope of the capital plan is limited to affordability, the City continues to have a significant challenge in meeting capital demands. While financial shortcomings will always be a challenge within City government, the CIP enables the City to develop a strategy for the timing of projects and for the replacement of aging equipment. In past years, work on many buildings and road projects was deferred due to budgetary constraints. The City has made a concerted effort to address its capital needs by restructuring its debt for the purposes of increasing its capacity for future debt issuances. The City is finally reaping the benefits of these efforts and has a better ability to address high priority projects within the CIP.

In February 2017, the City issued $\$ 44.3$ million of debt for multiple completed and on-going projects. In order to address high priority capital needs, Springfield issued short and long term debt, along with a combination of MSBA, FEMA, Pay-Go, unexpended bond proceeds, and grant funding to finance over $\$ 105.8$ million of capital improvement projects. These projects include the completed School Dense Wireless Project, building of the John J. Shea Bright Nights Technical Training Facility (Skill \& Technical Training Center), the renovation of the Clifford A. Phaneuf Environmental Center (ECOS) in Forest Park, the Union Station parking garage, and the purchase of vehicles for the Police Department and DPW. Additionally, the City will bond for ongoing projects such as the Springfield Public School Culinary and Nutrition Center, the renovation of 50 East Street, the building of the Raymond Jordan Senior Center in Blunt Park, the construction of a new South End Community Center (SECC), and multiple school projects.

| PROJECT | BOND <br> PROCEEDS |
| :--- | ---: |
| Emergency Appropriations relating to Tornado \& Snow Storm Damage | $4,079,300$ |
| School Hardware/Software (Dense Wireless Project) | $2,025,400$ |
| Kennedy Middle School Windows \& Doors | $1,364,500$ |
| Kensington International School Windows \& Doors | 463,100 |
| Mary M. Walsh School Windows and Doors | 500,700 |
| Public High School | 319,000 |
| Daniel Brunton Elementary School | 504,200 |
| STEM Middle School Roof Replacement | 397,000 |
| Food Service Building | $6,645,500$ |
| 50 East Street Renovation | $8,594,100$ |
| Senior Center Construction | $4,166,650$ |
| South End Community Center Planning \& Construction | $4,049,500$ |
| Skill \& Techincal Training Facility | $1,638,000$ |
| Environmental Center for our Schools (ECOS) | $1,411,700$ |
| Police Vehicles | $1,016,000$ |
| DPW Vehicles | 817,300 |
| Landfill Closure | $1,736,600$ |
| Demolitions | $1,881,600$ |
| Roads/Sidewalks | $2,694,850$ |
| TOTALS | $\mathbf{4 4 , 3 0 5 , 0 0 0}$ |

The strategic use of outside funding allows for maximum impact, at a minimum price for the City. As illustrated in the February 2017 bond issuance, the City was left responsible for only $41 \%$ of the $\$ 105.8$ million project costs. The City continues to employ this strategy of leveraging alternative funding sources. The following sources have been used to help the City fund portions of the CIP:

- Federal and State funding - There continues to be an effort to seek federal and state funds for projects such as school rehabilitations, road and dam repairs, emergency mitigation plans, and economic development.

[^0]- Housing and US Department of Urban Development (HUD)
- Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency (MEMA)
- Federal Transportation and Highway departments (FHWA)
- Federal, State, and Private Grants -There continues to be an interest in seeking grants for projects such as park rehabilitation, first responder equipment, repair of dams, the rehabilitation of roads, and energy efficiency. Gaining access to grant funds will require the City to maximize the use of its grants management capabilities.
- Strategic use of Pay-As-You-Go (Pay-Go) capital funds - The Pay-Go capital account was established in the financial ordinances with a goal to fund smaller capital projects through the annual operating budget. By financial ordinance, the City is required to fund the Pay-Go account with $1.5 \%$ of the local source revenue, which is approximately $\$ 3.4$ million. These funds are used strategically to pay for emergency projects, small capital projects, and for projects that do not fit the debt issuance requirements.
- Review use of bond funds - On an annual basis, the City conducts a Debt Affordability Analysis to monitor factors that rating agencies and other stakeholders use to evaluate the amount of debt the City has and its ability to afford new debt. This will help City leaders make financially sound decisions in issuing new debt which is particularly important because the City is legally required to pay for debt service before all other City expenses.
- Use reserves or other one-time funds for certain one-time capital projects.
- Increase the frequency of asset inventory - By regularly taking an inventory of City assets, the City can determine the need to replace pieces of small equipment. It also ensures that departments are properly storing and maintaining important tools that are essential for their operations.
- Use of unexpended bond proceeds - On a continuing basis, the Office of Management and Budget compiles a list of projects funded by bond proceeds in an effort to determine if there were proceeds that were unexpended. When projects are completed, meaning that all tasks are finished and all expenses have been paid, any money left in the bond account is considered an unexpended bond proceed. Unexpended bond proceeds are the result of project scope changes, projects being completed under budget, or receiving reimbursements from outside agencies for expenses that were initially deemed "ineligible." The City has used unexpended bond proceeds for various school building improvements, the Fire Department Vocal Alert System Upgrade, and to fund the first phase of repairs at the Central Library.


## Breakdown of Fiscal Year 2018 Capital Requests

The capital plan is a fluid document that will be subject to change during the year as priorities change and additional information becomes available. All final requests approved by the Capital Improvement Committee will be submitted for final review and approval to the Mayor and the City Council as required by law. This year the final submissions totaled $\$ 850,139,111$ which is a decrease of over $\$ 5.1$ million from the FY17 Capital Improvement Plan. This decrease can be attributed to removing fully funded projects from the list and updating projects as information becomes available. The chart below shows the breakdown of the 451 department submitted projects by priority.

| Priority | Range | Number of <br> Entries | FY18 Estimated <br> Total Project Cost | FY17 CIP | Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| A | $100-65$ | 96 | $461,690,439$ | $328,756,377$ | $132,934,062$ |
| B | $64-45$ | 175 | $240,022,742$ | $285,110,408$ | $(45,087,666)$ |
| C | $44-26$ | 128 | $98,905,930$ | $190,737,502$ | $(91,831,572)$ |
| D | $25-0$ | 52 | $49,520,000$ | $50,720,000$ | $(1,200,000)$ |
| TOTAL |  | $\mathbf{4 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 5 0 , 1 3 9 , 1 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 5 5 , 3 2 4 , 2 8 7}$ | $(\mathbf{5 , 1 8 5 , 1 7 6 )}$ |

As stated in the FY17 Debt Affordability Study, a majority of the City's debt is dedicated to facilities projects because of varying degrees of need ranging from repairs, to major renovations, and new school construction. This is reflected in the CIP with the number of Facilities and DCAC entries for both City and School totaling 266 entries for an estimated $\$ 622.9$ million in project costs.

## Estimated Total Project Cost



When a project is added to the CIP, the total estimated project cost is entered, even if the MSBA or another outside source will be contributing to the project. It is also important to note that many department requested projects (mainly School Department) are listed under Facilities or DCAC as they will manage and oversee the project. For example, the Culinary and Nutrition Center - Food Service Building for the School Department will be managed by DCAC and is listed as a DCAC project.

## Proposed FY18 Capital Budget and Projects

## Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) Projects <br> William N. DeBerry Elementary School

The City is currently looking into the replacement of the William N. DeBerry Elementary School located in the Old Hill Neighborhood. Based on a report published by the Department of Parks, Buildings and Recreation Management, the current building located at 670 Union Street is in need of extensive repairs. The issuance of $\$ 1.0$ million will begin the planning phase of the project for the feasibility study and schematic design which must be paid by the City as it is not a Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) eligible cost.

| MSBA Funding | City Contribution | Total Estimated Project Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 1,000,000$ | $\$ 1,000,000$ |

## Zanetti, Balliet Middle, Thomas Balliet, Kensington, Kiley, Lynch

In May 2016, six Springfield public schools were invited to apply for the MSBA Accelerated Repair Program: Alfred G. Zanetti School, Balliet Middle School, and M. Marcus Kiley Middle School for window and door replacements and Thomas M. Balliet School, Kensington International School, and the Mary M. Lynch Elementary School for roof replacements. Each proposed repair project would materially extend the useful life of each school. The City funded $\$ 368,985$ through the Pay-go account to conduct feasibility studies and schematic designs for the six schools. The studies and designs with final estimated costs are scheduled to be complete in April 2017. Once finalized, the City Council will need to authorize the total estimated cost of the project. The City can anticipate an $80 \%$ reimbursement of all eligible costs from MSBA. Any project costs in excess of the total project budget as determined by MSBA will have to be paid by the City as additional expenses; the MSBA will not increase the amount to be reimbursed.

| School Project | MSBA Funding | City Contribution | Total Estimated <br> Project Cost |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Alfred G. Zanetti Montessori | $2,525,137$ | 631,284 | $3,156,421$ |
| Balliet Middle School | $1,609,775$ | 402,444 | $2,012,219$ |
| M. Marcus Kiley Middle School | $7,598,889$ | $1,899,722$ | $9,498,611$ |
| Thomas M. Balliet School | $1,715,810$ | 428,953 | $2,144,763$ |
| Kensington International School | $1,191,130$ | 297,783 | $1,488,913$ |
| Mary M. Lynch Elementary | $1,693,704$ | 423,426 | $2,117,130$ |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{\$ 1 6 , 3 3 4 , 4 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 4 , 0 8 3 , 6 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 0 , 4 1 8 , 0 5 7}$ |

## Riverfront Park

Pursuant to the MGM Host Community Agreement (paragraph 3 of exhibit E), MGM has provided the City $\$ 1.0$ million to improve Riverfront Park, which runs parallel to West Columbus Avenue and Hall of Fame Avenue. The funds will be used to remodel the City's down town riverfront, aiming to enhance the accessibility and appearance of the Park prior to the opening of the MGM Casino in the fall of 2018.

| MGM <br> Host Community Agreement | City Contribution | Total Estimated <br> Project Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 1,000,000$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 1,000,000$ |

## Stearns Square and Duryea Way Redevelopment

The Springfield Park Commission has approved a plan for the redevelopment of Stearns Square Park and Duryea Way in downtown Springfield. The improvements include new and widened sidewalks, new landscaping, and enhancements for pedestrians and outdoor dining. The suggested move of Springfield's iconic statue "The Puritan" to Stearns Square is not included in this project and it will remain in its current location at the Quadrangle.

| Outside Funding | City Contribution | Total Estimated <br> Project Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 1,500,000$ | $\$ 1,500,000$ |

## Jaime Ulloa Park

The Parks Department has been awarded a Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) grant from the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA). The grant award is for $\$ 250,000$ and requires a City match of $\$ 250,000$. The total project amount is $\$ 500,000$ and will fund the design and construction costs to renovate the Jaime Ulloa Park.

The $\$ 250,000$ LWCF grant will provide funding for design costs $(\$ 25,000)$ and for construction costs ( $\$ 225,000$ ). The City's total match of $\$ 250,000$ will be paid through the Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) $(\$ 105,900)$ and Pay-as-you-go Capital (Pay-Go) funds $(\$ 144,100)$.

| Jaime Ulloa Park Project |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| LWCF Grant |  | City of Springfield |  |
| Design Costs | 25,000 | CDBG Funding | 105,900 |
| Construction Costs | 225,000 | City Pay-go Capital | 144,100 |
| Total |  | 250,000 | Total |
|  | Total Estimated | Cost $=\mathbf{\$ 5 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |  |

Construction at Jaime Ulloa Park will include a new main entrance on Morgan Street, a gaming and seating plaza at Morgan Street, playground area improvements, and renovation of the ballfield.

## Mary Lynch Park

On December 12, 2016, the Parks Department was selected by the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) to receive up to $\$ 400,000$ in Parkland Acquisitions and Renovations for Communities (PARC) assistance. The EEA will provide $\$ 35,000$ in funding for design costs in FY17 and $\$ 365,000$ for construction costs in FY18. The City's match of $\$ 350,000$ will be paid in FY17 through funds provided by the Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) in the amount of $\$ 200,000$ and $\$ 150,000$ of Pay-go funds will be allocated to the project in FY18.

| Mary Lynch Park Project |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| PARC Grant |  | City of Springfield |  |
| Design Costs | 35,000 | CDBG Funding | 200,000 |
| Construction Costs | 365,000 | City Pay-go Capital | 150,000 |
| Total 400,000 |  | Total | 350,000 |
|  | Total Estimated | Cost $=\$ 750,000$ |  |
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The funding will be used to enhance Mary Lynch Park: Beauregard/Schiavina Memorial Fields with improvements to the playing fields, drainage and walkways, and ADA accessibility. The City also plans to create a memorial dedicated to Springfield Police Officers Alain Beauregard and Michael Schiavina.

## Fiscal Year 2017 Overview

## HUD/NDRC Projects

In January 2016, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) announced that the City of Springfield had been selected as one of thirteen winners of the National Disaster Resilience Competition (NDRC). The City will receive a total of $\$ 17,056,880$ in CDBG-NDR (Community Development Block Grant - National Disaster Resilience) funding for innovative projects that will increase resilience in the City. Receiving this award will also leverage $\$ 80,199,042$ from outside sources to fund projects throughout the City.

The NDRC was developed through a partnership between HUD and the Rockefeller Foundation in response to requests from state and local leaders seeking to build resilience and better prepare their communities for the impacts of climate change. The competition was modeled after the Rebuild by Design Competition that occurred after Hurricane Sandy. In the initial Phase I of the competition, 67 eligible applicants were invited to participate. Of the 67 participants, 40 finalists were asked to submit specific projects that would advance the resilience of their states and communities. HUD then selected 13 states and local communities to award funding. Of those awarded funding, eight were states, four municipalities (including Springfield), and one county.

The National Disaster Resilience Competition was designed to promote risk assessment, stakeholder engagement, and resilience. The City of Springfield will use these funds to carry-out the following HUD selected projects:

## Hydropower at Watershops Pond

Hydropower will be restored at the Watershops Pond Dam on land currently owned by the City. The City has already conducted a feasibility analysis for this project and has filed a FERC (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission) permit. The restored hydropower will generate $707,000 \mathrm{kwh}$ during an average year and will be capable of functioning independent of the grid. A portion of the electricity will fully power the newly-built Brookings School, which will also have the capacity to serve as an emergency community shelter in the event of a disaster. The remainder of the energy can be made available to neighboring businesses. The expectation is that an uninterrupted power source can be an attractive amenity to businesses interested in locating in the area. The City will contribute $\$ 1.0$ million toward the $\$ 6.05$ million total project cost.

| NDRC Funding | City Contribution | Total Project Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 5,050,000$ | $\$ 1,000,000$ | $\$ 6,050,000$ |

## Safe and Healthy Rental Homes

Rehabilitation program for owners of 1-4 unit homes to restore affordable housing stock damaged by the 2011 tornado.

## Business and Job Opportunities

Creation of the Springfield Innovation Center and provision of job training to foster a community of entrepreneurs, jumpstart re-investment and redevelopment in the City's core, and equip low-income residents with the skills they need to work on NDRC-funded projects.

## Community Engagement

The Citizen Tree Steward Program and the Community Based Citizen Science Initiative was created to involve the community in water quality and water conservation activities. The City will also partner with the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission to complete the remaining phases of the City's climate change plan.

The following organizations partnered with the City of Springfield in Phase I or Phase II applications:

- Baystate Medical Center
- Develop Springfield
- Pioneer Valley Planning Commission
- Partners for a Healthier Community
- ReGreen Springfield
- Regional Employment Board
- Tech Foundry
- Northeast Climate Change Center and University of Massachusetts

MassMutual and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs agreed to commit a combined $\$ 2.4$ million to the City's resilience projects.

## Lower Van Horn Reservoir Dam

The City began repairing and upgrading the Lower Van Horn Dam in FY17. Currently, the Dam is in poor condition and deemed to have high hazard potential, making the $\$ 2.4$ million in repairs crucial. In the event of dam failure, Baystate Medical Center would be unable to continue operations; currently it is the only Level I trauma center in the region. Furthermore, many homes, industrial, and commercial facilities would be lost. The repairs and upgrades to the dam include new access roads to the outlet and inlet of the dam, and repairing the dam's primary spillway, which currently has debris making it dangerous to access for maintenance purposes. The Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs and MassMutual each contributed $\$ 1.0$ million toward the project and the City contributed the remaining $\$ 400,000$ through Pay-go.

| MA Energy Grant | MassMutual Contribution | City Contribution | Total Project Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 1,000,000$ | $\$ 1,000,000$ | $\$ 400,000$ | $\$ 2,400,000$ |

## Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) Projects <br> Brightwood Elementary School

The City plans to replace the 118 year old Brightwood Elementary School located in the North End with a new school at a site yet to be determined. MSBA has pledged to fund $80 \%$ of all eligible construction expenses for the approximate $\$ 35$ million project that will replace the existing school building located at 471 Plainfield Street. The City can anticipate reimbursement for all eligible construction costs up to the budgeted project cost as determined by MSBA. Any expenses above the MSBA maximum are the responsibility of the City. As shown below, the City plans to contribute more than $20 \%$ of the project total because a land acquisition and schematic design for the new building are MSBA ineligible costs. Based on a report published by the Department of Parks, Buildings and Recreation Management, the current building is in need of extensive repairs and the City, along with MSBA, has found that a full replacement of the school is financially the best solution. Planning for this extensive construction project began in July 2016. The City has been authorized to spend $\$ 1.0$ million for the schematic design that will be submitted to the MSBA along with a solid estimated cost for the project.

City of Springfield

| MSBA Funding | City Contribution | Total Estimated Project Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 21,000,000$ | $\$ 14,000,000$ | $\$ 35,000,000$ |

## Walsh, Public Day, Brunton, STEM

In FY16, four Springfield public schools were invited into the MSBA Accelerated Repair Program: Mary M. Walsh School, Public Day High School, Daniel B. Brunton Elementary School for window and door projects and STEM Middle School for a roof replacement. In order to pay for this project, the City Council has authorized bonds for the total amount of the $\$ 9,103,543$ project. The City anticipates an $80 \%$ reimbursement of all eligible costs from MSBA. Any project costs in excess of the total project budget of $\$ 7,204,577$ as determined by MSBA will have to be paid by the City as additional expenses, because MSBA will not increase the amount to be reimbursed. The roof system for STEM Middle School and the window and door systems for Brunton, Walsh, and Public Day High School projects are currently in the construction phase.

| School Project | MSBA Funding | City Contribution | Total Estimated <br> Project Cost |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mary M. Walsh | $\$ 2,117,495$ | $\$ 529,374$ | $\$ 2,646,869$ |
| Public Day High | $\$ 1,352,646$ | $\$ 338,162$ | $\$ 1,690,808$ |
| Daniel B. Brunton Elem. | $\$ 2,129,976$ | $\$ 532,494$ | $\$ 2,662,470$ |
| STEM Middle | $\$ 1,604,459$ | $\$ 498,937$ | $\$ 2,103,396$ |
| Total | $\$ \mathbf{7 , 2 0 4 , 5 7 7}$ | $\$ \mathbf{1 , 8 9 8 , 9 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 9 , 1 0 3 , 5 4 3}$ |

## Culinary and Nutrition Center - Food Service Building

Springfield Public Schools ("SPS") provide universal free breakfast and lunch, dinner programs, summer meals, and full service vending for all of its students and staff. Currently, meals are prepared in four facilities and then transported to 60 feeding sites because there isn't a central production kitchen. The current food service facility is too small to accommodate the current program leaving SPS to outsource cold storage, baked goods production, and ship whole fruits and vegetables from its local farm partner, to a facility in Rhode Island to be cleaned, cut, and packaged for SPS meals. The acquisition, design, and renovation of a building to house the operations, food storage, food preparation, and meal distribution for the Springfield Public Schools Food Service Program will enable the program to become centralized and expand. Last year alone, the expansion of the food service program has added 34 jobs. This new, cutting edge facility will be the first in the nation and will be a model to other school systems around the country.

Through design and renovation, the new facility could include: producing and packaging food components to support the Breakfast in the Classroom (BIC) Program ( 30 schools, $84.6 \%$ participation), Lunch, Dinner, and Summer Program, centralizing catering services, increased frozen food storage to support direct USDA shipments and the Field to Freezer Programs. It will also increase food and equipment storage, increase vending operations, implement a student culinary arts training program (in partnership with Putnam Vocational and Central High), create a district bakery, and house an equipment maintenance and repair workshop. The new facility could also be designed and outfitted to produce 100,000 meals daily to support the Springfield District Programs (BIC, lunch, dinner, and summer) and those that could potentially be outsourced to surrounding communities. Additionally, the acquisition and creation of the SPS food storage facility could create an additional 40 full-time jobs.

The purchase of the property will save SPS $\$ 582,881$ annually in storage and shipping costs, as well as commodity assessment fees and pay the City $\$ 375,000$ with an overall net savings of $\$ 207,881$. The first phase of the project is estimated to cost $\$ 12.0$ million for the acquisition, design, and renovation of the
new building. The City issued bonds in February 2017 for $\$ 7.0$ million as their share for the first phase, while the remaining balance will be paid using USDA funds and grants.

| USDA \& Grant Funding | City Contribution | Total Estimated Project Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 5,000,000$ | $\$ 7,000,000$ | $\$ 12,000,000$ |

## Central Library

The Central Library, part of the Quadrangle-Mattoon Historic District in the City, has been around since 1912. After many years of daily use and natural "wear and tear", the Central Library is in need of many renovations. The restoration of the Central Library is estimated to cost $\$ 15.4$ million and will take place in three phases. The first phase of the project was funded through the use of unexpended bond proceeds from the completed Putnam Construction project. Totaling $\$ 3,957,898$; the first phase includes the replacement of the existing rear library/museum stairs and closed ramp with a new plaza; including accessible ramp, stairs, decorative metal railings, seating, plantings, and lighting. The roof will also be replaced and the front stairs at the State Street entrance will be rebuilt. The second phase of the restoration will include: replacing the existing windows, installing a new HVAC system, upgrading the lighting, and replacing the existing electrical with a new electrical system, telecommunication system, fire alarm system, and video surveillance system. Lastly, in the third phase, a new handicapped parking lot for easier accessibility will be created and the existing dock lift will be repaired.

## Police Vehicles

The Police Department's current fleet is made up of 216 vehicles, serving many purposes, most important of which is primary patrol cruisers. The purchase of new vehicles was necessary to continue the provision of public safety and to improve, and contribute to, the quality of life for the citizens of the City of Springfield by protecting, serving, and working with the community. These replacements protect officers' safety, save money on repair costs, and reduce the amount of time vehicles will be out of service.

| Vehicle Purchase | Units | Price per Unit | Total Amount |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Police Cruisers | 25 | $\$ 45,000$ | $\$ 1,125,000$ |

## DPW Vehicles

The DPW currently has 40 vehicles in its fleet: 19 fully-automated trucks, 16 semi-automated trucks, four pick-up trucks, and one box truck. The purchase of new vehicles to replace those that are aging is necessary in order to continue the support of the City's solid waste program. The vehicles purchased include two pick-up trucks for daily operations, two semi-automated and one fully-automated 31-cubic yard truck for trash removal services. These vehicle replacements will allow DPW to address the highest prioritized needs of its fleet.

| Vehicle Purchase | Units | Price per Unit | Total Amount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Semi-Automated 31 Cubic-yard Truck | 2 | $\$ 281,300$ | $\$ 562,600$ |
| Fully-Automated 31 Cubic-yard Truck | 1 | $\$ 281,325$ | $\$ 281,325$ |
| Pick-up Truck | 2 | $\$ 40,000$ | $\$ 80,000$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{5}$ |  | $\$ \mathbf{9 2 3 , 9 2 5}$ |

The complete FY18 Capital Improvement Plan can be found in Appendix A of this document.

## Conclusion

This plan is intended to provide a detailed view of the capital needs within the City of Springfield. The total amount of capital requests for FY18 through FY22 is $\$ 850.1$ million. The highest priority projects total $\$ 462.1$ million. The City continues to leverage funds from outside agencies to fund high priority projects identified in the CIP. Subsequently, the City of Springfield has maintained its
'AA-' credit rating from Standard and Poor's (S\&P) and recently received a reaffirmed credit rating of A2, with a stable outlook by Moody's in January 2017.

Springfield recently issued $\$ 44.3$ million in bonds with an average interest rate of $3.07 \%$ on February 14, 2017. Due to the City's high bond rating, the City was able to lock in low interest rates for twenty years; allowing the City to maintain a responsible debt payment plan with low interest. The City also refinanced bonds issued in 2007 and financed the Union Station Project on March 7, 2017. By exchanging the original interest rate of $4.263 \%$ for a lower rate of $2.0063 \%$, the City anticipates saving over $\$ 3.8$ million over the next six years. The City will continue to be strategic in investing and funding capital needs by choosing high priority projects, leveraging funds from outside agencies, and selling bonds when the market is highly favorable.

This plan focuses on upgrading and modernizing the City's aging infrastructure and facilities, expanding the City's economic base, and helping to improve the City's diverse and vibrant neighborhoods. This Capital Improvement Plan is the City's investment roadmap for the next five years and should be strategically implemented to provide Springfield's residents with an improved quality of life, along with a more efficient and effective government.
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[^1]| PRIORITY | DEPT | PROJECT NAME | PARTIAL/FULL FUNDING | TOTAL RATING | ESTIMATED TOTAL PROJECT COST | FUNDING SOURCES | YEAR 1 | YEAR 2 | YEAR 3 | YEAR 4 | YEAR 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | DCAC | CENTRAL HIGH - CHILLERS \& HVAC UPGRADES |  | 71 | 2,500,000 |  | 2,500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | DPW | PRIVATE WAYS - RESURFACING | P | 70 | 1,346,811 |  | 300,000 | 446,811 | 300,000 | 300,000 |  |
| A | DPW | STORM REPAIR S.BRANCH AND BRIARWOOD | P | 69 | 180,000 | CITY BOND | 50,000 | 130,000 |  |  |  |
| A | DCAC | EAST FOREST PARK - NEW LIBRARY |  | 69 | 9,500,000 | GRANTS | 9,500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | PARKS | FOREST PARK NEIGHBORHOOD EROSION \& MAIN GREETING ROAD |  | 69 | 1,500,000 |  | 1,500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | PARKS | SOUTH BRANCH PKWY CULVERT IMPROVEMENTS |  | 69 | 500,000 |  | 500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | DCAC | STEARNS SQUARE RENOVATION |  | 69 | 1,500,000 | PAY-GO, CITY BOND | 1,500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | DCAC | BRUNTON - ROOF REPLACEMENT |  | 68 | 1,200,000 |  | 1,200,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | FACILITIES | GLENWOOD SCHOOL - ROOF REPLACEMENT |  | 68 | 760,000 |  | 760,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | FACILITIES | SUMNER AVE ELEMENTARY - BOILERS |  | 68 | 2,000,000 |  | 2,000,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | FACILITIES | TALMADGE - BOILERS |  | 68 | 1,000,000 |  | 1,000,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | FACILITIES | GERENA SCHOOL - WINDOWS \& DOORS |  | 68 | 7,500,000 |  | 7,500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | DCAC | INDIAN ORCHARD ELEMENTARY - ROOF REPLACEMENT |  | 68 | 1,500,000 |  | 1,500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | DCAC | WASHINGTON - WINDOWS \& DOORS |  | 68 | 2,500,000 |  | 2,500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | PARKS | FOREST PARK ROADWAYS |  | 67 | 950,000 |  | 950,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | DCAC | SKYWALK |  | 67 | 150,000 |  | 150,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | PARKS | UPGRADES TO ALL CITY PARKS FOR UNIVERSAL ACCESSIBILITY |  | 67 | 750,000 |  | 750,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | DCAC | CITY HALL - FRONT STEP REPAIR |  | 67 | 1,000,000 | CITY BOND | 1,000,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | POLICE | IT SANS UPGRADE |  | 67 | 250,000 |  | 250,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | POLICE | IT ARCHIVING |  | 67 | 75,000 |  | 75,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | FACILITIES | DUGGAN - GYM FLOOR |  | 67 | 300,000 |  | 300,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | PARKS | WESSON PARK |  | 67 | 500,000 |  | 500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | POLICE | IT - DISASTER RECOVERY SITE | F | 66 | 400,000 |  | 400,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | DPW | DPW VEHICLE REPLACEMENT - NON-PUBLIC SAFETY (ONGOING) | P | 66 | 5,000,000 | PAY-GO, CITY BOND | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 |
| A | DCAC | CENTRAL LIBRARY - PHASE II |  | 66 | 11,053,009 | GRANTS, CITY BOND |  | 11,053,009 |  |  |  |
| A | DCAC | CENTRAL LIBRARY - PHASE III |  | 66 | 440,727 | GRANTS, CITY BOND |  | 440,727 |  |  |  |
| A | DISPATCH | CONSOLIDATED DISPATCH BUILDING, BUILDING USE STUDY |  | 66 | 80,000 |  | 80,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | DISPATCH | CONSOLIDATED DISPATCH BUILDING W/EQUIPMENT |  | 66 | 10,000,000 |  | - | 10,000,000 |  |  |  |
| A | FACILITIES | DEBERRY - REBUILDING FLOOR |  | 66 | 2,400,000 |  | 2,400,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | PARKS | FOUNTAIN LAKE DAM - REPAIR |  | 65 | 1,500,000 |  | 1,500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | PARKS | PORTER LAKE DAM - REPAIR |  | 65 | 1,500,000 |  | 1,500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | PARKS | FOREST PARK MAGAWISKA RD STABILITY AND DRAINAGE |  | 65 | 800,000 | STATE FUNDS | 800,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | PARKS | VAN HORN PARK |  | 65 | 2,500,000 |  | 2,500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | POLICE | IT - HARD DRIVE BACKUP APPLIANCE |  | 65 | 35,000 |  | 35,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | FACILITIES | DORMAN - ROOF REPLACEMENT (MAIN BUILDING) |  | 65 | 1,500,000 |  | 1,500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | FACILITIES | LINCOLN - ROOF REPLACEMENT |  | 65 | 1,500,000 |  | 1,500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | FACILITIES | VAN SICKLE - ROOF REPLACEMENT |  | 65 | 4,500,000 |  | 4,500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | DCAC | BOLAND - ROOF REPLACEMENT |  | 65 | 3,000,000 |  | 3,000,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | DCAC | HARRIS ELEMENTARY - ROOF REPLACEMENT |  | 65 | 1,500,000 |  | 1,500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | DCAC | REBECCA JOHNSON - WINDOWS \& DOORS |  | 65 | 5,000,000 |  | 5,000,000 |  |  |  |  |
| A | DCAC | POTTENGER - WINDOWS \& DOORS |  | 65 | 2,500,000 |  | 2,500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| B | DPW | BELMONT AVENUE - FLOOD PREVENTION SYSTEM (FPS) |  | 64 | 200,000 |  | - | - | 200,000 |  |  |
| B | ECO DEV | DEMOLITION OF ABANDONED RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS |  | 64 | 1,500,000 |  | 1,500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| B | PARKS | FOREST PARK - TROLLEY PAVILION |  | 64 | 500,000 |  | 500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| B | DPW | FLOOD PREVENTION SYSTEM (FPS) TRASH RACK |  | 64 | 40,000 |  | - | 40,000 |  |  |  |
| B | FACILITIES | STEM - PLAYING FIELD INSTALLATION |  | 64 | 200,000 |  | 200,000 |  |  |  |  |
| B | PARKS | GREENLEAF PARK |  | 64 | 2,500,000 | STATE FUNDS | 2,500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| B | POLICE | RADIO REPAIR - MOTOROLA - RADIOS | P | 63 | 390,000 | JAG/PAY-GO | 150,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 |
| B | POLICE | RADIO REPAIR - MOTOROLA - REPLACEMENT PARTS | P | 63 | 50,000 | FY17 PD BUDGET | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| B | PARKS | UPDATE STREET TREE INVENTORY AND TREE REPLACEMENT |  | 63 | 750,000 | APPLIED FOR DR GRANT | 750,000 |  |  |  |  |
| B | PARKS | FOREST PARK - TRAIL RENOVATIONS |  | 63 | 750,000 |  | 750,000 |  |  |  |  |
| B | DPW | FPS (SPS) CURTAIN DRAINS CENTRAL \& SOUTHERLY SECTIONS | F | 62 | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |  |  |  |  |
| B | PARKS | TREE NURSERY |  | 62 | 500,000 | APPLIED FOR DR GRANT | 500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| B | IT | BUSINESS CONTINUITY PLAN - PHASE 2- CITY HALL/TAPLEY ST |  | 62 | 1,000,000 | CITY | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 |
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## Appendix B: Capital Improvement Process

## Capital Improvement Process

Departments submit capital requests to the Office of Management and Budget electronically along with necessary supporting documentation (See Appendix A for a summary of requested projects). Requests are captured in a database maintained by the Office of Management and Budget and are reviewed by the Capital Improvement Committee. This process is required by City ordinance and is consistent with best practices regarding capital investment.

Database Requirements - All capital requests are submitted in electronic format and include the following information:

| - | Project Category |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | Project Type |
| - | Department Priority |
| - | Estimated Project Cost |
| - | Proposed Funding Sources |
| - | Project Description |

- Project Urgency
- Project Benefits
- Fiscal Impact
- Department Priority
- Legal Obligations
- Proposed Funding Sources
- Public Service Impact
- Project Description
- Completed Prior Phases

Categories - Capital projects are categorized into one of eleven categories:

- Building (School, City) - This includes acquisition, replacement, renovation, and addition to, construction or long-term lease of a building or a major component thereof.
- Infrastructure (IT) - This category includes wireless and fiber networks, technology upgrades and other technology improvements of a lasting nature that are not building structures.
- Infrastructure (Roadways/Sidewalks, Other) - This category includes roadwork, sidewalks, traffic signals, drainage systems and other improvements of a lasting nature that are not building structures.
- Equipment (Vehicular) - This includes equipment capable of self-propulsion from one location to another.
- Equipment (IT) - This category includes all purchases that meet the definition of a capital item in the area of technology such as computers, digital copiers, printers, telephone systems and software programs.
- Equipment (Other) - This includes all other equipment that meets the definition of a capital project item but is not capable of self-propulsion.
- Land/Parks/Fields - This category includes the acquisition, replacement, renovation, addition to, construction or long-term lease of parks and playing fields. If the acquisition of land is associated with the acquisition of a building or an infrastructure project, the project would be categorized in those respective categories.
- Salary - This category includes salary for staff associated with a specific project and helps to determine what, if any, operating costs are included in the project plan.
- Other - This category includes all capital projects that do not fall in the categories listed above.

Types - Each project is further classified into one of three different types of projects:

- New - The purchase, acquisition or construction of new capital, as distinct from the purchase of new capital items to replace existing capital.
- Rehab - Large-scale renovations and repairs to capital assets, such as building system replacements, equipment overhauls and other items intended to extend the useful life of an existing capital asset.
- Demolition - This includes commercial and residential building demolition.

Capital Improvement Committee - The Capital Improvement Committee is responsible for identifying and prioritizing the City's needs and coordinating them with the operating budget. The Committee is comprised of the Chief Administrative and Financial Officer, the Budget Director, the Director of Public Works, the Director of Parks, Buildings and Recreation, the Director of the City's Capital Asset Construction Department and the Director of Economic Development and Planning for the City and a representative of the City Council. Any member who has an interest in any item before the committee must recuse him or herself from deliberations on that item. For the FY17 planning process the Committee members included:

- Chief Administrative and Financial Officer - Timothy J. Plante
- Budget Director - Lindsay Hackett
- Director of Department of Public Works - Christopher Cignoli
- Director of Parks, Building/Recreation - Patrick Sullivan
- Director of Capital Asset and Construction - Peter Garvey
- Chief Development Officer - Kevin Kennedy
- City Council Representative - Timothy Rooke
- Deputy Director of Economic Development - Brian Connors
- Capital Improvement Analyst - Jennifer Whisher

The Capital Improvement Committee reviews each submission. After appropriate review and consideration, the committee establishes project priorities giving quantitative measures of need and justification as established by the rating department and reviewed by the committee.

Criteria - Each project is ranked on eight criteria:

- Overall fiscal impact - Will the project bring in additional revenue or will it cost additional money to operate? Are there funding sources other than the general fund for this project?
- Impacts on service to the public - Will residents receive better service if the project is conducted? Will it address a public health, safety, accreditation or maintenance need?
- Promotion of Economic growth - How significant of an impact is the project to economic development?
- Legal obligations and mandates - Does the project improve compliance with federal law, state law, or local ordinance?
- Operation and maintenance impact - Is the asset currently broken and in need of immediate replacement?
- Relationship to other projects/coordination - If the project is a multi-year project, have prior phases been previously conducted?
- Resiliency improvement and resolution - What does the project do for vulnerable populations or in the wake of chronic stress or an acute shock?
- Public perception of need - What is the awareness level of need for the project and who requested it?

| FY17 Capital Improvement Criteria |
| :--- |
| Criteria 1 - Project Funding / Fiscal Impact - 25\% |
| Criteria 2 - Impact On Service To The Public - 15\% |
| Criteria 3 - Promotes Economic Development $-15 \%$ |
| Criteria 4 - Legal Obligations And Mandates $-15 \%$ |
| Criteria 5 - Operation and Maintenance Impact - 10\% |
| Criteria 6 - Relationship to Other Projects/Coordination - 10\% |
| Criteria 7 - Resiliency Improvement and Resolution - 5\% |
| Criteria 8 - Public Perception of Need - 5\% |

Each criterion above receives a different weight as seen in Appendix C. Each project is assigned to one of four priority levels based on the overall weighted score.

The capital plan is intended to be a fluid document that will be subject to change each year as priorities change and additional information becomes available. All final requests approved by the Capital Improvement Committee will be submitted for final review and approval to the Mayor and the City Council.

## Appendix C: Rating Criteria

## CRITERIA 1 - OVERALL FISCAL IMPACT

## Weight: 5

Rationale: Limited resources exist for competing projects. This requires that each project's full impact on the City's budget be considered in rating and evaluating projects. Projects that are selffunded or have a large proportion of external funding will receive higher ratings than those that do not, as these projects have less impact on the funding portion of our capital budget.

Considerations: Ratings for this factor will consider these major points:
A. Capital cost of the project relative to all other project requests.
B. Impact of the project on City operating costs and personnel levels.
C. Whether the project requires City appropriation or is funded from agency, grant funds, matching funds or generated revenue.
D. Impact on the City's tax revenue or fee revenue.
E. Will external funding be lost should the project be delayed?

Illustrative Ratings:
Criteria 1 - Project Funding / Fiscal Impact - 25\%
5 - Less than 10\% City funding
4 - Less than $30 \%$ City funding
3 - Less than $50 \%$ City funding
2 - More than $50 \%$ City funding, decreases operating costs
1 - More than $50 \%$ City funding, operating costs remain the same
0 - More than $50 \%$ City funding, increases operating costs

## CRITERIA 2 - IMPACT ON SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC

Weight: 3
Rationale: Consideration will be given to capital projects that address health, safety, accreditation or maintenance issues as well as those that improve the services provided by a department. Service is broadly defined, as are the City's objectives in meeting the health, safety or accreditation needs of our residents and/or improved operations of an existing department.

Considerations: Ratings for this factor will consider these major points:
A. Whether the project focuses on a service that is currently a "high priority" public need.
B. Whether the project has immediate impact on service, health, safety, accreditation or maintenance needs.
C. Whether the service is already being provided by existing agencies.

Illustrative Ratings:
Criteria 2 - Impact On Service To The Public - 15\%
5 - Project would address an immediate public health or safety need
4 - Project would improve service and addresses a public health or safety need
3 - Project would improve service to meet current desired goals
2 - Project would address deficiencies or problems with existing services; would establish new service
1 - Project would maintain existing standard of service
0 - Project not related to maintaining an existing standard of service

## CRITERIA 3 - PROMOTES ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Weight: 3
Rationale: Some projects offer a regional, citywide, or neighborhood benefit, enticing home buyers and business owners by making the City an attractive place to live or work. Criteria 3 assesses projects based on the impact to the City's economic development efforts.

Considerations: Ratings for this factor will consider these major points:
A. Whether the project enhances the City's economic vitality by stimulating the local economy, increasing revenue, improving government effectiveness, or reducing operating costs.

Illustrative Rating:
Criteria 3-Promotes Economic Development - 15\%
5 - Significant regional benefit
4 - Citywide improvement
3 - Benefits large portion of City
2 - Benefits one neighborhood
1 - Assists in the elimination of slum and blight
0 - No impact

## CRITERIA 4 - LEGAL OBLIGATIONS AND COMPLIANCE

## Weight: 3

Rationale: Some projects are essentially mandatory due to court orders, federal mandates, or state laws that require their completion. These projects should receive higher consideration than those which are considered discretionary. Criteria B evaluates both the severity of the mandate and the degree of adherence to state and federal laws.

Considerations: Ratings for this factor will consider these major points:
A. Whether the City is under direct court order to complete this project.
B. Whether the project is needed to meet requirements of federal or state legislation.

Illustrative Ratings:
Criteria 4 - Legal Obligations And Mandates - 15\%
5 - City or Department is currently under court order to take action
4 - Project is necessary to meet existing state and federal requirements
3 - Legislation is under discussion that would require the project in future
2 - There is no legal or court order or other requirement to conduct the project
1 - Project requires change in state or law to proceed
0 - Project requires change in federal or law to proceed

## CRITERIA 5 - URGENCY OF MAINTENANCE NEEDS

## Weight: 2

Rationale: The City's most immediate goal in both capital and operating finance is to maintain current service levels for our citizens, businesses and visitors. Capital projects that are essential to maintain services, protect investments, or restore service that have been interrupted due to failure of capital assets will receive the highest rating in this criterion.

Considerations: Ratings for this factor will consider these major points:
A. Whether a service is currently interrupted.
B. Whether the project as requested will result in full restoration of an interrupted service.
C. Whether the project is the most cost-effective method of providing or maintaining a service.
D. Where a service is not currently interrupted, the likelihood that it will be in the next five years if the project is not funded.
E. Whether costs of the project will increase (beyond inflation) if the project is delayed.
F. Whether the agency has prepared a comprehensive maintenance/rehabilitation/ replacement schedule and the project is due under that schedule.

## Illustrative Ratings:

## Criteria 5 - Operation and Maintenance Impact - 10\%

5 - Service is currently interrupted and the project will restore service in the most cost-effective manner possible
4 - Service is likely to be disrupted in a five-year horizon if the project is not funded
3 - The project is necessary to maintain an orderly schedule for maintenance and replacement
2 - The cost of the project will increase in future (beyond inflation) if it is delayed at this time
1 - There is a minor risk that costs will rise or service will be interrupted if the project is not funded
0 - There is no financial or service risk in delaying or not funding the project

## CRITERIA 6 - PRIOR PHASES

## Weight: 2

Rationale: Some projects are developed in phases due to their complexity or size. In such cases, the need has already been established by a prior commitment of funding. Therefore, continuation of the project will be given higher consideration.

Considerations: Ratings for this factor will consider these major points:
A. Whether the project has received prior funds.
B. Whether the project requires additional funding to be operational.

Illustrative Ratings:
Criteria 6 - Relationship to Other Projects/Coordination - 10\%
5 - All but the final phase has been fully funded
4 - Multiple phases have been fully funded
3 - Multiple phases have been partially funded
2 - The first phase has been fully funded
1 - The first phase has been partially funded
0 - No prior phases have been funded or partially funded

## CRITERIA 7 - RESILIENCY

Weight: 1
Rationale: Some projects are developed in an effort to mediate unseen risks or disasters the City could face. These projects take a proactive approach to alleviating chronic stresses to the City to assist with resilience efforts after a disaster.

Considerations: Ratings for this factor will consider these major points:
A. Whether the project addresses stresses that weaken the fabric of a city on a daily or cyclical basis, examples include: High unemployment, Overtaxed or inefficient public transportation system, Endemic violence, Chronic food and water shortages
B. Whether the project addresses response to a vulnerable population after a disaster. A vulnerable population is a group or community whose circumstances present barriers to obtaining or understanding information or accessing resources. Typically, lower-income persons are considered vulnerable populations since they are less able to recover from the effects of disasters.

Illustrative Ratings:

| Criteria 7 - Resiliency Improvement and Resolution $-5 \%$ |
| :--- |
| 5 - Resolves chronic stressors to the City |
| 4 - Resolves response to vulnerable population after shock |
| 3 - Improves chronic stressors to the City |
| 2 - Improves response to vulnerable population after shock |
| 1- Enhances natural resources |
| 0 - No impact |

## CRITERIA 8 - PERCEPTION

## Weight: 1

Rationale: This criterion refers to project assessment of the extent of public support or interest group advocacy and/or opposition.

Considerations: Ratings for this factor will consider these major points:
A. Whether the project has been identified by a plan, Government official or public organization.
B. The public's perception of the project, positive or negative.

Illustrative Ratings:

## Criteria 8 - Public Perception of Need - 5\%

5 - Identified in comprehensive plan, project plan or other study
4 - Specific project request from the City Council
3 - Project request from neighborhood organization or other group
2 - Public perception of need known to City department
1 - Knowledge of public perception of need unknown
0 - Public opposition


[^0]:    - Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
    - Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA)

[^1]:    

