

INTRODUCTION

The City has taken several steps towards doing a capital improvements program and a capital improvements budget. Forms have been prepared, distributed, completed, and compiled. Maps and charts have been prepared. A Capital Improvements Committee has been formed. But the City has not yet made any commitment to a process for capital improvements programming and budgeting. Without this process, the program will lose its effectiveness, continuity, and credibility.

The best, and maybe the only, way to establish the process is through a City Council ordinance. Although the Council should not specify all steps in the process, it should specify the time period to be covered by the capital improvements program and the date for submission of the capital improvements program and budget to Council. Both the capital improvements program and the one year budget would be approved by Council ordinance. Projects not included in the capital improvements budget would not be built. The Council ordinance establishing the process for capital improvements programming and budgeting should also require that all projects be reviewed by the City Plan Commission to insure that the proposed projects are in conformance with the City's Comprehensive Plan. Once the Administration has decided on a process, it should take the initiative in preparing the ordinance and submitting it to Council.

Although an ordinance requiring a capital improvements program and budget is certain to be controversial, it does have several important advantages. First, the ordinance insures the continuity of the capital improvement program and budget. Time and effort will not have to be expended every few years in attempts to revive the process. Second, the program and budget will provide the Mayor with a mechanism for setting departmental and city wide priorities and insuring that these priorities are adhered to by the departments. It, thus, increases the Mayor's control over City departments which

may well have their own long established priorities. A third reason for Council ordinance is that it would lend weight to the City's annexation program. A Council approved program and budget would not only allow easy identification of projects outside the City limits, but more importantly, it would establish a timetable for providing these areas with capital improvements. This timetable should increase the City's credibility both with the residents of the areas that the City is trying to annex and with the courts. A fourth, and final, reason for the Council ordinance is that it will increase the City's ability to compete for federal and state grants. By having a mandated program, the City departments will be able to concentrate on those projects that are in the program. This will also reduce the amount of time spent pursuing grants for projects which have no chance of obtaining either Mayoral or Councilmanic approval.

The following sections contain a proposed process for capital improvements programming and budgeting. These sections are drawn, for the most part, from A Manual of Suggested Practice for the Preparation and Adoption of Capital Programs and Capital Budgets by Local Governments.

PREPARATION OF FORMS AND INSTRUCTION MANUAL

This section contains three suggested modifications to the form and instruction manual that has been used. First, space should be provided on the forms to note the status of the grants. Some questions concerning the grant might be (a) has the grant been applied for? (b) has it been approved? (c) is it an entitlement or discretionary type grant? and (d) has the federal agency approved all of the money on just part? Furthermore, several departments simply cited the federal government as the source of funds. This is unacceptable. The departments should be required to name the specific grant program from which funds will be obtained.

A second modification is that the instruction manual's explanation of what is meant by each of the sub-categories in Item 9 "Project Costs" should be expanded. This would both aid the departments in completing the forms and help to insure that the information provided is comparable between departments.

A third modification in either the form or the manual appears to be necessary to eliminate contradictions found in the Status of Project, Project Costs, and Sources of Funds items of the forms that have been submitted. The nature of the contradictions can be illustrated by an example. The Water Pollution Control Engineering Department submitted a form for a project in the Belmont Area. The Status of Project section states that the studies and surveys are complete and that the estimated start date of construction is 1981. In the Project Cost section, the report states that the studies and surveys cost \$6,000. According to the Source of Funds section, no funds are to be expended until 1981. If the studies and surveys costing \$6,000 are complete, then money has been spent. Where did these funds come from? A more detailed explanation of these sections in the instruction manual might result in fewer contradictions of the type described above.

DISTRIBUTION OF STATEMENTS OF POLICY, FORMS AND INSTRUCTION MANUAL

On a set date, a statement of policy by the Mayor, the project forms, and the instruction manuals should be distributed to all department heads. The Mayor's statement should be used to inform the departments of which types of projects should be expanded or contracted, accelerated or slowed down. It should also comment on the City's budgetary situation. The instruction manual should specify when each step in the capital improvements process must be completed.

PREPARATION OF FORMS BY DEPARTMENTS

The individual departments are responsible for completing all items on the project forms and returning these forms to CD & P. An examination of this year's forms shows considerable

room for improvement by the departments. For instance, on all the forms submitted by Water Engineering Department, only the total project cost is stated; costs are not given for the components (e.g. survey and studies, land, construction, etc.) of the total cost. Another example - the project form for the Glenwood Park Lift Station states that the project will eliminate "a lift station with its associated cost and maintenance problems...". Yet, the form also states that the project will have no impact on the operating budget. Furthermore, all departments should use a standard project form.

The departments would also rank their projects in order of priority. This ranking is actually the department's recommendation to the Mayor on what should be built.

REVIEW BY CD & P

CD & P should review the completed forms to ensure that the projects meet the definition of capital improvements and that the forms are correct and complete. Forms which contain omissions and obvious inaccuracies should be returned to the department responsible. CD & P should also check to determine what changes, if any, have been made to projects submitted in previous years.

REVIEW BY C.I.P. COMMITTEE

The C.I.P. Committee would review all the projects that have been submitted. They would examine projects for the purpose of eliminating any conflicts and/or contradictions that may exist between projects. They would also make a recommendation to the Mayor on what projects should be included in the one year capital improvements budget and the multi-year capital improvements program. In order not to unduly delay the process, the review by the C.I.P. Committee should take no more than one week.

REVIEW BY CONTROLLER'S OFFICE

The Controller's Office should prepare yearly estimates of how much money will be available in each fund and how much can be reasonably be devoted to capital improvements. Some of the funds which are used for capital improvements are revenue sharing, the city light lease, the motor vehicle highway fund, the aviation fund, and the redevelopment capital fund. This analysis is crucial to preparing the yearly capital improvements budget.

The Controller's Office should also check the operating cost estimates for all projects. Inaccuracies and omissions on operating costs should be resolved by the departments and the Controller.

ANALYSIS BY CD & P

The analysis of the projects by CD & P should be in two steps. First, CD & P would examine the projects to make sure that they are in conformance with the City's Comprehensive Plan. The purpose of this review is to spot those projects which are in obvious conflict with the Comprehensive Plan; it would not supplant a formal review of the capital improvements program by the City Plan Commission.

The second step in CD & P's analysis would be an examination of the justification given for each project as well as the project's costs and benefits. For example, what population projects are being used to determine the location of new fire stations, parks, and schools? Are these projections consistent? Obviously, CD & P cannot scrutinize each and every project. But, the Department can, and should, do some analysis on major projects. Some of the analysis could be done concurrently with the review by the Controller's Office.

PREPARATION OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM REPORT

CD & P would be responsible for compiling all the capital improvements information into a report for presentation to the Mayor. Copies of this report would also be sent to all department heads.

The material in this report would include project summaries, cost summaries, the Controller's report on finances, and any project analysis done by CD & P.

REVIEW BY MAYOR

The Mayor would review the material prepared by CD & P, add, delete, or modify projects, and prepare the capital improvements program and budget. In doing this, he would be, in effect, reviewing and re-ordering departmental and city-wide priorities. Clearly the Mayor could not accomplish these tasks alone. But it would be his responsibility to call upon specific departments to answer questions about the projects and to prepare the final program and budget.

REVIEW BY CITY PLAN COMMISSION

The City Plan Commission should review the capital improvements program prepared by the Mayor to see whether or not the projects are in conformance with the City's Comprehensive Plan.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL BY CITY COUNCIL

The Mayor would submit the final capital improvements program and budget to the City Council. The Council would then be responsible for passing, with or without modifications, ordinances establishing both the capital improvements program and the capital improvements budget.

MONITORING PROCESS

Departments should be required to submit brief reports to the Mayor on the progress of those projects included in the one year capital improvements budget. These reports, submitted 3 or 4 times a year, would enable the Mayor to monitor the progress of his high priority projects and to insure that these projects are receiving the attention they deserve.

SCHEDULING

In the previous sections, a process for preparing a capital improvements program and budget has been suggested. But, regardless of which process is adopted, a timetable must be decided upon for completing the steps in the process. This decision would be governed to a large extent by the date on which the program and budget must be submitted to Council. Based on that date, deadlines for completing the other steps could be established. Once established, the deadlines should be met. This year, departments turned in their project forms as much as two months after the due date. If delays such as this occur in the future, the capital improvements program will be vitiated.

Any date that is set for the submission of the capital improvements program and budget is bound to inconvenience some departments. Probably the best time for the submission is either just prior to or just after the completion of the City's operating budget. This would increase the Council's awareness of the tradeoffs that must be made between capital improvements and the operating budget.

Table 1 shows a suggested process and schedule for the capital improvements program.

TABLE 1: SUGGESTED PROCESS AND SCHEDULE

<u>Days Required</u>	<u>Task</u>
5	Preparation of Forms, Instruction Manual and Mayor's Policy Statement

TABLE 1: SUGGESTED PROCESS AND SCHEDULE (continued)

<u>Days Required</u>	<u>Task</u>
2	Distribution of Forms, Instruction Manual and Mayor's Policy Statement
50	Preparation of Forms by Departments
15	Review by CD & P
5	* Review by C.I.P. Committee
30	* Review by Controller's Office
30	* Analysis by CD & P
14	Preparation of Capital Improvement Program Report
20	Review by Mayor
10	Review by City Plan Commission
20	Review by City Council

166 Days

* These tasks should be undertaken concurrently.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS
FOR PRIORITIZATION

May, 1978

ABBREVIATIONS

W - Water Engineering
S - Street Engineering
P - Parks & Recreation
MPC - Water Pollution Control
R - Redevelopment Commission
F - Fire Department
A - Board of Aviation
S - Score
V - Votes

CITY-WIDE PRIORITY	DEPART- MENTAL PRIORITY	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	TOTAL CAPITAL COST	PROJECT STATUS
<u>1</u> S: 105 V: 1,1, 1,1,1, 1,1	R 1	Civic Center - land acquisition, site preparation, parking garage, botanical gardens, site preparation.	\$11,765,000	Preliminary Plan Complete
<u>2</u> S: 56 V: 13,2, 2,5,2	R 2	West Main Street - acquire land and prepare site for an office building, parking, and boulevarding of the street.	\$ 3,204,000	Studies and surveys Complete
<u>3</u> S: 55 V: 5,9, 2,2,7	S 23	Wells Street Corridor from Fairfield - Ewing to Northrup 2.5 miles - 4 lanes, street lights, storm sewers, walks.	\$6,044,000	EIS & Location Underway
<u>4</u> S: 41 V: 12,4, 3,9,11	MPC 17	Hillcrest Relief - Construct sanitary sewer to relieve overload in Hillcrest area	\$200,000	Start Date: 1979 Studies & Surveys Complete

CITY-WIDE PRIORITY	DEPART-MENTAL PRIORITY	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	TOTAL CAPITAL COST	PROJECT STATUS
<u>5</u> S: 40 V: 13,4 6,11,6	A 3	Baer Field - Overlay and strengthen runway 13-31 - Narrow same by installing new lighting at 150' width.	\$1,499,000	Start Date: 7/79 Preliminary Plans Complete
<u>5</u> S: 40 V: 14,4 11,7,4	TE 7	CBD Signal Modernization - Phase III Continue program.	\$ 705,000	Start date: Contingent upon funding. Preliminary plans complete.
<u>6</u> S: 37 V: 3,3, 5	TE 1	Bypass 30 Signal Computerization	\$400,000 to \$700,000	Studies & surveys complete. City owns Right of Way.
<u>7</u> S: 36 V: 3,15 7,3	R 3	Semi-Mall/Streetscape (Wayne/Calhoun) - landscaping of downtown retail area to reduce traffic.	\$ 1,070,000	Studies and surveys Complete
<u>8</u> S: 34 V: 6,2, 13,9	S 27	Rudisill Blvd. - widening signals and street lights from Harrison to Lafayette.	\$278,500	Start date: 1980 Studies & surveys complete, EIS required.

CITY-WIDE PRIORITY	DEPART-MENTAL PRIORITY	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	TOTAL CAPITAL COST	PROJECT STATUS
<u>9</u> S: 33 V: 8,12, 10,3,14	W 8	Baer Road Feeder Main - 5750± feet of 16" water main from Dalman Road to Ferguson Road	\$332,240	Est. Start Date: July 1, 1979 Studies & Surveys Complete
<u>9</u> S: 33 V: 15,6, 13,10, 11,8	A 5	Baer Field - Lengthen N.W., S.E. runway to the N.W. 2200'. Construct parallel taxiway 2200' to N.W.	\$3,196,912	Start Date: 7/81 Studies & Surveys Complete
<u>10</u> S: 31 V: 5,7, 5	A 4	Baer Field - Road improvements to Smith & Dalman Roads. Smith from highway to Dalman Road and Dalman Road from intersection of Smith Road to Baer Field Thruway.	\$825,000	Start Date: 7/80 Studies & Surveys Complete
<u>11</u> S: 26 V: 8,13, 6,11	S 29	Vance Avenue - corridor study, .8 mile from Kentucky to Clinton, new construction, street, bridge, lights, storm sewers, walks	\$4,225,000	Start date: 1980 EIS; Location Study
<u>12</u> S: 22 V: 10,1, 15	F 3	Construction of Fire Station #3 in Shoaff Park	\$125,000	Start Date: 1979 Studies & Surveys Complete

CITY-WIDE PRIORITY	DEPART- MENTAL PRIORITY	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	TOTAL CAPITAL COST	PROJECT STATUS
13 S: 19 V: 14, 13,9, 9	W 11	8 Million Gallon Ground Level Storage Tank - Baer Field in vicinity of Baer and Ferguson Roads.	\$1,386,750	Est. Start Date: June 1, 1979 Studies & Surveys Complete
14 S: 18 V: 9, 12,9	S 22	St. Joe Road - from S.R. 37 to Eward Road - 4 lanes, median, street lights, storm sewers, walks, (joint City-County project).	\$3,050,000	Start Date: 1980 Preliminary Plans Complete EIS Complete EIS & Location Underway.
15 S: 17 V: 8,7	F. 6	Relocation of Fire Station #10 near intersection of Lake Avenue and Hobson Road	\$150,000	Start Date: 1981-1982 Studies & Surveys Complete
16 S: 15 V: 7,10	A. 6	Baer Field - Relocate instrument landing system.	\$520,000	Start Date: 4/82 Studies & Surveys Complete
16 S: 15 V: 15, 15,3	S 21	Ardmore Corridor - from Dalman Road to Dupont Road - 11.5 miles to 4 lanes.	\$14,470,000	Location & EIS Required [#]

CITY-WIDE PRIORITY	DEPART- MENTAL PRIORITY	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	TOTAL CAPITAL COST	PROJECT STATUS
<u>17</u> S: 12 V: 4	W 13	State-Beineke-Bass Road Feeder Main - 18,400 feet of 16" water main from Lindenwood Avenue to Hadley Road.	\$663,325	Est. Start Date: April 1, 1980
<u>17</u> S: 12 V: 12,8	P 11	Northside Park - development of a park on the site of the Old State School on State Street.	\$322,309	Start date: Contingent upon funding. Preliminary plans completed.
<u>18</u> S: 11 V: 11, 10	P 20	Capital Improvements for Zoo and African Veldt	\$780,500	Start date: Contingent upon funding. Preliminary plans complete.
<u>19</u> S: 10 V: 8, 14	WPC 16	Lakeside Area: Central part of City. - recommendations from completed study will be used for facilities study.	\$32,000,000	Start Date: 1979 Studies & Surveys. Complete
<u>19</u> S: 10 V: 7,15	S 17	Crescent Avenue - from Anthony to U.S. 30 Bypass including intersection improvements at St. Joe River Drive and Anthony-Vance.	\$924,000	Start Date: 1980-81 Studies & Surveys Complete

CITY-WIDE PRIORITY	DEPART- MENTAL PRIORITY	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	TOTAL CAPITAL COST	PROJECT STATUS
<u>20</u> S: 9 V: 14,11 4	P 12	Diehm Museum of Natural History - Rebuild the museum that was burned.	\$303,000	Start date: 1979 Preliminary plans complete.
<u>21</u> S: 8 V: 12,12	WPC .19	Belmont Area - south central side of City. Includes study of combination sewer and regulator system	\$300,000	Start Date: 1981 Studies & Surveys Complete
<u>21</u> S: 8 V: 8	S 28	Calhoun - Pettit - intersection redesign including elimination of one traffic signal, street lights, walks and storm sewers.	\$314,000	Start date: 1980 Studies and surveys complete. EIS required.
<u>21</u> S: 8 V: 10,14	W 12	10 Million Gallon Per Day Pumping Station - Baer Field vicinity of Baer and Ferguson Road	\$433,360	Est. Start Date: June 1, 1979 Studies & Surveys Complete
<u>22</u> S: 6 V: 10	S 15	Hobson Road - U.S. 30 to S.R. 37 - .66 mile - 4 lanes, left turn lanes, street lights, walks, and storm sewers. (Joint City-County project.)	\$880,000	Start Date: 1979 EIS Approved a

CITY-WIDE PRIORITY	DEPART-MENTAL PRIORITY	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	TOTAL CAPITAL COST	PROJECT STATUS
<u>23</u> S: 5 V: 12, 15	WPC 20	St. Mary's Area - South Central side of City study of pollution sources caused by unsewered areas and pumping stations	\$250,000	Start Date: 1981
<u>24</u> S: 4 V: 12	F 5	Construction of Fire Station #4 at the intersection of U.S. 14 & U.S. 24	\$125,000	Start Date: 1980 Studies & Sutveys Complete
<u>25</u> S: 3 V: 13	WPC 18	Spy Run Area: Northwest side of City. - considers pollution sources including privately served area and Spy Run Creek	\$1,200,000	Start Date: 1980 Studies & Surveys Complete
<u>26</u> S: 2 V: 14	P 17	Development of Maumee Park at Eastern edge of Allen County.	\$1,090,000	Start date: Contingent upon funding. Studies, and surveys complete.
<u>26</u> S: 2 V: 14	WPC 17	Junk Ditch Area: West Central side of City. Study will consider pollution sources and a segment of a privately served area.	\$1,400,000	Start Date: 1980 Studies & Surveys Complete

CITY-WIDE PRIORITY	DEPART- MENTAL PRIORITY	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	TOTAL CAPITAL COST	PROJECT STATUS
<u>27</u> S: 1 V: 15	S 20	Paulding Road. - from Hessen Cassel to Wayne Trace - addition lanes, storm sewers, street lights, curbs & sidewalks.	\$800,000	Start Date: 1979 Preliminary Plans Complete
<u>27</u> S: 1 V: 15	F 2	Construction of Fire Department Administrative Office	\$120,000	Start Date: 1979 Studies & Surveys Complete
<u>28</u> S: 0 V: 0	P 15	Plant Conservatory and Botanical Gardens	\$3,798,200	Studies and surveys complete.
<u>28</u> S: 0 V: 0	W 29	8 Million Gallon Ground Level Storage Tank - East Side in vicinity of New Haven and Estella Drive	\$1,722,755	Est. Start Date: June 1, 1982
<u>28</u> S: 0 V: 0	S 25	Lake Avenue corridor from Anthony Blvd to the City limits - Widening to 4 lanes with turn lanes, storm sewers, curbs, walks and streetlights.	Unknown at this time.	Studies and surveys not yet begun

CITY-WIDE PRIORITY	DEPART- MENTAL PRIORITY	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	TOTAL CAPITAL COST	PROJECT STATUS
<u>28</u> S: 0 V: 0	W 28	Thomas Road Connecting Feeder Main - 5000+ feet of 12" water main from Bass Road to Illinois Road	\$202,425	Est. Start Date: August 1, 1982 Studies & Surveys Complete
<u>28</u> S: 0 V: 0	W 17	Lima Road Feeder Main - 5500 feet of 24" water main from Washington Center Road to Cook Road	\$293,800	Est. Start Date: April 1, 1981 Studies & Surveys Complete
<u>28</u> S: 0 V: 0	W 19	8 Million Gallon Ground Level Storage Tank in vicinity Cook Road and Penn Central Railroad	\$1,602,560	Est. Start Date: June 1, 1981 Studies & Surveys Complete
<u>28</u> S: 0 V: 0	W 20	10 Million Gallon Per Day Pumping Station - in vicinity of Cook Road and the Penn Central Railroad	\$500,800	Est. Start Date: June 1, 1981 Studies & Surveys Complete
<u>28</u> S: 0 V: 0	W 16	10 Million Gallon Per Day Pumping Station in vicinity of Bass and Hadley Roads	\$465,860	Est. Start Date: June 1, 1980

CITY-WIDE PRIORITY	DEPART- MENTAL PRIORITY	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	TOTAL CAPITAL COST	PROJECT STATUS
<u>28</u> S: 0 V: 0	.W 15	8 Million Gallon Ground Level Storage Tank in vicinity of Bass and Hadley Roads	\$1,490,750	Est. Start Date: June 1; 1980
<u>28</u> S: 0 V: 0	WPC 21	Arbor Area: Southwest part of City. Study will include sources of pollution from unsewered areas	\$225,000.	Start Date: 1981 Studies & Surveys Complete

