



## CITY OF WASILLA

290 E. HERNING AVE.

WASILLA, ALASKA 99654-7091

PHONE: (907) 373-9050

FAX: (907) 373-9085

### COUNCIL MEMORANDUM 97- 17

From: John T. Felton, Public Works Director/City Engineer

Date: March 17, 1997

Subject: L.I.D. Prioritization

---

The administration has been working with Councilman Chappel to formulate a policy for Council to adopt regarding the prioritization of L.I.D. projects. We offer the following policy for Council consideration (the text in parenthesis is in way of explanation and is not meant to be included in the final policy):

The initial steps in the formation of any L.I.D. are followed per Section 2.60.70 WMC. The specific sections would be 2.60.070A.1 through 2.60.070B.3. (This would allow any concerned citizen to find out how the system works. It would allow for the logical formation of any proposed L.I.D. The Public Works Department will have a standard packet ready to hand out to any prospective party wanting to form an LID.)

The Council may want to consider not allowing a project to go forth. That is, if there are too many unfunded projects, the Council may decide not to allow any more projects to enter the system until a number of the existing projects are finished.)

On January 1st of each year the Public Works Department will begin to update the cost estimates for each previously approved project. Projects that have not been approved by Council action prior to January 1 will not be considered for funding until the next calender year. The updated estimates will be presented to the Council for review. The Council could direct a resurvey if the revised cost estimate was outside of the original estimate. ( Cost and scopes of work may change from year to year. There is no policy that directs the Council to fund every LID. The Council may have more pressing needs for funds and could have no LIDs in any given fiscal year. If the Council sees fit NOT to fund a project, the costs for that project will rise, over a period of time, and then the people of the LID will have to vote to increase their authorization.)

The Public Works Department will rate the projects, per the attached criteria and

format, and present the ratings, in descending order of desirability, to the Council during the second meeting in April. (The ratings would be done at this time so that the projects could be logically integrated into the ongoing budget process. The rating system that is proposed is factual rather than subjective; therefore, any individual should rate any given project the same way. For this reason, it is very important that the Council review the rating system that is proposed to assure that it reflects the Council's philosophy on paving streets.

This rating would be for the proposed unfunded, Council approved, L.I.D.s only. There needs to be a cutoff for consideration for funding. The logical point would be during the budget process. If the project has received Council acceptance, theoretically it is ready to be designed and built.)

During the annual Capital budget process, the Council would consider the rated L.I.D. projects with all other requests for funding. Any L.I.D. project that the Council sees fit to fund during the Capital budget process will be designed during that summer/fall season. Actual project construction would begin the following construction season. (This would allow for data collection when the ground is not frozen and there is no snow cover. Because there can be no funds expended before July 1, there is not enough time to design, bid, and construct the project before freezing conditions curtail paving. The City has accelerated projects in the past, but the overall quality is not the same as a project completed on a normal schedule.)

Rating Parameters:

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Criterion</u>
Comprehensive Plan	+5	Project is consistent with the Plan
	+3	Project generally conforms to the Plan
	- 1	Project does not follow Plan
Traffic Safety	+5	Project corrects serious safety problems
	+3	Project corrects minor safety problems
	0	Existing road has no safety considerations
Traffic Counts	+5	Local road with ADT to 400
	+3	Local road with ADT to 200
	+1	Local road with ADT to 50

Local Support	+5	LID Protests less than 10%
	+3	LID Protests less than 25%
	+1	LID Protests less than 50%
Existing Roadway	+5	Badly needs upgrading, poor serviceability
	+3	Adequately serviceable with normal maintenance
	0	Recently upgraded, in good condition
Environmental	+5	Significant dust and air quality problems exist
	+3	Moderate dust problems exist on roadway
	+1	Minor dust and air quality problems exist
Right-of-way	+5	Adequate right-of-way exists to complete project
	+3	Standard right-of-way limits part of the project
	+1	Needed right-of-way will be donated to project
	- 5	Right-of-way needs to be acquired for the project
Modal Connection	+5	Part of an ongoing or just completed project
	+3	Part of an approved project that has not started
	+1	Not a part of any general paving plan
	- 3	Dead end street with no through service to others
Project Cost	+5	Project cost less than 20% of total projects rated
	+3	Project cost less than 33% of total projects rated
	+1	Project cost less than 50% of total projects rated
Seniority		One point for every year that the project has not been funded

A sample rating sheet has been provide for Council review. This rating would have occurred just before the FY 96 budget process started. There are five fictitious projects rated that range from a whole new subdivision to a dead end road. What is important for the Council to see from this sheet is the various effects of the relative points assigned to each parameter. Note that a new project (ABC Subdivision) is in line ahead of a four and five year old project. The ABC Subdivision project is standing in the way, from a funding view point, of three other projects. These are the type of considerations the Council should give prior to adopting this policy. By setting the relative magnitude of points per parameter, the Council will be establishing the policy that Administration will follow. For example, if you wish to correct the funding issue and fund as many projects as possible in any given year, you may want to change the points as follows:

Project Cost	+15	Project cost less than 10% of total projects rated
	+10	Project cost less than 15% of total projects rated
	+5	Project cost less than 20% of total projects rated
	+3	Project cost less than 40% of total projects rated
	+1	Project cost less than 50% of total projects rated
	0	Project cost more than 50% of total projects rated

This is an example of how the Council can add more or less weight to any item listed. As you can see from the rating sheet marked "Example 2", the most expensive project is now rated last and if funding was available, would allow the other projects to proceed. The Council may add more or different parameters now or at anytime in the future to tailor the policy to reflect Council's wishes.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration recommends that the Council modify, as it sees fit, the policy presented for the prioritization and implementation of L.I.D.s within the City of Wasilla. It is further recommended that the Council direct Administration to present the modified Policy, in the proper form, for adoption and replacement of Council Policy 95-07 at the April 14, 1997, meeting.



John T. Felton  
Public Works Director/City Engineer

*on 3/24/97 there was no objection to prepare this in Council Policy format for the next regular meeting 04/14/97. and add verbage for points on funding options and utilities.*

# C.I.P. Rating Worksheet

City Fiscal Year: FY1996

Rater: Jack Felton

Date of Rating: 5-Apr-95

## PROPOSED L.I.D.

Name	Green Street	ABC Subdivision	Northwood	Cul-de-sac	Old Place Road
Total Cost	\$328,000	\$1,568,000	\$456,000	\$210,000	\$380,000
% of Total Cost	11%	53%	15%	7%	13%
<b>PARAMETER</b>					
Comprehensive Plan	5	5	3	5	3
Traffic Safety	0	3	5	0	5
Traffic Counts	3	5	3	1	5
Local Support	5	5	3	5	1
Existing Roadway	5	5	3	0	3
Environmental	5	3	3	5	5
Right-of-way	5	5	3	3	-5
Modal Connection	3	5	5	-3	5
Project Cost	5	1	5	5	5
Seniority	2	0	1	4	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>32</b>

L.I.D.s listed by desirability:

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>COST</u>	<u>ACCUM COST</u>
Green Street	\$328,000	
ABC Subdivision	\$1,568,000	\$1,896,000
Northwood	\$456,000	\$2,352,000
Old Place road	\$380,000	\$2,732,000
Cul-de-sac	\$210,000	\$2,942,000

**SAMPLE ONLY**

# C.I.P. Rating Worksheet

City Fiscal Year: FY1996

Rater: Jack Felton

Date of Rating: 5-Apr-95

## PROPOSED L.I.D.

Name	Green Street	ABC Subdivision	Northwood	Cul-de-sac	Old Place Road
Total Cost	\$328,000	\$1,568,000	\$406,000	\$260,000	\$380,000
% of Total Cost	11%	53%	14%	9%	13%
<b>PARAMETER</b>					
Comprehensive Plan	5	5	3	5	3
Traffic Safety	0	3	5	0	5
Traffic Counts	3	5	3	1	5
Local Support	5	5	3	5	3
Existing Roadway	5	5	3	3	1
Environmental	5	3	3	5	5
Right-of-way	5	5	3	3	-5
Modal Connection	3	5	5	-3	5
Project Cost	10	0	10	15	10
Seniority	2	0	1	4	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>37</b>

L.I.D.s listed by desirability:

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>COST</u>	<u>ACCUM COST</u>
Green Street	\$328,000	\$328,000
Northwood	\$406,000	\$734,000
Cul-de-sac	\$260,000	\$994,000
Old Place Road	\$380,000	\$1,374,000
ABC Subdivision	\$1,568,000	\$2,942,000

## SAMPLE ONLY EXAMPLE 2