



Capital Improvement Program

Proposed

**Fiscal Year 2013-2018
City of Annapolis, Maryland**



FY2013 – FY2018
Capital Improvement Program
Proposed

City of Annapolis
Maryland
March, 2012

City of Annapolis
FY13-FY18 Capital Improvement Program

Table of Contents

Introduction	Page 1
Authority	
Purpose	
Role of the Comprehensive Plan in the CIP	
Relationship of the CIP to the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)	
Priority Scoring of Capital Projects	
Funds Overview.....	Page 5
Changes from FY12 Adopted Capital Budget	Page 7
Current Capital Projects	Page 8
Project Stages.....	Page 9
FY13 – FY 18 Capital Budget and 5-Year Capital Improvement Program	
Summary: FY13 Proposed Projects, source of funding.....	Page 10
Summary: FY13-FY18 Projects, total project cost.....	Page 11
Summary: Bond Debt Analysis.....	Page 12
Transfer to Operating Budget – Salary Costs/Construction Management.....	Page 13
Project Detail Sheets	
General Fund Projects.....	Page 14 - 24
Stormwater Projects.....	Page 25 - 26
Water Projects.....	Page 27 - 29
Sewer Projects.....	Page 29 - 31
Off Street Parking Projects.....	Page 32
Harbor and Maritime Projects.....	Page 33 - 34
Long-Term Capital Program.....	Page 35
Consistency with Comprehensive Plan.....	Page 37

Appendices

Appendix A - Capital Planning and Budget Policy: Proposed Amendments

Appendix B - Scoring of Capital Projects - Summary

INTRODUCTION

Authority

The preparation of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is done in accordance with Title 6.16.030 of the City Code. As laid out in the Code, the Mayor submits the proposed CIP to City Council and the Planning Commission in March of each year. The Capital Improvement Program consists of a capital budget for the ensuing fiscal year and a capital improvement program for the five fiscal years following. The Planning Commission holds a public hearing on the proposed CIP and submits its recommendations to City Council by May. The budget must be adopted by Resolution of the City Council before June 30, and becomes effective on July 1.

Purpose

The Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is a recommended schedule of improvements to City capital assets, including the planning and design thereof. The CIP is a 6-year plan, of which the first year represents the proposed capital budget for the current fiscal year. The remaining five years of the CIP serve as a financial plan for capital investments. The CIP will be updated annually, at which time the schedule of projects will be re-evaluated, and another fiscal year added with new projects, as appropriate.

Capital assets are comprised of facilities, infrastructure, equipment, and networks that enable or improve the delivery of public sector services. The procurement, construction, and maintenance of capital assets are critical activities in the management of those assets. The threshold for the City's definition of a capital asset is:

- The asset has a gross purchase price equaling \$50,000 or more.
- The asset has a useful life of 5 years or more.
- The asset is owned by the City or will be City-owned when project is complete.

Capital projects are major projects undertaken by the City that fit one or more of the following categories:

1. Construction of new facilities or infrastructure.
2. Non-recurring rehabilitation or major repairs to a capital asset.
3. Acquisition of land for a public purpose.
4. All projects requiring debt obligation or borrowing.
5. Purchase of major equipment and vehicles meeting the threshold definition of a capital asset.
6. Any specific planning, engineering study or design work related to a project that falls in the above categories.

The City's Capital Improvement Program serves as a useful budgeting and managing tool:

- a. It allows the City to balance needed or desired capital investments with available financing, thereby receiving the optimum benefits for the available public revenue.
- b. It allows the City to ensure a clear relationship between capital spending and government service delivery.
- c. It allows the City to align its planning activity, programs, and operating resources with the capital improvement program and facilitate coordination between City departments.
- d. It allows the City to take advantage of government, foundation, and other grant programs and leverage project-specific funding resources.
- e. It provides for a logical process of assigning priorities to projects based on their overall importance to the City.
- f. It allows other government sectors, the community, and the private sector to anticipate when the City will undertake public improvements, and make decisions and plan investments accordingly.

Role of the Comprehensive Plan in the Capital Improvement Program

The Annapolis Comprehensive Plan is the financially unconstrained long-range plan for the City. In accordance with Article 66B of the Annotated Code of Maryland it identifies goals and policies for city land use, economic development, transportation, sensitive environmental resources, housing, community facilities, including parks and recreation, and water resources. It is prepared with a substantial amount of public input and public deliberation and includes review by State and County agencies. As such, it ensures that the City's long-range plan is aligned with the State of Maryland's Planning Visions as determined in 1992 and amended in 2000 and 2006. The Comprehensive Plan is recognized as a key component of the Capital Improvement Program because it determines the strategic goals that the City aims to achieve over the long term via its program of capital investments. The link between the Comprehensive Plan and CIP is supported by various planning documents and studies, including functional master plans that inventory and assess particular types of physical infrastructure, identify deficiencies, and prioritize needed investments.

Relationship of the Capital Improvement Program to the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)

The City's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO), codified as Title 22 of the City Code, ensures that when new development is proposed, the impact of that development on public facilities is assessed. Public facilities are defined in the APFO as those provided, managed or within the exclusive control of the City. They include Water and Sewer services; Stormwater Management facilities; Recreational facilities; Non-Auto Transportation Facilities; Public Maintenance Services; Fire, Rescue, Emergency Medical and Fire Inspection Services; and Police Protection. Among the purposes of the APFO is to:

- Assure that development and redevelopment occurs in concert with the CIP and enable the City to provide adequate public facilities in a timely manner and achieve the growth objectives of the Comprehensive Plan;
- Require new or upgraded facilities when existing facilities will not provide or maintain an adequate level of service; and
- Correct deficiencies in providing adequate levels of service within a 6-year timeframe via the annual CIP and based on a "community facilities plan".
- The APFO also provides that if a proposed project is subject to denial or delay under the APFO, the project may provide infrastructure funds to improve the capacity or safety of existing public facilities.

Priority Scoring of Capital Projects

Beginning this year, the City prepared the CIP under the *Capital Planning and Budget Policy* approved by the City Council in June, 2011. Among other things, the policy requires that all projects be scored on nine criteria to receive up to 100 points. This is to provide a measure of objectivity in the assessment of the relative priority of projects and resulting funding commitments. The goal of the project scores is to help rank projects within funding categories. For instance, projects funded via the General Fund are ranked relative to each other, projects funded via the Water Enterprise Fund are ranked relative to other water projects, etc. The evaluation criteria are listed in Table 1. This year's project scores are shown on the Summary of FY13 projects on page 10 and listed in detail in Appendix B. Project scores will be updated annually

Table 1. Evaluation Criteria

<p>1. Health, Safety & Welfare An assessment of the degree to which the project improves health and safety factors associated with the infrastructure asset. For example, projects that result in the reduction of accidents, improved structural integrity, and mitigation of health hazards would score higher.</p>	25
<p>2. Regulatory or legal mandates An assessment of the degree to which the project is under a regulatory order or other legal mandate, or meets a federal, State or local safety requirement. For example, projects that are required by consent decrees, court orders, and other legal mandates would score higher.</p>	25
<p>3. Operational Necessity An assessment of the degree to which the project supports operational efficiency and effective delivery of services. Guidelines: <i>Improves</i> operational functions and services: up to 10 points <i>Sustains</i> operational functions and services: up to 5 points</p>	10
<p>4. Implication of Deferring the Project (opportunity costs) An assessment of the costs associated with deferring the project, such as inflationary construction costs or additional annual operating and maintenance costs for each year the project is not funded. For example, projects that would have significantly higher future costs, negative community aspects, or negative public perception, should they be deferred, would score higher.</p>	10
<p>5. Budget Impact An assessment of the project's budget impact, ie. the degree to which it affects operations and maintenance costs positively or negatively. For example, a roof replacement project that reduces both maintenance requirements and energy consumption or a storm drain that reduces the need for periodic cleaning would score higher. On the other hand, a new facility that increases maintenance, energy and staffing costs would score lower.</p>	5
<p>6. Strategic Goals An assessment of the degree to which the project furthers thirteen (13) City's strategic goals as adopted in the Comprehensive Plan and listed in the section of the policy addressing the Comprehensive Plan.</p>	6
<p>7. Grant Funding Opportunity An assessment of the amount of funding in the project compared to the amount of funding provided by grant funds from outside agencies. This should include an assessment of the amount of funding needed to complete the current project phase and the entire project. For example, a project that would bring grant funds from an outside agency into the City would score higher, while a project that relies only on City funds would score lower.</p>	7
<p>8. Community Demand An assessment of the degree to which the project meets a community need or responds to community demand. How need/demand was assessed, measured, or recorded will be noted.</p>	7
<p>9. Implementation readiness An assessment of the time required for a project to begin. This should include an assessment of: project complexity; internal decisions/commitments that are required; review requirements by boards/commissions; agreements or approvals required by non-City entities; timing considerations with other capital projects (if applicable); the degree to which the project is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan or other City-adopted plans; and level of public support. Whether a public information strategy is recommended will be noted.</p>	5
Total points possible:	100

Presentation Format

At the beginning of this year's CIP, changes from the last year's Adopted CIP are noted, followed by a listing of all current "live" capital projects. The current "live" projects received funding in prior years and are still underway. If prior year funding is considered adequate to complete the project and no new funding is requested, no further detail is provided in this document. Only prior year budgets are shown, not expenditures or encumbrances.

Capital projects can be categorized by the project's stage in the sequence from project planning to design to construction. The projects proposed to receive funding in FY13 are listed by project stage on page 9. A summary of all capital projects in the 6-year Capital Improvement Program begins on page 10.

An analysis of bond debt for the 6-year capital program is provided on page 12, and repeated on the project detail sheets that follow. This analysis is provided for illustrative purposes and for order of magnitude comparisons across projects, to assist decision-makers to better understand the fiscal impacts of the capital budget. The actual terms of bond debt will not be finalized until the time of a bond issue; the figures shown are illustrative only. The impact of bond debt is expressed in two forms; as average annual debt service, and as average tax rate impact. The average tax rate impact is expressed as the dollar cost per \$1,000 of a property's value. For example, a project shown with an average tax rate impact of .01, would cost \$1 from the annual property tax payment of a property valued at \$100,000. No changes to the tax rate are enacted via the CIP, as the tax rate is determined by separate action of the Annapolis City Council. Further, the projects funded by Enterprise Funds have no real impact on the tax rate, as the Enterprise Funds are self-supporting with fees and other sources of revenue.

Beginning in FY13, costs incurred for construction project management in the Capital Budget will be transferred to the Operating Budget to offset salary costs. These expenditures are itemized on page 13.

Each capital project is described on a project detail sheet, beginning on page 14.

Additional capital needs anticipated over the long term are noted. Those potential projects may be included in the CIP in future years, depending on priorities, funding availability, and other considerations. They are included in this document to convey to City leaders and other interested parties the general parameters and breadth of upcoming capital needs.

Finally, the consistency of capital projects with the Annapolis Comprehensive Plan are noted, as reviewed and scored by the Capital Working Committee.

FUNDS - OVERVIEW

The City considers all forms of public financing when developing its CIP. Sources of financing include operating funds, General Obligation Bonds, Revenue Bonds, government loans and grants, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, revenue from fees, revenue from Capital Facilities Assessments (CFAs), and contributions. The capital projects presented in the CIP are grouped by the funds which support them – the General Fund and five enterprise funds (Stormwater Management Fund, Dock Fund, Off Street Parking Fund, Water Fund, and Sewer Fund). The Market Fund, Refuse Fund, and Transportation Fund are not included in the CIP, as those funds are dedicated entirely to operating needs and are not currently supporting capital projects.

General Fund

Capital projects supported by the General Fund generally fall into the following categories:

- City Buildings/Facilities
- Information Technology systems and infrastructure
- Roadways, Sidewalks, and infrastructure assets located in the public right of way
- Recreation Facilities and Parks
- Special projects addressing Economic Development, Revitalization, and Redevelopment

Stormwater Management Special Revenue Fund

The Stormwater Management Fund supports capital projects related to drainage and stormwater management. The fund's primary source of revenue is the Stormwater Utility Fee levied on utility customers.

The Stormwater Management Fund also accounts for all financial activity associated with the operation of the City's stormwater facilities. The Stormwater Management division of Public Works is responsible for the maintenance of public storm drainage systems, including pipes, inlets, manholes, drainage ways, and stormwater management facilities. Some restoration work is done by with general operating funds, but larger, more complex projects are done with capital funds.

Planning documents pertaining to stormwater management infrastructure include:

- DPW maintains a prioritized list of storm drainage infrastructure needs
- Watershed Study & Action Plan (Draft/2009)

Water Enterprise Fund

The Water Fund supports capital projects related to the water distribution system and water treatment plant. The fund's primary sources of revenue are user charges levied on water customers and capital facilities assessments (CFAs).

The Water Fund also supports two operational divisions: the Water Supply & Treatment Facility and the Water Distribution division. The Water Supply & Treatment Facility is responsible for the production, treatment, testing, storage, and initial distribution of all potable water for customers of the City. The Water Distribution division is responsible for meter reading and operating, maintaining and repairing the City's 138-mile water distribution system, including service lines, water meters and fire hydrants.

Planning documents pertaining to water infrastructure include:

- City of Annapolis Ten Year Water & Sewerage Plan for water and sewer infrastructure (underway)
- Water Supply Capacity Management Plan (2008)
- Anne Arundel County Master Plan for Water Supply & Sewerage Systems (2007)

Sewer Enterprise Fund

The Sewer Fund supports capital projects related to wastewater collection and treatment. The fund's primary sources of revenue are user charges levied on sewer system customers and capital facilities assessments (CFA).

The Sewer Fund also supports the Wastewater Collection division and a portion of the costs associated with the Wastewater Reclamation Facility, which is owned jointly by Annapolis and Anne Arundel County. The Wastewater Collection division is responsible for operating, maintaining and repairing the City's 127-mile sewage conveyance system, including 25 pumping stations.

Planning documents pertaining to wastewater (sewer) infrastructure include:

- City of Annapolis Ten Year Water & Sewerage Plan for water and sewer infrastructure (underway)
- Anne Arundel County Master Plan for Water Supply & Sewerage Systems (2007)

Off Street Parking Enterprise Fund

The Off Street Parking Fund supports capital projects related to the City's parking garages and off-street parking lots. The fund's primary source of revenue is from parking fees generated by the parking garages.

Planning documents pertaining to off street parking infrastructure include:

- Annapolis Region Transportation Vision and Master Plan (Draft/2006)

Dock Enterprise Fund

The Dock Fund supports capital projects related to harbor and maritime infrastructure. The Dock Fund's primary source of revenue is from fees charged for mooring at City Dock boat slips.

Planning documents pertaining to harbor and maritime infrastructure include:

- City Dock Master Plan (underway)

CHANGES FROM FY12 ADOPTED CAPITAL BUDGET

During the annual update of the Capital Program, project budgets are re-evaluated to reflect the best cost estimates, revised priorities and any new information. Through this update process, the project budgets presented in the prior year's CIP as *planned* budgets for year 2 become the *proposed* budget allocation for year 1 of the current year's CIP.

	FY13 planned budget per FY12-FY17 CIP	FY13 proposed budget per FY13-FY18 CIP	Notes
<i>New Projects</i>			
Truxtun Park Pool	n/a	100,000	Project was on long-term Capital program in prior year CIP.
Fire Station Paving Project	n/a	426,212	
Trail Connections	n/a	1,097,000	Project was on long-term Capital program in prior year CIP.
Kingsport Park	n/a	172,875	Project was on long-term Capital program in prior year CIP.
Stream Restoration	n/a	406,000	
Capital Program Land Acquisition	n/a	2,575,000	
<i>Cost and Scope Changes</i>			
City Hall	1,960,874	1,560,000	Construction budget was revised based on project planning and design.
City Dock Development	0	315,000	City Dock planning initiative has clarified the FY13 implementation phase.
General Sidewalks	500,000	600,000	Project budget was revised to address current conditions.
Sewage Pump Station Rehabilitation	333,500	614,000	Newly identified problems with pump station generators, Belmont Station flow meter and need to install a grinder.
Capital Grants to Non-Profits	0	50,000	
<i>Projects Deferred</i>			
Truxtun Park Improvements	100,000	0	Woodland Trail portion of project expected to be completed with FY12 funds. Ongoing project to be evaluated by new Rec/Parks director.
Landfill Gas Mitigation	360,000	0	Project phasing revised in consultation with MDE.
Stormwater Management Retrofit Projects	100,000	0	Projects benefitting the Weems Creek Watershed underway with prior year funds.

ALL CURRENT CAPITAL PROJECTS

Listed here are all current 'live' capital projects – projects that received funding in prior years and are still underway. Not included on this list are new projects recommended to receive funding in FY13.

<i>Project Name</i>	<i>Project Years</i>	<i>Prior Year Total Project Budget</i>	<i>FY13 Total Project Budget</i>	<i>Project Total Budget</i>
General Fund				
City Hall Restoration	FY11-FY13	1,086,035	1,560,000	2,646,035
General Roadways	recurring	2,800,000*	2,000,000	2,000,000 recurring
General Sidewalks	recurring	0*	600,000	600,000 recurring
City Dock Development	FY11-FY13	190,000	315,000	505,000
Landfill Gas Mitigation	FY11-FY14	1,780,990	0	4,355,990
Maintenance Facilities	FY11, FY12	560,000	-	560,000
Market House	FY11, FY12	950,000	-	950,000
Facility/Infrastructure Asset Mngmt	FY12	200,000	-	200,000
Stanton Center	FY12	150,000	-	150,000
Truxtun Park Improvements	FY12	200,000	-	200,000
Eastport Fire Station: Emergency Equipment Storage	FY11	150,000	-	150,000
Roof Replacement	FY11	100,000	-	100,000
WYRE Tower	FY11	20,000	-	20,000
IT System Implementation	FY11	1,210,000	-	1,210,000
Dam Repair at Waterworks Park	FY11	1,000,000	-	1,000,000
Stormwater Fund				
Stormwater Management Retrofit Projects	FY11, FY12	150,000	0	100,000 recurring
Water Enterprise Fund				
Water Treatment Plant	FY11-FY15	780,000	0	50,747,000
Water Distribution Rehab	recurring	1,820,000*	1,880,000	recurring
SCADA/Radio Upgrade - Water	FY11-FY14	1,203,000	120,000	1,443,000
Sewer Enterprise Fund				
Sewer Pump Station Rehab	FY11-FY14	1,729,743	614,000	3,028,743
Sewer Rehab & Upgrades	recurring	2,250,000*	2,320,000	recurring
SCADA/Radio Upgrade - Sewer	<i>see notes under Water Fund</i>			

* "Prior Year Funding" captures FY11 and FY12 only.

PROJECT STAGES

Capital projects are shown according to the project stage. This allows like projects to be considered together, so as to determine overall City priorities and allow for resources to be allocated accordingly. The activities undertaken within each stage clarify the budget and tasks for the ensuing stage.

- **Project Planning Stage:** includes the development of the project scope, feasibility study, a design budget, and order of magnitude construction budget.
- **Design Stage:** includes the development of any environmental documents, legal documents, construction plans and specifications, and a detailed construction budget.
- **Construction Stage:** includes site preparation, utility and infrastructure placement, equipment installation, construction, and environmental mitigation.

FY13 budget commitment allows Project Stage:	Project Name	FY13 proposed budget per FY13-FY18 CIP	Funding Status*
Planning & Design			
Planning	Truxtun Park Pool	100,000	New
Planning/Design/Construction	Trail Connections	1,097,000	New
Planning/Design	City Dock Development	315,000	Current
Planning/Design	Water Treatment Plant	0	Prior
Design & Construction			
Design/Construction	Landfill Gas Mitigation	0	Prior
Design/Construction	Kingsport Park	172,875	New
Design/Construction	Stream Restoration	406,000	New
Design/Construction	Water Distribution Rehab	1,880,000	Current
Design/Construction	Sewer Rehab & Upgrades	2,320,000	Current
Construction	City Hall Restoration	1,560,000	Current
Construction	Fire Station Paving	426,212	New
Construction	General Roadways	2,000,000	Current
Construction	General Sidewalks	600,000	New
Construction	Sewage Pump Station Rehabilitation	614,000	Current
Construction	SCADA/Radio Upgrade	120,000	Current

*Funding Status Definitions:

Prior – project was funded in prior years and is still underway; no new funds requested in FY13

Current – project was funded in prior years an FY13 funding is requested

New – project is a new proposal; fy13 funding is requested

Capital Improvement Program - Proposed
 FY13 Proposed Projects: Source of Funds

FY13 - FY18

Categories	Acct #		Project Name	FY13 Need	FY 13 Source of Funds				FY13 Project Score	
	T4	MUNIS		Total	Bond funds	Operating funds	Other			
							MDE Grant	MDE Loan		State Capital Funds
GENERAL FUND										
City Buildings	544	20005	City Hall Restoration	1,560,000	1,310,000			250,000		62
	-	tbd	Truxtun Park Pool	100,000	100,000					72
	-	tbd	Fire Station Paving	426,212	426,212					55
Roads/ Sidewalks	477	40001	General Roadways	2,000,000	2,000,000					73
	-	tbd	General Sidewalks	600,000		600,000				*
	-	tbd	Trail Connections	1,097,000	1,097,000					44
Special Projects/ Econ Dev/ Parks	739	74001	City Dock Development	315,000	315,000					48
	122	10001	Landfill Gas Mitigation	0						75
	-	tbd	Kingsport Park	172,875	25,931				146,944	44
	-	tbd	Capital Program Land Acquisition	2,575,000	2,570,000	5,000				*
	531	20006	Capital Grants to Annapolis Non-profits	50,000		50,000				*
General Fund Total:				8,896,087	7,844,143	655,000		250,000	146,944	
ENTERPRISE FUNDS										
Stormwater	735	77002	Stormwater Mgmt Retrofit Projects							*
	-	tbd	Stream Restoration	406,000	406,000					*
Stormwater Fund Total:				406,000	406,000					
Water	724	71001	Water Treatment Plant				230,000	12,300,000		74
	738	71003	Water Distribution Rehab	1,880,000	1,880,000					55
	tbd	tbd	SCADA/Radio Upgrade - Water	120,000		120,000				45
Water Fund Total:				2,000,000	1,880,000	120,000	230,000	12,300,000		
Sewer	706	72002	Sewer Pump Station Rehab	614,000	614,000					59
	743	72004	Sewer Rehab & Upgrades	2,320,000	2,320,000					59
	tbd	tbd	SCADA/Radio Upgrade - Sewer							45
Sewer Fund Total:				2,934,000	2,934,000					
Off Street Parking	732	tbd	Hillman Garage							*
Off Street Parking Total:										
Dock	717	tbd	Bulkhead Replacement, Phase 2							*
	731	tbd	Harbormaster Building							*
Dock Fund Total:										
ALL FUNDS TOTAL				14,236,087	13,064,143	775,000	230,000	12,300,000	250,000	146,944

* project not reviewed by CWC

SUMMARY: FY13 - FY18
CAPITAL PROJECTS: TOTAL PROJECT COST

Categories	Acct #		Project Name	Proposed FY13	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	T4	MUNIS			FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	
GENERAL FUND										
City Buildings	544	20005	City Hall Restoration	1,560,000						1,560,000
	-	tbd	Truxtun Park Pool	100,000						100,000
	-	tbd	Fire Station Paving	426,212						426,212
Roads/ Sidewalks	477	40001	General Roadways	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	12,000,000
	-	tbd	General Sidewalks	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	3,600,000
	-	tbd	Trail Connections	1,097,000	87,000	170,000	1,291,200			2,645,200
Special Projects/ Econ Dev/ Parks	739	74001	City Dock Development	315,000						315,000
	122	10001	Landfill Gas Mitigation	0	2,575,000					2,575,000
	-	tbd	Kingsport Park	172,875						172,875
	-	tbd	Capital Program Land Acquisition	2,575,000						
	531	20006	Capital Grants to Annapolis Non-profits	50,000	50,000	25,000	25,000	25,000		175,000
General Fund Total:				8,896,087	5,312,000	2,795,000	3,916,200	2,625,000	2,600,000	23,569,287
ENTERPRISE FUNDS										
Stormwater	735	77002	Stormwater Mgmt Retrofit Projects		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	500,000
	-	tbd	Stream Restoration	406,000						406,000
Stormwater Fund Total:				406,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	906,000
Water	724	71001	Water Treatment Plant							
	738	71003	Water Distribution Rehab	1,880,000	1,930,000	1,990,000	2,050,000	2,110,000	2,170,000	12,130,000
	-	tbd	SCADA/Radio Upgrade - Water	120,000	120,000					240,000
Water Fund Total:				2,000,000	2,050,000	1,990,000	2,050,000	2,110,000	2,170,000	12,370,000
Sewer	706	72002	Sewer Pump Station Rehab	614,000	685,000					1,299,000
	743	72004	Sewer Rehab & Upgrades	2,320,000	2,390,000	2,460,000	2,530,000	2,600,000	2,680,000	14,980,000
	tbd	-	SCADA/Radio Upgrade - Sewer							0
Sewer Fund Total:				2,934,000	3,075,000	2,460,000	2,530,000	2,600,000	2,680,000	16,279,000
Off Street Parking	732	tbd	Hillman Garage			300,000	765,190	20,787,970		21,853,160
Off Street Parking Total:						300,000	765,190	20,787,970		
Dock	717	tbd	Bulkhead Replacement, Phase 2		130,000	6,000,000				6,130,000
	731	tbd	Harbormaster Building		130,000	2,000,000				2,130,000
Dock Fund Total:					260,000	8,000,000				8,260,000
ALL FUNDS TOTAL				14,236,087	10,797,000	15,645,000	9,361,390	28,222,970	7,550,000	61,384,287

Capital Improvement Program - Proposed

FY13 - FY18

Assumption: \$660,000 in annual debt service = \$0.01 raise on the tax rate.

Categories	CIP #	Project Name	Borrowing Term	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY13-FY17 Total	Average Annual	Average Tax Rate
										Debt Service	Impact
GENERAL FUND											
	122	Landfill Gas Mitigation	25	0.00	2,575,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,575,000.00	168,662.50	0.26
	544	City Hall Restoration	20	1,310,000.00					1,310,000.00	99,068.75	0.15
	477	General Roadways	10	2,000,000.00	2,000,000.00	2,000,000.00	2,000,000.00	2,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	1,262,500.00	1.91
	tbd	Fire Station Paving	10	462,212.00					462,212.00	58,354.27	0.09
	358	Truxtun Park Pool	5	100,000.00					100,000.00	22,750.00	0.03
	739	City Dock Development	5	315,000.00					315,000.00	71,662.50	0.11
	tbd	Kingsport Park*	5	26,000.00					26,000.00	5,915.00	0.01
	tbd	Trail Connectors	5	1,097,000.00					1,097,000.00	249,567.50	0.38
		Total		5,310,212.00	4,575,000.00	2,000,000.00	2,000,000.00	2,000,000.00	15,885,212.00	1,938,480.52	2.94
		<i>crossfoot error / source test</i>							-	-	Debt Service if expressed as Tax Rate Impact **
ENTERPRISE FUNDS**											
Stormwater	735	Stormwater Mgmt Retrofit Projects	Fees	0.00	100,000.00	100,000.00	100,000.00	100,000.00	400,000.00	0.00	0.00
	tbd	Stream Restoration***	10	406,000.00					406,000.00	51,257.50	0.08
	tbd	Stormwater Best Management Practices							0.00	0.00	0.00
		Total		406,000.00	100,000.00	100,000.00	100,000.00	100,000.00	806,000.00	51,257.50	0.08
		<i>crossfoot error / source test</i>							-	-	
Water	724	Water Treatment Plant	30						0.00	0.00	0.00
	738	Water Distribution Rehab	30	1,880,000.00	1,930,000.00	1,990,000.00	2,050,000.00	2,110,000.00	9,960,000.00	585,150.00	0.89
	tbd	SCADA/Radio Upgrade - Water	Operating Funds	120,000.00	120,000.00			0.00	240,000.00	0.00	0.00
		Total		2,000,000.00	2,050,000.00	1,990,000.00	2,050,000.00	2,110,000.00	10,200,000.00	585,150.00	0.89
		<i>crossfoot error / source test</i>							-	-	
Sewer	706	Sewer Pump Station Rehab	30	614,000.00					614,000.00	36,072.50	0.05
	743	Sewer Rehab & Upgrades	30	2,320,000.00	2,390,000.00	2,460,000.00	2,530,000.00	2,600,000.00	12,300,000.00	722,625.00	1.09
	tbd	SCADA/Radio Upgrade - Sewer	10				0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		Total		2,934,000.00	2,390,000.00	2,460,000.00	2,530,000.00	2,600,000.00	12,914,000.00	758,697.50	1.15
		<i>crossfoot error / source test</i>							-	-	
Off Street Parki	732	Hillman Garage	30			300,000.00	765,190.00	20,787,970.00	21,853,160.00	1,283,873.15	1.95
		Total		0.00	0.00	300,000.00	765,190.00	20,787,970.00	21,853,160.00	1,283,873.15	1.95
		<i>crossfoot error / source test</i>							-	-	
Dock	717	Bulkhead Replacement, Phase 2	20		130,000.00	6,000,000.00			6,130,000.00	463,581.25	0.70
	731	Harbormaster Building	20		130,000.00	2,000,000.00			2,130,000.00	161,081.25	0.24
		Total		0.00	260,000.00	8,000,000.00	0.00	0.00	8,260,000.00	624,662.50	0.95
		<i>crossfoot error / source test</i>							-	-	
Sidewalk Revolving Fund											
Sidewalk	tbd	Sidewalk Repairs	Tax Rate Increase\$.01	600,000.00	600,000.00	600,000.00	600,000.00	600,000.00	3,000,000.00	0.00	0.00
		Total		600,000.00	600,000.00	600,000.00	600,000.00	600,000.00	3,000,000.00	0.00	0.00
		<i>crossfoot error / source test</i>							-	-	
		Project Cost TOTAL:		11,250,212.00	9,975,000.00	15,450,000.00	8,045,190.00	28,197,970.00	72,918,372.00	5,242,121.17	7.94
		<i>crossfoot error / source test</i>							-	-	
		*This project may be deferred: It is dependent on grant funds which were anticipated by the former Recs. and Parks Director. Director transition may impact the acquiring of the grant.									
		**No impact to the tax rate from projects funded by enterprise funds.									
		***This project may be partially funded by stormwater fees.									

TRANSFER TO FY13 OPERATING BUDGET: CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT COSTS

Categories	Project Name	Total	FY13 Need			Const Mngmt %
			sub-totals			
			Non-Construction budget	Construction budget	Construction Mngmt budget	
GENERAL FUND						
City Buildings	City Hall Restoration	1,560,000		1,500,000	60,000	4.0%
	Truxtun Park Pool	100,000	100,000	0		
	Fire Station Paving	426,212	83,900	335,600	6,712	2.0%
Roads/ Sidewalks	General Roadways	2,000,000		1,981,000	19,000	1.0%
	General Sidewalks	600,000	10,000	584,000	6,000	1.0%
	Trail Connections	1,097,000	815,000	272,000	10,000	3.7%
Special Projects/ Econ Dev/ Parks	City Dock Development	315,000	315,000	0		
	Landfill Gas Mitigation	0				
	Kingsport Park	172,875	20,625	145,000	7,250	5.0%
Transfer to Operating Budget - Salaries - Total:					108,962	
ENTERPRISE FUNDS						
Stormwater	Stormwater Mgmt Retrofit Projects					
	Stream Restoration	406,000	101,000	300,000	5,000	1.7%
Transfer to Operating Budget - Salaries - Total:					5,000	
Water	Water Treatment Plant					
	Water Distribution Rehab	1,880,000	275,000	1,531,000	74,000	4.8%
	SCADA/Radio Upgrade - Water	120,000	20,000	95,500	4,500	4.7%
Transfer to Operating Budget - Salaries - Total:					78,500	
Sewer	Sewer Pump Station Rehab	614,000	22,000	564,000	28,000	5.0%
	Sewer Rehab & Upgrades	2,320,000	355,000	1,875,000	90,000	4.8%
	SCADA/Radio Upgrade - Sewer					
Transfer to Operating Budget - Salaries - Total:					118,000	
Off Street Parking	Hillman Garage				n/a	
Dock	Bulkhead Replacement, Phase 2				n/a	
	Harbormaster Building				n/a	

Project Title City Hall Restoration	Project Number: T4/MUNIS 544 / 20005	Initiating Department Public Works
Asset Category City Facility	Asset Number 50138	Priority Score 62
Project Description Renovation of City Hall and restoration of the City Council Chambers. The complete scope of the project includes new roofing, HVAC system, and complete interior restoration consistent with the 1868 design. Much of the interior renovation is funded, however additional project funding is needed to complete mechanical and energy improvements to City Hall. Remaining project tasks include the installation of new storm windows, roof repairs, the installation of a new mechanical system, and replacement of City Hall's water heaters. The goal of these tasks is improvement of the HVAC system's efficiency, reduced building maintenance costs, and increased comfort for City residents, meeting attendees, and City employees.		
Regulatory or Legal Mandates Possible OSHA requirements.		Operational Necessity Energy efficiency and improved working environment will result from improvements to mechanical and HVAC systems.
Prior Funding FY11: \$1,386,035 budgeted; reduced by \$300,000 per GT46-12 in February, 2012. FY09, FY10: Non-capital planning funds (~\$180,000).		Non-City sources of funding \$250,000 from State (reprogrammed 2011 funds); City match required.
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: Construction		Project Years FY11-FY13
		Total Project Budget 2,646,035

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition							
Design Costs							
Construction Costs	1,500,000						1,500,000
Construction Project Mgmt	60,000						60,000
IT Costs							
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment							
Legal Fees							
Contingencies							
Total	1,560,000						1,560,000

Funding Schedule							
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	FY13 - FY18 Total
Bond funds	1,310,000						1,310,000
Operating funds							
Other	250,000						250,000
Total	1,560,000						1,560,000

Debt Analysis			
FY13-FY18 Total	Borrowing Term (Years)	Average Annual Debt Service	Average Tax Rate Impact
1,310,000	20	99,069	0.15

Project Title Truxtun Park Pool	Project Number TBD	Initiating Department Recreation & Parks
Asset Category Parks/Rec. facilities/Open Space	Asset Number TBD	Priority Score 72
Project Description The project will replace and update the outdoor swimming pool, bath house and office area with a modern community aquatics center. The pool structure has undergone numerous “band-aid” repairs. The age of the structures are causing the operations systems to slowly fail. Updated ADA and safety requirements will also be addressed with this replacement. Year 1 will include a feasibility/assessment study which will determine subsequent design and construction budgets. Year 2 will include the design phase, and year 3 will include construction.		
Regulatory or Legal Mandates More stringent ADA requirements take effect within a few years.		Operational Necessity Due to increasing maintenance needs to this aging facility, this improvement is essential to ensure this service. Improvements to the facility will result in higher revenues. Exact improvement costs and revenue potential will be discovered during Phase 1 feasibility study.
Prior Funding None		Non-City sources of funding
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: Planning		Project Years FY13-FY15
		Total Project Budget 2,375,000

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition							
Design Costs	100,000	150,000					250,000
Construction Costs			2,000,000				2,000,000
Construction Project Mgmt			50,000				50,000
IT Costs							0
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment			50,000				50,000
Legal Fees			25,000				25,000
Contingencies							0
Total	100,000	150,000	2,125,000	0	0	0	2,375,000

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds	100,000	150,000	2,125,000				2,375,000
Operating funds							
Other							
Total	100,000	150,000	2,125,000	0	0	0	2,375,000

Debt Analysis			
FY13 Total	Borrowing Term (Years)	Average Annual Debt Service	Average Tax Rate Impact
100,000	5	22,750	0.03

Project Title Fire Station Paving	Project Number TBD	Initiating Department Public Works with Fire Department	
Asset Category City Facility	Asset Number 50218 (Forest), 50220 (Eastport), 50688 (Taylor)	Priority Score 55	
Project Description Paving of traffic areas at all three Annapolis Fire Stations (27,000 square feet in total). This project will enable safe and efficient passage of emergency vehicles to and from facilities and provide safe pavement conditions for employee and public parking.			
Regulatory or Legal Mandates None		Operational Necessity Project sustains an existing asset.	
Prior Funding None		Non-City sources of funding	
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: Construction		Project Years FY13	Total Project Budget 426,212

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition							
Design Costs							
Construction Costs	335,600						335,600
Construction Project Mgmt	6,712						6,712
IT Costs							
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment							
Legal Fees							
Contingencies	83,900						83,900
Total	426,212						426,212

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds	426,212						426,212
Operating funds							
Other							
Total	426,212						426,212

Debt Analysis			
FY13-FY18 Total	Borrowing Term (Years)	Average Annual Debt Service	Average Tax Rate Impact
426,212	10	58,354	0.09

Project Title General Roadways	Project Number: T4/MUNIS 477 / 40001	Initiating Department Public Works
Asset Category Roadways/Sidewalks	Asset Number Numerous asset numbers are assigned to road segments	Priority Score 73
Project Description This project is a consolidation of annual efforts to resurface and reconstruct the City's streets, curbs, and gutters. The City continually analyzes each area to develop a list based on conditions. Resurfacing activities include pavement milling and patching, utility adjustments, curb and gutter replacement, pavement resurfacing, brick repairs and replacement, and replacement of pavement markings. Traffic calming projects may also be funded through this project. The ADA requires wheelchair accessible ramps at intersections where sidewalks adjoin streets. Although most of the City intersections have a handicapped ramp, funds are used, as deemed necessary to update the existing ramps to the current standard or for additional ramps installed.		
Regulatory or Legal Mandates The Maryland Transportation Code mandates that Highway User Revenue (HUR) be applied to transportation projects.		Operational Necessity Sustains operations of the existing street network.
Prior Funding Project is funded via the capital budget annually		Non-City sources of funding Highway User Revenue 'Safe Routes to School' grant program
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: Construction		Project Years Recurring
		Total Project Budget 2,000,000 annually

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition							
Design Costs							
Construction Costs	1,981,000	1,981,000	1,981,000	1,981,000	1,981,000	1,981,000	11,886,000
Construction Project Mgmt	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000	114,000
IT Costs							
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment							
Legal Fees							
Contingencies							
Total	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	12,000,000

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000		10,000,000
Operating funds						2,000,000	2,000,000
Other							
Total	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	12,000,000

Debt Analysis			
FY13-FY17 Total	Borrowing Term (Years)	Average Annual Debt Service	Average Tax Rate Impact
10,000,000	10	1,262,500	1.91

Project Title General Sidewalks	Project Number TBD	Initiating Department Public Works	
Asset Category Roadways/Sidewalks	Asset Number Numerous asset numbers are assigned to sidewalks	Priority Score Project not scored to date	
<p>Project Description Project is designed as an ongoing infrastructure repair program for the sidewalks in Annapolis. In the summer of 2009, DPW conducted a comprehensive city-wide sidewalk condition assessment. Sidewalks were inspected for cracking, faulting and scaling. Based upon this first inspection, a list of priorities for repair and reconstruction was developed taking into account not only sidewalk condition, but location of sidewalk in terms of its importance to citywide pedestrian traffic. In 2004, a three-tier sidewalk hierarchy was developed with resident and business participation. This hierarchy and the condition rating of individual sidewalk segments will determine the sequence of specific replacement projects.</p> <p>Funding for this project is contingent on the identification of a funding source for sidewalk repairs.</p>			
Regulatory or Legal Mandates		Operational Necessity Allows continued safe use of the existing sidewalk network.	
Prior Funding None		Non-City sources of funding	
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: Construction		Project Years Recurring	Total Project Budget \$600,000 annually

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition							
Design Costs	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	60,000
Construction Costs	584,000	584,000	584,000	584,000	584,000	584,000	3,504,000
Construction Project Mgmt	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	36,000
IT Costs							
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment							
Legal Fees							
Contingencies							
Total	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	3,600,000

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds							
Operating funds	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	3,600,000
Other							
Total	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	3,600,000

Debt analysis: no debt to be incurred for this project.

Project Title Trail Connections	Project Number TBD	Initiating Department Transportation	
Asset Category Roadways/Sidewalks	Asset Number TBD	Priority Score 44	
Project Description As recommended in the Comprehensive Plan (2009), Team Ped Initiative (2006) and Bicycle Master Plan (2012), this project consists of several components to create a more cohesive trail system in the City. This project improves the safety of bike travel and supports City policy to encourage alternative transportation options. Year 1: Connect the Poplar Trail to the Spa Creek Trail with pavement markings and signage. For trail segment from Taylor Ave. to West Washington St., planning, land acquisition, design, and begin construction. Year 2-4: Trail segment between Admiral Drive and Gibraltar Ave.			
Regulatory or Legal Mandates No		Operational Necessity	
Prior Funding None		Non-City sources of funding Grant funding is expected to offset design and construction costs, for which various State and Federal grants are available for up to 100% funding.	
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: Planning through Construction (first trail segment)		Project Years FY13-FY16	Total Project Budget 2,645,200

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition	750,000			954,000			1,704,000
Planning	15,000	55,000					70,000
Design Costs	45,000		128,000				173,000
Construction Costs	272,000	32,000		327,200			631,200
Construction Project Mgmt	10,000			10,000			20,000
IT Costs							0
Legal Fees	5,000		42,000				47,000
Contingencies							0
Total	1,097,000	87,000	170,000	1,291,200	0	0	2,645,200

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds	1,097,000	87,000	42,000	964,000			2,190,000
Operating funds							
Other			128,000	327,200			455,200
Total	1,097,000	87,000	170,000	1,291,200	0	0	2,645,200

Debt Analysis			
FY13 Total	Borrowing Term (Years)	Average Annual Debt Service	Average Tax Rate Impact
1,097,000	5	249,567	0.38

Project Title City Dock Development	Project Number: T4/MUNIS 739 / 74001	Initiating Department Planning & Zoning		
Asset Category Roadways/Sidewalks, City Facilities	Asset Number Numerous asset numbers	Priority Score 48		
Project Description Revitalization and renewal of the City Dock area. Project involves master planning of public space and public access to the waterfront, circulation, parking, land use and redevelopment, real property acquisition, wayfinding, drainage and stormwater management, and construction phasing. The master planning is coordinated with other capital projects (Market House, Harbormaster Building, Bulkhead Replacement). Project encompasses the following City assets: · Susan Campbell park, Kunta Kinte park, Hopkins Plaza, Newman Street playground & park · Sidewalks, Roadways - approx. 5,611 linear feet (4.99 acres) · 307 parking spaces at: Donner Lot, Market Plaza, Dock Street, City Dock surface lot, area between Fawcett's and Fleet Reserve properties, and on-street. · Former Rec Center/Community Service building, Harbormaster building, Market House				
Regulatory or Legal Mandates			Operational Necessity Project aligns City policy, plans, and management of City facilities, City parking lots, and circulation infrastructure.	
Prior Funding FY12: \$140,000. FY11: \$50,000. Additional non-capital planning funds in FY11, FY12.		Non-City sources of funding Various grant opportunities are under investigation.		
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: Planning, Design		Project Years FY11-FY13 <table border="1" style="float: right; margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td>Total Project Budget</td> <td>505,000</td> </tr> </table>	Total Project Budget	505,000
Total Project Budget	505,000			

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition							
Design Costs	300,000						300,000
Construction Costs							
Construction Project Mgmt							
IT Costs							
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment							
Legal Fees	15,000						15,000
Contingencies							
Total	315,000						315,000

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds	315,000						315,000
Operating funds							
Other							
Total	315,000						315,000

Debt Analysis			
FY13 Total	Borrowing Term (Years)	Average Annual Debt Service	Average Tax Rate Impact
315,000	5	71,662	0.11

Project Title Landfill Gas Mitigation	Project Number: T4/MUNIS 122 / 10001	Initiating Department Public Works
Asset Category Landfill	Asset Number 50240	Priority Score 75
Project Description MDE policy requires groundwater between the Annapolis Landfill and down-gradient streams to comply with maximum contaminant levels (MCLs). The volatile organic compound (VOC) groundwater plume emanating from the unlined Annapolis Landfill has reached down gradient streams; therefore the landfill does not comply with the MDE's policy. This is a multi-phase project with Phase 1, the Nature & Extent Study (NES), underway and expected to be completed by the beginning of the 2013 calendar year. Phase 2 and 3, the Alternative Corrective Measures Study (ACM) and Corrective Measures Implementation (CMI), will be dependant on the results of the Nature & Extents Study and may cost up to \$2,500,000. Additional property remediation costs associated with corrective measures could be \$350,000 annually for 10 years.		
Regulatory or Legal Mandates Project is under a Draft Consent Order with the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE).		Operational Necessity The work must be done to comply with the Draft Consent Order.
Prior Funding FY12: \$989,990 budgeted. FY11: \$1,910,000 budgeted. Reduced to \$772,000 per GT 24-12 in November, 2011.		Non-City sources of funding
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: Construction	Project Years FY11-FY14	Total Project Budget 4,355,990

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition							
Design Costs		1,000,000					1,000,000
Construction Costs		1,500,000					1,500,000
Construction Project Mgmt		75,000					75,000
IT Costs							
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment							
Legal Fees							
Contingencies							
Total	0	2,575,000	0	0	0	0	2,575,000

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds		2,575,000					2,575,000
Operating funds							
Other							
Total	0	2,575,000	0	0	0	0	2,575,000

Debt Analysis			
FY14 Total	Borrowing Term (Years)	Average Annual Debt Service	Average Tax Rate Impact
2,575,000	25	168,662	0.26

Project Title Kingsport Park	Project Number TBD	Initiating Department Recreation & Parks
Asset Category Parks/Rec. facilities/Open Space	Asset Number	Priority Score 44
Project Description This project will complete the development of the Kingsport Park, a 3-acre parcel donated as part of the Kingsport residential development. The project will include a 10-car off street parking area, pathway, small linear field, community garden plots, security lighting, water, landscaping and a park sign. Some preliminary design has been completed, but will need to be updated.		
Regulatory or Legal Mandates No	Operational Necessity Meets the essential recreation and park services for the community. Anticipate small increase in operating costs (~\$500 annually) after project is completed.	
Prior Funding None	Non-City sources of funding Application to DNR will be made in summer of 2012 (Community Parks and Playground program). Match of \$25,000 (15% of total) is factored into project budget.	
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: Design, Construction	Project Years FY13	Total Project Budget 172,875

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition							
Design Costs	2,500						2,500
Construction Costs	145,000						145,000
Construction Project Mgmt	7,250						7,250
IT Costs							
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment							
Legal Fees							
Contingencies	18,125						18,125
Total	172,875	0	0	0	0	0	172,875

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds	25,931						25,931
Operating funds							
Other	146,944						146,944
Total	172,875						172,875

Debt Analysis			
FY13 Total	Borrowing Term (Years)	Average Annual Debt Service	Average Tax Rate Impact
25,931	5	5,915	0.01

Project Title Capital Program Land Acquisition	Project Number: T4/MUNIS TBD	Initiating Department Mayor's Office
Asset Category Real Property, Right of Way	Asset Number TBD	Priority Score Project not scored to date
Project Description Opportunities for acquiring land for capital projects arise, and the City can respond in a timely fashion if funds are available. Opportunities may be related to roadway, trail, facility and park projects that are in the conceptual planning stage, many of which are noted in the City's Comprehensive Plan. Funds may be used to provide matching funds for non-City sources of funding. Legal expenses associated with land acquisition are included in this project budget for the purposes of real property title research, appraisals, and related legal advice.		
Regulatory or Legal Mandates	Operational Necessity Opportunity cost savings.	
Prior Funding None	Non-City sources of funding	
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: Project planning	Project Years	Total Project Budget

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition	2,550,000						2,550,000
Design Costs							
Construction Costs							
Construction Project Mgmt							
IT Costs							
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment							
Legal Fees	25,000						25,000
Contingencies							
Total	2,575,000						2,575,000

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds	2,570,000						2,570,000
Operating funds	5,000						5,000
Other							
Total	2,575,000						2,575,000

Debt analysis to be completed as projects progress.

Project Title Capital Grants to Annapolis non-profit organizations	Project Number: T4/MUNIS 531 / 20006	Initiating Department Mayor's Office	
Asset Category Community Assets	Asset Number n/a	Priority Score Project not scored	
Project Description The City supports the Capital Campaigns of two organizations important to the Annapolis community; Maryland Hall for the Creative Arts, and the planned National Sailing Hall of Fame. Funds will support Maryland Hall's Auditorium Renovation project and development of the Sailing Hall of Fame's facility and site (shown).			
Regulatory or Legal Mandates		Operational Necessity	
Prior Funding Maryland Hall granted \$250,000 FY09 through FY12. National Sailing Hall of Fame granted \$250,000 FY07 through FY12.		Non-City sources of funding	
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: n/a	Project Years	Total Project Budget n/a	

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Maryland Hall	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000		125,000
Nat'l Sailing Hall of Fame	25,000	25,000					50,000
Total	50,000	50,000	25,000	25,000	25,000		175,000

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds							
Operating funds	50,000	50,000	25,000	25,000	25,000		175,000
Other							
Total	50,000	50,000	25,000	25,000	25,000		175,000

Debt analysis: no debt incurred for this expenditure.

Project Title Stormwater Management Retrofit Projects	Project Number: T4/MUNIS 735 / 77002	Initiating Department Public Works
Asset Category Drainage/Stormwater	Asset Number	Priority Score Project not scored to date
Project Description Storm drains, inlets and other stormwater facilities are in need of repair due to age. Some corrugated metal pipes have fallen apart in the ground, and many concrete pipe joints have failed and need replacement. Some manholes and inlets need rebricking. This project also maintains 32 major outfalls 15" or greater in diameter. This is an ongoing infrastructure project; sections will be replaced, repaired, or retrofitted based on field inspections by utility crews on an annual basis.		
Regulatory or Legal Mandates		Operational Necessity Sustains operations of existing stormwater conveyance infrastructure.
Prior Funding FY12: 100,000 budgeted FY11: 50,000 budgeted		Non-City sources of funding
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: No funds requested in FY13		Project Years Recurring
		Total Project Budget 100,000 annually

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition							
Design Costs		6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	32,500
Construction Costs		90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000	450,000
Construction Project Mgmt		3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	17,500
IT Costs							
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment							
Legal Fees							
Contingencies							
Total	0	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	500,000

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds							
Operating funds - Stormwater		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	500,000
Other							
Total	0	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	500,000

Debt analysis: Project is funded by fees. No debt is incurred for this project.

Project Title Stream Restoration	Project Number TBD	Initiating Department DNEP
Asset Category Drainage/Stormwater	Asset Number	Priority Score Project not scored to date
Project Description Restoration of 1,000 linear feet of streams eroded by stormwater. The EPA-mandated Chesapeake Bay 'pollution diet' requires that all jurisdictions in the Chesapeake Bay watershed reduce the amount of nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment that is discharged into the bay. One way to reduce nutrient pollution is to restore stormwater-scoured urban streams. Stream restoration projects slow the stormwater velocity in the stream and re-vegetate eroded stream banks, thus reducing the nutrient laden sediment load distributed into receiving waters. Several miles of Annapolis' streams have been degraded by excessive stormwater flow and this project will begin to rectify that degradation.		
Regulatory or Legal Mandates EPA mandates related to Chesapeake Bay 'pollution diet'.		Operational Necessity
Prior Funding None		Non-City sources of funding No
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: Design, Construction		Project Years FY13
		Total Project Budget 406,000

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition							
Design Costs	100,000						100,000
Construction Costs	300,000						300,000
Construction Project Mgmt	5,000						5,000
IT Costs							
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment							
Legal Fees	1,000						1,000
Contingencies							
Total	406,000	0	0	0	0	0	406,000

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds	406,000						406,000
Operating funds - Stormwater							
Other							
Total	406,000						406,000

Debt Analysis			
FY13 Total	Borrowing Term (Years)	Average Annual Debt Service	Average Tax Rate Impact
406,000	10	51,257	0*

* No tax rate impact: project is funded from Stormwater Fund. If expressed as a tax rate impact, debt service would equate to .08.

Project Title Water Treatment Plant	Project Number: T4/MUNIS 724 / 71001	Initiating Department Public Works
Asset Category Water Infrastructure	Asset Number	Priority Score 74
Project Description The Water Treatment Plant is at the end of its useful life and in need of replacement. It has significant operational and structural constraints. The existing facility has regulatory and safety issues. Hydraulic issues limit the production capacity of the plant to below its design capacity. A Facility Plan Report (2009) showed that operational and structural constraints result in less than efficient and economical production of drinking water. Replacement parts for most of the mechanical equipment are difficult to find; some parts are no longer being made. The results of the life-cycle cost and qualitative analyses in the report showed that a new water treatment plant was the better alternative, as compared to major upgrades. The possibility of a partnership with Anne Arundel County and the ultimate location of new water treatment facilities is under consideration, but regardless of the outcome, new water treatment capacity for the City is necessary.		
Regulatory or Legal Mandates		Operational Necessity The water treatment plant is the only source of water for the City and therefore, a critical operation.
Prior Funding FY12: \$277,000 budgeted FY11: \$503,000 budgeted		Non-City sources of funding The City has been approved for a low-interest loan and grant from MD Department of the Environment (MDE) for federal Fiscal Year 2013 (funds available November 2012).
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: Planning, Design		Project Years FY11-FY15
		Total Project Budget 50,747,000

Appropriation Schedule	Budget Proposed FY13	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
		Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition							
Design Costs							
Construction Costs							0
Construction Project Mgmt							0
IT Costs							
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment							
Legal Fees							
Contingencies							
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds		8,000,000	7,970,000				15,970,000
Operating funds - Water Fund							
MDE Loan	12,300,000	10,100,000	10,000,000				32,400,000
MDE Grant	230,000	1,200,000	680,000				2,110,000
Total	12,530,000	19,300,000	18,650,000				50,480,000

Debt analysis to be completed as project planning and design progresses.

* Note: Appropriation Schedule is shown in FY12 and represents anticipated total project appropriation needs. Funding Schedule represents cash flow expectations. Temporary funds will be needed to cover D/B Contractor costs prior to MDE reimbursement.

Project Title Water Distribution Rehab	Project Number: T4/MUNIS 738 / 71003	Initiating Department Public Works
Asset Category Water Infrastructure	Asset Number Numerous asset numbers are assigned	Priority Score 55
Project Description The existing water distribution grid is aging, as is evidenced by the frequent failures. Based on a useful life of 80 years, the financial consultant has calculated the required water distribution system rehabilitation capital needs for the next 20 years to address the pipes, valves, and hydrants that have exceeded or will reach the end of their useful life. Addressing the capital needs will minimize the potential for a major failure. The water distribution infrastructure replacement plan was developed based on priorities identified by DPW Operations in areas where multiple failures have occurred in the last several years.		
Regulatory or Legal Mandates		
Prior Funding FY12: 1,718,000 budgeted FY11: 102,000 budgeted		Non-City sources of funding
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: Design, Construction		Project Years Recurring
		Total Project Budget Annual range 1.8M to 2.1M

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition							
Design Costs	210,000	225,000	240,000	250,000	260,000	265,000	1,450,000
Construction Costs	1,531,000	1,555,000	1,595,000	1,630,000	1,680,000	1,730,000	9,721,000
Construction Project Mgmt	74,000	75,000	80,000	85,000	85,000	85,000	484,000
IT Costs							
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment							
Legal Fees	25,000	30,000	30,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	190,000
Contingencies	40,000	45,000	45,000	50,000	50,000	55,000	285,000
Total	1,880,000	1,930,000	1,990,000	2,050,000	2,110,000	2,170,000	12,130,000

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds	1,880,000	1,930,000	1,990,000	2,050,000	2,110,000		9,960,000
Operating funds - Water Fund							
Capital Reserve - Water Fund						2,170,000	2,170,000
Total	1,880,000	1,930,000	1,990,000	2,050,000	2,110,000	2,170,000	12,130,000

Debt Analysis			
FY13-FY17 Total	Borrowing Term (Years)	Average Annual Debt Service	Average Tax Rate Impact
9,960,000	30	585,150	0*

* No tax rate impact due to 2011 adjustment in water rates. If expressed as a tax rate impact, debt service would equate to .89.

Project Title SCADA/Radio Upgrade	Project Number: T4/MUNIS TBD	Initiating Department Public Works
Asset Category Wastewater & Water Infrastructure	Asset Number	Priority Score 45
Project Description This project continues the replacement of obsolete controls and communications system of Supervisory Controls And Data Acquisition (SCADA) information from the City's sewage pump stations to the central system at 935 Spa Road and from the water tanks to the WTP chart recorders. The new wastewater collection SCADA system project is underway. The new water tank SCADA system will include LC3000 master telemetry system at the Water Treatment Plant and LC2000 remote telemetry units at each tank site. Communication will be using VHF radio (licensed through FCC), which after the original licensing process, has only a small annual relicensing fee (which may be waived for local governments), allowing the City to eliminate the costly monthly telephone lease lines.		
Regulatory or Legal Mandates No		
Prior Funding FY12: 413,000 budgeted. FY11: 790,000 budgeted		Operational Necessity The SCADA system and reliable communications are necessary for proper operation of the automated components of the sewer collection and water distribution systems. If the existing leased telephone communication carrier ceases to maintain the obsolete system, the City would need to manually monitor the tank elevations at a cost of approximately \$120,000 per year.
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: Construction		Non-City sources of funding Project Years FY11-FY14 Total Project Budget 1,443,000

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition							
Equipment/Programming	15,000	15,000					30,000
Construction Costs	90,000	90,000					180,000
Construction Project Mgmt	10,000	10,000					20,000
IT Costs							
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment							
Legal Fees	2,000	2,000					4,000
Contingencies	3,000	3,000					6,000
Total	120,000	120,000	0	0	0	0	240,000

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds							
Operating funds-Water Fund	120,000	120,000					240,000
Other							
Total	120,000	120,000	0	0	0	0	240,000

Debt analysis: FY13-FY18 no debt will be incurred.

Project Title Sewer Pump Station Rehab	Project Number: T4/MUNIS 706 / 72002	Initiating Department Public Works
Asset Category Wastewater Infrastructure	Asset Number	Priority Score 59
Project Description Replacement of sewage pump stations, pump station components and/or pumps. There are 25 pump stations in the City and most have aging pumps and other components that pose an imminent threat of failure, and thus a threat to the health and safety of the citizens. Several pumps have failed, requiring immediate dispatch of emergency pumps to prevent sewage spill, and having an adverse impact on the cost of operation. Some of the pumps are so old that parts have to be specially made for them. Pump Station generator failures have also occurred resulting in no back-up power in the event of a power failure. One of the pump stations, Whitton Ct., requires complete replacement. This pre-fabricated "Tin Can" pumping station consists of an underground steel shell containing the pumps and controls. This station is in excess of 30 years old and the steel containment vessel is at the end of its design life. In all cases, new high efficiency or variable speed drive pumps result in longer pump life, reduced energy consumption, and more constant flow in down stream pipes.		
Regulatory or Legal Mandates Sewage spills or overflows that can result from pump failure, which are more likely with older pumps and stations, are regulated and usually require payment of a fine.		Operational Necessity Continuous operation of sewage pump stations is critical to providing sewer service to most customers.
Prior Funding FY12: \$1,239,000 budgeted FY11: \$490,743 budgeted		Non-City sources of funding Low interest loan and grant funding may be available for a portion of the project in future fiscal years.
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage Construction		Project Years FY11-FY14
		Total Project Budget 3,028,743

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition							
Design Costs							
Construction Costs	564,000	630,000					1,194,000
Construction Project Mgmt	28,000	31,000					59,000
IT Costs							
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment							
Legal Fees	11,000	12,000					23,000
Contingencies	11,000	12,000					23,000
Total	614,000	685,000	0	0	0	0	1,299,000

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds	614,000	685,000					1,299,000
Operating funds - Sewer Fund							
Other							
Total	614,000	685,000					1,299,000

Debt Analysis			
FY13 Total	Borrowing Term (Years)	Average Annual Debt Service	Average Tax Rate Impact
614,000	30	36,072	0*

* No tax rate impact due to 2011 adjustment in sewer rates. If expressed as a tax rate impact, debt service would equate to .05.

Project Title Sewer Rehabilitation & Upgrades	Project Number: T4/MUNIS 743 / 72004	Initiating Department Public Works
Asset Category Wastewater Infrastructure	Asset Number	Priority Score 59
<p>Project Description Over half of the City’s sewers are greater than 50 years old and many are over 80 years old and require repair. Based on a useful life of 80 years, our financial consultant has calculated the required sewer rehabilitation capital needs for the next 20 years to address the sewers that have exceeded or will reach the end of their useful life.</p> <p>Most of the pipes needing rehabilitation can be lined using trenchless methods. Others will need replacement. The decision is made based on site investigation. This project is expected to be multi-year and is expected to be focused on the oldest pipes, such as those in the Eastport and Historic District areas. The majority of the pipes are either vitrified clay (terracotta) pipes, which notoriously have joint failures, or concrete pipes, which deteriorate due to the sewer gases. Pipe joint failures and other leaks due to deterioration typically cause excessive infiltration and increased pumping and treatment needs and costs. In addition, the environmental impact of pipe failure is of concern.</p>		
<p>Regulatory or Legal Mandates Sewage spills require reporting to MDE and often result in fines. Sewer system industry/professional standards related to materials, methods of construction, etc. change regularly. Likely most of the City’s sewer collection system would not meet current standards.</p>		
<p>Prior Funding FY11: \$1,200,000. FY12: \$1,050,000</p>		<p>Non-City sources of funding</p>
<p>FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: Design, Construction</p>		<p>Project Years Recurring</p> <p>Total Project Budget Annual range 2.3 to 2.7M</p>

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition							
Planning/Design Costs	270,000	275,000	285,000	300,000	310,000	315,000	1,755,000
Construction Costs	1,875,000	1,936,000	1,979,000	2,040,000	2,095,000	2,160,000	12,085,000
Construction Project Mgmt	90,000	94,000	96,000	100,000	105,000	105,000	590,000
IT Costs							
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment							
Legal Fees	35,000	35,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	50,000	240,000
Contingencies	50,000	50,000	60,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	310,000
Total	2,320,000	2,390,000	2,460,000	2,530,000	2,600,000	2,680,000	14,980,000

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds	2,320,000	2,390,000	2,460,000	2,530,000	2,600,000		12,300,000
Operating funds - Sewer Fund							
Capital Reserve - Sewer Fund						2,680,000	2,680,000
Total	2,320,000	2,390,000	2,460,000	2,530,000	2,600,000	2,680,000	14,980,000

Debt Analysis			
FY13-FY17 Total	Borrowing Term (Years)	Average Annual Debt Service	Average Tax Rate Impact
12,300,000	30	722,625	0*

* No tax rate impact due to 2011 adjustment in sewer rates. If expressed as a tax rate impact, debt service would equate to 1.09.

Project Title Hillman Garage	Project Number: T4/MUNIS 732 /	Initiating Department Central Services
Asset Category Off Street Parking Facility	Asset Number 50026	Priority Score Project not scored to date
Project Description Replacement of the deteriorating 435-space garage with a new facility, with state of the art controls, ADA compliant pedestrian access, elevators, and appearance more compatible with the surrounding community. Structural repairs completed in 2010 extended the life of this facility. Project planning & design is recommended to begin in 2015. (per Department of Central Services, 2009)		
Regulatory or Legal Mandates		Operational Necessity
Prior Funding Approximately \$700,000 spent in 2009 and 2010 on structural repairs.		Non-City sources of funding
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: No funds requested in FY13		Project Years FY15-FY17 anticipated
		Total Project Budget

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition							
Design Costs			300,000	765,190	1,530,360		2,595,550
Construction Costs					16,723,150		16,723,150
Construction Project Mgmt							0
IT Costs							
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment							
Legal Fees					334,460		334,460
Contingencies					2,200,000		2,200,000
Total	0	0	300,000	765,190	20,787,970	0	21,853,160

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds			300,000	765,190	20,787,970		21,853,160
Operating funds - O.S. Parking							
Other							
Total	0		300,000	765,190	20,787,970	0	21,853,160

Debt Analysis			
FY13-FY18 Total	Borrowing Term (Years)	Average Annual Debt Service	Average Tax Rate Impact
21,853,160	30	1,283,873	0*

*No tax rate impact: project is funded from Off Street Parking Fund. If expressed as a tax rate impact, debt service would equate to 1.95.

Project Title Bulkhead Replacement, Phase 2	Project Number TBD	Initiating Department Harbormaster
Asset Category Harbor and Maritime Infrastructure	Asset Number	Priority Score Project not scored to date
Project Description The existing bulkhead is showing signs of failure which are noticeable at low tides. This section of the bulkhead, referred to as Phase 2, extends ~700 feet from the Harbormaster building, wraps around Ego Alley in front of the market place and ends at the Chandler (former Fawcetts) property line. The scope of work will include, but not be limited to, steel bulkhead, drainage, and resurfacing of the parking around the Harbormaster office where a sinkhole keeps developing. Includes the installation of 14' wide walkways. This project is recommended for funding in FY14, to allow completion of the City Dock Plan (currently underway).		
Regulatory or Legal Mandates		Operational Necessity
Prior Funding Project cost for Phase 1, completed in 2008: 9M. With assistance from federal and State partners, City share of project cost: ~ 4M.		Non-City sources of funding Phase 2 may be able to leverage approx. half of total project cost via same federal and State partners that assisted with Phase 1.
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: No funds requested in FY13.		Project Years FY14-FY15 anticipated
		Total Project Budget

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition							
Design Costs		130,000					130,000
Construction Costs			6,000,000				6,000,000
Construction Project Mgmt							
IT Costs							
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment							
Legal Fees							
Contingencies							
Total	0	130,000	6,000,000	0	0	0	6,130,000

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds		130,000	3,000,000				3,130,000
Operating funds - Dock Fund							
Other			3,000,000				3,000,000
Total	0	130,000	6,000,000	0	0	0	6,130,000

Debt Analysis			
FY13-FY18 Total	Borrowing Term (Years)	Average Annual Debt Service	Average Tax Rate Impact
6,130,000	20	463,581	0*

* No tax rate impact: project is funded from Dock Fund. If expressed as a tax rate impact, debt service would equate to .70.

Project Title Harbormaster Building	Project Number TBD	Initiating Department Harbormaster with Central Services
Asset Category Harbor and Maritime Infrastructure/ City Facility	Asset Number 50137 (Johnson Building) 50593 (Welcome Center)	Priority Score Project not scored to date
Project Description The Visitor Information Booth, Maritime Welcome Center, and public restrooms at the Johnson Harbormaster Building serve more visitors every year than any other City building. The existing Harbormaster building is in need of repair and expansion, as well as updating to provide appropriate access compliant with the ADA. The current offices are cramped and noisy due to new data and homeland security systems in place, and there are no meeting facilities. The work will include enlarged public restrooms on the ground floor, a new roof, refinishing the interior office space and customer counter, sprinklers, enlarged boater shower facilities, a new visitors' center window, and IT enhancements. All work is intended to include new security and access controls to allow for higher security of the public restroom facilities. Project is recommended for funding in FY14, to allow completion of the City Dock Plan, currently underway, and coordination with the Facility Asset Management Program.		
Regulatory or Legal Mandates		Operational Necessity
Prior Funding		Non-City sources of funding State and federal funds (Waterways Improvement Fund and Boating Infrastructure grant program) may cover up to 65% of the components of the project providing boater facilities.
FY13 Budget commitment allows project stage: No funds requested in FY13.		Project Years FY14-FY15 anticipated
		Total Project Budget

Appropriation Schedule	Budget	5-Year Capital Plan					FY13 - FY18 Total
	Proposed FY13	Proposed FY14	Proposed FY15	Proposed FY16	Proposed FY17	Proposed FY18	
Land Acquisition							
Design Costs		130,000					130,000
Construction Costs			2,000,000				2,000,000
Construction Project Mgmt							0
IT Costs							
Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment							
Legal Fees							
Contingencies							
Total	0	130,000	2,000,000	0	0	0	2,130,000

Funding Schedule							
Bond funds		130,000	2,000,000				2,130,000
Operating funds - Dock Fund							
Other							
Total	0	130,000	2,000,000	0	0	0	2,130,000

Debt Analysis			
FY13-FY18 Total	Borrowing Term (Years)	Average Annual Debt Service	Average Tax Rate Impact
2,130,000	20	161,081	0*

* No tax rate impact: project is funded from Dock Fund. If expressed as a tax rate impact, debt service would equate to .24.

LONG-TERM CAPITAL PROGRAM

The projects listed in this section represent upcoming capital needs that are subject to more careful scope definition. They are included in this section to convey to City leaders and other interested parties the general parameters and breadth of those capital needs. These projects, generally identified via area plans or other planning activity, may be included in the CIP in future years, depending on priorities, funding availability, and other considerations. They are listed in no particular order.

Taylor Avenue (#462)

Planning for this project was begun in prior years, and it is recommended in the Comprehensive Plan. With the completion of Park Place, this project will improve safety along this arterial route. Included in the project are curb and gutter, sidewalks, and a traffic signal at the Police Station and Poplar Trail. Construction documents and right of way plats are prepared, and right of way acquisition may begin upon funding.

Barbud Lane (#476)

Planning for this project was begun in prior years. Reconstruction of the street from Forest Drive to Janwall Street will include storm drains, curb and gutter, sidewalks and road paving. Additional right-of-way width will be required to establish a uniform width to support the desired improvements. This street currently lacks curbs and sidewalks and has stormwater ponding at the roadway edges.

Chinquapin-Admiral Intersection Realignment

This project was studied and recommended in the Outer West Land Use Analysis report (2003), West Street Transit Study (2009), and Comprehensive Plan. The Chinquapin Round Road and Admiral Drive intersections with West Street are offset, which inhibits continuous cross town movements and contributes to local and system-wide traffic congestion. This project should move forward in concert with the Outer West Street Opportunity Area Sector Plan, recommended to guide the transformation of the Outer West Street corridor from an automobile oriented suburban commercial character to an urban character focused on residential development and commercial uses.

Outer West Street Gateway & Corridor (#457)

This project should proceed in coordination with the Chinquapin-Admiral Intersection Realignment project. Outer West Street, with its multiple and uncoordinated commercial driveways, poor pedestrian safety record, high vehicle collision rates, congestion, and inefficient carrying capacity, is obsolete in its current configuration. The route needs to be improved, deserving of its role as a major gateway street. Pedestrian amenities, bicycle lanes, and modern and efficient transit operations will be featured prominently on the new Outer West Street. This project is recommended in the Comprehensive Plan and West Street Transit Study (2009) and should move forward in concert with the Outer West Street Opportunity Area Sector Plan.

Multi-Modal Transportation Hub

A Multi-Modal Transportation Hub is recommended in the vicinity of the intersection of Old Solomons Island Road and West Street per the Comprehensive Plan and the West Street Transit Study (2009). The Hub should serve as the primary terminal for regional and local transit, taxis, and airport shuttles. In addition to serving as the Hub for public transit, it should provide intercept parking for vehicles, a bicycle rental facility, and be connected to the developing bicycle network. A partnership of public agencies and the private sector is recommended to implement this project.

Fleet and Cornhill Street Reconstruction (#454)

Planning for this project was begun in prior years, and it is part of the City's commitment to underground utilities in the Historic District. The project is proposed for the Design stage and value engineering. Original project scope included total reconstruction of water, sewer, and storm drains, undergrounding of overhead wires, installation of granite curbs, brick sidewalk replacement, new roadway surface, and street lights. The original scope included street lights and brick sidewalk along Market Place. These streets are among the major streets in the vista of Maryland's State Capital Building.

Maryland Avenue Improvements (#472)

This project is part of the City's commitment to underground utilities in the Historic District. The project will replace existing water, sewer, gas and storm drains, and construct new brick roadway and sidewalks with granite curbs. This project should not proceed without funds from the State of Maryland.

Sixth Street Improvements (#471)

This project is an outcome of the Eastport Streetscape Plan (2005). The project would replace underground infrastructure, place overhead utilities underground, and create a sense of arrival to Eastport with paving, widened sidewalks, and other streetscape treatments.

Smithville and Russell Street Improvements (#455)

This project is recommended in the Bates Neighborhood Community Legacy Plan (2005). The project improves the roads and sidewalks on Smithville and Russell streets, and supports the Wiley Bates Heritage Complex, specifically the Senior Center, Boys & Girls Club, and residences.

West Annapolis Improvements

This project should proceed with the West Annapolis Sector Study as recommended in the Comprehensive Plan. The project will implement features important to the area's future character and identity, circulation, and economic viability. This could include measures to enhance pedestrian and bicycle safety, a parking strategy, signage, road alignment, access management, urban design amenities, and connections to the bicycle network.

Flood Control Infrastructure (#728)

The study, "Flood Mitigation Strategies for the City of Annapolis: City Dock and Eastport Area" will be completed during 2011. The goals of the study include the identification of structural options for protecting property in flood threatened areas and estimating design and construction costs associated with the structural protection measures. This study will be the basis for future capital projects.

CONSISTENCY OF CAPITAL PROJECTS WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Beginning this year, capital projects were scored on nine evaluation criteria, as described in the *Capital Planning and Budget Policy*. One evaluation criteria is consistency of the project with the Comprehensive Plan. An assessment of the degree to which the project furthers any of Comprehensive Plan's strategic goals, as adopted in the Comprehensive Plan, was provided by the department proposing the project and reviewed by the Capital Working Committee. Projects may be consistent with more than one Strategic Goal, but can receive no more than the 6-point maximum.

<i>Comprehensive Plan Strategic Goal</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>Score (of 6 points possible)</i>
Economic Development: Improve the city's property tax base by investing in projects that will spur new private investment to redevelop vacant and/or underutilized properties.	City Dock Development	6
Buildings/Facilities: Shrink the City's carbon footprint and become a community of green buildings to combat climate change.	City Hall Restoration	5
Roads: Specific and targeted improvements to the local street system should be made with priority to those that improve cross-town circulation, route continuity for public transit, and intersection capacities.	General Roadways City Dock Development	2 6
Roads: Street improvements should be made to support the implementation of the Opportunity Areas.		
Roads: The City will invest in system-wide improvements to convert main streets and avenues into "complete streets" - that is, streets which serve the full needs of the community.		
Recreation/Parks: Enhance existing parks and facilities with the objective of supporting structured and informal recreation, protecting the natural environment, and encouraging human health and fitness.	Truxtun Park Pool	5
Recreation/Parks: Expansion of the parks system should be undertaken selectively and strategically, with the objective of taking advantage of rare opportunities, providing parks and recreation services to underserved areas, allowing public access to the waterfront, and furthering environmental goals.	Kingsport Park	4
Trails: Complete the network of pedestrian and bicycle pathways.	Trail Connections	5

<p>Transportation: Pursue the creation of a regional transit system serving the needs of Annapolis commuters, residents, and visitors.</p>		
<p>Buildings/Facilities and Roads: Protect and enhance Annapolis' rich cultural history and wealth of historic resources.</p>	<p>City Hall Restoration City Dock Development</p>	<p>5 6</p>
<p>Stormwater: Reduce the polluting effects of stormwater runoff into the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries.</p>	<p>City Dock Development Landfill</p>	<p>6 4</p>
<p>Water: Protect and conserve the existing water supply and distribution systems by modernizing the existing treatment, storage and distribution system.</p>	<p>Water Treatment Plant Water Distribution System SCADA/ Radio Upgrade</p>	<p>6 6 6</p>
<p>Sewer: Enhance the Wastewater collection and treatment systems by modernizing the existing collection system</p>	<p>Sewer Pump Station Rehab Sewer Rehab & Upgrades SCADA/ Radio Upgrade</p>	<p>6 6 6</p>

Appendix

**CITY OF ANNAPOLIS
CAPITAL PLANNING AND BUDGET POLICY**

Sections:

Overview

Threshold Definition

Organization & Process

Capital Programming Committee

Capital Working Committee

Annual Submission & Assessment Components

Evaluation Process

Evaluation Criteria

Presentation & Project Categories

Annual Reporting

Annual Inventory

Role of Comprehensive Plan/Master Plans in Capital Improvement Planning

OVERVIEW

Capital infrastructure is the cornerstone to providing core City services. The procurement, construction, and maintenance of capital assets are critical activities performed by the municipality. Capital assets are comprised of facilities, infrastructure, and the equipment and networks that enable, or improve the delivery of public sector services. Examples of capital assets include, but are not limited to: streets and public rights-of-way, supporting road infrastructure such as sidewalks and lighting; storm water and drainage systems; water and sewer systems; public buildings; recreation and community centers; public safety facilities; certain types of rolling stock/vehicles; and computer technology, information systems and technology infrastructure.

The City meets its current and long-term needs with a sound long-term capital plan that clearly identifies capital and major equipment needs, maintenance requirements, funding options, and operating budget impacts. A properly prepared capital plan is essential to the future financial viability of the City. Recognizing that budgetary pressures make capital program investments difficult, it is imperative that the City's annual budget and capital improvement plan ensures the continuing investment necessary to avoid functional obsolescence and preclude the negative impact of deferring capital investments.

When considering funding solutions for its capital program, the City considers all forms of public financing and not only general obligation bonds or general fund revenues. By minimizing the burden on general revenues and the reliance on general fund debt, the City will be able to maximize the city's future fiscal flexibility. Other funding sources include, but are

City of Annapolis - Capital Planning and Budget Policy

not limited to; general fund receipts, debt proceeds, grant funds, special revenue fund revenues and transfers from other available funds including fund balance and/or retained earnings. Additionally, one time revenues should be restricted to one time uses. One time revenue sources should not be used to augment operating budgets; rather, one time revenues should be used to fund one-time capital projects and expenditures, or to increase fund balance. Other capital planning objectives include:

- compliance with arbitrage regulations, bond covenants, and/or bond referenda requirements related to long-term debt;
- compliance with state and local laws, including debt capacity limits, public bidding and reporting requirements;
- ensuring a relationship between capital projects and the City's planning processes;
- the alignment of external and internal stakeholder information needs, such as project engineers, contractors, finance staff, executive management, elected officials, and constituents;
- meeting the business needs of key participants, including timing, cost activity, and project scope;
- reporting of project performance measures based on legal and fiduciary requirements and stakeholder needs; and
- compliance with the City's contracting procedures and requirements.

Finally, the quality and continued utilization of existing and new capital assets are essential to the health, safety, economic development and quality of life for the citizens of Annapolis. A vibrant local economy is integral to the community's vitality and the financial health of surrounding regional jurisdictions. Regional economic development may require the financial participation of the City. For these reasons, capital planning is not only an important component of fiscal planning, it is equally important to the vitality of the local economy.

The City shall adopt an annual long-term Capital Improvement Program as part of the annual capital budget. Furthermore, depending upon changes in project scope, funding requirements, or other issues and modifications, it may be necessary to amend the long-term capital plan annually to update the City's long-term capital plan to reflect these changes. The City will annually reconsider the impacts these may have on the long-term capital improvement plan and the City's pro-forma budgets and re-prioritize projects as necessary.

THRESHOLD DEFINITION

The City shall define a capital asset as an asset meeting the following criteria.

- The asset shall have a gross purchase price equaling \$50,000 or more.
- The asset shall have a useful life equaling 5 years or more.

ORGANIZATION AND PROCESS

Capital Programming Committee:

The City shall establish a Capital Programming Committee (CPC). In addition to insuring overall compliance with the City's Capital Policy, the core responsibility of the CPC is to

City of Annapolis - Capital Planning and Budget Policy

objectively evaluate departmental requests, and to submit an annual capital budget and an updated twenty-year capital plan to the Mayor and City Council. These submissions shall be based upon the Capital Working Committee's (CWC) recommendations. ~~Prior to submitting the annual capital budget and the twenty year capital plan, the CPC shall hold a public hearing for the purpose of receiving public input.~~

The Capital Programming Committee shall consist of seven members and be comprised of the following people; the Chairman of the Finance Committee, the Chairman of the Financial Advisory Committee, the Chairman of the Planning Commission and/or a member at large, the City Manager, the City's Director of Planning and Zoning, the City's Public Works Director, and the City's Finance Director.

Capital Working Committee

The Capital Working Committee (CWC) shall be comprised of the City's department directors and any additional members the City Manager shall appoint at his discretion. The Chairman of the Working Committee shall be appointed by the City Manager. The Working Committee shall be charged with annually compiling departmental requests and assuring supplemental information is current and timely, such as vehicle replacement and inventory schedules. Additionally, the CWC may assist the CPC with updating the City's long-term Capital Improvement Plan. The long-term capital plan will be revised based on departmental requests and current City priorities as outlined in the Mayor's Budget.

Annual Submission and Assessment Components

When submitting capital projects for consideration, managers shall provide the information outlined below for each project. This information will be sufficiently documented in the early stages of the planning and development stage since the quality of the documentation may significantly impact the deliberative decision making process. It is the responsibility of the Working Committee to assure that required documentation accompanies each capital request that is forwarded to the CPC. If this information is not complete or if it is otherwise lacking, funding decisions may be deferred.

- **Project Scope;** a complete description of the project's scope.
- **Useful Life;** the capital asset's anticipated useful life and the project's maximum bonding period.
- **Residual Value;** the expected value of the asset at the end of its useful life.
- **Financial Components**
 - **Total project cost:** The asset's total project and/or acquisition cost based on timely and accurate source documentation. This estimate shall include all cost components, including but not limited to; land acquisition, design, construction, project management, technology and communication costs, long-term and/or temporary financing debt service costs, furniture/fixtures/equipment, moving, legal fees and project contingencies.
 - **Funding plan:** recommended funding sources, including; grants, loans, operating funds, general revenues, debt, an allocated source or earmarked revenue streams, and transfers from other available funds.

City of Annapolis - Capital Planning and Budget Policy

- Grant Funding: the amount of funding to be provided by grant funds from outside agencies. This should also address:
 - status of the grant application and key dates or timelines;
 - grant matching fund requirements;
 - the amount of grant funding compared to the project cost: both for the current project stage and for the entire project;
 - if/when associated operating grant offsets will cease.
- Budget impact analysis: an analysis of the capital asset's annual operating costs before and after construction/purchase. This should include; operating expenses, repair and maintenance budget, and insurance costs. These costs should be detailed for the duration of the asset's useful life and adjusted for anticipated inflation for the asset's useful life.
- Implication of deferring the project (opportunity costs): costs associated with deferring the project, such as inflationary construction costs or additional annual operating and maintenance costs for each year the project is not funded.
- Preparation of analytical modeling, including;
 - Net present value
 - Payback period
 - Cost-benefit analysis
 - Life cycle costing
 - Cash flow modeling
 - Cost Benefit analysis
- ***Health, safety and welfare***; an assessment of the degree to which the project improves public health, safety, and welfare.
- ***Regulatory or legal mandates***; legal mandates associated the project - compliance with court orders, consent orders or other legal mandates; compliance with federal/state/local safety requirements or mandates; requirements to meet industry best practices and/or professional standards; and/or addresses a deficiency in providing adequate levels of service as determined during the Adequate Public Facilities review process.
- ***Operational necessity***; improved productivity and/or efficiencies that are supported or enabled by the asset.
- ***Strategic Goals***; an assessment of the degree to which the project furthers the City's strategic goals as adopted in the Comprehensive Plan and listed in the section of this policy that addresses the role of the Comprehensive Plan.
- ***Community Demand***; an assessment of the degree to which the project meets a community need or responds to community demand. How need/demand was assessed, measured, or recorded will be noted.
- ***Implementation readiness***; an assessment of the time required for a project to begin. This should include an assessment of: project complexity; internal decisions/commitments that are required; review requirements by boards/commissions; agreements or approvals required by non-City entities; timing considerations with other capital projects (if applicable); the degree to which the project is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and/or other City-adopted plans; and level of public support. Whether a public information strategy is recommended will be noted.

City of Annapolis - Capital Planning and Budget Policy

- **Departmental Prioritization;** departments should provide a score for each of their capital requests based on the evaluation criteria in this policy. This score will be reviewed by the CWC during the annual CIP process.

Evaluation Process

It shall be the responsibility of the Capital Programming Committee to review the Working Committee’s recommendations and scores for each of the projects based on the criteria outlined below. The initiating department shall score the capital project, with full justification provided for the assigned scores. The Capital Working Committee will review the assigned scores for each submitted project, and will recommend changes in order to maintain consistent scoring across all projects. The scores will then be reviewed by the CPC. If the CPC does not agree with the assigned scores, it can either make changes or send the project back to the Working Committee for re-evaluation. When the CPC completes the review of project scoring, the resulting rank ordering will determine the prioritization of the projects.

Evaluation Criteria

Criteria are described more fully in the Assessment Components section.

<p>1. Health, Safety & Welfare An assessment of the degree to which the project improves health and safety factors associated with the infrastructure asset. For example, projects that result in the reduction of accidents, improved structural integrity, and mitigation of health hazards would score higher.</p>	25
<p>2. Regulatory or legal mandates An assessment of the degree to which the project is under a regulatory order or other legal mandate, or meets a federal, State or local safety requirement.. For example, projects that are required by consent decrees, court orders, and other legal mandates would score higher.</p>	25
<p>3. Operational Necessity An assessment of the degree to which the project supports operational efficiency and effective delivery of services. Guidelines: <i>Improves</i> operational functions and services: up to 10 points <i>Sustains</i> operational functions and services: up to 5 points</p>	10
<p>4. Implication of Deferring the Project (opportunity costs) An assessment of the consequences of delaying a project. For example, projects that would have significantly higher future costs, negative community aspects, or negative public perception, should they be deferred, would score higher.</p>	10
<p>5. Budget Impact An assessment of the project’s budget impact, ie. the degree to which it affects operations and maintenance costs positively or negatively. For example, a roof replacement project that reduces both maintenance requirements and energy consumption or a storm drain that reduces the need for periodic cleaning would score higher. On the other hand, a new facility that increases maintenance, energy and staffing costs would score lower.</p>	5
<p>6. Strategic Goals An assessment of the degree to which the project furthers the City’s strategic goals as adopted in the Comprehensive Plan. (These are listed in the section of this policy</p>	6

City of Annapolis - Capital Planning and Budget Policy

addressing the Comprehensive Plan.)	
7. Grant Funding Opportunity An assessment of the amount of funding in the project compared to the amount of funding provided by grant funds from outside agencies. This should include an assessment of the amount of funding needed to complete the current project phase and the entire project. For example, a project that would bring grant funds from an outside agency into the City would score higher, while a project that relies only on City funds would score lower.	7
8. Community Demand An assessment of the degree to which the project meets a community need or responds to community demand.	7
9. Implementation readiness An assessment of the time required for a project to begin.	5
Total points possible:	100

Presentation and Project Categories

Capital projects and the capital plan should be categorized using the asset classifications outlined below.

- Buildings/Facilities
- Information Technology Systems and Technology Infrastructure
- Roads, Sidewalks, and assets located in the public right of way
- Parks/Recreation Facilities/ Open Space
- Drainage/Stormwater
- Harbor and Maritime Infrastructure
- Off-Street Parking Facilities
- Water
- Wastewater
- Rolling Stock/Vehicles
- Transportation
- Landfill

In order to maintain project oversight during each development phase, to ensure accurate and timely data is being used in the deliberative evaluative process, and to ensure that projects are being compared and ranked at each step during the develop phases; projects shall be categorized into the following stages.

- The Planning Stage; includes development of a feasibility study, the scope and a construction budget including the financial criteria outlined above.
- The Design Stage; includes development of the environmental document, construction plans and specifications, and a cost estimate per above criteria.
- The Construction Stage; includes site preparation, utility and infrastructure placement, equipment installation, construction and environmental mitigation.

Additionally, annual capital budgets should be submitted for the following time periods.

City of Annapolis - Capital Planning and Budget Policy

- Years 1-5; separate submissions for each request by year, year 1 being the budget year being submitted.
- Year 6-10, 11-15 and 16-20; separate submissions for each request by year range.

Example
City of Annapolis
Capital Plan
Fiscal Year 20XX

Project Category / Stage / Project	Current Year	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Years 6-10	Years 11-15	Years 16-20	Total
<u>Building</u>									
<i>Planning Stage</i>	_____								
Subtotal	_____								
<i>Design Stage</i>	_____								
Subtotal	_____								
<i>Construction Stage</i>	_____								
Subtotal	_____								
Total	_____								
<u>Roads</u>									
<i>Planning Stage</i>	_____								
Subtotal	_____								
<i>Design Stage</i>	_____								
Subtotal	_____								
<i>Construction Stage</i>	_____								
Subtotal	_____								
Total	_____								
<u>Water</u>									
<i>Planning Stage</i>	_____								
Subtotal	_____								
<i>Design Stage</i>	_____								
Subtotal	_____								
<i>Construction Stage</i>	_____								
Subtotal	_____								
Total	_____								
Total Capital	_____								

ANNUAL REPORTING

The financial management and oversight of the City's capital assets reflect a substantial commitment of the City's resources. Given this materiality, capital projects represent a significant risk to the City if proper management and oversight functions are not in place. Consequently, one purpose of this policy is to implement procedures to support effective project monitoring and reporting, thereby mitigating such risks. Further, it is the intent of the policy to insure financial accountability, enhance operational effectiveness and promote transparency in the City's financial reporting. Finally, an objective of annual reporting is to facilitate compliance with auditing and financial reporting requirements, consistent with generally accepted accounting principles and jurisdictional reporting and grant requirements. .

Annual Inventory

It shall be the responsibility of the City's Finance Office to assure that departments are maintaining a complete inventory of the City's capital assets. This inventory shall be updated and reconciled to the City's Financial Records; e.g., general ledger/fixed asset module on a quarterly basis. To facilitate the process, database, project management and geographic information technologies should be employed. This inventory shall contain the following information.

- Purchase date
- Purchase price
- Asset number
- Description of the asset
- Asset location
- Department
- Accumulated Depreciation
- Useful Life
- Book Value
- Replacement Cost, if obtainable
- Annual operating and maintenance costs
- The physical condition

On an annual basis, by September 30st, the Department Director shall verify the inventory of assets under their respective department's responsibility, including the physical condition of all existing capital assets.

Since executive leadership, legislators, and citizens should have the ability to review the status and expected completion of approved capital projects, as part of the annual capital budget process, the Finance department shall report on non-completed capital projects funded in prior years. The reports shall compare actual expenditures to the original budget, identify level of completion of the project, enumerate any changes in the scope of the project, and alert management to any concerns with completion of the project on time or on schedule.

THE ROLE OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND MASTER PLANS IN CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLANNING

In its Comprehensive Plan, the City establishes long-range strategies focused on community development and sustainability. As a blueprint for the future, and in accordance with Article 66B of the Annotated Code of Maryland, this plan identifies economic, land use, and transportation policies, and includes policies guiding infrastructure, housing, sensitive environmental resources, and community facilities. Regular updates to this plan will ascertain development or infrastructure needs as local conditions change.

The City's Comprehensive Plan should be the foundation for the following.

- The development of physical plans for sub-areas of the jurisdiction.
- The study of subdivision regulations, zoning standards and maps.
- The location and design of thoroughfares and other major transportation facilities.
- The identification of areas in need of utility development or extensions.
- The acquisition and development of community facility sites.
- The acquisition and protection of open space.
- The identification of economic development areas.
- The incorporation of environmental conservation and green technologies.
- The evaluation of short-range plans (zoning requests, subdivision review, site plan analysis) and day-to-day decisions with regard to long-range jurisdictional benefit; and the alignment of local jurisdictional plans with regional plans.
- The development of a capital plan to facilitate the City's Comprehensive Plan.

The Comprehensive Plan also adopts Strategic Goals, which are referenced in the evaluation of capital projects, and these are incorporated into this policy. When the Comprehensive Plan is updated, the update shall formulate new strategic goals. The Strategic Goals per the 2009 Comprehensive Plan are as follows:

1. Economic Development: Improve the city's property tax base by investing in projects that will spur new private investment to redevelop vacant and/or underutilized properties.
2. Buildings/Facilities: Shrink the City's carbon footprint and become a community of green buildings to combat climate change.
3. Roads: Specific and targeted improvements to the local street system should be made with priority to those that improve cross-town circulation, route continuity for public transit, and intersection capacities.
4. Roads: Street improvements should be made to support the implementation of the Opportunity Areas.
5. Roads: The City will invest in system-wide improvements to convert main streets and avenues into "complete streets" - that is, streets which serve the full needs of the community.
6. Recreation/Parks: Enhance existing parks and facilities with the objective of supporting structured and informal recreation, protecting the natural environment, and encouraging human health and fitness.
7. Recreation/Parks: Expansion of the parks system should be undertaken selectively and strategically, with the objective of taking advantage of rare opportunities, providing parks and recreation services to underserved areas, allowing public access to the waterfront, and furthering environmental goals.
8. Trails: Complete the network of pedestrian and bicycle pathways.

City of Annapolis - Capital Planning and Budget Policy

9. Transportation: Pursue the creation of a regional transit system serving the needs of Annapolis commuters, residents, and visitors.
10. Buildings/Facilities and Roads: Protect and enhance Annapolis' rich cultural history and wealth of historic resources.
11. Stormwater: Reduce the polluting effects of stormwater runoff into the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries.
12. Water: Protect and conserve the existing water supply and distribution systems by modernizing the existing treatment, storage and distribution system.
13. Sewer: Enhance the Wastewater collection and treatment systems by modernizing the existing collection system

Functional Master Plans may be developed to inventory and assess particular types of physical infrastructure, identify deficiencies, and prioritize needed investments. Functional (topic) areas include, but are not limited to:

- City Facilities
- Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
- Transportation, including Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
- Water and Sewer Infrastructure
- Information Technology Systems and Technology Infrastructure

The City recognizes the role of the Comprehensive Plan and master plans as key components of the City's long-term Capital Improvement Plan. Therefore, the Comprehensive Plan should help identify capital projects and investments. Accordingly, the Comprehensive Plan should be supported by realistic planning documents, solid financial policies targeted for the implementation of stated goals, and trends on the City's accomplishments and progress toward these goals. Such plans forecast the outlook for the City, underscoring the alignment between demand generators, capital improvement programs, and funding policies.

Appendix B

Scoring of Capital Projects – Summary

This is the first year that the City is preparing its Capital Improvement Program (CIP) under the *Capital Planning and Budget Policy* approved by the City Council in June, 2011. Among other things, the policy requires that all projects be scored on nine criteria to receive up to 100 points. This is to provide a measure of objectivity and help determine the relative priority of projects and resulting funding commitments. The project scores will help rank projects within funding categories. For instance, projects funded via the General Fund are ranked relative to each other, projects funded via the Water Enterprise Fund are ranked relative to other water projects, etc. The evaluation criteria are listed on page 2.

This year, a total of thirteen capital projects were scored using the new criteria. Four are existing projects recommended for continued funding from the General Fund; four are new projects via the General Fund; and five are existing water and sewer projects.

For each project, the department submitting the project provided a score based on the evaluation criteria. Project scores were then reviewed by the Capital Working Committee (CWC) and the CWC recommended changes in order to maintain consistent scoring across all projects. The departmental and CWC scores are presented on pages 3 – 5.

The project scores were then submitted to the Capital Programming Committee (CPC) for review. Per the policy, if the CPC does not agree with the assigned scores, it can either make changes or send the project back to the CWC for re-evaluation. When the CPC completes the review of project scoring, the resulting rank ordering helps determine the prioritization of projects. The ranking of projects should help determine funding recommendations for the FY13-FY18 CIP.

Evaluation Criteria

<p>1. Health, Safety & Welfare An assessment of the degree to which the project improves health and safety factors associated with the infrastructure asset. For example, projects that result in the reduction of accidents, improved structural integrity, and mitigation of health hazards would score higher.</p>	25
<p>2. Regulatory or legal mandates An assessment of the degree to which the project is under a regulatory order or other legal mandate, or meets a federal, State or local safety requirement. For example, projects that are required by consent decrees, court orders, and other legal mandates would score higher.</p>	25
<p>3. Operational Necessity An assessment of the degree to which the project supports operational efficiency and effective delivery of services. Guidelines: <i>Improves</i> operational functions and services: up to 10 points <i>Sustains</i> operational functions and services: up to 5 points</p>	10
<p>4. Implication of Deferring the Project (opportunity costs) An assessment of the costs associated with deferring the project, such as inflationary construction costs or additional annual operating and maintenance costs for each year the project is not funded. For example, projects that would have significantly higher future costs, negative community aspects, or negative public perception, should they be deferred, would score higher.</p>	10
<p>5. Budget Impact An assessment of the project's budget impact, ie. the degree to which it affects operations and maintenance costs positively or negatively. For example, a roof replacement project that reduces both maintenance requirements and energy consumption or a storm drain that reduces the need for periodic cleaning would score higher. On the other hand, a new facility that increases maintenance, energy and staffing costs would score lower.</p>	5
<p>6. Strategic Goals An assessment of the degree to which the project furthers thirteen (13) City's strategic goals as adopted in the Comprehensive Plan and listed in the section of the policy addressing the Comprehensive Plan.</p>	6
<p>7. Grant Funding Opportunity An assessment of the amount of funding in the project compared to the amount of funding provided by grant funds from outside agencies. This should include an assessment of the amount of funding needed to complete the current project phase and the entire project. For example, a project that would bring grant funds from an outside agency into the City would score higher, while a project that relies only on City funds would score lower.</p>	7
<p>8. Community Demand An assessment of the degree to which the project meets a community need or responds to community demand. How need/demand was assessed, measured, or recorded will be noted.</p>	7
<p>9. Implementation readiness An assessment of the time required for a project to begin. This should include an assessment of: project complexity; internal decisions/commitments that are required; review requirements by boards/commissions; agreements or approvals required by non-City entities; timing considerations with other capital projects (if applicable); the degree to which the project is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan or other City-adopted plans; and level of public support. Whether a public information strategy is recommended will be noted.</p>	5
Total points possible:	100

General Fund – Existing Projects (scored at 11/9/11 CWC meeting)

		Roadways #477		Landfill #122		City Hall Restoration #544		City Dock Development #739	
Stage (in FY13)		Construction		Design/ Construction		Design/ Construction		Planning/ Design	
Evaluation Criteria	Total possible	Dept.	CWC	Dept.	CWC	Dept.	CWC	Dept.	CWC
Health Safety & Welfare	25	20	20	22	22	15	14	15	15
Regulatory or legal mandates	25	20	18	22	24	10	9	10	8
Operational Necessity	10	5	5	9	7	10	9	5	5
Implication of deferring (financial component #3)	10	7	7	9	9	10	10	0	0
Budget impact (financial component #2)	5	5	4	0	0	5	4	0	0
Strategic goals (Comp Plan)	6	2	2	4	4	5	5	6	6
Grant funding (financial component #1)	7	7	5	1	1	5	4	4	4
Community demand	7	7	7	5	3	5	4	7	6
Implementation readiness	5	5	5	5	5	2	3	5	4
	100	78	73	77	75	67	62	52	48

General Fund - New Projects (scored at 11/3/11 CWC meeting)

		Truxtun Park Pool		Trail Connections		Kingsport Park		AFD Paving	
Stage (in Year 1)		Planning		Design/Construct		Design/ Construction		Construction	
Evaluation Criteria	Total possible	Dept.	CWC	Dept.	CWC	Dept.	CWC	Dept.	Dept.
Health Safety & Welfare	25	20	17	20	14	20	13	20	18
Regulatory or legal mandates	25	22	19	0	0	0	0	12	12
Operational Necessity	10	8	8	5	5	7	6	5	8
Implication of deferring (financial component #3)	10	8	8	5	3	5	3	3	7
Budget impact (financial component #2)	5	4	3	4	3	4	3	0	1
Strategic goals (Comp Plan)	6	5	5	4	5	4	4	0	1
Grant funding (financial component #1)	7	4	2	5	5	6	6	0	0
Community demand	7	6	6	5	5	6	5	5	3
Implementation readiness	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	5
	100	82	72	52	44	56	44	50	55

Water Projects (Enterprise Fund) - scored at 10/20/11 CWC meeting

Evaluation Criteria	Total possible	Water Treatment Plant (#724)		Water Distribution System (#738)		SCADA Also shown with sewer projects	
		Dept.	CWC	Dept.	CWC	Dept.	CWC
Health Safety & Welfare	25	22	21	18	19	19	19
Regulatory or legal mandates	25	15	13	12	12	0	0
Operational Necessity	10	10	10	8	6	10	10
Implication of deferring (financial component #3)	10	10	10	3	3	3	3
Budget impact (financial component #2)	5	4	4	2	2	1	1
Strategic goals (Comp. Plan)	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Grant funding (financial component #1)	7	5	5	2	1	0	0
Community demand	7	2	2	2	2	1	1
Implementation readiness	5	3	3	4	4	5	5
	100	77	74	57	55	45	45

Sewer Projects (Enterprise Fund)

Evaluation Criteria	Total possible	Sewer Pump Station Rehab (#706)		Sewer Rehab Upgrades (#743)		SCADA Also shown with water projects	
		Dept.	CWC	Dept.	CWC	Dept.	CWC
Health Safety & Welfare	25	18	18	18	18	19	19
Regulatory or legal mandates	25	15	14	15	14	0	0
Operational Necessity	10	8	7	8	8	10	10
Implication of deferring (financial component #3)	10	4	4	5	5	3	3
Budget impact (financial component #2)	5	1	2	1	1	1	1
Strategic goals (Comp. Plan)	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Grant funding (financial component #1)	7	1	1	1	1	0	0
Community demand	7	1	2	1	2	1	1
Implementation readiness	5	4	5	4	4	5	5
	100	58	59	59	59	45	45

SCADA Project ranked at 10/20/11 CWC meeting. #706 and #743 ranked at 11/9/11 CWC meeting.

Summary of all scores:

	Dept Score	CWC Score
General Fund - Existing Projects		
City Hall	67	62
Roadways	78	73
City Dock	52	48
Landfill	77	75
General Fund - New Projects		
Truxtun Park Pool	82	72
AFD Paving	50	55
Trail Connections	52	44
Kingsport Park	56	44
Water Projects		
Water Treatment Plant	77	74
Water Distribution System	57	55
SCADA	45	45
Sewer Projects		
Sewer Pump Station Rehab	58	59
Sewer Rehab Upgrades	59	59