Citywide Funding Prioritization Criteria

The prioritization process used for the 2011-2017 CIP update is intended to directly link capital investments to the seven Outcome areas established by the City Council and those elements identified in the City's Comprehensive Plan and supporting documents. The following outlines the criteria likely to be used by the CIP Panel to evaluate all non-utility CIP projects submitted for funding consideration.

Effectiveness at achieving City Mission/Community Outcomes

- Effectiveness/extent to which project achieves Outcome
- Tangibility/clarity of project results
- Multiple benefits

Mandates

- Legal
- Appropriate level of investment needed to meet mandate

Financial Factors

- Leveraging other funds—extent to which project is funded by external sources
- Cost v. benefit--"bang for the buck"
- Sunk costs—extent to which project expenditures have already been incurred
- Avoided costs—extent to which project creates savings/decreases future costs/reduces risks
- Stewardship—extent to which project protects and leverages existing investments

Timing/Urgency

- Project readiness—extent to which project can proceed within CIP period
- Need to move forward during this 7-year CIP period
- Critical linkage to other high priority projects

Scaling

- LOS
- Right element of project at this time (e.g. full build, partial build, design only)

Funds contractually committed, such as debt service obligations are funded first. There are a number of criteria that are not used by the CIP Panel in its evaluation, but are criteria that are generally considered by each Program area in its evaluation and prioritization process. The following are examples:

- Program area distribution
- "Policy Mandates"
- Community Support
- Geographic Distribution
- Outcome Distribution