

UPTOWN PLANNERS: Uptown Community Planning Group Subcommittee on FY2014 CIP

CIP SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT – MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 22, 2012

Attendees: Christopher Ward, University Heights; Joe Naskar, Middletown/Five Points; Matt Winter, Hillcrest; Ernie Bonn, University Heights; Leo Wilson, Bankers Hill/Park West

Discussion: Group reviewed CPC Guidelines for CIP process and determined that:

- Heightened public outreach and effort to solicit feedback from all members of the public in the planning area, especially to those that do not normally attend monthly meetings of Uptown Planners, is a key City requirement to validate the public input component of the budget development process and needs to be demonstrated.
- Having a structured discussion to introduce the community to the CIP process is important to maintaining order in the larger Uptown Planners conversation. It needs to be facilitated to allow for an overview of projects eligible for CIP funding, full opportunity for public input on these projects or other projects brought forward by members of the public, and thorough consideration of projects so that the board would be able to make appropriate conclusion of projects to recommend to CPC.
- It is important to be strategic in submissions to the CPC. We should offer proposals that are significant to the community, are varied in their neighborhoods of direct benefit so that all areas of Uptown have a chance at funding, and focus on those that are limited in their source of funding. Rather than submit a “wish list” of dozens of projects where our most important projects get lost in the pile, we should limit our submissions to a specific number so that we are emphasizing to the City what our priority projects are relative to dozens of other potential projects identified which are also eligible for CIP funding.
- There was a need for a consolidated list of potential projects for consideration, so that no potential project would be overlooked during the public vetting process. The group reviewed the City’s recommended sources: most recent CIP list, most recent Uptown Public Facilities and Financing Plan (2003), and the City’s “needs list” (2010-2012) found on their website. All Uptown projects that have not been completed were identified and integrated into a master list, with significant projects as determined by the subcommittee listed first. Several known “wish

list” projects that may not already be on one of the city’s source lists were added to this master list. The master list is included as an appendix to this report.

- While at the Uptown Planners meeting on September 4 it was discussed that there could be a Special Meeting of the full board in October following our regularly scheduled Oct. 2 meeting, this may not be necessary if sufficient public participation and feedback are accomplished at that meeting. There would be another opportunity at the regularly scheduled Nov. 6 meeting for public input prior to Nov. 7 submission deadline.

Recommendations:

- At the regularly scheduled meeting of Uptown Planners on October 2, offer subcommittee report and background as a starting point for public conversation. Describe list of identified projects and encourage feedback on these or other projects. Take notes of levels of public interest on any one proposed project. For new projects, encourage description of project and satisfaction
- Ask UP Board members to reach out to other community groups and encourage attendance at Oct 2, Nov 6, or any other subcommittee meeting or special meeting.
- The CIP subcommittee would meet (open to the public and allowing further public input) in late October to evaluate the public feedback from Oct. 2, review the city’s factors of consideration of new projects, and formulate a proposed list of projects to bring to the board on Nov. 6th for approval (subject to additional modification by the full board).
- At least one priority project located in or primarily benefitting each of the five neighborhoods would be selected (Hillcrest, University Heights, Mission Hills, Bankers Hill/Park West, Middletown/Five Points) with up to three additional projects of community-wide significance would be chosen.

ATTACHMENT A: BACKGROUND ON CIP RECOMMENDATION PROCESS

FY2014 Capital Improvement Program Budget Development Process

An opportunity for those in the Uptown Community Planning Area to identify city projects in their neighborhood they want funded.

Background

In an unprecedented move the Mayor's Office is inviting the public to participate in development of the FY2014 (July 2013 - June 2014) Capital Improvement Program budget. Previously the public could not provide input until the draft budget was published on April 15. This year the public is encouraged to suggest projects (studies, design, construction) *before* city staff starts work in December.

Proposed Schedule

- Public process first proposed, Jul 2012
- Community Planners Committee frames the process, Aug 28
- Introduction of Process, Uptown Planners, September 4
- City Training Session, September 10 & 20
- Uptown Planners CIP Subcommittee Meeting, Sept 22
- **Uptown Planners Hearing, Oct 4** – receive input
- Uptown Planners CIP Subcommittee Meeting, TENATIVELY Oct 20
- **Uptown Planners Hearing, Nov 6** – adopt recommendations to CPC
- CPG input due to CPC, Nov 7

Sourcing

Communities are encouraged to make their recommendations from the following sources, listed in the order of preference.

1. Projects currently on the CIP list that haven't been funded or only partially funded and therefore are moving too slowly for the community. [[ADD LINK](#)]
2. Projects on Uptown's [Public Facilities Finance Plan](#).
3. Projects drawn from the "[needs lists](#)" as may be available from various city departments.
4. "New" projects that have not previously been considered by the city.

Challenges

While broad-based and inclusive public participation is the goal opportunities to fund new projects is tempered by the following realities:

- limited capital funds in the city's budget
- prior funding commitments to multi-year projects
- lack of operational funding for new/expanded facilities, and

- the short timeframe for public education and outreach. Nevertheless, this is an exciting opportunity to have a voice and build community consensus on our priorities. Work we do this year will be carried over to subsequent years and may be a basis to seek funding sources outside the city's general fund.

Reference Documents

- [A Citizen's Guide to the Capital Improvements Program](#)
- [Framing the Public Process](#)
- [City's Capital Improvement Program Webpage](#)
- *Additional documents will be posted as they become available.*

ATTACHMENT B: LIST OF KNOWN PROJECTS

GENERAL UPTOWN PRIORITIES (2003 PFFP)

- Parkland Area, including mini-parks
- Swimming / Recreation
- Joint Use Facilities
- Replacing Libraries

PARKS / FACILITIES

ON CURRENT CIP LIST

- Hillcrest Fire Station #5 (S00788) (ALSO IN UPTOWN 2003 PFFP)
- Pioneer Park Comfort Station (B12005) (MHTC letter)
- Mission Hills Branch Library (S00804) (ALSO LISTED ON WISH LIST BELOW)
- Alzheimer Family Center ADA Improvements (S10126)
- Olive Street Park – Acquisition & Development (S10051)
- West Maple Canyon Mini-Park (S00760)

KNOWN “NEW” PROJECTS

- Teachers Annex 1 / University Heights Library renovation, plus parkland
- Teachers Annex 2 / University Heights Recreation Center
- Mission Hills-Hillcrest Library and Joint Use Civic Center (MHTC)
- Community Gardens – dedication and irrigation
- Park under Vermont Street Bridge (a.k.a. “Mystic Park”) / realignment of SR 163 on-ramps, Washington Street, improvements to pedestrian and bicycle lanes.

ON CITY’S “NEEDS LIST”

- Birney Elem Joint Use area: electronic marquee, backstop and fencing for dugouts, ballfield lighting, picnic benches, entrance to future annex of recreation facility
- Old Trolley Barn Park: repair erosion & plant landscaping under bridge. Permanent stage for concerts & other special events.
- University Heights Library renovations (would not need if new library / Teachers Annex 1 renovation moved forward).

TRANSPORTATION

KNOWN “NEW” PROJECTS

- Washington Street Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements (MHTC).
- Extend Washington Street improvements from 3rd to Normal.
- Traffic calming measures on Washington: 5th to Richmond
- 6th & Nutmeg Traffic Signal
- Train “Quiet Zone” extension: Sassafras to Old Town

ON CURRENT CIP LIST

- Bicycle Loop Detectors (S11058) - \$83k. in design
- Five Points Neighborhood Pedestrian Improvements (S00988) - \$316k. in design.
- Park @ Cypress. Popouts and lighted crosswalk (B00994) - \$318k. in design.

ON CITY’S “NEEDS LIST”

- Robinson & Landis – Bike route class III
- Normal St / Washington Street – University to El Cajon – Class II lanes and III routes.
- Richmond btw Myrtle & Pennsylvania – new guardrail
- Washington btw University westbound & India – extend guardrail
- University btw Albatross & Front – new guardrail
- Washington from 5th to Richmond – widen to 6-lane major street
- University from Normal to Florida – widen to 60 ft with Georgia St bridge project
- Washington from San Diego to India – widen to 6-lanes
- Richmond from Myrtle to Pennsylvania – widen for curb, gutter, sidewalk & retaining wall
- 4th & Date – new traffic signal
- 10th & Robinson – new traffic signal
- San Diego Ave from Wright-Noell: new curb, gutter, sidewalk
- 6th Ave btw University and Washington St overpass (to 163) – raised median, remove orange pylons

ATTACHMENT C: FACTORS OF CONSIDERATION BY CITY FOR NEW PROJECTS

Factor 1 - Risk to Health, Safety & Environment (25 points)

- Risk to Public Safety (High= 12; Medium= 8; Low= 4; N/A=0)
- Risk to Public Health (High= 8; Medium= 5; Low= 3; N/A=0)
- Risk to Environment (High= 5; Medium= 3; Low= 2; N/A=0)

Factor 2 - Asset Condition & Level of Service (20 points)

- Poor Condition of Existing Asset (High= 12; Medium= 8; Low= 4; N/A=0)
- Level of Service is Low (High= 8; Medium= 5; Low= 3; N/A=0)

Factor 3 - Regulatory or Mandated Requirements (20 points)

- The project itself is under a legal requirement (High= ; Medium= ; Low= ; N/A=0)
- The project satisfies a program mandate (High= ; Medium= ; Low= ; N/A=0)

Factor 4 - Community Investment & Sustainability (15 points)

- Benefit to Environment (High= 5; Medium= 3; Low= 2; N/A=0)
- CDBG Eligible (High= 4; Medium= 3; Low= 1; N/A=0)
- Project Benefit to Low & Moderate Income (High= ; Medium= ; Low= ; N/A=0)
- Proximity to Low Income Housing (High= 3; Medium= 2; Low= 1; N/A=0)
where, High is within x miles from low income housing, Medium w/in y miles, low = w/in z miles or more

Factor 5 - Funding, Annual Recurring Costs & Asset Longevity (10 points)

- Increases the overall asset useful life (High= 4; Medium= 2; Low= 1; N/A=0)
- Reduces the asset's annual recurring operations and maintenance costs (High= 3; Medium= 2; Low= 1; N/A=0)
- Potential for use of available grant funding (High= 3; Medium= 2; Low= 1; N/A=0)

Factor 6 - Project Readiness (5 points)

- Ease of implementing the project (no obstructions, city owned, ...) (High= 5; Medium= 2; Low= 1)

Factor 7 - Multiple Category Benefits & Bundling Opportunities (5 points)

- Project provides more than one benefit (e.g. cars & pedestrians) (High= 3; Medium= 2; Low= 1; N/A=0)
- Potential for combining w/ existing project? (High= 2; Medium= 1; Low= 0; N/A=0)

ATTACHMENT D: CITY'S PROJECT SUBMISSION FORM

(attached as a PDF) or as weblink here: [Reporting Template](#)