

APPENDIX B

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

BASTROP COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE (2016 - 2036)

A stylized graphic at the bottom of the page features three trees with rounded, leafy canopies and thin trunks, standing on a small, rounded island. Below the island are several wavy, horizontal lines representing water. The entire graphic is rendered in a light, semi-transparent teal color that blends with the background.



APPENDIX B

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM TEMPLATE

A capital improvements program (CIP) is a multi-year plan that identifies and prioritizes projects related to public facilities and services. Developed in accordance with documented community goals and objectives, the CIP is focused on physical enhancements that upgrade, extend, or replace infrastructure, and provide a governing authority with increased service capacity for its constituents. Capital improvement projects may include: streets; water, waste water, and drainage utilities; open space, trails, and recreation facilities; public buildings; major equipment; and, technology investments.

Prior to the development of the Bastrop Comprehensive Plan (2016-2036), the City of Bastrop's capital improvement planning process did not utilize uniform criteria or ranking methodologies to prioritize municipal facility or infrastructure needs. Although previous City budgets have included "capital improvements," these project lists were compiled by individual municipal departments and were not subject to a centralized process. A more uniform approach to capital improvement programming was viewed by the City as necessary to ensure that Bastrop's future capital expenditures would correspond to the goals and objectives of the City's new comprehensive plan (adopted in November, 2016). With an intention of matching future capital needs with community goals and objectives, Bastrop city staff conducted a capital improvements programming process concurrent to the development of the Bastrop Comprehensive Plan.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

This document provides the City of Bastrop with a template to engage in future capital improvements programming. Utilizing the framework documented in this report, Bastrop has the tools to incorporate coordinated capital programming into the City's annual budgeting process. This template summarizes how the City may identify capital projects, conduct ranking exercises, establish project costs, identify anticipated funding sources, and annually evaluate the program.

The Bastrop Capital Improvements Program Template is divided into two (2) principal parts:

- **A. Template Development Process.** *Describes the staff-level process by which a preliminary CIP list was compiled, and the corresponding project prioritization methodology. Includes details on ranking criteria, and a fiscally unconstrained project list.*
- **B. Utilizing the Bastrop Capital Improvements Program Process.** *Provides recommendations on how the capital improvements program template can be incorporated into Bastrop's annual funding cycle. Provides suggestions on the public input process, scheduling, and funding options.*

Many of the capital improvement program elements described/displayed in this template (i.e. scoring methodologies, project lists, project sheets) have been provided to the City of Bastrop in digital format for use in future fiscal years.

A. TEMPLATE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The Bastrop Capital Improvements Program template was developed by a staff-level committee of City department heads. Principal participants included the Director of Planning and Development, Director of Public Works, Finance Director, and City Engineer. Other department heads were directly or indirectly involved in the CIP planning process including the Public Safety Director, Main Street Director, and Director of Bastrop Power and Light. All municipal activities were coordinated by the Director of Planning and Development. Template development was overseen by a consultant team led by Halff Associates.

Between July and November 2016 the City/consultant capital improvements program team coordinated on the following tasks:

- *Development of capital improvements program parameters;*
- *Compilation of capital improvements project lists;*
- *Establishment of capital project ranking criteria;*
- *Development of ranking criteria weights and scores;*
- *Preparation of the capital project nomination forms; and,*
- *Ranking of capital improvement projects.*

The completion of these activities provides the basic tools for the City of Bastrop to implement a formal capital improvements programming process in upcoming fiscal years. The results of this preliminary process, and corresponding tools are referenced in this report.

A.1. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM PARAMETERS

Table 1 identifies basic parameters which guided the development of the Bastrop Capital Improvements Program Template, and which should apply to the City's future CIP planning processes.

TABLE 1. BASTROP CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM PARAMETERS

TOPIC	CONSIDERATIONS ¹	DETERMINATIONS ²
CATEGORIES	How will CIP project lists be organized? Bastrop's current CIP project categories include: Roadway, Wastewater, Water, Parks and Recreation, and Facilities. Examples of other categories may include: Drainage, Electric, Equipment, Miscellaneous, Mobility, Public Safety.	Project categories: Facilities, Quality of Life, Utilities, Transportation
COST	What will be the minimum estimated cost of a capital project?	\$100,000
GROUPING	Will similar project types be grouped into a single CIP project? If so, will there be a geographic relationship between grouped projects?	Yes to grouping projects by type. Deferred maintenance must be grouped.
PROGRAMMATIC	Will the Bastrop CIP include projects for recurring operations and maintenance activities?	Yes. Deferred maintenance projects will be placed in the CIP. Grouped based on timing, and to meet minimum dollar amount.
STUDIES	Will the Bastrop CIP be limited to physical infrastructure improvements? Will studies/plans that inform project design and construction be considered in the CIP?	Studies will not be part of the CIP ranking process, but included in the document. Minimum value varies.

¹ Provides options for the structure of the capital improvements program.

² Preferred capital improvements program structure as determined by participating City department heads.

A.2. PROJECT SELECTION

The initial capital improvement project list was compiled by the consultant team through a review of prior capital improvements plans, City project lists, and adopted planning documents. This list was subsequently reviewed and adjusted by participating City staff. Additional projects were submitted by City staff utilizing a project nomination form prepared by the City/consultant team. The Capital Improvements Program form is located on the facing page. Project nomination form instructions are listed in **Table 2**.

TABLE 2. BASTROP CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM - PROJECT FORM INSTRUCTIONS¹

CATEGORY ¹	INSTRUCTION
PROJECT CATEGORY	Choose from the following categories: Facilities, Quality of Life, Transportation, Utilities.
SUB-CATEGORY	List specific infrastructure, facility, or utility type (ex. roads, waste water, buildings, etc.)
RECOMMENDED BY:	Examples include: City Council, City staff. Other categories to be determined.
RESPONSIBLE DEPT.:	City department that will administer the project and/or directly benefit from project completion.
JUSTIFICATION:	Statement of need. Should reference applicable recommendation from the Bastrop Comprehensive Plan or other policy document(s).
QUALIFIERS:	Four questions relate directly to the "Operational" criteria for ranking proposed capital projects.
NOTES:	Clarify any "Yes" answers to the Qualifiers questions. Additional miscellaneous information.
ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:	Estimated costs to be divided by fiscal year. All remaining costs beyond FY 20/21 to be lumped into single column (">YR 20/21").
COST NOTES:	Description of estimated project cost categories.
FUNDING SOURCE NOTES:	Description of funding sources to be used including grants and outside funding sources. Outside funding source will influence "Operational" ranking criteria.
FUNDING SURPLUS/ DEFICIT:	Project does not have to be 100% funded to be nominated to the CIP project list.

¹ Project form on facing page.

A.3. CAPITAL PROJECT RANKING CRITERIA

Ten capital project ranking criteria were developed for prioritizing submitted capital projects. Ranking criteria were divided into two (2) categories: Community and Organizational. Capital project ranking criteria are listed in **Table 3** (page B-6).

Table 3 includes corresponding criteria descriptions. In general terms, Community criteria may be viewed as value-based. They are largely qualitative in nature and are designed to reflect community values that were identified throughout the 2016 Bastrop comprehensive planning process. In contrast, Organizational criteria are more directly tied to the administrative realities of budgets, project leveraging, and regulatory mandates. Although all ranking criteria were initially scored and weighted together, future CIP weighting exercises should take care that the cumulative values of Community criteria and Organizational criteria remains balanced.

BASTROP CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM - PROJECT FORM

CITY OF BASTROP, TEXAS
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM



PROJECT TITLE (ID No.)	
Project Category: <i>Text</i>	Sub-category: <i>Text</i>
Recommended by: <i>Text</i>	Responsible Dept.: <i>Text</i>
Project Description/Location: <i>Text</i>	

<p>Justification: <i>Text</i></p> <hr/> <p>Qualifiers:</p> <table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="font-size: small;">Can be funded fully/partially through non-municipal sources?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="font-size: small;">Necessary to meet a regulatory mandate?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="font-size: small;">Requires completion of another project?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="font-size: small;">Will additional resources/staff be required to operate/maintain the completed project?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> </tr> </table> <p>Notes: <i>Text</i></p>	Can be funded fully/partially through non-municipal sources?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	Necessary to meet a regulatory mandate?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	Requires completion of another project?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	Will additional resources/staff be required to operate/maintain the completed project?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<p>Hold for Map or Picture</p>
Can be funded fully/partially through non-municipal sources?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No											
Necessary to meet a regulatory mandate?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No											
Requires completion of another project?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No											
Will additional resources/staff be required to operate/maintain the completed project?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No											

Estimated Project Cost(s)	YR 16/17	YR 17/18	YR 18/19	YR 19/20	YR 20/21	> YR 20/21	TOTAL
Acquisitions (ROW/Easements/Land)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Design	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction (+10%)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Project Cost	\$0						

Cost Notes: *Text*

Funding Source(s)	YR 16/17	YR 17/18	YR 18/19	YR 19/20	YR 20/21	> YR 20/21	TOTAL
Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Revenue Bonds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
CO Bonds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
GO Bonds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Fund Balance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Interest	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other Source(s)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Project Funding	\$0						

Funding Source Notes: *Text*

Funding Surplus/(Deficit)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

TABLE 3. CAPITAL PROJECT RANKING CRITERIA¹

CATEGORY (COMMUNITY)	DESCRIPTION	CONSIDERATIONS
PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY	The project will directly or indirectly improve public health and safety - either by reducing a known/existing health of safety hazard, or mitigating a potential hazard that may negatively impact the general public if not addressed.	"1. Does the project directly impact the public health and safety of Bastrop residents? To what degree? 2. Does the project indirectly enhance community-wide health or safety? 3. Does the project pro-actively mitigate a hazardous condition? Will it promote community resiliency in the event of a disaster?"
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	The project will increase the marketability and/or development potential of one or more properties. The project may support one or more economic development goals and objectives referenced in the comprehensive plan, redevelopment plan, or other relevant City-adopted planning document.	"1. Does the project have the potential to promote economic development in a new area of town? 2. Does the project implement plans or policy documents adopted or endorsed by the City of Bastrop?"
LAND DEVELOPMENT AND GROWTH	The project is consistent with and will promote the recommended development patterns contained in the Bastrop Comprehensive Plan – particularly the recommendations contained in the Bastrop Growth Program and Bastrop Future Land Use Plan.	"1. Does the project support the development of land uses that are recommended in one (1) or more City plans? 2. Does the project channel development activities to areas recommended by the Bastrop Growth Program?"
COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT	The project improves the living standards in existing residential neighborhoods, or reinvestment potential within established commercial areas – particularly those areas that exhibit conditions of blight. The project's impact is associated with a tax increment reinvestment zone, neighborhood improvement district, or other public reinvestment tool.	"1. Does the project create reinvestment in a previously developed portion of Bastrop? 2. Does the project support other public reinvestment activities within the vicinity. 3. Does a traditionally under-served area or population benefit from the project?"
QUALITY OF LIFE	The project will improve Bastrop residents' quality of life by enhancing community aesthetics, promoting local heritage, preserving historic resources, providing recreational opportunities, promoting healthy lifestyles, and/or conserving natural resources.	"1. Does the project improve community aesthetics or otherwise assist in development/maintaining a preferred community image? 2. Does the project enable or support the preservation of a cultural, historical, or natural resources? 3. Does the project provide greater citizen access to recreational opportunities that support healthy lifestyles?"
CATEGORY (ORGANIZATIONAL)	DESCRIPTION	CONSIDERATIONS
IMPACT ON OPERATIONAL BUDGET	The project will add to the City's annual maintenance and operations costs. The project will require new personnel to operate and/or new equipment or other expenditures to maintain. Conversely, the project will reduce long-term municipal operational costs through savings in staff time, energy efficiency, etc. The project may have the opportunity to generate revenue.	"1. Does the project require additional personnel to operate? 2. Does the project create a significant increase in Bastrop's annual maintenance budget? 3. Will new equipment be required to support the long-term operation of the project? 4. Will the project result in operational efficiencies? 5. Will the project be used to generate revenue or the City? Will revenue generated mitigate annual operations costs?"
COST SHARING	The project can/will be fully or partially funded through non-municipal sources such as private development funds, grants, agency donations, and other external sources. Completion of the project may involve direct participation by other partners in the form of labor and/or materials.	"1. Will the cost of the project be split between the City of Bastrop and one or more other sources? 2. Is City financial commitment to the project required to utilize substantial funds from another source?"
REGULATORY COMPLIANCE	The project assists the City in meeting a federal, state, or other regulatory mandate.	"1. Does the project satisfy one (1) or more existing regulatory mandates? 2. Will the project impact foreseeable regulatory compliance issues?"
LEVERAGING	The project may be coupled with other projects due to timing and/or location. Other projects are dependent on completion of the listed project (including a study).	"1. May the project be constructed in conjunction with another CIP project? 2. Will completion of the project allow for other CIP projects to be initiated?"
ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT	The project improves natural habitat or ecology that may have been negatively impacted by prior human activity or a natural event. Environmental enhancements may be directly enjoyed by Bastrop residents through access and passive recreational activities.	"1. Does the project improve an environmental condition in or around Bastrop? 2. Does the project abate an environmental hazard? 3. Does the project improve wildlife habitat?"

Capital project ranking criteria were prioritized by the votes of participating City staff and members of the Bastrop Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee in August 2016. Based on voting results, relative scoring values and weights were assigned to each criteria. The application of scoring values and weights to each criteria resulted in a scale of between 13.5 and 67.5 points within which all nominated capital projects could be scored. The capital project scoring scale is illustrated in **Table 4** (page B-8).

BASTROP CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM - PROJECT FORM

BASTROP COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

C.I.P. RANKING EXERCISE

Please help us determine which criteria should be weighted most heavily during the Capital Improvements Programs scoring exercise.

Please score the following criteria on a scale of 1-5 based on their importance to you, with **one (1)** being **MOST** important and **five (5)** being **LEAST** important. *Please score Community Goals and Operational Goals seperately.*

COMMUNITY GOALS

- Public Health and Safety.** The project will directly or indirectly improve public health and safety - either by reducing a known/existing health of safety hazard, or mitigating a potential hazard that may negatively impact the general public if not addressed.
- Economic Development.** The project will increase the marketability and/or development potential of one or more properties. The project may support one or more economic development goals and objectives referenced in the comprehensive plan, redevelopment plan, or other relevant City-adopted planning document.
- Land Development and Growth.** The project is consistent with and will promote the recommended development patterns contained in the Bastrop Comprehensive Plan – particularly the recommendations contained in the Bastrop Growth Program and Bastrop Future Land Use Plan.
- Community Reinvestment.** The project improves the living standards in existing residential neighborhoods, or reinvestment potential within established commercial areas – particularly those areas that exhibit conditions of blight. The project's impact is associated with a tax increment reinvestment zone, neighborhood improvement district, or other public reinvestment tool.
- Quality of Life.** The project will improve Bastrop residents' quality of life by enhancing community aesthetics, promoting local heritage, preserving historic resources, providing recreational opportunities, promoting healthy lifestyles, and/or conserving natural resources.

OPERATIONAL GOALS

- Impact on Operational Budget.** The project will add to the City's annual maintenance and operations costs. The project will require new personnel to operate and/or new equipment or other expenditures to maintain. Conversely, the project will reduce long-term municipal operational costs through savings in staff time, energy efficiency, etc. The project may have the opportunity to generate revenue.
- Cost Sharing.** The project can/will be fully or partially funded through non-municipal sources such as private development funds, grants, agency donations, and other external sources. Completion of the project may involve direct participation by other partners in the form of labor and/or materials.
- Regulatory Compliance.** The project assists the City in meeting a federal, state, or other regulatory mandate.
- Leveraging.** The project may be coupled with other projects due to timing and/or location. Other projects are dependent on completion of the listed project.
- Environmental Enhancement.** The project improves natural habitat or ecology that may have been negatively impacted by prior human activity or a natural event. Environmental enhancements may be directly enjoyed by Bastrop residents through access and passive recreational activities.

TABLE 4. BASTROP CAPITAL PROJECT SCORING SCALE

CRITERIA ¹	CATEGORY	INSTRUCTION	MAXIMUM VALUE	WEIGHT	MIN. WEIGHTED SCORE	MAX. WEIGHTED SCORE
ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT	Organizational	0.5	2.5	1	0.5	2.5
LAND DEVELOPMENT AND GROWTH	Community	0.5	2.5	1.2	0.6	3
COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT	Community	1	5	1.2	1.2	6
REGULATORY COMPLIANCE	Organizational	1	5	1.3	1.3	6.5
LEVERAGING	Organizational	1	5	1.4	1.4	7
IMPACT ON OPERATIONAL BUDGET	Organizational	1	5	1.5	1.5	7.5
COST SHARING	Organizational	1	5	1.6	1.6	8
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	Community	1	5	1.7	1.7	8.5
QUALITY OF LIFE	Community	1	5	1.8	1.8	9
PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY	Community	1	5	1.9	1.9	9.5
TOTAL		9	45	-	13.5	67.5

¹Lowest to highest priority in descending order following City staff and Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee voting in August 2016.

MOBILITY PROJECT CRITERIA

The 2016-2021 preliminary capital project list presented in **Table 5** (facing page) includes 26 roadway projects that were identified during the development of the Bastrop Master Transportation Plan (2016). Although scored utilizing the capital project ranking criteria presented in **Tables 3** and **4**, a separate set of ranking criteria were also used to prioritize each project within the Master Transportation Plan document. These mobility-focused criteria reflect federal goals and objectives for transportation system development and include:

- *Manage traffic congestion.*
- *Enhance transportation connectivity.*
- *Preserve/maintain existing assets.*
- *Improve safety.*
- *Improve active transportation options.*
- *Expand/enhance transit services.*
- *Enhance freight capacity.*
- *Complete streets/quality of place.*
- *Support land use, economic development and design.*

Category-specific criteria may be used to rank different project types in the CIP. Care should be taken however to retain consistent weighting and scoring scales - particularly where projects from distinct categories will be prioritized according to a consolidated project list.

A.4. CAPITAL PROJECT SUMMARY

Table 5 lists all capital projects for which a project nomination form was submitted during the preparation of the Bastrop Capital Improvements Program template. All projects contained in the list were submitted by Bastrop City staff. Many project forms remained incomplete at the conclusion of this project (reflected by the number of projects for which estimated costs are unprovided). Nonetheless, the ranking exercise completed by City staff provides the groundwork for the development of an annual capital improvements program in Bastrop which reflects the procedures recommended in this report.

Table 5 lists projects chronologically. All corresponding project nomination forms are maintained by the Bastrop Planning and Development Department.

TABLE 5. BASTROP CAPITAL PROJECT LIST (2016-2021)¹

PROJECT CATEGORY ²	NUMBER	SUB-CATEGORY ²	PROJECT NAME	TOTAL SCORE	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST ⁴
FACILITIES	F-1	Building	New Fire Station	23.60	Undetermined
FACILITIES	F-2	Study	Public Library Expansion	-	-
FACILITIES	F-3	Building	Bastrop Power & Light Capital Improvements	-	-
FACILITIES	F-4	Building	Police Station Renovation	-	-
QUALITY OF LIFE	QOL-1	Study	Arts Master Plan	-	-
QUALITY OF LIFE	QOL-2	Equipment	Public Wi-Fi Network	23.60	\$0
QUALITY OF LIFE	QOL-3	Safety/Parks & Recreation	Old Iron Bridge Repairs	31.80	\$1,000,000
QUALITY OF LIFE	QOL-4	Study	River Loop Phase 1	33.40	\$350,000
QUALITY OF LIFE	QOL-5	Parks & Recreation	Skate Park Construction	21.40	\$270,000
QUALITY OF LIFE	QOL-6	Parks & Recreation	Cover Stock Pens at Mayfest	27.30	\$65,000
QUALITY OF LIFE	QOL-7	Parks & Recreation	Replace Restrooms at Mayfest	27.30	\$265,000
QUALITY OF LIFE	QOL-8	Parks & Recreation	Additional/Covered Seating at Mayfest	27.30	\$265,000
QUALITY OF LIFE	QOL-9	Study	Develop Historic Preservation Design Guidelines	-	-
QUALITY OF LIFE	QOL-10	Study	Commission Historic Resources Survey	-	-
QUALITY OF LIFE	QOL-11	Study	Commission Downtown Master Plan	-	-
TRANSPORTATION	TR-1	Roadway	Roadway Maintenance Program	31.4	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-2	Roadway	Future Pitt Street	24.6	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-3	Roadway	Jefferson Street Reconstruction	18.7	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-4	Roadway	Jasper Street Extension	30.9	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-5	Roadway	Burleson Extension	23.4	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-6	Roadway	Lost Pines Extension	21.7	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-7	Roadway	Pine Hollow Drive	24.2	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-8	Roadway	Shiloh Road Phase 1	23.9	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-9	Roadway	Farm Street Phase 3	24.1	Undetermined

¹ Project nomination form submitted by Bastrop City staff (August - October, 2016). Projects listed in chronological order.

² See Table 2 (page B-6). Studies included in the CIP, but not ranked.

³ Preliminary. Ranked by City-staff department head committee (September - October, 2016).

⁴ Some cost estimates pending City staff completion of project nomination forms. Preliminary projects scores subject to change pending cost estimates.

TABLE 5. BASTROP CAPITAL PROJECT LIST (2016-2021)¹

PROJECT CATEGORY ²	NUMBER	SUB-CATEGORY ²	PROJECT NAME	TOTAL SCORE	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST ⁴
TRANSPORTATION	TR-10	Roadway	Jackson Street Extension	27.9	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-11	Roadway	South Street Extension	30.9	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-12	Roadway	MLK Drive Extension	27.0	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-13	Roadway	MLK Drive Reconstruction	32.6	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-14	Roadway	Hunters Point Drive Extension	26.3	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-15	Roadway	Carter Street Extension	30.8	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-16	Roadway	Charles Boulevard Extension	23.1	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-17	Roadway	Orchard Parkway	33.0	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-18	Roadway	Agnes Street - FM 304 Connection	33.0	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-19	Roadway	Hasler Boulevard Extension Phase 1	29.8	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-20	Roadway	Childers Drive Reconstruction	27.2	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-21	Roadway	Lovers Lane Extension	28.7	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-22	Roadway	Blakey Lane Extension	31.5	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-23	Roadway	Hasler Boulevard Extension Phase 2	29.7	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-24	Roadway	Mesquite Street Arterial	27.5	Undetermined
TRANSPORTATION	TR-25	Roadway	Downtown Bastrop Traffic Calming	43.5	\$1,650,000
TRANSPORTATION	TR-26	Roadway	Downtown Bastrop Signage & Way-finding	29.6	\$120,000
UTILITIES	U-1	Equipment	Fiber-Optic Network Expansion	16.00	Undetermined
UTILITIES	U-2	Wastewater	Main Line from WWTP #3 to Trunk Main #1	32.10	\$774,000
UTILITIES	U-3	Wastewater	Trunk Main #1 from Bastrop Grove to Hunters Crossing	41.60	\$1,467,600
UTILITIES	U-4	Wastewater	Trunk Main #3 along SH 304 to Trunk Main #4	40.20	\$2,376,400
UTILITIES	U-5	Wastewater	Trunk Main #4 from SH 304 to Trunk Main WWTP #3	40.20	\$1,320,000
UTILITIES	U-6	Wastewater	Design & Construction of WWTP #3	40.40	\$10,266,000
UTILITIES	U-7	Wastewater	WW Main Extension: SH 20 to Hunters Crossing Blvd.	28.60	\$960,000
UTILITIES	U-8	Wastewater	WW Main Extension: Tahitian Dr. to McAllister Rd.	19.50	\$600,000
UTILITIES	U-9	Wastewater	WW Main Extension: East on HWY 21/Loop 150 to City Limits	29.90	\$300,000
UTILITIES	U-10	Wastewater	WW Main Extension/Lift Station: Future Mesquite St. & Carter St.	38.90	\$600,000
UTILITIES	U-11	Wastewater	WW Main Extension: SH 71 from Duff Dr. to SH 21	27.60	\$1,000,000
UTILITIES	U-12	Wastewater	WW Main Extension: Blakey Ln. from Bureson Ln. to Settlement Dr.	27.60	\$450,000
UTILITIES	U-13	Water	Storage Tank at SH 20 & SH 71 E	31.50	\$3,800,000
UTILITIES	U-14	Water	Water Main Extension: SH 71 from MLK & College to Perkins St.	31.50	\$1,215,000
UTILITIES	U-15	Water	Water Main Replacement: Pine St. Main St. to Haysel St.	31.80	\$250,000
UTILITIES	U-16	Water	Phase 2 Infrastructure for Well Site #1	36.40	\$4,900,000
UTILITIES	U-17	Water	Water Main Extension: Future Mesquite St. & Carter St.	31.00	\$700,000

¹ Project nomination form submitted by Bastrop City staff (August - October, 2016). Projects listed in chronological order.

² See Table 2 (page B-6). Studies included in the CIP, but not ranked.

³ Preliminary. Ranked by City-staff department head committee (September - October, 2016).

⁴ Some cost estimates pending City staff completion of project nomination forms. Preliminary projects scores subject to change pending cost estimates.

TABLE 5. BASTROP CAPITAL PROJECT LIST (2016-2021)¹

PROJECT CATEGORY ²	NUMBER	SUB-CATEGORY ²	PROJECT NAME	TOTAL SCORE	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST ⁴
UTILITIES	U-18	Water	Riverwood Addition	34.20	\$1,000,000
UTILITIES	U-19	Water	Water Main Extension: East on HWY 20 from the ET to Packhorse Dr.	31.70	\$1,440,000
UTILITIES	U-20	Water	Water Main Extension: Hoffman Rd. to CCN Boundary	31.60	\$420,000
UTILITIES	U-21	Water	Water Main Extension: Undeveloped Portion Pineforest	36.90	\$865,000
UTILITIES	U-22	Water	Water Main Extension: Pitt St. to Arena Dr.	24.70	\$420,000
UTILITIES	U-23	Water	Water Main Extension: HWY 21 East to City Limits	24.70	\$420,000
UTILITIES	U-24	Water	Water Main Extension: Tahitian Dr. to Mahalau Ln.	22.90	\$300,000
UTILITIES	U-25	Water	Water Main Extension: Mahalau Dr. to Hulu Ct.	22.90	\$300,000
UTILITIES	U-26	Water	Water Main Extension: SH 304 Hunters Point Dr. to WWTP #3	28.80	\$960,000
UTILITIES	U-27	Water	Water Main Extension: Blakey Ln. East to Charles Blvd.	34.70	\$420,000

¹ Project nomination form submitted by Bastrop City staff (August - October, 2016). Projects listed in chronological order.

² See Table 2 (page B-6). Studies included in the CIP, but not ranked.

³ Preliminary. Ranked by City-staff department head committee (September - October, 2016).

⁴ Some cost estimates pending City staff completion of project nomination forms. Preliminary projects scores subject to change pending cost estimates.

B. UTILIZING THE BASTROP CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM TEMPLATE

The Bastrop Capital Improvements Program template was prepared as an administrative exercise during the development of the Bastrop Comprehensive Plan (2016-2036). As such, there remain additional steps which must be taken in the City's future CIP planning process to adjust the preliminary project list identified in **Table 5** into a capital program that truly reflects community priorities and Bastrop's financial realities. This part of the CIP template recommends procedures that Bastrop should incorporate into future CIP planning processes.

B.1. CIP OVERSIGHT

The Bastrop Capital Improvements Program template was developed by a staff-level committee of City department heads. The Bastrop Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee also participated in the criteria ranking process to link subsequent scoring exercises to public priorities identified during the development of the comprehensive plan. The CIP ranking process was further influenced by citizen participation at a comprehensive plan open house focused on plan implementation. All activities were coordinated by the Director of Planning and Development.

While it is suitable for the Bastrop Planning and Development Department to retain administrative authority over the City's CIP process in the future, additional public oversight will be necessary to ensure that the CIP remains closely linked to the goals and objectives of the City's comprehensive plan and other applicable policy documents.

The Bastrop CIP process should incorporate a Capital Improvements Program Advisory Committee (CIPAC). The CIPAC would be a citizen committee appointed by the Mayor and City Council to assist City staff in prioritizing annual CIP lists. The CIPAC would be responsible for the following tasks:

- Review and recommend modifications to CIP ranking criteria.
- Assist staff in soliciting public input into the CIP project list.
- Remove CIP projects which do not meet the definition of a suitable project from the project list.
- Ranking CIP projects.
- Presenting CIP project prioritization recommendations to City Council.

It is an essential component of the CIP process. In addition to the above referenced tasks, a CIPAC provides an ongoing citizen voice to the CIP process. The CIPAC’s presence and activities also shield City staff from criticism if annual project rankings do not align with the preferences of specific interest groups. To facilitate CIPAC formation, membership may be drawn largely from existing boards and commissions.

Although CIPAC membership would be determined at the discretion of the Mayor and City Council, Council participation in the CIPAC’s activities should be limited. No more than 1-2 Council members should serve on a CIPAC, and should represent a distinct minority of the overall membership. This recommended limitation is due to the fact that individual members of City Council are permitted to nominate CIP projects, and could unduly influence ranking criteria weights or project scores.

B.2. CIP TIME-LINE

The annual CIP process should be conducted in conjunction with the City’s annual budget. Key CIP activities and benchmarks are suggested in **Table 6** below.

TABLE 6. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TIME-LINE

ACTIVITY/BENCHMARK	TIME FRAME	DESCRIPTION (& CORRESPONDING OPERATIONAL BUDGET BENCHMARK)
CIP PLANNING INITIATION	January	City Council action including: Establishment of fiscal year CIPAC; Review of CIP process; Call for project nominations. (Operational Budget Benchmark: Finance conducting the annual vehicle and equipment replacement fund review.)
CALL FOR PROJECTS	January - February	Submittal period for new fiscal year projects; Update prior year project nomination forms; Prepare for fiscal year ranking.
CIPAC MEETING #1	March	Review of prior fiscal year process. Consider suitability of ranking criteria, weights and scoring. Overview of upcoming City budget process. (Operational Budget Benchmark: Preliminary departmental budgets submitted to Finance.)
PUBLIC INPUT PERIOD	April	Presentation of project list to the general public. Public voting on projects via survey and/or open house. Results incorporated into project scoring process.
CIPAC MEETING #2	May	Project scoring. Evaluation of criteria, weights, and scoring. (Operational Budget Benchmark: Final departmental budgets due.)
CIPAC MEETING #3	May	Project scoring. Prepare final report.
CITY COUNCIL SUBMITTAL	June	CIPAC submittal of prioritized project list to Mayor and City Council. Presentation of process and findings. (Operational Budget Benchmark: Department head meetings to refine departmental budget.)
CITY COUNCIL ACTION	July	City Council consideration of CIPAC recommendations. Refinement and endorsement of selected projects into fiscal year capital budget.

B.3. PROJECT NOMINATION

CIP projects may be nominated by the City Manager, City department heads, the Mayor, and members of the City Council. Administrative project nominations should be vetted and approved by the City Manager prior to submitted to the CIPAC for review and recommendation. The Mayor and City Council should submit their nominated projects as a group. Project nomination forms must be complete before they are submitted to the Director of Planning and Development and CIPAC for consideration.

Nominated projects must meet the definition and minimum parameters of a capital project (currently a minimum estimated cost of \$100,000). City staff may assist individual City Council members in preparing project nomination forms, but the CIPAC would determine whether or not a nominated project met minimum project criteria and would receive a score.

B.4. RANKING CRITERIA

The Bastrop Capital Improvements Program ranking criteria presented in **Table 4** (page B-8) should be reviewed on an annual basis. Category descriptions and considerations may be subject to minor modifications at the staff and CIPAC level. Ranking criteria replacement should only occur subject to the approval of the Mayor and City Council. The process by which the Bastrop Capital Improvements Program template was created reveals that Community Reinvestment and Environmental Enhancement criteria should be modified or replaced.

The CIP scoring scale presented in **Table 4** (page B-8) should be revised to provide for a maximum weighted score of 100 points. The current 67.5 point scale was developed to correspond with parallel ranking criteria created for major thoroughfare plan projects identified in the Bastrop Master Transportation Plan. The priority of each CIP “Community” and “Organizational” criteria may be adjusted by the CIPAC and participating City staff throughout the ranking process.

Direct citizen input on the relative priority of the five (5) “Community” criteria identified in **Table 3** (page B-6) may be considered early in the annual CIP process. Citizen input may also be sought in ranking initial lists of CIP projects. While important, citizen input must not however be allowed to skew the CIP process by diminishing the importance of “Organizational” criteria. (At its core the CIP is a budgeting process.) If incorporated into the CIP process, direct citizen project rankings should be consolidated into a new ranking criteria entitled “Citizen Input” and assigned a value not in excess of 5 percent of the maximum weighted score.

B.5. PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

Annual CIP projects should initially be prioritized by combining the individual votes of each CIPAC member and participating City staff members. Participating City staff members will include the City Manager, Director of Planning and Development, Finance Director, Director of Public Works, and any other department head or senior staff member that the City Manager may designate. Subsequent project ranking exercises should be conducted as a group, and may include the adjustment of ranking criteria scores or weights (excluding the optional “Citizen Input” category).

CIPAC and City staff members should not be compelled to change their voting on individual projects as a result of group ranking sessions, but may be offered the opportunity to voluntarily (and anonymously) adjust their votes between ranking sessions. Optional adjustments to individual project voting should be permitted only between the first and second ranking sessions because group discussion may provide common clarity to how each criteria should be applied to individual projects. All voting results will be maintained by the Director of Planning and Development.

B.6. PROJECT FUNDING

The list of projects identified in **Table 5** (page B-9) is fiscally unconstrained. Anticipated City revenues are insufficient to ensure that all projects identified in this "catch-all" list may be initiated within the five-year CIP time frame. In preparing its annual capital improvements program, Bastrop should identify funding scenarios that would enable the City to implement prioritized capital projects at different paces – ranging from conservative to assertive.

B.7. FUNDING SOURCES

Many funding sources are currently available to the City of Bastrop to implement its CIP. Some funding sources may be applied to most or all project types. Other funding sources are limited to specific project categories. **Table 7** (facing page) identifies municipal funding sources that may be utilized to fund capital projects. The table is limited only to those funding sources which are generated and administered by the City (e.g. excludes grants, cost sharing with other entities, land dedications, etc).

B.8. FUNDING OPTIONS

The constraints that current municipal revenues can place on CIP implementation may be viewed by community leaders as too limiting when considering the City's immediate and long-term goals. Bastrop may consider some of the following funding options to increase the rapidity by which the City's capital needs can be addressed:

- **Park Land Dedication and/or Development Fee.** Pending adjustments to the City's park land level of service measures (as discussed in Chapter 7 of the Bastrop Comprehensive Plan) current park land dedication and/or development fees may be increased to generate additional revenues.
- **Roadway Impact Fee.** The City may levy an impact fee on new development for roadway improvements.
- **Storm Water Utility Fee.** Following completion of master drainage study (as discussed in Chapter 2 of the Bastrop Comprehensive Plan) the City may establish a storm water utility and levy applicable fees.
- **General Obligation Bonds.** The City may hold a referendum to issue general obligation bonds to fund prioritized capital projects, subject to voter approval.

TABLE 7. MUNICIPAL FUNDING SOURCES FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS¹

FUNDING SOURCE	APPLICABILITY
GENERAL FUNDS	Category includes property and sales tax revenues, as well as special revenue funds such as hotel/motel taxes. Most general fund sources are suitable for a wide range of capital projects; but, special revenue funds are often limited by category.
PROPRIETARY FUNDS	Includes enterprise funds for select utilities (water, waste water, storm water, electric), and associated franchise fees for collected for the use of public property by a commercial venture. Expenditures of most proprietary funds on capital projects must relate to a specific service category.
BOND FUNDS	Additional fees (in the form of taxes or utility fees) to service the debt on bonds issued for the development of specific capital projects.
IMPACT FEES	Fees associated with new development to provide new public services and infrastructure. Tied to specific capital projects. May also include park land dedication and or park development fees.
USER FEES	Fees assessed to a specific user for a specific point-in-time service or use of a public facility (i.e. rental fees, public recreation programs, etc.)

¹ List excludes funding sources that require partnership with another entity such as grants, cost-sharing scenarios, in-kind services, and land dedications.

B.9. SUMMARY

Implementation of a capital improvements programming process is an annually-evolving process, but should be fairly easy to administer after completion of the first funding cycle where the recommended procedures and tools identified in this report are implemented. Essential CIP tools are introduced in Part A of this report (pages B-3 - B-11). These tools should be utilized by the City of Bastrop as it applies this template to its annual capital budgeting process.

Since this report is a template only, it includes recommended procedural adjustments (in Part B) to the City's CIP process that were not incorporated into the process introduced in this report.

Table 8 identifies CIP procedural modifications that the City of Bastrop should exercise in any future capital programming process.

TABLE 8. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM TEMPLATE - UTILIZATION SUMMARY¹

TOPIC	SUMMARY	PAGE
B.1. CIP OVERSIGHT	Establish a capital improvements program advisory committee (CIPAC) for annual CIP oversight - including CIP project prioritization.	B-11
	Council membership on the CIPAC should be limited to no more than 1 - 2 representatives (serving as a distinct minority on the committee). The CIPAC is a citizen's committee and should not be unduly influenced.	
B.3. PROJECT NOMINATION	Nominated projects should only be accepted if project nomination forms are completed within a prescribed time frame. Projects lacking an incomplete project nomination form should not be ranked.	B-12
B.4. RANKING CRITERIA	Ranking criteria should only be changed subject to the approval of the Mayor and City Council.	B-13
	Changes in ranking criteria weights and scoring may occur at the City-staff/CIPAC level during the annual ranking process, but should be addressed the CIPAC's report to City Council.	
	The current ranking score should be modified to a maximum 100 point scale. A new category for citizen input should be added to the ranking criteria (subject to City Council approval).	
B.5. PROJECT PRIORITIZATION	CIPAC members should be permitted to change their project prioritization votes throughout the ranking process, but should not be compelled to do so.	B-13
B.6. PROJECT FUNDING	Annually identify multiple funding scenarios, including a baseline scenario utilizing anticipated revenues, and alternatives requiring fee adjustments and/or bonding obligations.	B-14

¹ Summarizes key implementation steps in Part B of this report only. CIP implementation should also utilize all tools introduced in Part A of this report.

This page intentionally left blank.