

<b>ALBUQUERQUE FIRE DEPARTMENT</b>	<b>CIP 10-YEAR DECADE PLAN</b>
Standard Operating Guidelines	Directive 5.1
<b>FIRE CHIEF'S EXECUTIVE DIRECTIVES</b>	02/02/ Page 1 of 1

## **CIP 10-YEAR DECADE PLAN**

### **PURPOSE:**

To provide the Planning Process overview for the City of Albuquerque Capital Improvements Plan (CIP). The CIP Ordinance requires the Mayor to forward a ten-year plan to the City Council every two years. In turn, the council is required to hold at least one public hearing on the proposed program. The CIP Ordinance states that "Council action shall be within 60 days after it has been submitted by the Mavor."

# PROCESS OVERVIEW

This document is for use by the City Council in reviewing the Mayor's proposed Decade Plan for capital improvements. The CIP Ordinance requires the Mayor to forward a ten-year capital improvement program to the City Council every two years. In turn, the Council is required to hold at least one public hearing on the proposed program. The CIP Ordinance states that "Council action shall be within 60 days after it has been submitted by the Mayor."

The General Obligation Bond Program for 2001 has been established by F/S R-37; Enactment 118-2000 (*Appendix C, page C-1*) at \$130 million, including a \$4.0 million set-aside for Neighborhood Initiated Projects and a \$9 million set-aside for discretionary use by the City Council. Departments submitted approximately \$141 million in project requests, and the neighborhoods applied for projects totaling approximately \$11.5 million, as shown in the chart below. In order to conform to the funding guidelines, many City projects were reduced or deferred to out-years. Neighborhood Set-Aside projects were awarded generally based on rank order.

DEPARTMENT / DIVISION	SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW	ALLOCATED FUNDING (F/S R-37)	PROPOSED FOR APPROVAL
Community Improvement	\$62.00 Million	\$45.50 Million	\$45.50 Million
Parks & Open Space	\$14.00 Million	\$13.00 Million	\$13.00 Million
Public Works/Storm Drainage	\$15.14 Million	\$13.00 Million	\$13.00 Million
Public Works/Streets	\$39.43 Million	\$39.00 Million	\$39.00 Million
Transportation	\$10.07 Million	\$6.50 Million	\$6.50 Million
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$140.68 Million</b>	<b>\$117.00 Million</b>	<b>\$118.00 Million</b>
Set-Aside Programs			
• Neighborhood Set-Aside	\$11.47 Million	\$4.00 Million	\$4.00 Million
• Council Set-Aside (Not Reviewed)	\$9.00 Million	\$9.00 Million	\$9.00 Million
Total Set-Aside	\$20.47 Million	\$13.00 Million	\$13.00 Million
<b>GRAND TOTAL G.O. PROGRAM</b>	<b>\$161.15 Million</b>	<b>\$130.00 Million</b>	<b>\$131.00 Million</b>

---

## PROCESS OVERVIEW (CONT.)

The G.O. Bond projects summarized in this document have been through several stages of review including:

- **Staff Review Committee (Appendix A, page A-3)**  
Staff members rated all projects based upon the criteria specified in F/S R-37. Individual ratings were averaged to achieve the overall rank of the project. Members of the committee included staff from the Office of Management and Budget; the Planning Department and the Capital Implementation Program. Departments / Divisions made informal presentations to the Staff Review Committee and formal presentations to the CIP Committee.
- **CIP Review Committee (Appendix A, page A-1)**  
Ranked projects were evaluated by senior City Management, including the Chief Administrative Officer, the three Deputy Chief Administrative Officers, the Director of Aviation, the Director of Finance and Administration, and the Director of Council Services. Funding recommendations were made to the Mayor by this committee.
- Funding decisions were made by the Mayor and forwarded to the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC).
- EPC reviewed the Mayor's proposed program at a public hearing on January , 2001 and issued their recommendations at a public meeting on January 18, 2001.

Neighborhood Set-Aside projects included in this document were rated by the Staff Committee; reviewed and recommended to the Mayor by the CIP Committee; and made public by notification to the applicants and through the EPC Public Hearing. All registered neighborhood associations were notified twice in writing of the opportunity to apply for this funding; in addition they were notified of an all day public meeting / workshop to explain the General Obligation Bond Program and the application process for set-aside funds. Implementation staff from various departments were available throughout the day to assist individuals with defining a scope and estimating the cost of their project. This meeting was also advertised in both the Albuquerque Journal and the Albuquerque Tribune. More than 80 interested citizens attended, a record number. All applicants were advised of the status of their application and of the EPC public hearing in writing.

Project Request Forms for G.O. Bond projects and for Enterprise funds show each project's scope, justification/alternative, estimated budget, participating funds, and operating costs if applicable. Project titles and proposed amounts are shown for the out-years in the summary tables. General Obligation Bond projects are summarized in two-year increments; Enterprise fund projects are summarized in annual increments.

---

## PROCESS OVERVIEW (CONT.)

The Decade Plan also contains a complete section detailing the proposed two-year Urban Enhancement Trust Fund Program. Neighborhood and Cultural organizations applied for about \$4 million in projects for available funding of approximately \$1 million. Consistent with the UETF Ordinance (*Appendix C, page C-16*) recommendations concerning the selection of projects to be funded and the funding amount were made to the Mayor by the UETF committee which includes at least one member from each Council District.

The product of the current phase of the Decade Plan process will be adoption of:

A Decade Plan for capital improvements;

A two-year General Obligation Bond Program to be submitted to the voters in the October 2001 general election;

A two-year Urban Enhancement Trust Fund Program to begin July 2001; and

Capital plans for the Enterprise fund departments, which will be refined and formally appropriated as part of other budget hearings.

# PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA

(From F/S R-37, Enactment 118-2000)

Project selection criteria specified in F/S R-37 have been established to be consistent with the adopted Growth Policy Framework outlined in Council Bill F/S R-70; Enactment #91-1998 (*Appendix C, page C-10*) and with the preliminary conclusions of the Planned Growth Strategy Study, a joint City / Count effort that is generally consistent with the Growth Policy Framework. Rating criteria were established by funding allocation category and are detailed below. In addition, all projects are required to be categorized as Growth, Rehabilitation; Deficiency, Mandate or Improvements and no more than ten-percent (10%) of the Mayor's proposed G.O. Bond Program shall be allocated to projects with low priority ratings.

In this General Obligation Bond Program, only 3.27% of projects are ranked low, and about 77% of 'non set-aside' projects will be directed to maintenance and upgrade of existing systems, as shown in the following chart:

## 2001 GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND PROGRAM REHABILITATION & DEFICIENCY REMEDIATION SUMMARY

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION	FUNDING REQUESTED	REHABILITATION	% OF TOTAL	DEFICIENCY	% OF TOTAL	TOTAL % R & D
Community Facilities	\$45.5 Million	\$10.43 Million	22.9%	\$21.08 Million	46.3%	69.3%
Parks & Open Space	\$14.0 Million	\$5.65 Million	40.4%	\$3.41 Million	24.4%	64.7%
Storm Drainage	\$13.0 Million	\$3.33 Million	25.6%	\$6.69 Million	51.5%	77.1%
Streets	\$39.0 Million	\$21.19 Million	54.3%	\$15.64 Million	40.1%	94.4%
Transit	\$6.5 Million	\$2.25 Million	34.6%	\$1.68 Million	25.8%	60.5%

---

# PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA (CONT.)

(From F/S R-37, Enactment 118-2000)

Project selection criteria adopted in F/S R-37 have been formulated by funding category and are as follows:

## STREETS AND STORM DRAINAGE

### **25% Rehabilitation & Protection of Assets // Enhancements of Existing Areas vs. Expansion into Unserved Areas**

- High** Supports Maintenance, rehabilitation and/or upgrades of streets, and storm drainage within the 1960 boundaries;  
Supports the implementation of centers and corridors;  
Located in an activity center;
- Low** Supports orderly growth.

### **20% Cultural // Recreation // Beautification**

- High** Supports bicycle transportation;  
Improves pedestrian mobility;  
Supports improved ambience along major unlandscaped arterial roadways;
- Low** Project does not include a cultural, recreational or beautification component.

### **25% Operating Budget Impact**

- High** Leverages non-City revenues;  
Reduces operating costs;  
Partners with non-City public or private sector organization in support of joint development;
- Low** Increases operating costs.

### **15% Economic // Community Vitality**

- High** In order to create a better balance of jobs and housing, supports job creation in the parts of the city annexed from 1960 to the present;  
Supports residential development within the 1960 boundaries;
- Low** Project does not contribute to economic vitality.

### **15% Implementation of Plans // Legal Mandates**

- High** Required to fulfill a legal mandate;
- Low** Required to fulfill an adopted plan.

---

# PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA (CONT.)

(From F/S R-37, Enactment 118-2000)

## WATER AND WASTEWATER

**30% Rehabilitation & Protection of Assets // Enhancements of Existing Areas vs. Expansion into Unserved Areas**

- High** Supports Maintenance, rehabilitation and/or upgrades of water and wastewater facilities within the 1960 boundaries;  
Supports the implementation of centers and corridors;  
Located in an activity center;
- Low** Supports orderly growth.

**30% Operating Budget Impact**

- High** Leverages non-City revenues;  
Reduces operating costs;  
Partners with non-City public or private sector organization in support of joint development;
- Low** Increases operating costs.

**25% Economic // Community Vitality**

- High** In order to create a better balance of jobs and housing, supports job creation in the parts of the city annexed from 1960 to the present;  
Supports residential development within the 1960 boundaries;
- Low** Project does not contribute to economic vitality.

**15% Implementation of Plans // Legal Mandates**

- High** Required to fulfill a legal mandate;
- Low** Required to fulfill an adopted plan.

## TRANSIT

**30% Rehabilitation & Protection of Assets // Enhancement of Existing Areas vs. Expansion into Unserved Areas**

- High** Supports public transportation within the 1960 boundaries;  
Supports the implementation of centers and corridors plan;  
Provides improvements related to transit, including high capacity transportation along major corridors;
- Low** Supports public transportation at the edge of the Water Pressure Zone area.

**30% Operating Budget Impact**

- High** Leverages non-City revenues;  
Reduces operating costs;  
Partners with non-City public or private sector organization in support of joint development;
- Low** Increases operating costs.

---

# PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA (CONT.)

(From F/S R-37, Enactment 118-2000)

**20% Economic // Community Vitality**

- High In order to create a better balance of jobs and housing, supports job creation in the parts of the city annexed from 1960 to the present;  
Supports residential development within the 1960 boundaries;
- Low Project does not contribute to economic vitality.

**20% Implementation of Plans // Legal Mandates**

- High Required to fulfill a legal mandate;
- Low Required to fulfill an adopted plan.

## PARKS & OPEN SPACE

**25% Rehabilitation & Protection of Assets // Enhancement of Existing Areas vs. Expansion into Unserved Areas**

- High Supports maintenance, rehabilitation and/or upgrades of parks within the 1960 boundaries;  
Supports maintenance, rehabilitation and/or upgrades of existing Open Space or existing Open Space facilities;
- Low Supports new park development.

**20% Cultural // Recreation // Beautification**

- High Supports bicycle transportation;  
Improves pedestrian mobility;  
Improves the appearance of major unlandscaped or partially landscaped arterial roadways;  
Promotes, and/or supports existing recreational opportunities for Albuquerque's young people;
- Low Promotes, and/or tends to support new recreational opportunities.

**25% Operating Budget Impact**

- High Leverages non-City revenues;  
Reduces operating costs;  
Partners with non-City public or private sector organization in support of joint development;
- Low Increases operating costs.

**15% Economic // Community Vitality**

- High In order to create a better balance of jobs and housing, supports job creation in the parts of the city annexed from 1960 to the present;  
Supports residential development within the 1960 boundaries;
- Low Project does not contribute to economic vitality.

---

# PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA (CONT.)

(From F/S R-37, Enactment 118-2000)

**15% Implementation of Plans // Legal Mandates**

- High Required to fully complete an existing park and/or open space project within the 1960 boundaries;  
Required to fully complete an existing park or open space project;
- Low Required to fulfill an adopted plan.

## COMMUNITY FACILITIES

**25% Rehabilitation & Protection of Assets // Enhancements of Existing Areas vs. Expansion into Unserved Areas**

- High Supports maintenance, rehabilitation and/or upgrades of community facilities within the 1960 boundaries;  
Located in an activity center or along a transportation corridor;
- Low Supports orderly growth.

**20% Cultural // Recreation // Beautification**

- High Promotes and/or supports recreational or social opportunities for Albuquerque's young people;  
Promotes and/or supports recreational or social opportunities for Albuquerque's senior citizens;
- Low Promotes neighborhood livability.

**25% Operating Budget Impact**

- High Leverages non-City revenues;  
Reduces operating costs;  
Partners with non-City public or private sector organization in support of joint development;
- Low Increases operating costs.

**15% Economic // Community Vitality**

- High In order to create a better balance of jobs and housing, supports job creation in the parts of the city annexed from 1960 to the present;  
Supports residential development within the 1960 boundaries;
- Low Project does not contribute to economic vitality.

**15% Implementation of Plans // Legal Mandates**

- High Required to fulfill a legal mandate;
- Low Required to fulfill an adopted plan.

(See Appendix B , pages B-1 and B-2 for description and map of centers and corridors)

---

## PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA (CONT.)

(From F/S R-37, Enactment 118-2000)

Additional project selection criteria are:

- As part of the CIP planning process, the Administration shall categorize all streets and storm drainage, transit, parks and open space, community facilities, and water and wastewater projects in the Mayor's proposed Capital Program as growth, rehabilitation, deficiency, mandate or improvements, defined as follows:
  - **Growth:** New facilities, component additions, or system upgrades that provide service or capacity for new customers (customers not currently using the system;) or that restore needed reserves previously used to support new users.
  - **Rehabilitation:** Projects that extend the service life of an existing facility or system, or that restore original performance or capacity by rehabilitating or replacing system components.
  - **Deficiency:** Projects that correct inadequate service, provide system backup capability, or minimize downtime or loss of service ability.
  - **Improvements:** Projects that enhance the efficiency or customer satisfaction of an existing system that are not covered in the above categories, including costs to conduct special studies directly related to the implementation of the capital program.
  - **Mandate:** Projects which meet regulations of federal, state, or local jurisdictions.
- A boundary, based on the water line extension policy contained in Bill Number R-390, has been established. Projects outside that boundary may not be funded. (*Appendix B, page B-3 for the Water Infrastructure Zone map.*)
- All projects proposed for the 2001 Bond cycle shall be rated by a staff committee using the above listed criteria. The ratings shall be divided into high, medium and low priority, and no more than ten percent (10%) of the Mayor's proposed General Obligation Bond Program funds shall be allocated to projects with low priority ratings.

# CALENDAR OF EVENTS

## SCHEDULE OF THE PLANNING PROCESS

DECADE PLAN  
2001-2010

2000

Apr  
May  
Jun  
Jul  
Aug  
Sep/  
Oct  
Dec

- Project Rating Criteria heard by Full Council.
- 8 Public meeting/open house about application process.
- 22 Applications Due for Urban Enhancement and Neighborhood G.O. proposals.
- Staff Reviews Urban Enhancement and Neighborhood G.O. proposals.
- 14 Project Requests due in CIP from Departments.
- UETF Committee receives Urban Enhancement proposals.
- Project Request reviewed by staff (rating and ranking of G.O. requests).
- Departmental Presentations to CIP Committee.
- Mayor determines final proposed plan and transmits it to Environmental Planning Commission.

2001

Jan  
Feb  
Mar  
Oct

- 11 Decade Plan public hearing by Environmental Planning Commission
- 18 Decade Plan public meeting by Environmental Planning Commission
- Plan transmitted to Council by Mayor
- Public hearings (Council Committee)
- Full Council public hearing on approval of Decade Plan
- G.O. Bond Election