



Memo

To: Community Development and Capital Improvement Program (CDCIP) Advisory Board

From: Capital Asset Planning (CAP) Committee

Date: March 7, 2024

Re: CAP Committee Recommendations to CDCIP Board

Summary

The Capital Asset Planning Committee (CAP Committee) was established in 2023 to evaluate Salt Lake City department Capital Improvement Program (CIP) proposals and make recommendations to the Community Development and Capital Improvement Program (CDCIP) Advisory Board. The goal of the Committee is to reduce the amount of time it takes the Board to review internal applications. Aligning with the Mayor's goal of One City, CAP Committee members represent major departments and divisions in Salt Lake City government. The CAP Committee met regularly over the course of several months to set a scoring criteria matrix and then applied these criteria while reviewing and scoring applications. The CAP Committee reviewed, scored, and ranked a total of 32 internal applications. The scoring matrix, criteria definitions, and detailed scoring summary are provided in the appendices.

Background

The CAP Committee is tasked with reviewing and ranking internal Salt Lake City department/division CIP applications and then sending recommendations to the CDCIP Board, with the goal of reducing the amount of time it takes the CDCIP Board to review internal applications. The CDCIP Board is responsible for reviewing, scoring, and ranking constituent *and* internal applications, and sending recommendations to the Salt Lake City Council and Mayor.

The scoring criteria, definitions and weighted scores were built from a framework of Resolution 29 of 2017 (see Appendix A) and Mayor's Goals. The CAP Committee intentionally developed the scoring criteria to be neutral and quantitative, removing as much bias as possible from the scoring process. Definitions for each of the scoring criteria can be found in the appendices. Salt Lake City's Capital Improvement Program is a multi-year planning program of capital expenditures needed to replace or expand the City's public infrastructure. Capital improvements involve design, community engagement, construction, purchase or renovation of buildings, parks, streets, or other physical structures. Capital assets are important to Salt Lake City and its management approach centers on having a unified city approach that focuses on sustainability, equity, and meeting the growing needs and demands on our public asset systems. City Council appropriation of CIP funding for a particular project does not guarantee that the City will ultimately implement and complete that project. The City reserves the right to withdraw or reappropriate funding for any project at the City's sole discretion. The City has withdrawn or reappropriated funding

from projects in the past, and it is anticipated that circumstances requiring the withdrawal or reappropriation of funding for projects will arise in the future. In addition, capital projects that aren't in capital plans/master plan can't be funded.

Upon completing the scoring process for FY25's internal CIP applications, the CAP Committee will begin developing a 10-year CAP Plan that will be guided by Salt Lake City master plans, as well as division and department capital plans.

CAP Committee

The CAP Committee began meeting in fall 2023 to set the scoring criteria and weights. Earlier this year SLC departments presented their CIP applications to the committee, committee members scored the applications, and met to discuss the application scores.

The CAP Committee is comprised of directors, deputy directors, and other leaders from the following Salt Lake City departments or divisions: Finance, Engineering, Transportation, Public Services, Community & Neighborhoods, Public Lands, Police, Fire, Equity & Inclusion, Community Outreach, Information Management Services, Public Utilities, Mayor's Office, Redevelopment Agency (RDA), Economic Development, and Sustainability.

Committee Discussions

The Committee met multiple times to discuss internal applications and the scores they assigned. They discussed critical assets and critical failure at great length and found agreeing on scores for these two criteria to be challenging. There was strong consensus that Critical Failure Category 1 should be prioritized over all other requests. Further discussions revealed challenges with distinguishing maintenance requests versus assets, the difference between projects and programs in several applications, restrictions surrounding the spending of Impact Fee funds, and scoring overall within the limited criteria. The CAP Committee will work through and resolve these challenges prior to the development of the 10-year CAP Plan and next year's scoring.

Scoring

The CAP Committee used the following criteria to score internal applications:

- Existing Asset
- Critical Failure Category 1, 2, or 3
- Legal/Contractual Obligation Category 1 or 2 (determined by Attorney's Office)
- Risk: Life, Health & Safety
- Includes Outside Funding
- Project Phase
- Promotes Equity, Resiliency, Sustainability
- Reduce Cost/Increase Investment
- One City Approach
- Workforce Support

See the Appendices for the CAP Scoring Criteria and CAP Scoring Criteria Definitions.

The CAP Committee's scores are ranked by average score, in the order of highest to lowest. The scores have been placed in the following groups: Renewal and Replacement, Program, New Public Asset (Increase Level of Service), and New Asset that Supports City Operations.

Funding Requests

The funding amount being requested for internal applications is \$72,593,600 and the funding request for constituent applications is \$17,796,496 for a total of \$90,309,096. The total available funding for FY25 is \$39,300,000, of which an estimated \$18,000,000 is Parks Impact Fees and is restricted to eligible Parks projects.

CAP Committee Funding Recommendation

The CAP Committee has provided a ranked list of projects, and various other ways of looking at the internal projects to aid the CDCIP Board in making their recommendation. Partial funding information and guidance has been provided on each project by the internal applicant(s). Programs are intended to receive funding year after year to elevate and maintain the City's assets at a reasonable and safe level. Also provided are the desired/needed funding and the historical funding for each of these programs.

Rank	Project Title	Score
1	Stabilize the Fire Training Tower Deterioration	72.82
2	400 South Jordan River Bridge Reconstruction	71.44
3	Complete Streets Reconstruction 2025	66.44
4	Public Way Concrete 2025	62.41
5	Complete Streets Overlay 2025	61.74
6	HVAC Control Replacement at PSB	60.76
7	Plaza 349 HVAC Improvements - Phase I	59.71
8	Traffic Signal Replacement and Upgrades Program	57.76
9	Liberty Park Greenhouse Design and Construction Documents	57.76
10	700 South (Phase 7, 4600 West to 5000 West) Additional Funding	57.06
11	Facilities Replacement and Renewal Plan	55.53
12	Safer Crossings Citywide	53.97
13	Sugar House Park – Two Pavilion Replacements for the Cost of One	52.47
14	Transitioning to Regionally – Appropriate Landscapes, Adapting Irrigation Systems, and Reducing Water Use	51.91
15	Transit Capital Program / Funding Our Future Transit	51.38
16	Art Barn Failing Infrastructure and Accessibility Improvement Request	50.94
17	Neighborhood Byways Program	49.65
18	Amplifying Our Jordan River Revitalization: Doubling Bond Investment	49.65
19	Courts & Playgrounds	48.62
20	Police Department Training Center	48.18
21	Livable Streets Program	48.12
22	Memory Grove Park Urgent Repairs + Preservation & Maintenance Plan	46.85
23	Transportation Corridor Transformations Program	46.44
24	Fire Training Grounds Site Improvements	46.21
25	PSB EV Charging Phase 1 and 2	43.50
26	Urban Trails Program	42.18
27	Green Loop Implementation	41.88
28	Alleyway Improvements 2025	41.29
29	Plaza 349 EV Charging Phase 1 and 2	40.62
30	"Elevating Access": The Regional Athletic Complex's Blueprint for the Future	38.74
31	SLCPSB (Police Occupancy) Remodels	37.41
32	Drop Arm Gate on the Entry to the Rear Parking Lot at PSB	26.85

Appendices:

- A. Resolution 29 of 2017
- B. CAP Scoring Criteria Definitions
- C. CAP Scoring Criteria
- D. Ranked list of Internal Applications
- E. Ranked List by Department/Division
- F. Ranked List by Group
- G. Program Amounts – ~~estimated annual need~~, minimum required and historical annual amounts
- H. Partial Funding Details

RESOLUTION NO. 29 OF 2017

(Salt Lake City Council capital and debt management policies.)

WHEREAS, the Salt Lake City Council ("City Council" or "Council") demonstrated its commitment to improving the City's Capital Improvement Program in order to better address the deferred and long-term infrastructure needs of Salt Lake City; and

WHEREAS, the analysis of Salt Lake City's General Fund Capital Improvement Program presented by Citygate Associates in February 1999, recommended that the Council review and update the capital policies of Salt Lake Corporation ("City") in order to provide direction to the capital programming and budgeting process and adopt and implement a formal comprehensive debt policy and management plan; and

WHEREAS, the City's Capital Improvement Program and budgeting practices have evolved since 1999 and the City Council wishes to update the capital and debt management policies by updating and restating such policies in their entirety to better reflect current practices; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to improve transparency of funding opportunities across funding sources including General Fund dollars, impact fees, Class C (gas tax) funds, Redevelopment Agency funds, Public Utilities funds, repurposing old Capital Improvement Program funds and other similar funding sources.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of Salt Lake City, Utah:

That the City Council has determined that the following capital and debt management policies shall guide the Council as they continue to address the deferred and long-term infrastructure needs within Salt Lake City:

Capital Policies

1. Capital Project Definition – The Council intends to define a capital project as follows:

"Capital improvements involve the construction, purchase or renovation of buildings, parks, streets or other physical structures. A capital improvement must have a useful life of five or more years. A capital improvement is not a recurring capital outlay item (such as a motor vehicle or a fire engine) or a maintenance expense (such as fixing a leaking roof or painting park benches). In order to be considered a capital project, a capital improvement must also have a cost of \$50,000 or more unless such capital improvement's significant functionality can be demonstrated to warrant its inclusion as a capital project (such as software). Acquisition of equipment is not considered part of a capital project unless such acquisition of equipment is an integral part of the cost of the capital project."

2. Annual Capital Budget Based on 10-Year Capital Facilities Plan – The Council requests that

the Mayor's Recommended Annual Capital Budget be developed based upon the 10-Year Capital Facilities Plan and be submitted each fiscal year to the City Council for consideration as part of the Mayor's Recommended Budget no later than the first Tuesday of May.

3. Multiyear Financial Forecasts – The Council requests that the Administration:
 - a. Prepare multi-year revenue and expenditure forecasts that correspond to the capital program period;
 - b. Prepare an analysis of the City's financial condition, debt service levels within the capital improvement budget, and capacity to finance future capital projects; and
 - c. Present this information to the Council in conjunction with the presentation of each one-year capital budget.
4. Annual General Fund Transfer to CIP Funding Goal – Allocation of General Fund revenues for capital improvements on an annual basis will be determined as a percentage of General Fund revenue. The Council has a goal that no less than nine percent (9%) of ongoing General Fund revenues be invested annually in the Capital Improvement Fund.
5. Maintenance Standard - The Council intends that the City will maintain its physical assets at a level adequate to protect the City's capital investment and to minimize future maintenance and replacement costs.
6. Capital Project Prioritization - The Council intends to give priority consideration to projects that:
 - a. Preserve and protect the health and safety of the community;
 - b. Are mandated by the state and/or federal government; and
 - c. Provide for the renovation of existing facilities resulting in a preservation of the community's prior investment, in decreased operating costs or other significant cost savings, or in improvements to the environmental quality of the City and its neighborhoods.
7. External Partnerships - All other considerations being equal, the Council intends to give fair consideration to projects where there is an opportunity to coordinate with other agencies, establish a public/ private partnership, or secure grant funding.
8. Aligning Project Cost Estimates and Funding - The Council intends to follow a guideline of approving construction funding for a capital project in the fiscal year immediately following the project's design wherever possible. Project costs become less accurate as more time passes. The City can avoid expenses for re-estimating project costs by funding capital projects in a timely manner.
9. Advisory Board Funding Recommendations - The Council intends that all capital projects be evaluated and prioritized by the Community Development and Capital Improvement Program Advisory Board. The resulting recommendations shall be provided to the Mayor, and shall be included along with the Mayor's funding recommendations in conjunction with the Annual Capital budget transmittal, as noted in Paragraph two above.

10. Prioritize Funding Projects in the 10-Year Plan - The Council does not intend to fund any project that has not been included in the 10-Year Capital Facilities Plan for at least one (1) year prior to proposed funding, unless extenuating circumstances are adequately identified.

11. Cost Overrun Process - The Council requests that any change order to any capital improvement project follow the criteria established in Resolution No. 65 of 2004 which reads as follows:

- a. "The project is under construction and all other funding options and/or methods have been considered and it has been determined that additional funding is still required.
- b. Cost overrun funding will be approved based on the following formula:
 - i. 20% or below of the budget adopted by the City Council for project budgets of \$100,000 or less;
 - ii. 15% or below of the budget adopted by the City Council for project budgets between \$100,001 and \$250,000;
 - iii. 10% or below of the budget adopted by the City Council for project budgets over \$250,000 with a maximum overrun cost of \$100,000.
- c. The funds are not used to pay additional City Engineering fees.
- d. The Administration will submit a written notice to the City Council detailing the additional funding awarded to projects at the time of administrative approval.
- e. If a project does not meet the above mentioned criteria the request for additional funding will be submitted as part of the next scheduled budget opening. However, if due to timing constraints the cost overrun cannot be reasonably considered as part of a regularly scheduled budget opening, the Administration will prepare the necessary paperwork for review by the City Council at its next regularly scheduled meeting."

12. Recapture Funds from Completed Capital Projects - The Council requests that the Administration include in the first budget amendment each year those Capital Improvement Program Fund accounts where the project has been completed and a project balance remains. It is the Council's intent that all account balances from closed projects be recaptured and placed in the CIP Cost Overrun Contingency Account for the remainder of the fiscal year, at which point any remaining amounts will be transferred to augment the following fiscal year's General Fund ongoing allocation.

13. Recapture Funds from Unfinished Capital Projects – Except for situations in which significant progress is reported to the Council, it is the Council's intent that all account balances from unfinished projects older than three years be moved out of the specific project account to the CIP Fund Balance. Notwithstanding the foregoing, account balances for bond financed projects and outside restricted funds (which could include grants, SAA or other restricted funds) shall not be moved out of the specific project account.

14. Surplus Land Fund within CIP Fund Balance – Revenues received from the sale of real property will go to the unappropriated balance of the Capital Projects Fund and the revenue will be reserved to purchase real property unless extenuating circumstances warrant a different use. It is important to note that collateralized land cannot be sold.

15. Transparency of Ongoing Costs Created by Capital Projects – Any long-term fiscal impact to the General Fund from a capital project creating ongoing expenses such as maintenance, changes in electricity/utility usage, or additional personnel will be included in the CIP funding log and project funding request. Similarly, capital projects that decrease ongoing expenses will detail potential savings in the CIP funding log.
16. Balance Budget without Defunding or Delaying Capital Projects – Whenever possible, capital improvement projects should neither be delayed nor eliminated to balance the General Fund budget.
17. Identify Sources when Repurposing Old Capital Project Funds – Whenever the Administration proposes repurposing funds from completed capital projects the source(s) should be identified including the project name, balance of remaining funds, whether the project scope was reduced, and whether funding needs related to the original project exist.
18. Identify Capital Project Details – For each capital project, the capital improvement projects funding log should identify:
 - a. The Community Development and Capital Improvement Program Advisory Board's funding recommendations,
 - b. The Administration's funding recommendations,
 - c. The project name and a brief summary of the project,
 - d. Percentage of impact fee eligibility and type,
 - e. The project life expectancy,
 - f. Whether the project is located in an RDA project area,
 - g. Total project cost and an indication as to whether a project is one phase of a larger project,
 - h. Subtotals where the project contains multiple scope elements that could be funded separately,
 - i. Any savings derived from funding multiple projects together,
 - j. Timing for when a project will come on-line,
 - k. Whether the project implements a master plan,
 - l. Whether the project significantly advances the City's renewable energy or sustainability goals,
 - m. Ongoing annual operating impact to the General Fund,
 - n. Any community support for the project - such as community councils or petitions,
 - o. Communities served,
 - p. Legal requirements/mandates,
 - q. Whether public health and safety is affected,
 - r. Whether the project is included in the 10-Year Capital Facilities Plan,
 - s. Whether the project leverages external funding sources, and
 - t. Any partner organizations.

Debt Management Policies

1. Prioritize Debt Service for Projects in the 10-Year Capital Facilities Plan - The Council intends to utilize long-term borrowing only for capital improvement projects that are included in the City's 10-Year Capital Facilities Plan or in order to take advantage of

opportunities to restructure or refund current debt. Short-term borrowing might be utilized in anticipation of future tax collections to finance working capital needs.

2. Evaluate Existing Debt before Issuing a New Debt - The Council requests that the Administration provide an analysis of the City's debt capacity, and how each proposal meets the Council's debt policies, prior to proposing any projects for debt financing. This analysis should include the effect of the bond issue on the City's debt ratios, the City's ability to finance future projects of equal or higher priority, and the City's bond ratings.
3. Identify Repayment Source when Proposing New Debt - The Council requests that the Administration identify the source of funds to cover the anticipated debt service requirement whenever the Administration recommends borrowing additional funds.
4. Monitoring Debt Impact to the General Fund - The Council requests that the Administration analyze the impact of debt-financed capital projects on the City's operating budget and coordinate this analysis with the budget development process.
5. Disclosure of Bond Feasibility and Challenges - The Council requests that the Administration provide a statement from the City's financial advisor that each proposed bond issue appears feasible for bond financing as proposed. Such statement from the City's financial advisor should also include an indication of requirements or circumstances that the Council should be aware of when considering the proposed bond issue (such as any net negative fiscal impacts on the City's operating budget, debt capacity limits, or rating implications).
6. Avoid Use of Financial Derivative Instruments - The Council intends to avoid using interest rate derivatives or other financial derivatives when considering debt issuance.
7. Maintain Reasonable Debt Ratios - The Council does not intend to issue debt that would cause the City's debt ratio benchmarks to exceed moderate ranges as indicated by the municipal bond rating industry.
8. Maintain High Level Bond Ratings – The Council intends to maintain the highest credit rating feasible and to adhere to fiscally responsible practices when issuing debt.
9. Consistent Annual Debt Payments Preferred – The Council requests that the Administration structure debt service payments in level amounts over the useful life of the financed project(s) unless anticipated revenues dictate otherwise or the useful life of the financed project(s) suggests a different maturity schedule.
10. Sustainable Debt Burden – The Council intends to combine pay-as-you-go strategy with long-term financing to keep the debt burden sufficiently low to merit continued AAA general obligation bond ratings and to provide sufficient available debt capacity in case of emergency.
11. Lowest Cost Options – The City will seek the least costly financing available when evaluating debt financing options.

12. Avoid Creating Structural Deficits – The City will minimize the use of one-time revenue to fund programs/projects that require ongoing costs including debt repayments.
13. Aligning Debt and Project Timelines – Capital improvement projects financed through the issuance of bonded debt will have a debt service that is not longer than the useful life of the project.

Passed by the City Council of Salt Lake City, Utah, this 3rd day of October, 2017.



SALT LAKE CITY COUNCIL

By: _____

CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST:

By: [Signature]
City Recorder

Salt Lake City Approved As To Form By: <u>[Signature]</u> Jaysen Oldroyd Date: <u>10/2/17</u>

Appendix B: CAP Scoring Criteria Definitions

Critical Asset Failure: When reviewing this criterion, particular focus should be paid to whether the request will prevent a failure of a critical asset. These applications will be marked non-discretionary to highlight importance.

Legal/Contractual Obligations: When reviewing this criterium, considerations include coming into compliance with ordinances and executive orders, various contractual agreements, or state and federal mandates. Consideration of whether the issues penalize the City or puts the City in jeopardy. The urgency of needing to meet these obligations and consequences of not meeting them will be considered.

Risk: Life, Health, and Safety: When reviewing this criterium, particular focus should be paid to whether the request will correct various types of code violations, increase safety/reduce crime, or safety improvements toward eliminating fatalities and severe injuries related to mobility.

Includes Outside Funding: This criterium assesses whether there is external funding support for a particular initiative, including federal and state grants, coordination with other agencies, public/private partnerships, or donations. When analyzing outside funding, it should be noted how much of the funding will still need to be provided by the City in addition to any outside support. (Enterprise funding through the RDA and Public Utilities funding will be considered part of External Funding. Non-enterprise external funding will be weighted higher than internal enterprise funding.)

Project Phase: This is in accordance with Resolution Number 29 of 2017 which states, "The Council intends to follow a guideline of approving construction funding for a capital project in the fiscal year immediately following the project's design wherever possible. Project costs become less accurate as more time passes. The City can avoid expenses for re-estimating project costs by funding capital projects in a timely manner."

Promote Equity: Consideration should be given to areas of the city in order to improve the infrastructure of the city as a whole rather than improving some areas and allowing others to deteriorate. A map showing the condition of the infrastructure of the city and existing tools could help in performing this analysis.

Reduce Cost/Increase Investment: The main considerations for efficient investment are whether a project reduces maintenance expenditures or will be leveraged with another CIP project, thereby eliminating duplication of work or creating economies of scale. Funding projections should be as accurate as possible and vetted through the Department of Finance.

Resiliency: This criterium involves analyzing whether a project supports resiliency efforts to better enable the City to prepare for, prevent, or respond to events that have the potential to disrupt the City's operations or the delivery of services.

Sustainability: This criterium involves assessing whether the project supports water conservation, green infrastructure, materials resource reduction or a reduction in carbon emissions, fossil fuel use, and/or criteria pollutants.

One City Approach: Does the project involve coordination across City Divisions and align with Mayor's Goals?

Workforce Support: This criterium focuses on whether a project supports the physical, mental, or economic well-being of City employees, in keeping with the Mayor's goal of supporting "Our City Family".

Community Application: While the financial limitations of any municipality inhibit the ability to act on every request - the concerns and desires of our residents are vital to understanding how best to allocate our limited resources, therefore, projects that are closely aligned with community requests should be given proper consideration. (Yes/No)

Appendix C: CAP Scoring Criteria

	Decision Tree with Weighted Scores				
		Y	N	Score	Reference Question FY25 App
Step 1	Existing Asset Y/N		Step 3	0	Question #10
Step 2	Critical Failure Category 1		Step 3	0	Question #12
	Legal/Contractual Obligation Category 1		Step 3	0	Question #21
Step 3	Scoring Criteria	Scoring Scale (0-5)	Weight	Score	
1	Critical Failure Category 2 or 3		2	0	Question #12
2	Legal / Contractual Obligation Category 2		1	0	Question #21
3	Risk: Life, Health & Safety		2	0	Question #21
4	Includes Outside Funding		1	0	Question #17
5	Project Phase (further along scores higher)		1	0	Question #11
6	Promote Equity		1.5	0	Question #18, 19, 20
7	Resiliency		1.5	0	Question #2
8	Sustainability		1	0	Question #22
9	Reduce Cost / Increase Investment		1.5	0	Question #16, 21
10	One City Approach		1	0	Question #16
11	Workforce Support		1	0	Question #2
				<u>0</u>	

Weighted Score:

- Step 1 Existing Asset is worth 7.5 points.
- Step 2 Critical Failure Category 1 is worth 20 points.
- Step 2 Legal/Contractual Obligation Category 1 is worth 15 points.
- For Step 3, CAP Committee members gave a score ranging from 0-5 for the eleven criteria lines. Those scores are then multiplied by the weight assigned to the category in the next column to arrive at the score.

Appendix D: Ranked List of Internal Applications

Rank	Project Title	Average	Requested \$	Department	Group
1	Stabilize the Fire Training Tower Deterioration	72.82	\$858,800	Fire	Renewal and Replacement
2	400 South Jordan River Bridge Reconstruction	71.44	\$4,000,000	Engineering	Renewal and Replacement
3	Complete Streets Reconstruction 2025	66.44	\$4,500,000	Engineering	Program
4	Public Way Concrete 2025	62.41	\$750,000	Engineering	Program
5	Complete Streets Overlay 2025	61.74	\$3,500,000	Engineering	Program
6	HVAC Control Replacement at PSB	60.76	\$1,300,000	Facilities	Renewal and Replacement
7	Plaza 349 HVAC Improvements - Phase I	59.71	\$2,200,000	Facilities	Renewal and Replacement
8	Traffic Signal Replacement and Upgrades Program	57.76	\$2,700,000	Transportation	Program
9	Liberty Park Greenhouse Design and Construction Documents	57.76	\$921,700	Public Lands	Renewal and Replacement
10	700 South (Phase 7, 4600 West to 5000 West) Additional Funding	57.06	\$4,500,000	Engineering	Renewal and Replacement
11	Facilities Replacement and Renewal Plan	55.53	\$2,756,500	Facilities	Program
12	Safer Crossings Citywide	53.97	\$600,000	Transportation	Program
13	Sugar House Park – Two Pavilion Replacements for the Cost of One	52.47	\$960,000	Public Lands	Renewal and Replacement
14	Transitioning to Regionally – Appropriate Landscapes, Adapting Irrigation Systems, and Reducing Water Use	51.91	\$3,250,000	Public Lands	Program
15	Transit Capital Program / Funding Our Future Transit	51.38	\$1,500,000	Transportation	Program

16	Art Barn Failing Infrastructure and Accessibility Improvement Request	50.94	\$500,000	Arts Council	Renewal and Replacement
17	Neighborhood Byways Program	49.65	\$1,600,000	Transportation	Program
18	Amplifying Our Jordan River Revitalization: Doubling Bond Investment	49.62	\$1,500,000	Public Lands	New Public Asset (Increase LOS)
19	Courts & Playgrounds	48.62	\$3,100,000	Public Lands	Program
20	Police Department Training Center	48.18	\$250,000	Police	New Asset that Supports City Operations
21	Livable Streets Program	48.12	\$3,000,000	Transportation	Program
22	Memory Grove Park Urgent Repairs + Preservation & Maintenance Plan	46.85	\$1,910,000	Public Lands	Renewal and Replacement
23	Transportation Corridor Transformations Program	46.44	\$4,600,000	Transportation	New Asset that Supports City Operations
24	Fire Training Grounds Site Improvements	46.21	\$1,410,300	Fire	New Asset that Supports City Operations
25	PSB EV Charging Phase 1 and 2	43.50	\$874,400	Facilities	New Asset that Supports City Operations
26	Urban Trails Program	42.18	\$1,500,000	Transportation	Program
27	Green Loop Implementation	41.88	\$10,000,000	Public Lands	New Public Asset (Increase LOS)
28	Alleyway Improvements 2025	41.29	\$500,000	Engineering	Program
29	Plaza 349 EV Charging Phase 1 and 2	40.62	\$601,900	Facilities	New Asset that Supports City Operations
30	"Elevating Access": The Regional Athletic Complex's Blueprint for the Future	38.74	\$6,250,000	Public Lands	New Public Asset (Increase LOS)
31	SLCPSB (Police Occupancy) Remodels	37.41	\$650,000	Police	Renewal and Replacement
32	Drop Arm Gate on the Entry to the Rear Parking Lot at PSB	26.85	\$50,000	Police	New Asset that Supports City Operations

Appendix E: Ranked List of Internal Applications by Department/Division

Department	Rank	Project Title	Average	Requested \$	Group
Arts Council	16	Art Barn Failing Infrastructure and Accessibility Improvement Request	50.94	\$500,000	Renewal and Replacement
Engineering	2	400 South Jordan River Bridge Reconstruction	71.44	\$4,000,000	Renewal and Replacement
	3	Complete Streets Reconstruction 2025	66.44	\$4,500,000	Program
	4	Public Way Concrete 2025	62.41	\$750,000	Program
	5	Complete Streets Overlay 2025	61.74	\$3,500,000	Program
	10	700 South (Phase 7, 4600 West to 5000 West) Additional Funding	57.06	\$4,500,000	Renewal and Replacement
	28	Alleyway Improvements 2025	41.29	\$500,000	Program
Facilities	6	HVAC Control Replacement at PSB	60.76	\$1,300,000	Renewal and Replacement
	7	Plaza 349 HVAC Improvements - Phase I	59.71	\$2,200,000	Renewal and Replacement
	11	Facilities Replacement and Renewal Plan	55.53	\$2,756,500	Program
	25	PSB EV Charging Phase 1 and 2	43.50	\$874,400	New Asset that Supports City Operations
	29	Plaza 349 EV Charging Phase 1 and 2	40.62	\$601,900	New Asset that Supports City Operations
Fire	1	Stabilize the Fire Training Tower Deterioration	72.82	\$858,800	Renewal and Replacement
	24	Fire Training Grounds Site Improvements	46.21	\$1,410,300	New Asset that Supports City Operations
Police	20	Police Department Training Center	48.18	\$250,000	New Asset that Supports City Operations

Police	31	SLCPSB (Police Occupancy) Remodels	37.41	\$650,000	Renewal and Replacement
	32	Drop Arm Gate on the Entry to the Rear Parking Lot at PSB	26.85	\$50,000	New Asset that Supports City Operations
Public Lands	9	Liberty Park Greenhouse Design and Construction Documents	57.76	\$921,700	Renewal and Replacement
	13	Sugar House Park – Two Pavilion Replacements for the Cost of One	52.47	\$960,000	Renewal and Replacement
	14	Transitioning to Regionally – Appropriate Landscapes, Adapting Irrigation Systems, and Reducing Water Use	51.91	\$3,250,000	Program
	18	Amplifying Our Jordan River Revitalization: Doubling Bond Investment	49.62	\$1,500,000	New Public Asset (Increase LOS)
	19	Courts & Playgrounds	48.62	\$3,100,000	Program
	22	Memory Grove Park Urgent Repairs + Preservation & Maintenance Plan	46.85	\$1,910,000	Renewal and Replacement
	27	Green Loop Implementation	41.88	\$10,000,000	New Public Asset (Increase LOS)
	30	“Elevating Access”: The Regional Athletic Complex’s Blueprint for the Future	38.74	\$6,250,000	New Public Asset (Increase LOS)
Transportation	8	Traffic Signal Replacement and Upgrades Program	57.76	\$2,700,000	Program
	12	Safer Crossings Citywide	53.97	\$600,000	Program
	15	Transit Capital Program / Funding Our Future Transit	51.38	\$1,500,000	Program
	17	Neighborhood Byways Program	49.65	\$1,600,000	Program
	21	Livable Streets Program	48.12	\$3,000,000	Program
	23	Transportation Corridor Transformations Program	46.44	\$4,600,000	~~New Asset that Supports City Operations~~ New Public Asset (Increase LOS)
	26	Urban Trails Program	42.18	\$1,500,000	Program

Appendix F: Ranked List of Internal Applications by Group

Group	Rank	Project Title	Average	Requested \$	Department
New Asset that Supports City Operations	20	Police Department Training Center	48.18	\$250,000	Police
	24	Fire Training Grounds Site Improvements	46.21	\$1,410,300	Fire
	25	PSB EV Charging Phase 1 and 2	43.50	\$874,400	Facilities
	29	Plaza 349 EV Charging Phase 1 and 2	40.62	\$601,900	Facilities
	32	Drop Arm Gate on the Entry to the Rear Parking Lot at PSB	26.85	\$50,000	Police
New Public Asset (Increase LOS)	18	Amplifying Our Jordan River Revitalization: Doubling Bond Investment	49.62	\$1,500,000	Public Lands
	23	Transportation Corridor Transformations Program	46.44	\$4,600,000	Transportation
	27	Green Loop Implementation	41.88	\$10,000,000	Public Lands
	30	“Elevating Access”: The Regional Athletic Complex’s Blueprint for the Future	38.74	\$6,250,000	Public Lands
Program	3	Complete Streets Reconstruction 2025	66.44	\$4,500,000	Engineering
	4	Public Way Concrete 2025	62.41	\$750,000	Engineering
	5	Complete Streets Overlay 2025	61.74	\$3,500,000	Engineering
	8	Traffic Signal Replacement and Upgrades Program	57.76	\$2,700,000	Transportation
	11	Facilities Replacement and Renewal Plan	55.53	\$2,756,500	Facilities
	12	Safer Crossings Citywide	53.97	\$600,000	Transportation
	14	Transitioning to Regionally – Appropriate Landscapes, Adapting Irrigation Systems, and Reducing Water Use	51.91	\$3,250,000	Public Lands

Program	15	Transit Capital Program / Funding Our Future Transit	51.38	\$1,500,000	Transportation
	17	Neighborhood Byways Program	49.65	\$1,600,000	Transportation
	19	Courts & Playgrounds	48.62	\$3,100,000	Public Lands
	21	Livable Streets Program	48.12	\$3,000,000	Transportation
	26	Urban Trails Program	42.18	\$1,500,000	Transportation
	28	Alleyway Improvements 2025	41.29	\$500,000	Engineering
Renewal and Replacement	1	Stabilize the Fire Training Tower Deterioration	72.82	\$858,800	Fire
	2	400 South Jordan River Bridge Reconstruction	71.44	\$4,000,000	Engineering
	6	HVAC Control Replacement at PSB	60.76	\$1,300,000	Facilities
	7	Plaza 349 HVAC Improvements - Phase I	59.71	\$2,200,000	Facilities
	9	Liberty Park Greenhouse Design and Construction Documents	57.76	\$921,700	Public Lands
	10	700 South (Phase 7, 4600 West to 5000 West) Additional Funding	57.06	\$4,500,000	Engineering
	13	Sugar House Park – Two Pavilion Replacements for the Cost of One	52.47	\$960,000	Public Lands
	16	Art Barn Failing Infrastructure and Accessibility Improvement Request	50.94	\$500,000	Arts Council
	22	Memory Grove Park Urgent Repairs + Preservation & Maintenance Plan	46.85	\$1,910,000	Public Lands
	31	SLCPSB (Police Occupancy) Remodels	37.41	\$650,000	Police

Appendix G: Program Amounts

Department/Division	Project Title	Requested \$	Minimum \$ Required	Historical Annual Funding
Engineering	Complete Streets Reconstruction 2025	\$ 4,500,000	\$4,500,000 - Potential Street Improvements Construction Projects 2025 which equates to 20.23 total lane miles.	Street Reconstruction FY24: \$7,793,000 FY23: \$9,369,130 FY22: \$2,046,329 FY21: \$2,546,329 FY20: \$4,801,400
Engineering	Complete Streets Overlay 2025	\$ 3,500,000	\$3,500,000 - Potential Street Improvements Construction Projects 2025. We have submitted 13.29 lane miles as candidates for Complete Streets Overlay 2025. The 3.5 million asked would cover less than half of those 13.29 lane miles.	Street Overlay FY24: \$1,250,000 FY22: \$175,000 FY20: \$1,000,000
Engineering	Public Way Concrete 2025	\$ 750,000	\$750,000	Public Way Concrete FY24: 750,000 FY23: 436,281 FY22: \$750,000 FY20: \$402,443
Engineering	Alleyway Improvements and Mitigation 2025	\$ 500,000	\$200,000 would allow us to address two alleys (this request would cover ~5 alleys)	Alleyway Improvements FY24: \$250,000 FY23: \$142,919 FY21: \$200,000
Public Lands	Courts & Playgrounds	\$ 3,100,000	Approximately \$600,000 for one playground or \$950,000 for one court, depending on the location, size, need, and condition of the asset(s).	Courts and Playgrounds FY24: \$1,574,000 FY23: \$521,564 FY22: \$1,113,045
Public Lands	Transitioning to Regionally-Appropriate Landscapes, Adapting Irrigation Systems, and Reducing Water Use	\$ 3,250,000	\$500,000: design and new irrigation for roughly 2.5 acres. Replacing irrigation systems costs an average of \$200,000 per acre, when factoring in design, construction, and soft costs.	Waterwise Enhancements FY20: \$419,328
Public Services	Facilities Replacement and Renewal Plan	\$ 2,756,500	\$1,366,350	Facilities Asset Replacement and Renewal FY24: \$2,848,771 FY23: \$1,790,149 FY22: \$1,570,509 FY21: \$2,503,710 FY20: \$1,250,000
Transportation	Livable Streets Program	\$ 3,000,000	\$500,000	Livable Streets FY24: \$1,644,126 FY21: \$270,000 FY20: \$849,500

Transportation	Neighborhood Byways Program	\$ 1,600,000	\$970,000	Neighborhood Byways FY24: 800,000 FY22: \$1,545,000 FY20: \$150,000
Transportation	Safer Crossings Citywide	\$ 600,000	\$300,000	Transportation Safety FY24: \$1,220,000 FY23: \$1,013,313 FY22: \$2,178,815 FY21: \$2,284,945 FY20: \$452,000
Transportation	Traffic Signal Replacement and Upgrades Program	\$ 2,700,000	\$800,000	Traffic Signal and Intersection Upgrades FY24: \$400,000 FY23: \$81,000 FY22: \$1,014,450 FY21: \$1,800,000 FY20: \$700,000
Transportation	Transit Capital Program / Funding Our Future Transit	\$ 1,500,000	\$500,000	Transit Capital FY24: \$1,100,000 FY23: \$1,100,000 FY21: \$1,067,000 FY20: \$1,100,000
Transportation	Urban Trails Program	\$ 1,500,000	\$600,000	Urban Trails FY24: \$1,700,000 FY22: \$2,231,750 FY21: \$3,192,000

Notes:

Minimum \$ Required - How much funding is needed to accomplish critical items this fiscal year

The Historical Annual Funding column does not include dollar amounts allocated in Budget Amendments, Recaptures or Administrative Budget Adjustments

Appendix H: Partial Funding

Department/Division	Project Title	Requested \$	Partial Funding Details
Econ Dev/Arts Council	Art Barn Failing Infrastructure and Accessibility Improvement Request	\$ 500,000	Yes, Hardwood Floor Replacement \$45,000 Lighting Upgrade - \$35,000 Interior Accessibility Ramp \$45,000 Lower-Level Artist Studio and Community Workspace Renovation \$100,000 Office Suite Renovation \$30,000
Engineering	Complete Streets Reconstruction 2025	\$ 4,500,000	Yes, although it is not advised. Even if fully funded at this requested funding rate, we will still witness a continued degradation to the city street system as a whole and the city will be forced to continuously seek bond after bond to improve the road network. Currently 447 Lane Miles have an OCI of less than 40 (SLC has approximately 1,850 lane miles total). Minimum funding needed: \$4,500,000 - Potential Street Improvements Construction Projects 2025 which equates to 20.23 total lane miles. Recommended annual funding: \$46,500,000 this is to achieve a backlog of 15%
Engineering	Complete Streets Overlay 2025	\$ 3,500,000	Yes, this is a partial funding request. Even if fully funded at this requested funding rate, we will still witness a continued degradation to the city street system as a whole and the city will be forced to continuously seek bond after bond to improve the road network. 86.25 lane miles are eligible as of 2/21/2024. This is based on RAS maintenance recommendations of 40-50 OCI and additional criteria set by the SLC Engineering Division. Minimum funding needed: \$3,500,000 - Potential Street Improvements Construction Projects 2025. We have submitted 13.29 lane miles as candidates for Complete Streets Overlay 2025. The 3.5 million asked would cover less than half of those 13.29 lane miles. Recommended annual funding: \$20,000,000. This would fund roughly 31.56 lane miles of overlays.
Engineering	700 South (Phase 7, 4600 West to 5000 West) Additional Funding	\$ 4,500,000	We are asking for a portion of the required amount. Construction ready but cannot start until fully funded. The request is as follows: Additional funding is needed to complete the package for multiple reasons: a water main 1,300 feet long is required to be replaced (\$650,000) which is unfunded by SLC Public Utilities constrained budget; Styrofoam fill was proposed to mitigate settlement over the water main as a cost savings method, however that proposal was rejected; Union Pacific changed the City cost of the rail crossing from \$400,000 to \$1,200,000; and inflation continues to drive up the cost of construction Minimum funding needed: \$4,500,000
Engineering	400 South Jordan River Bridge Reconstruction	\$ 4,000,000	Yes, we are asking for a portion of the required amount. Funding could be split among multiple CIP FY cycles, however each year of delaying project construction for additional funding increases the final price tag. Minimum funding needed: \$4,000,000
Engineering	Public Way Concrete 2025	\$ 750,000	Yes. A reduction from the requested amount will reduce the length of sidewalk and number of access ramps that can be constructed. This requested amount is sorely needed to improve the current sidewalk network quality. Currently the city receives approximately 50% more service requests than can be addressed annually when this program is fully funded. Due to reduced funding in previous years (54% in FY19/20, 0% in FY20/21, and 58% in FY22/23) Engineering has a backlog of over 450 sidewalk service requests. Minimum funding needed: \$750,000 Recommended annual funding: \$750,000 based on current capacity; however, this figure is subject to change as data becomes available
Engineering	Alleyway Improvements and Mitigation 2025	\$ 500,000	Yes, although it is not advised as partial funding will reduce the number of alleys improved. It's worth highlighting that our current funding model operates more as a pilot program, addressing requests on a case-by-case basis rather than through an established standard or policy for alleyway mitigation. Minimum funding needed: \$200k would allow us to address two alleys (this request would cover ~5 alleys) Recommended annual funding: The precise value is currently unavailable as we await the results of an ongoing survey. These pending findings are expected to inform the establishment of a standard selection procedure, aiding in determining the appropriate funding level.
Fire	Fire Training Grounds Site Improvements	\$ 1,410,300	Yes. The project could be phased through 4 different areas. In order of priority: Required for all areas: • Engineering and Design \$196,617.00 • Contractor OH&P 17%, Bonding & Insurance 3.5%, Owner's Construction Contingency 10%, Escalation 32%, SLC Engineering Fees 0.8% 1. Turn-Out Cleaning Room expansion and PPV - \$40,240 2. Security System and lights - \$37,669 3. Grounds – excavation, re-grading, curb and gutter, landscaping, storm water, backfill, paving, extrication pads, and technical props - \$436,431 4. Fencing - \$86,200 Minimum funding needed: Required Amount (varies) + Turn-Out Cleaning Room expansion and PPV \$40,240
Fire	Stabilize the Fire Training Tower Deterioration	\$ 858,800	No. The project cannot be partially funded as each step is contingent on the other. The work is as follows: 1. Div 01 - Erect Scaffolding and Prepare Existing Surface \$333,040 2. Div 03 - Patch and Repair Spalled Concrete \$99,445 3. Div 07 - Concrete Waterproofing \$58,140 4. Div 32 - Misc. \$25,000 Subtotal \$515,625 5. General Conditions \$103,125 6. Overhead & Profit \$51,563 7. Bonds & Insurance \$10,313 8. Contingency \$77,344 Total \$757,969 – adjusted for 2024 = \$858,800 Minimum funding needed: \$858,800

			Yes, the Structural Assessments and Concept Design (the constituent application's scope) could be completed separately. Funding both the constituent application (\$124,000) and this internal application (\$921,700) would be preferable and would fund concept design and construction document development, which are both critical steps that must occur before an accurate construction/implementation funding request can be made in FY 26.
Public Lands	Liberty Park Greenhouse Design and Construction Documents	\$ 921,700	Another note: Public Lands is currently exploring emergency improvements to the east bay of the Liberty Park Greenhouse to allow this one part of the greenhouse to be used for operations while a larger renovation project is underway.
Public Lands	Transitioning to Regionally-Appropriate Landscapes, Adapting Irrigation Systems, and Reducing Water Use	\$ 3,250,000	This is likely to be a programmatic, reoccurring application with annual funding requests for replacement of irrigation systems (critical infrastructure) that support the city's living landscape. The minimum effective amount of funding for this fiscal year's request is \$500,000: design and new irrigation for roughly 2.5 acres. Replacing irrigation systems costs an average of \$200,000 per acre, when factoring in design, construction, and soft costs. Fully funding this request would fund new irrigation systems for up to 16 acres (which is less than 2% of the Public Lands Department's irrigated landscapes). Due to the 25-30 year lifespan of irrigation systems and some landscapes, and in order to replace and/or upgrade systems that irrigate 3-5% of the Public Lands' landscapes per year, on-going requests would be around the \$6 million to \$9 million per year range going forward, though that determination has not been made or included in the department's capital asset plan. Replacement of irrigation systems significantly reduces the use of water, a critical resource in our climate. Water costs are also the single largest operating cost for the Public Lands Department. The Department suggests that irrigation system upgrades or replacements and turf reduction strategies (for the same site) be funded and occur at the same time. This will allow new landscaping to be appropriately cared for rather than retrofitted to fit an unaccommodating, inefficient irrigation system.
Public Lands	Green Loop Implementation	\$ 10,000,000	Yes, in the following order. 1. A minimum of \$700,000 (for design and construction) in 1/4 Cent transportation funding is needed to match the federal grant for State Street's addition of active transportation facilities. 2. An additional \$5 million would fund full design (i.e., create bid documents ready for construction) for 3-5 blocks of 200 East. Design is typically estimated at 10% of project construction costs. The combination of State Street match (for design and construction) and 200 East (for design) would bring a partial funding request to \$5.7 million. 3. Fully funding this request (including the above and the remaining \$4.3 million) in FY 24/25 would provide the Green Loop team more flexibility and leverage when exploring additional funding sources to bring strategic segments to construction as quickly as possible. Not funding the remaining \$4.3 million would push a much larger construction funding request to FY 25/26. Additional funding requests are likely in FY 25/26 and other future application rounds. If no additional, outside funds are available, a minimum construction strategy might focus this \$10 million funding request (along with state funds awarded or pending) to construct at least one prototype block on 200 East, tentatively in 2026.
Public Lands	Memory Grove Park Urgent Repairs + Preservation & Maintenance Plan	\$ 1,910,000	Yes. This Memory Grove Park application comprises two possible phases: Phase 1 consists of urgent repairs while Phase 2 is focused on the development of a Preservation & Maintenance Plan. 1. The full request for the Preservation & Maintenance Plan (\$160,000) should be considered essential. It must work hand-in-hand with any of the urgent repairs (Phase 2) that are funded. 2. Nine (9) urgent repairs have been prioritized by City staff (see project description for the complete list). If needed, the order of priority and/or number of repairs could be adjusted to meet nearly any partial funding amount. It should be noted that performing repairs in separate phases would result in a higher overall cost (particularly due to "soft costs").
Public Services	Plaza 349 HVAC Improvements - Phase I	\$ 2,200,000	Yes - this is a phased project. We are seeking funding for phase 1. Phase I - Estimated Cost \$2.2 Million (adjusted for inflation), a reduction in funding would allow us to address some of the items below. • Design Life safety, access controls, and security systems • Upgrade Life safety, access control, and security systems • Design HVAC System • Upgrade Key HVAC Systems Phase II - Estimated Cost \$2 Million (not adjusted for inflation) • Upgrade piping and terminal units on floors 1-3 Phase III - Estimated Cost \$2 Million (not adjusted for inflation) • Upgrade piping and terminal units on floors 4-6 Phase IV - Estimated Cost \$1 Million (not adjusted for inflation) • Upgrade air handlers • Repair parking structure and canopy
Public Services	Plaza 349 EV Charging Phase 1 and 2	\$ 601,900	Yes. The project is broken into 3 phases, currently seeking funding for phase 1 and 2, currently 7 electrical vehicles are in this lot and only 4 EV chargers. Chargers to be added in phase 2. In order of priority: 1. Phase 1 – Addition of a utility switch, 500kVA Utility Transformer, and 1600A 208V 3Ø SES-EV-1 - \$499,043 2. Phase 2 - (8) L2 Chargers - \$102,836 3. Phase 3 - (8) L2 Chargers -\$105,715 Minimum funding needed: \$499,043 + 102,836
Public Services	PSB EV Charging Phase 1 and 2	\$ 874,400	Yes. The project is broken into 3 phases, currently seeking funding for phase 1 and 2 to capture the needs for the current and incoming PD and Fire EV. In order of priority: 1. Phase 1 – Addition of a 1000kVA Utility Transformer, 2500A 208V 3Ø SES-EV-1, Proposed 1200A 208V Panel, and (6) L2 Chargers- \$709,633 2. Phase 2 - 1000A 208V Panel and (8) L2 Chargers - \$164,749 3. Phase 3 - (6) L2 Chargers - \$76,118 Minimum funding needed: \$709,633
Public Services	HVAC Control Replacement at PSB	\$ 1,300,000	No, all of the controls will need to be addressed at the same time.

			We are seeking \$250,000 in funding for the second phase of our initiative, aimed at conducting a comprehensive feasibility study for a new training facility. The current facility's inadequacy in capacity and condition is exacerbated by the anticipated growth in the Northwest region, driven by an inland port and business developments. With projected population growth in the downtown area and the potential addition of two more professional sports teams, the demand on the Salt Lake City Police Department (SLC PD) and Salt Lake City Fire Department (SLC FD) is expected to surge. Meeting these increasing demands necessitates additional trained personnel to address the heightened call volume from residents and visitors. A new training center is central to our ability to adequately train current and future first responders, making planning for these anticipated increases vital to ensuring the safety and security of our growing community. The requested funds will be used to conduct the feasibility study, addressing Public Safety, Public Services, and Community Access components. This study is essential for identifying design requirements and establishing a well-defined project scope, laying the foundation for subsequent project phases.
Police	Police Department Training Center	\$ 250,000	Minimum funding needed: \$75,000 (this is our on-call purchasing limit, for scoping, designing, and rendering the project we will require the full amount.)
Police	Drop Arm Gate on the Entry to the Rear Parking Lot	\$ 50,000	No, all of the electrical trenching for the booth, cameras, and lighting will need to be addressed at the same time.
			Yes. The project could be phased through 4 different areas. In order of priority: Priority 1 - ROOM 4621 - \$186,902.30 Priority 2 - ROOM 3445 - \$78,842.40 Priority 3 - ROOM 2214 - \$112,984.30 Priority 4 4th ROOM 2251 - \$142,499.50 4th ROOM 2412 - \$26,868.40 4th ROOM 2263 - \$96,801.90
Police	SLC Public Safety Building (Police Occupancy) Remodels	\$ 650,000	Minimum funding needed: \$265,744.70 (Priority 1 & 2)
			Yes. The minimum partial funding amount would be approximately \$600,000 for one playground or \$950,000 for one court, depending on the location, size, need, and condition of the asset(s). If the CDCIP Board, Mayor, or City Council would like to inquire about one or more specific sites, Public Lands will provide a more accurate (and potentially less expensive) estimate. However, this application expresses a programmatic, reoccurring need with annual funding requests for the replacement of courts and playgrounds that support the city's ability to provide safe recreation and active play infrastructure. The expected life cycle of each playground/court is roughly 20-25 years. Based on the number of courts and playgrounds in Salt Lake City's inventory, two to three playgrounds and two to three courts should be funded for replacement each year (an approximately \$4.5 to \$5 million recurring request). The General Fund is the only funding source eligible for these project types, unless an expansion of level of service is desired for any court or playground replacement (in which case that part of the work would be impact fee eligible). The following is a list of potential parks where courts and/or playground replacement projects could occur with this year's and subsequent years' funding requests, in descending order of priority (including condition, opportunity, geographic need, and equity criteria). 1. Popperton Park (playground) 2. Wasatch Hollow Park (playground) 3. Sunnyside Park (courts) 4. 10th East Senior Center (courts) 5. Riverside Park (courts and playground) 6. Fairmont Park (courts, possibly playground) 7. Warm Springs Park (courts) 8. Westpointe Park (courts and playground)
Public Lands	Courts & Playgrounds	\$ 3,100,000	
Public Lands	Amplifying Our Jordan River Revitalization: Doubling Bond Investment	\$ 1,500,000	The bulk of this request (\$1,250,000) could be partially funded at any dollar amount in order to increase the impact of GO Bond funding. Any partial funding dedicated to this part of the scope would go towards expanding improvements funded by the GO Bond, specifically in Bend in the River, Modesto Park, and the International Peace Gardens. Planning, design, and immediate improvements at the International Peace Gardens could also be funded independently at \$350,000.
			This project could be funded in three separate phases. However, funding more than one phase at a time (in the following order of priority) would ensure better project outcomes, less overlap or rework, and lower costs. 1. Planning, Design, and Engagement for the RAC and the Rose Park Lane Open Space: Must be completed prior to construction (see #2, below) and is estimated to cost \$1,300,000 (likely 100% impact fee eligible). 2. Construction (also known as Phase 1 Construction): Two multi-use fields, walkways, and the northern parking lot in the RAC are estimated to cost \$4,100,000 (likely 100% impact fee eligible). If only partial funding is available, this request could be reduced to fund one field (\$1,750,000 each) and the parking lot and walkways (\$600,000) for \$2,350,000, or just the parking lot and walkways for \$600,000 as they are essential to facilitating use of any new fields. 3. Rose Park Lane Trail Reconstruction and Beautification: This part of the scope could be implemented by itself or along with any other phase for \$850,000, and is partially impact fee eligible.
Public Lands	"Elevating Access": The Regional Athletic Complex's Blueprint for the Future	\$ 6,250,000	
Public Lands	Sugar House Park – Two Pavilion Replacements for the Cost of One	\$ 960,000	No, not very easily. Salt Lake County (a 50/50 funding partner) can only match what the City funds. Due to the County's funding decision occurring between the time of this writing (February 2024) and the City's CIP funding award (August 2024), partial funding by the City would result in only a 33% match, which is at odds with the City's and County's cooperative funding agreement for Sugar House Park. Delays in Salt Lake City's or Salt Lake County's funding would also increase the risk to and costs of this project and future projects.

			Yes, although it is not advised as these critical and deferred assets will increase the risk of a costly critical failure and will be more expensive to replace in the future due to inflation. The program could be addressed at the following funding levels: 1. Critical Components – Priority 1 and 2 – \$1,366,350 2. Critical Components – Priority 1, 2, and 3 – \$2,756,500 Minimum funding needed: \$1,366,350 Recommended annual funding: \$9,240,000 (IFMA National Standard), we currently receive \$350K ongoing and variable \$1.7M to 2.2M through CIP requests, ideally this can also become ongoing, bringing our total to \$2,500,000.
Public Services	Facilities Replacement and Renewal Plan	\$ 2,756,500	
Transportation	Transportation Corridor Transformations	\$ 4,600,000	\$560,000
Transportation	Livable Streets Program	\$ 3,000,000	See Transportation specific spreadsheet
Transportation	Neighborhood Byways Program	\$ 1,600,000	See Transportation specific spreadsheet
Transportation	Safer Crossings Citywide	\$ 600,000	See Transportation specific spreadsheet
Transportation	Traffic Signal Replacement and Upgrades Program	\$ 2,700,000	See Transportation specific spreadsheet
Transportation	Transit Capital Program / Funding Our Future Transit	\$ 1,500,000	See Transportation specific spreadsheet
Transportation	Urban Trails Program	\$ 1,500,000	See Transportation specific spreadsheet

Program priority	Program	Project Title	Project priority within Program	Program request	Program minimum	Project ideally needed + program request may be fiscally constrained	Project minimum	Constraints of minimum	Leveraged funds / grants	Amount Leveraged	Legal considerations	Could this project be partially funded? (i.e. phasing the project or supplementing with other funding sources)
1	Livable Streets Program (Zone 10-15)			\$3,000,000	\$500,000					-		Average \$500,000 per zone; amount varies with zone size, street characteristics, traffic intensity, etc.
2	Safer Crossings Citywide			\$600,000	\$300,000			limited to minor treatments		-		At current costs, single crossing (HAWK + bulbouts) may cost in excess of the \$600,000 being requested. \$300,000 would allow some RRFBs or other less expensive treatments.
3	Traffic Signal Replacement and Upgrades Program			\$2,700,000	\$800,000			2 signals				Yes. Full funding would help us to retire aged traffic signals closer to their normal retirement age of 30 years, decreasing maintenance costs and improving safety. This program has been chronically underfunded for over a decade. Need flexibility for emergency situations.
4	Neighborhood Byways Program			\$1,600,000	\$970,000							
		Kensington Neighborhood Byway (700 E crossing)	6A			\$1,600,000	\$400,000	\$400k as match, or \$1.6 million to proceed without TTIF award	Pending state TTIF-FLM; scored #5 statewide	\$1,120,000		If pending state grant is received, \$400,000 needed for match. If no grant, \$1,600,000 will enable this crossing to go forward w/ prior Kensington CIP & federal funds. Otherwise this crossing will be held until additional funds are received.
		800 East Neighborhood Byway (400 S to 1300 S)	6B			\$570,000	\$570,000	match or design	Pending state TTIF-FLM; scored #7 statewide (tied)	\$1,330,000		If pending state grant is received, \$570,000 needed for match for design & construction. If not received, \$570,000 would go toward design and/or other citywide.
		800 East Neighborhood Byway / 1300 South Intersection	6C			\$480,000	\$480,000					If pending state grant is received, \$570,000 needed for match for design & construction. If not received, \$570,000 would go toward design and/or other citywide.
		Other citywide / contingency	6D			\$150,000						Funds to ensure completion of projects listed above and/or to be used strategically toward design and construction of other neighborhood byways in Salt Lake City.
5	Transit Capital Program / Funding Our Future			\$1,500,000	\$500,000			Note: FOF Transit funding source for this program.	UTA matches with shelters and amenities	generally doubles our investment		This project is highly scalable. Partial funding could be used to construct fewer stops and connections. These investments are budget neutral for maintenance, except when custom furnishings are used, which will be included at key locations as part of FTN branding. UTA funds the maintenance of the furnishings at standard bus stops, but will not fund the maintenance of custom furnishings.
6	Urban Trails Program			\$1,500,000	\$600,000							
		Sugar House Greenway Extension (to accompany S-Line Extension)	8A			\$450,000	\$300,000		State legislature earmark, UTA funds	\$16,000,000		S-Line Extension under construction in later part of 2024; without funding UTA will require an ugly chainlink fence to provide a physical barricade between pedestrians and the train.
		Alphabet Trail (along east side of 1300 East, Alphabet Streets area)	8B			\$500,000	\$300,000	Concrete only; no landscaping or lights.	WFRC federal grant (\$8 million), SLC Bond	\$11,700,000	Complete Streets ordinance	Ideal construction timing with 1300 East reconstruction in 2025.
		The Other Side Village to Orange Street Transit Hub	8C			\$500,000	\$500,000	design only				Construction preparation: Soil testing, design, and permitting for trail skirting or on top of retired SLC landfill on SLC-owned land
		Citywide / contingency	8D			\$50,000						Funds to ensure completion of projects listed above and/or to be used strategically toward design and construction of other urban trails in Salt Lake City.