



City of North Mankato, Minnesota

To: Mayor Dehen & City Council
 From: Kevin McCann, Finance Director and John Harrenstein, City Administrator
 Date: September 23, 2016
 Re: CIP Priority Memo

Background

As explained in the last CIP memo, the 2017-2021 CIP totals \$21 Million for the City of North Mankato. This CIP is the first draft of a multi-year planning instrument identifying the needs and financing sources for vehicles, equipment, public infrastructure, and amenities over the next five years. Staff has taken a look at existing documents, department goals and other documents to expand the CIP to 2022-2026. Although there are many projects and equipment in the CIP, the goal of this memo and the Council Workshop on October 3rd is for the council to score and prioritize the projects identified by staff for CIP consideration.

Project Scoring

The proposed CIP Policy is being developed that explains how projects and equipment are added to the CIP and ranked two ways. Items to be submitted into the CIP are initially ranked by staff based on the Project Submittal Ranking System based on the item's priority and proposed financing. The top needs are then further scored through the Council Ranking System. The explanation of these ranking methods is explained below.

Project Submittal Ranking System – As project requests are submitted, staff will score the project on two grades - one to rank the priority and one to rank the financing. In both instances the rankings receive a score of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5. An explanation of the scoring system is as follows:

Level	Project Priority	Project Financing
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integral component to continuity of City's operations; • High community demand • Identified in planning document, strategic plan, departmental budget request, or City Council action 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available funds on hand or outside funding obtained • No impact on utility rates or property tax levy
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very important component to continuity of City's operations • Great Community Interest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds may be available with nominal impact on utility rates or property tax levy.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important component to continuity of City's operations • Some Community Interest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate impact on utility rates or property tax levy
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low component to continuity of City's operations; • Limited community interest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future Consideration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unidentified

City Council Ranking System – Staff and Council will further prioritize projects based on the following criteria and scoring process to determine the top projects for funding. This will then be reviewed by the City Council as part of the CIP process.

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group • 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal • 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority • 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan • 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support.
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy • 3 pts. – Nominal to moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal to moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates • 4 pts – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates • 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or significant outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Less than 10 years • 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. • 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. • 4 pts – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. • 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint.
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service • 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems • 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems • 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 • 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 • 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 • 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 • 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000

Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato • 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato • 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions.
Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide.
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on the local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have moderate effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional economy
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment.
Additional Questions	• Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? With whom?	Not ranked
	• Project has a current development agreement? With whom?	Not ranked
	• Project leverages non-city financial resources?	Not ranked

Staff Scoring

After reviewing all the items submitted for inclusion in the CIP, staff has identified 47 projects or equipment that needed further evaluation. During a staff meeting on September 14th, staff scored 39 out of the 47 projects. The complete ranking of projects is found in **Attachment A**. The top ten projects identified are:

Project	Priority	Staff Project Score (53 max)	Council Project Score (53 max)	Total	YEAR
Benson Park Shelter and Restroom Complex	2	42		187,500	2017
Benson Park North Parking Lot	2	42		165,000	2017
Trail from Marie to Lake St	5	40		100,000	2018
Spring Lake Park Restroom Facility	2	38		75,000	2017
Benson Park Lady Bug Trail Bridge	2	37		30,000	2017
Benson Park Linear Pond Bridge	2	37		50,000	2017
Marvin Lift Station Rehab	3	36		100,000	2018
I&I Investigation & Lining Repairs – Study Req.	2	36		1,500,000	2026
1997 Pumper Replacement	3	33		550,000	2022
Pump Station - Sherman St.	3	33		500,000	2026

With the exception of the \$1.5 million I&I project, most of these projects are smaller park projects funded with Park Capital Funding, utility projects funded with utility rates, or the fire pumper with a to be determined funding source. Staff then broke the projects into different categories as identified in **Attachment B** for the council.

Projects

Attachment B breaks the projects down into different categories and ranks them according to the staff scores. Additional notes were added based on how the project will move forward based on development needs, utility needs, or additional studies needed. Notes have also been added based on known funding sources. For simplicity, staff has split these 47 projects into the two phases of the CIP: 2017-2021 projects and equipment (**Attachment C**) and 2022-2026 (**Attachment D**) projects and equipment.

In general staff has scored these projects based on their department needs and perspectives, but now we ask for the City Council’s input in these projects. Some takeaways from Staff that should be shared are: reconstruction projects are not identified as the big priority they once were considered and there has not been much subdivision activity in the past year, therefore subdivision partnerships should be explored.

Council Scoring

Due to various factors and unknowns, street reconstruction projects, development related projects, and utility related projects are being excluded of the Council’s scoring. Instead, the Council will score the projects requiring the input for further consideration. Please score the projects contained in **Packet 1**. This has the project summaries for the 25 projects staff needs further direction on. **Packet 2** has the scoring sheet for each corresponding project. Please use the next week to score these projects from your own perspectives and understanding of each project. The scoring sheet has the definition for each criterion and explains how points are distributed. Please return the scores to City Hall by noon on Friday, September 30th so staff can begin to compile scores before the October 3rd Workshop.

Once again, The goal of the Council scoring and Workshop is to determine the top priorities for the CIP, essentially what should be done in the first few years of the CIP, and to determine next steps for specific projects.

A.

City of North Mankato, Minnesota
Capital Improvement Plan

2017 2026

ALL PROJECTS

Project	Priority	Staff Project Score (53 max)	Council Project Score (53 max)	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
Benson Park Shelter and Restroom Complex	2	42		187,500										187,500
Benson Park North Parking Lot	2	42		165,000										165,000
Trail connecting Lake and Marie	5	40			100,000									100,000
Spring Lake Park Restroom Facility	2	38		75,000										75,000
Benson Park Lady Bug Trail Bridge	2	37		30,000										30,000
Benson Park Linear Pond Bridge	2	37		50,000										50,000
Marvin Lift Station Rehab	3	36			100,000									100,000
IBI Investigation & Lining Repairs	2	36										1,500,000		1,500,000
1997 Pumper Replacement	3	33							550,000					550,000
Pump Station - Sherman St.	3	33										500,000		500,000
Pump Station - Wheeler Ave.	3	33										500,000		500,000
Pump Station - Lake St.	3	33										750,000		750,000
Belgrade Street/Sidewalk, Beautification Project	4	33										2,500,000		2,500,000
Street Project - Aspen Lane Ext.	4	33										1,500,000		1,500,000
Future Subdivision Project	5	33										1,500,000		1,500,000
Caswell Park Facility Upgrades & Improvements	5	32										1,500,000		1,500,000
Trail along Lookout Dr.	3	32										1,250,000		1,250,000
Ringhofer Dr. Extension	4	32										1,200,000		1,200,000
Spring Lake Park Parking Lot	5	31										150,000		150,000
Edgewood Ravine Stabilization	4	31							100,000					100,000
Taylor Library Expansion	5	29										1,800,000		1,800,000
Street & Utility Project - Jeffer., Quincy, Sherman	3	29									1,500,000			1,500,000
Street & Utility Project - McKinley Ave.	3	29									1,500,000			1,500,000
Street & Utility Project - Harrison, Monroe	2	29							1,500,000					1,500,000
Street & Utility Project - Cross and Tyler	3	29										1,500,000		1,500,000
Street & Utility Project - Garfield and Grant	3	29										1,500,000		1,500,000
Street & Utility Project - Cliff Dr. & Cliff Ct.	3	29											1,500,000	1,500,000
Street & Utility Project - Park & Page	3	29										1,800,000		1,800,000
The Reserve 2 Project	5	29							1,500,000					1,500,000
Caswell Park Exp. - Ice Arena - Ph. 1	3	28											8,210,000	8,210,000
Splash Pad	5	28											50,000	50,000
Downlowm Parking Lot	2	28							190,000					190,000
Placemaking and Historic Preservation	5	27											100,000	100,000
Commerce Dr. Street Redevelopment	5	27											1,500,000	1,500,000
Caswell Park Expansion - Indoor Turf Facility	3	26											5,150,000	5,150,000
Public Works Building Project	5	26											3,600,000	3,600,000
1991 Support Van Replacement	3	25							110,000					110,000
Caswell Park Expansion - Aquatic Facility	3	23											9,050,000	9,050,000
Street Facility Evaluation & Roof Repair	2	N/A		20,000										20,000
Spring Lake Park Swim Facility Study	3	N/A		8,500										8,500
Swim Facility - Filter Upgrades	3	N/A			120,000									120,000
Swim Facility - Diving Well Upgrades	4	N/A											20,000	20,000
Swim Facility - Slide Feature	4	N/A											100,000	100,000
Swim Facility - Upgrade Pool	3	N/A											1,500,000	1,500,000
Well and Pump Repairs	n/a	N/A			65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000		520,000
Rehab Filter at Plant 1	n/a	N/A							350,000					350,000
Water Tower Maintenance	n/a	N/A							150,000					150,000
GRAND TOTAL				536,000	385,000	65,000	65,000	175,000	4,405,000	65,000	3,065,000	5,015,000	45,280,000	59,056,000

B.

City of North Mankato, Minnesota
 Capital Improvement Plan
 2017 through 2026
 PROJECTS BY CATEGORY

Category	Priority	Staff Project Score (53 max)	Council Project Score (53 max)	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total	Development Driven	Utility Funded	Additional Study Needed	Notes
Small Projects & Equipment																		
Benson Park Shelter and Restroom Complex	2	42		187,500										187,500				Funded with park capital outlay
Benson Park North Parking Lot	2	42		165,000										165,000				Funded with park capital outlay
Trail from Marie to Lake	5	40			100,000									100,000				
Spring Lake Park Restroom Facility	2	38		75,000										75,000				Half funded by MAYBA
Benson Park Lady Bug Trail Bridge	2	37		30,000										30,000				Funded with park capital outlay
Benson Park Linear Pond Bridge	2	37		50,000										50,000				Funded with park capital outlay
1997 Pumper Replacement	3	33							550,000					550,000				
Spring Lake Park Parking Lot	5	31										150,000		150,000				
Splash Pad	5	28											50,000	50,000				Funded with park capital outlay
Placemaking and Historic Preservation	5	27											100,000	100,000				
1991 Support Van Replacement	3	25						110,000						110,000				
Street Facility Evaluation & Roof Repair	2	N/A		20,000										20,000				Funded with cap. Fac. & Equip. Rep.
Spring Lake Park Swim Facility Study	3	N/A		8,500										8,500				Funded with swim facility operations
Small Projects & Equipment Total				536,000	100,000	0	0	110,000	550,000	0	0	150,000	150,000	1,596,000				
Street Projects																		
Belgrade Street/Sidewalk, Beautification Project	4	33											2,500,000	2,500,000			X	Master plan completion required
Street & Utility Project - Jeffer., Quincy, Sher.	3	29											1,500,000	1,500,000			X	Staff does not recommend in 2017
Street & Utility Project - McKinley Ave.	3	29											1,500,000	1,500,000			X	Staff does not recommend in 2017
Street & Utility Project - Harrison, Monroe	2	29											1,500,000	1,500,000			X	Staff does not recommend in 2017
Street & Utility Project - Cross and Tyler	3	29											1,500,000	1,500,000			X	Staff does not recommend in 2017
Street & Utility Project - Garfield and Grant	3	29											1,500,000	1,500,000			X	Staff does not recommend in 2017
Street & Utility Project - Cliff Dr. & Cliff Ct.	3	29											1,500,000	1,500,000			X	Staff does not recommend in 2017
Street & Utility Project - Park & Page	3	29											1,800,000	1,800,000			X	Staff does not recommend in 2017
Commerce Dr. Street Redevelopment	5	27											1,500,000	1,500,000			X	Staff does not recommend in 2017
Street Project Total				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,800,000	14,800,000				
Based on Development Demands																		
Street Project - Aspen Lane Ext.	4	33											1,500,000	1,500,000	X		X	Will move forward as development demands
Future Subdivision Project	5	33											1,500,000	1,500,000	X		X	Will move forward as development demands
Ringhofer Dr. Extension	4	32											1,200,000	1,200,000	X		X	Will move forward as development demands
The Reserve 2 Project	5	29											1,500,000	1,500,000	X		X	Will move forward as development demands
Downtown Parking Lot	2	28							190,000					190,000	X		X	Will move forward as development demands
Development Demands Total				0	0	0	0	0	190,000	0	0	0	5,700,000	5,890,000				
Operational Study Needed																		
Caswell Park Facility Upgrades & Improve.	5	32											1,500,000	1,500,000				Dependent on extension of sales tax
Trail along Lookout Dr.	3	32											1,250,000	1,250,000				Further study required
Taylor Library Expansion	5	29											1,800,000	1,800,000				Library strategic plan needed
Caswell Park Exp. - Ice Arena - Ph. 1	3	28											8,210,000	8,210,000				Sales tax extension & reg. partners needed
Caswell Park Expansion - Indoor Turf Facility	3	26											5,150,000	5,150,000				Additional feasibility studies needed
Public Works Building Project	5	26											3,600,000	3,600,000				Facility needs analysis required
Caswell Park Expansion - Aquatic Facility	3	23											9,050,000	9,050,000				Sales tax extension & reg. partners needed
Swim Facility - Filter Upgrades	3	N/A			120,000									120,000				
Swim Facility - Diving Well Upgrades	4	N/A											20,000	20,000				Dependent on results of study
Swim Facility - Slide Feature	4	N/A											100,000	100,000				Dependent on results of study
Swim Facility - Upgrade Pool	3	N/A											1,500,000	1,500,000				Dependent on results of study
Operational Study Needed Total				0	120,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32,180,000	32,300,000				

PROJECTS BY CATEGORY

Department	Priority	Staff Project Score (53 max)	Council Project Score (53 max)	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total	Development Driven	Utility Funded	Additional Study Needed	Notes
Utility Related																		
Marvin Lift Station Rehab	3	36		100,000										0		X		Will move depending on cash flow
I&I Investigation & Lining Repairs	2	36											1,500,000	1,500,000		X		Cost-benefit analysis required
Pump Station - Sherman St.	3	33											500,000	500,000		X		No funding identified
Pump Station - Wheeler Ave.	3	33											500,000	500,000		X		No funding identified
Pump Station - Lake St.	3	33											750,000	750,000		X		No funding identified
Edgewood Ravine Stabilization	4	31							100,000					100,000		X		No funding identified
Well and Pump Repairs	n/a	N/A		65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000		520,000		X		Will move forward based on cash flow
Rehab Filter at Plant 1	n/a	N/A							350,000					350,000		X		Will move forward based on cash flow
Water Tower Maintenance	n/a	N/A							150,000					150,000		X		Will move forward based on cash flow
Utility Related Total				100,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	665,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	3,250,000	4,370,000				
GRAND TOTAL				636,000	285,000	65,000	65,000	175,000	1,405,000	65,000	65,000	215,000	56,080,000	59,056,000				

B.

City of North Mankato, Minnesota
 Capital Improvement Plan
 2017 through 2021

PROJECTS BY CATEGORY

Category	Priority	Staff Project Score (53 max)	Council Project Score (53 max)	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total	Development Driven	Utility Funded	Additional Study Needed	Notes
Small Projects & Equipment													
Benson Park Shelter and Restroom Complex	2	42		187,500					187,500				Funded with park capital outlay
Benson Park North Parking Lot	2	42		165,000					165,000				Funded with park capital outlay
Trail from Marie to Lake	5	40			100,000				100,000				
Spring Lake Park Restroom Facility	2	38		75,000					75,000				Half funded by MAYBA
Benson Park Lady Bug Trail Bridge	2	37		30,000					30,000				Funded with park capital outlay
Benson Park Linear Pond Bridge	2	37		50,000					50,000				Funded with park capital outlay
1991 Support Van Replacement	3	25						110,000	110,000				
Street Facility Evaluation & Roof Repair	2	N/A		20,000					20,000				Funded with cap. Fac. & Equip. Rep.
Spring Lake Park Swim Facility Study	3	N/A		8,500					8,500				Funded with swim facility operations
Small Projects & Equipment Total				536,000	100,000	0	0	110,000	746,000				
Street Projects													
Street Project Total													
Based on Development Demands													
Development Demands Total													
Operational Study Needed													
Swim Facility - Filter Upgrades	3	N/A			120,000				120,000				
Operational Study Needed Total				0	120,000	0	0	0	0				
Utility Related													
Marvin Lift Station Rehab	3	36		100,000					100,000		X		Will move depending on cash flow
Well and Pump Repairs	n/a	N/A			65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	260,000		X		Will move forward based on cash flow
Utility Related Total				100,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	360,000				
GRAND TOTAL				636,000	285,000	65,000	65,000	175,000	1,226,000				

D.

City of North Mankato, Minnesota
 Capital Improvement Plan
 2022 through 2026

PROJECTS BY CATEGORY

Category	Priority	Staff Project Score (53 max)	Council Project Score (53 max)	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total	Development Driven	Utility Funded	Additional Study Needed	Notes
Small Projects & Equipment													
1997 Pumper Replacement	3	33		550,000					550,000				
Spring Lake Park Parking Lot	5	31					150,000		150,000				
Splash Pad	5	28						50,000	50,000				Funded with park capital outlay
Placemaking and Historic Preservation	5	27						100,000	100,000				
Small Projects & Equipment Total				550,000	0	0	150,000	150,000	850,000				
Street Projects													
Belgrade Street/Sidew, Beautification Project	4	33						2,500,000	2,500,000			X	Master plan completion required
Street & Utility Project - Jeffer., Quincy, Sher.	3	29						1,500,000	1,500,000			X	Staff does not recommend in 2017
Street & Utility Project - McKinley Ave.	3	29						1,500,000	1,500,000			X	Staff does not recommend in 2017
Street & Utility Project - Harrison, Monroe	2	29						1,500,000	1,500,000			X	Staff does not recommend in 2017
Street & Utility Project - Cross and Tyler	3	29						1,500,000	1,500,000			X	Staff does not recommend in 2017
Street & Utility Project - Garfield and Grant	3	29						1,500,000	1,500,000			X	Staff does not recommend in 2017
Street & Utility Project - Cliff Dr. & Cliff Ct.	3	29						1,500,000	1,500,000			X	Staff does not recommend in 2017
Street & Utility Project - Park & Page	3	29						1,800,000	1,800,000			X	Staff does not recommend in 2017
Commerce Dr. Street Redevelopment	5	27						1,500,000	1,500,000			X	Staff does not recommend in 2017
Development Demands Total				0	0	0	0	14,800,000	0				
Based on Development Demands													
Street Project - Aspen Lane Ext.	4	33						1,500,000	1,500,000	X		X	Will move forward as development demands
Future Subdivision Project	5	33						1,500,000	1,500,000	X		X	Will move forward as development demands
Ringhofer Dr. Extension	4	32						1,200,000	1,200,000	X		X	Will move forward as development demands
The Reserve 2 Project	5	29						1,500,000	1,500,000	X		X	Will move forward as development demands
Downtown Parking Lot	2	28		190,000					190,000	X		X	Will move forward as development demands
Street Project Total				190,000	0	0	0	5,700,000	5,890,000				
Operational Study Needed													
Caswell Park Facility Upgrades & Improve.	5	32						1,500,000	1,500,000				Dependent on extension of sales tax
Trail along Lookout Dr.	3	32						1,250,000	1,250,000				Further study required
Taylor Library Expansion	5	29						1,800,000	1,800,000				Library strategic plan needed
Caswell Park Exp. - Ice Arena - Ph. 1	3	28						8,210,000	8,210,000				Sales tax extension & reg. partners needed
Caswell Park Expansion - Indoor Turf Facility	3	26						5,150,000	5,150,000				Additional feasibility studies needed
Public Works Building Project	5	26						3,600,000	3,600,000				Facility needs analysis required
Caswell Park Expansion - Aquatic Facility	3	23						9,050,000	9,050,000				Sales tax extension & reg. partners needed
Swim Facility - Diving Well Upgrades	4	N/A						20,000	20,000				Dependent on results of study
Swim Facility - Slide Feature	4	N/A						100,000	100,000				Dependent on results of study
Swim Facility - Upgrade Pool	3	N/A						1,500,000	1,500,000				Dependent on results of study
Operational Study Needed Total				0	0	0	0	32,180,000	32,180,000				

D.

City of North Mankato, Minnesota
 Capital Improvement Plan
 2022 through 2026
PROJECTS BY CATEGORY

Category	Staff Project Priority	Staff Project Score (53 max)	Council Project Score (53 max)	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total	Development Driven	Utility Funded	Additional Study Needed	Notes
Utility Related													
Marvin Lift Station Rehab	3	36							0		X		Will move depending on cash flow
I&I Investigation & Lining Repairs	2	36						1,500,000	1,500,000		X		Cost-benefit analysis required
Pump Station - Sherman St.	3	33						500,000	500,000		X		No funding identified
Pump Station - Wheeler Ave.	3	33						500,000	500,000		X		No funding identified
Pump Station - Lake St.	3	33						750,000	750,000		X		No funding identified
Edgewood Ravine Stabilization	4	31		100,000					100,000		X		No funding identified
Well and Pump Repairs	n/a	N/A		65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000		260,000		X		Will move forward based on cash flow
Rehab Filter at Plant 1	n/a	N/A		350,000					350,000		X		Will move forward based on cash flow
Water Tower Maintenance	n/a	N/A		150,000					150,000		X		Will move forward based on cash flow
Utility Related Total				665,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	3,250,000	4,110,000				
GRAND TOTAL				1,405,000	65,000	65,000	215,000	56,080,000	57,830,000				

Packet 1

Project Summaries

Project # CP-17-003

Project Name Caswell Park Expansion - Aquatic Facility

Type Improvement

Department Caswell Park

Useful Life 40 years

Contact Phil Tostenson, Caswell Par

Category Park Improvements

Priority 3 Important

Project Status:

Project Score 23

Program Area: Parks and Trails



Description

Total Project Cost: \$9,050,000

Expand Caswell Park facilities for additional sports and recreational uses:

*Ice Arena Phase 1 - \$8.21 Million

*Aquatic Facility - \$9.05 Million

*Indoor Turf Facility - \$5.15 Million

Justification

Caswell Park sees tremendous use for softball and soccer, but demand is there for additional sports and recreational facilities to be added to the complex.

Expenditures	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
Planning/Design										1,550,000	1,550,000
Construction/Maintenance										7,500,000	7,500,000
Total										9,050,000	9,050,000

Funding Sources	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
Capital Fac. & Equip Replacement										50,000	50,000
G.O. Capital Project Bonds										9,000,000	9,000,000
Total										9,050,000	9,050,000

Budget Impact/Other

Additional staff and maintenance costs will be necessary due to added facility.

Project # COM-17-003

Project Name Placemaking and Historic Preservation

Type Unassigned

Department Community Development

Useful Life 10 years

Contact Mike Fischer, CD Director

Category Unassigned

Priority 5 Future Consideration

Project Status: Forecast

Project Score 27

Program Area: Community & Economic Dev.

Description

Total Project Cost: \$100,000

Expand placemaking - outdoor art, games, historic, and other features in the downtown.

Justification

According to the Project for Public Spaces, Placemaking is a multi-faceted approach to the planning, design and management of public spaces. Placemaking capitalizes on a local community's assets, inspiration, and potential, with the intention of creating public spaces that promote people's health, happiness, and well being.

Expenditures	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
Other										100,000	100,000
Total										100,000	100,000

Funding Sources	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
Sales Tax										100,000	100,000
Total										100,000	100,000

Budget Impact/Other

Project # LIB-17-001
Project Name Taylor Library Expansion

Type Improvement **Department** Library
Useful Life 40 years **Contact** Lucy Lowry, Library Direct
Category Buildings **Priority** 5 Future Consideration
Project Status: **Project Score** 29
Program Area: Leg/Admin. & Public Engage.

Description **Total Project Cost:** \$1,800,000
Taylor Library expansion to handle additional use and materials.

Justification

Expenditures	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
Planning/Design										300,000	300,000
Construction/Maintenance										1,500,000	1,500,000
Total										1,800,000	1,800,000

Funding Sources	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
G.O. Capital Project Bonds										1,800,000	1,800,000
Total										1,800,000	1,800,000

Budget Impact/Other

Project # P&R-17-004
Project Name Benson Park North Parking Lot



Type Unassigned
Useful Life 25 years
Category Park Improvements
Project Status: Design
Program Area: Parks and Trails

Department Parks
Contact Brad Swanson, PW Director
Priority 2 Very Important
Project Score 42

Description **Total Project Cost:** \$165,000

Complete parking lot project at Benson Park.

Justification

Benson Park is an unfinished park that has seen expanded use. The Benson Park project will incorporate the recommendations of the Benson Park Master Plan.

Expenditures	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
Construction/Maintenance	165,000										165,000
Total	165,000										165,000

Funding Sources	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
Capital Fac. & Equip Replacement	85,000										85,000
GF - Street Maint.	80,000										80,000
Total	165,000										165,000

Budget Impact/Other

Additional staff and maintenance costs will be necessary due to added parking lot.

Project # P&R-17-008
Project Name Trail from Marie to Lake

Type Unassigned **Department** Parks
Useful Life 10 years **Contact** Brad Swanson, PW Director
Category Unassigned **Priority** 5 Future Consideration
Project Status: **Project Score** 40
Program Area: Parks and Trails

Description **Total Project Cost:** \$100,000
 Re-establish trail along Lake Ave.

Justification
 Area is in need of recreational opportunities for citizens.

Expenditures	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
Construction/Maintenance		100,000									100,000
Total		100,000									100,000

Funding Sources	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
G.O. Capital Project Bonds		100,000									100,000
Total		100,000									100,000

Budget Impact/Other
 Additional trail maintenance

Project # P&R-17-010

Project Name Splash Pad

Type Improvement

Department Parks

Useful Life 10 years

Contact Brad Swanson, PW Director

Category Park Improvements

Priority 5 Future Consideration

Project Status:

Project Score 28

Program Area: Parks and Trails

Description

Total Project Cost: \$50,000

Splash pad added to popular neighborhood parks. Possible neighborhood parks to have a splash pad: North Ridge, King Arthur, Walter S. Farm.

Prices vary from \$50,000 for fresh water system (used water goes down storm drain) to \$300,000 for recycled water system (water treated and filtered then pumped back through)

Justification

Area is in need of recreational opportunities for citizens.

Expenditures	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
Construction/Maintenance										50,000	50,000
Total										50,000	50,000

Funding Sources	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
Capital Fac. & Equip Replacement										50,000	50,000
Total										50,000	50,000

Budget Impact/Other

Additional staff and maintenance costs will be necessary due to added facility.

Project # STR-17-003

Project Name Street Facility Evaluation & Roof Repair

Type Improvement

Department Street Maintenance

Useful Life 15 years

Contact Brad Swanson, PW Director

Category Unassigned

Priority 2 Very Important

Project Status: Design

Project Score N/A

Program Area: Public Works & Infrastructure

Description

Total Project Cost: \$20,000

The City shop is 40 years old and is in need of various maintenance and repairs. The City should evaluate upgrading vs. new construction

Justification

Expenditures	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
Planning/Design	20,000										20,000
Total	20,000										20,000

Funding Sources	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
General Fund	20,000										20,000
Total	20,000										20,000

Budget Impact/Other

Unknown at this time.

Project # STR-17-013
Project Name Belgrade Street/Sidew, Beautification Project

Type Improvement **Department** Street Maintenance
Useful Life 25 years **Contact**
Category Unassigned **Priority** 4 Less Important
Project Status: **Project Score** 33
Program Area: Community & Economic Dev.

Description **Total Project Cost: \$2,500,000**
 Redesign Belgrade Ave. to improve sidewalks for pedestrians and overall beautification of downtown with street lights, benches, planters, statues, etc.

Justification

Expenditures	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
Other										2,500,000	2,500,000
Total										2,500,000	2,500,000

Funding Sources	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
G.O. Improvement Bonds										2,500,000	2,500,000
Total										2,500,000	2,500,000

Budget Impact/Other

Project # SF-16-002

Project Name Spring Lake Park Swim Facility Study

Type Unassigned

Department Swimming Facility

Useful Life 4 years

Contact Brad Swanson, PW Director

Category Unassigned

Priority 3 Important

Project Status: Design

Project Score N/A

Program Area: Parks and Trails



Description

Total Project Cost: \$8,500

Project is for a consultant to evaluate future and proposed improvements to the Spring Lake Park swim facility.

Justification

The current facility is in need of upgrades to remain competitive with other swim facilities in the area.

Expenditures	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
Planning/Design	8,500										8,500
Total	8,500										8,500

Funding Sources	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
General Fund	8,500										8,500
Total	8,500										8,500

Budget Impact/Other

Unknown at this time.

Project # SF-17-003
Project Name Swim Facility - Slide Feature

Type Unassigned **Department** Swimming Facility
Useful Life 20 years **Contact** Brad Swanson, PW Director
Category Unassigned **Priority** 4 Less Important
Project Status: **Project Score** N/A
Program Area: Parks and Trails

Description **Total Project Cost:** \$100,000
 Add slide feature to swim facility

Justification

Expenditures	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
Other										100,000	100,000
Total										100,000	100,000

Funding Sources	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
General Fund										100,000	100,000
Total										100,000	100,000

Budget Impact/Other

Packet 2

Project Scoring Sheets



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Caswell Field Improvements
 Cost \$1,500,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group • 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal • 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority • 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan • 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	5
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy • 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates • 4 pts - moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates • 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	5
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	5
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Less than 10 years • 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. • 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. • 4 pts – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. • 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	5
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service • 3 pts. – Neutral impact • 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	5
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems • 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems • 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	5
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 • 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 • 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 • 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 • 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	5
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato • 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato • 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	3

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Caswell Ice Arena
 Cost \$8,210,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group • 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal • 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority • 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan • 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy • 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates • 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates • 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Less than 10 years • 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. • 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. • 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. • 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service • 3 pts. – Neutral impact • 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems • 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems • 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 • 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 • 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 • 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 • 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato • 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato • 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Caswell Aquatic Facility
 Cost \$9,050,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group • 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal • 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority • 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan • 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy • 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates • 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates • 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Less than 10 years • 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. • 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. • 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. • 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service • 3 pts. – Neutral impact • 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems • 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems • 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 • 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 • 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 • 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 • 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato • 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato • 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Caswell Turf Facility
 Cost \$5,150,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Less than 10 years 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 3 pts. – Neutral impact 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Placemaking
 Cost \$100,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group • 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal • 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority • 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan • 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy • 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates • 4 pts - moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates • 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Less than 10 years • 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. • 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. • 4 pts – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. • 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service • 3 pts. – Neutral impact • 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems • 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems • 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 • 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 • 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 • 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 • 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato • 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato • 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Library Expansion
 Cost \$1,800,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group • 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal • 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority • 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan • 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy • 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates • 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates • 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Less than 10 years • 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. • 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. • 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. • 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service • 3 pts. – Neutral impact • 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems • 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems • 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 • 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 • 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 • 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 • 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato • 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato • 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Benson Park Shelter & Restroom
 Cost \$187,500

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group • 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal • 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority • 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan • 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy • 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates • 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates • 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Less than 10 years • 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. • 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. • 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. • 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service • 3 pts. – Neutral impact • 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems • 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems • 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 • 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 • 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 • 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 • 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato • 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato • 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Benson Park North Parking Lot
 Cost \$165,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Less than 10 years 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 3 pts. – Neutral impact 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Benson Park Lady Bug Trail Bridge
 Cost \$30,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Less than 10 years 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 3 pts. – Neutral impact 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Spring Lake Restroom
 Cost \$75,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group • 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal • 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority • 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan • 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy • 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates • 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates • 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Less than 10 years • 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. • 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. • 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. • 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service • 3 pts. – Neutral impact • 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems • 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems • 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 • 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 • 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 • 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 • 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato • 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato • 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Trail from Marie to Lake
 Cost \$100,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Less than 10 years 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 3 pts. – Neutral impact 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Splash Pad
 Cost \$50,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group • 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal • 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority • 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan • 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy • 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates • 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates • 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Less than 10 years • 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. • 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. • 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. • 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service • 3 pts. – Neutral impact • 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems • 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems • 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 • 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 • 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 • 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 • 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato • 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato • 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Lookout Dr. Trail
 Cost \$1,250,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group • 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal • 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority • 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan • 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy • 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates • 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates • 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Less than 10 years • 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. • 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. • 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. • 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service • 3 pts. – Neutral impact • 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems • 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems • 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 • 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 • 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 • 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 • 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato • 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato • 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Spring Lake Park Parking Lot
 Cost \$150,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Less than 10 years 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 3 pts. – Neutral impact 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Benson Park Linear Pond Trail Bridge
Cost \$50,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Less than 10 years 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 3 pts. – Neutral impact 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project I&I Investigation and Sewer Lining
 Cost \$1,500,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group • 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal • 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority • 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan • 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy • 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates • 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates • 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Less than 10 years • 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. • 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. • 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. • 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service • 3 pts. – Neutral impact • 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems • 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems • 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 • 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 • 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 • 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 • 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato • 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato • 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	• Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom?	Not ranked	
	• Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom?	Not ranked	
	• Project leverages non-city financial resources?	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Street Facility Evaluation & Roof Repairs
 Cost \$20,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group • 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal • 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority • 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan • 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy • 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates • 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates • 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Less than 10 years • 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. • 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. • 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. • 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service • 3 pts. – Neutral impact • 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems • 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems • 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 • 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 • 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 • 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 • 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato • 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato • 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Belgrade Street/Sidewalk & Beautification
 Cost \$2,500,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Less than 10 years 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 3 pts. – Neutral impact 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Commerce Dr. Redevelopment
 Cost \$1,500,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Less than 10 years 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 3 pts. – Neutral impact 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Public Works Building
 Cost \$3,600,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Less than 10 years 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 3 pts. – Neutral impact 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Spring Lake Swim Facility Study
 Cost \$8,500

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Less than 10 years 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 3 pts. – Neutral impact 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Spring Lake Swim Facility - Filter Upgrades
 Cost \$120,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group • 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal • 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority • 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan • 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy • 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates • 4 pts - moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates • 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Less than 10 years • 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. • 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. • 4 pts – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. • 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service • 3 pts. – Neutral impact • 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems • 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems • 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 • 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 • 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 • 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 • 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato • 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato • 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

<p>Quality of Life</p>	<p>Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
<p>Economic Impact</p>	<p>Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
<p>Environmental Impact</p>	<p>Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
<p>Additional Questions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	<p>Not ranked</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	<p>Not ranked</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	<p>Not ranked</p>	
<p>Total Project Score</p>			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Spring Lake Swim Facility - Diving Well Upgrades
 Cost \$20,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Less than 10 years 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 3 pts. – Neutral impact 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Spring Lake Swim Facility - Slide Feature
 Cost \$100,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Less than 10 years 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 3 pts. – Neutral impact 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			



CIP Project Scoring Matrix

Project Spring Lake Swim Facility - Overall Upgrades & Improvements
 Cost \$1,500,000

Criteria	Description	Scoring Values	Score
Assessment of Need	Extent to which the project is deemed necessary and important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Project supported by a small group • 2 pts. – Department or community group long-term goal • 3 pts. – Department has identified the project as a priority • 4 pts. – Dept., Council, public priority or in draft plan • 5 pts. – Project is supported by the Comp Plan, and/or an adopted Master Plan and has overwhelming public support. 	
Funding	Expected source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Unknown or significant impact on utility rates or property tax levy • 3 pts. – Nominal outside funding obtained and/or moderate impact on tax levy/utility rates • 4 pts. – moderate outside funding obtained and/or nominal impact on tax levy/utility rates • 5 pts. – Available funds on hand or matching outside funding from grants/donations/partnerships obtained and/or little to no impact on tax levy/utility rates 	
City Council Goals	Extent to which this project addresses City Council goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-5 pts. – One point for each Council goal identified 	
Project Life Cycle and Life Cycle Costs	Expected useful life of the new facility or infrastructure, given various levels of maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Less than 10 years • 2 pts. – Greater than 10 years with extraordinary maint. • 3 pts. – Greater than 10 years without extraordinary maint. • 4 pts. – Greater than 20 years with extraordinary maint. • 5 pts. – Greater than 20 years without extraordinary maint. 	
Implications of Project Deferral	Extent to which deferring this project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruption to level of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Deferring project will NOT create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service • 3 pts. – Neutral impact • 5 pts. – Deferring project will create unsafe conditions and/or cause noticeable disruptions to level of service 	
Feasibility of Implementation	Extent to which this project can be realized within the requested budget and schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Probable budget and/or schedule problems • 3 pts. – Possible budget and/or schedule problems • 5 pts. – Project likely to be completed within the requested budget and schedule 	
Operating Budget Impact	Expected net change in operation and maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pt. – Net operational increase is > \$250,000 • 2 pts. – Net operational increase is \$100,000 to \$250,000 • 3 pts. – Net operational increase is \$50,000 to \$99,999 • 4 pts. – Net operational increase is \$25,000 to \$49,999 • 5 pts. – Net operational increase is < \$25,000 	
Regional Benefit/Linkages	Extent to which this project benefits the region and/or links North Mankato facilities to those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project benefits are confined within the municipal limits of the City of North Mankato • 1 pt. – Project benefits extend to neighboring jurisdictions and/or those passing through the City of North Mankato • 3 pts. – Project benefits are regional in nature and include linkages between North Mankato facilities and those of neighboring jurisdictions. 	

Quality of Life	Extent to which this project enhances the quality of life of North Mankato residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – No quality of life impact • 1 pt. – Project will provide a minor improvement to quality of life, with benefits to a single neighborhood or subdivision. • 3 pts. – Project will provide a general improvement to quality of life, with benefits to several subdivisions. • 5 pts. – Project will provide immediate and significant improvement to quality of life, with benefits citywide. 	
Economic Impact	Extent to which this project increases the city's tax base, creates jobs, and/or generates additional tourism/consumer spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have an adverse effect on the local economy • 1 pt. – Project will have no effect on the local economy • 2 pts. – Project will have little effect on local economy • 3 pts. – Project will have a moderate effect on local economy • 4 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on local economy • 5 pts. – Project will have a significant effect on regional econ. 	
Environmental Impact	Extent to which this project preserves the natural environment, conserves natural resources, reduces pollution, or otherwise contributes to a sustainable community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 pts. – Project will have a detrimental impact on the environment. • 1 pt. – Project will have little or no impact on the environment. • 3 pts. – Project will have a positive impact on the environment. • 5 pts. – Project will have a major positive impact on the environment. 	
Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is required by a State or Federal mandate? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a current development agreement? If yes, with whom? 	Not ranked	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project leverages non-city financial resources? 	Not ranked	
Total Project Score			