



CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

15.1 - INTRODUCTION

Purpose of a Capital Improvements Budget and Program

The fundamental purposes of the capital expenditures programming process are as follows:

1. To establish a system of procedures and priorities by which each proposal can be evaluated in terms of the public need, the city's comprehensive plan, the interrelationship of projects, and cost requirements.
2. To consolidate and coordinate all the various departmental requests with the hope of reducing delays and coordinating individual improvements programs of the departments.
3. To schedule the proposals according to their priority evaluation.
4. To set forth an overall financing program where by the Capital Improvements Program can be achieved.
5. To allow the general public an opportunity to review the capital expenditures program and provide their recommendations, suggestions, and comments.

Responsibility for the Capital Improvements Budget and Program

Primary responsibility for the development of the City's Capital Improvements Budget lies with the Planning Director. There are, however, a number of other participants in

this overall process. These include the following:

1. All departments that wish to have a capital project considered are involved in preparing a Capital Project Request Form and in participating in developing priorities and recommending items for inclusion in the Annual Capital Budget.

2. Capital Budget Committee - This committee will be on going with the purpose of reviewing all Capital Projects Requests recommendations for overall priorities and for funding. In this regard, they will participate actively in the development of the recommended Annual Capital Budget.

3. Planning Commission - The City Planning Commission will serve both as a source of recommendations for capital projects and as a review agency of the proposed Capital Project Budget towards the implementation of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

4. City Manager - The City Manager will review and approve the funding level associated with the Capital Improvements Budget and will amend the proposed Capital Budget as he deems necessary.

5. City Council - The City Council will review the Capital Budget proposed by the City Manager in conjunction with the review of the Annual Operating Budget. The City Council shall make alterations, or modifications as they deem necessary.

6. Citizens - The City Manager's proposed capital budget will also be the subject of a public hearing at which time citizens may

present their ideas for consideration.

Preparation of the City Capital Budget

1. The annual Capital Budget document will be prepared in conjunction with the Annual Operating Budget as indicated in the budget calendar.

2. The Capital Budget document will contain all capital projects which are presently under consideration whether currently funded or not. Each project will be listed in the overall priority sequence in relation to all other projects and source of funding will be identified to the extent available. For each project, the location and description of work required to complete project will be included. It is the responsibility of the department requesting the project to prepare this documentation.

3. All capital projects requested will be reviewed and placed in an overall recommended priority schedule by the Capital Budget Committee.

4. This document will then be submitted to the City Planning Commission for comments and recommendations and then to the City Manager for approval.

Definition of a Public Improvements Capital Budget

1. A Public Improvements Capital Project may be defined as one which is self-contained and which will usually be constructed as a unit. Many projects will be steps in the development of comprehensive programs.

2. A Public Improvements Capital Project will include all land (Acct. 400), Buildings (Acct. 401), or Other Improvements (Acct. 402) items purchased or constructed

where the cost exceeds \$1,000.

3. Public Improvements Capital Projects will also include all Capital Outlay item included in Accts. 403-Office Furniture and Equipment, 404-Mobile Equipment, and 405-Other Machinery and Equipment where the item has a unit value of more than \$5,000 and an estimated life in excess of 10 years.

Definition of the Estimated Carryover by Fund for Capital Projects

1. APPROPRIATED - Represents capital projects funds specifically approved for expenditure by official City Council action. The official action must either be the annual Capital Budget ordinance or subsequent appropriation ordinances. Appropriations will remain in effect until the project is completed or changed in some way by City Council action. At the end of each fiscal year the unexpended appropriation balance (excluding encumbrances) will automatically be reappropriated for the new fiscal year.

2. ALLOCATED - Represents capital projects officially planned for future years. In this case, no City Council action has taken place to approve expenditures for the project. The printed Capital Budget report is a "plan" for the succeeding five years for performing capital project improvements in a six-year period. The "plan" for the current fiscal year is officially approved and appropriated by City Council action. The "plan" for the succeeding five years is approved by intent only and does not require official City Council action to change that intent. Estimated costs of projects within this five-year "plan" are Capital Budget Funds which are allocated but not appropriated.

3. UNALLOCATED - The amounts of funds assigned to the Capital Projects Budget

which are neither appropriated (currently approved for expenditure) or allocated (proposed approval for expenditure in future fiscal years) are unallocated. This basically represents funds for which no current or proposed future commitment has been made by the City Council.

15.2 - FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Table 15.21 shows the financial resources that are estimated to be available for capital projects through fiscal year 1999-2000. The top portion of Table 15.21 indicates the revenue estimates. The middle portion shows the planned use of some of the available revenues (based on Council action associated with either appropriations or allocations to specific projects). The bottom portion of Table 15.21 shows the estimated carryover balances for each fiscal year. These balances reflect the differences between the resources available during a fiscal year and the estimated cost of the projects for that fiscal year.

Revenue Sources

The City's capital projects have historically been funded from a wide variety of revenue sources, most of which are identified in the top portion of Table 15.21. The number of revenue sources, and in many cases the amount of revenue from these sources, have been continually decreasing over the last several years. This report includes projects that are funded by revenue of the electric, sanitary sewer, and water utilities.

As mentioned in the preceding paragraph, the amount of funds for capital project purposes has been decreasing. In particular, revenues from Federal sources have significantly decreased in the last few years. The City's Community Development Block Grant entitlement has dwindled and the larger por-

tion of this revenue is allocated to projects in low and moderate income areas. The Federal Aid Urban highway funds that was allocated to Independence based on population has been changed by a new Federal Highway Bill passed in 1992. This new program is called the Surface Transportation Program and the same method for distribution of funds to city's in the Kansas City metropolitan area as the FAU program will be used. Under this new program the federal government will match 80% of the anticipated funds to a local match of 20%. One of the local requirements that has been recommended by MARC, is to require any community wishing to be placed on the priority list for funds to have the 20% matching funds available before they are placed on the list.. The city will use \$600,000 on Chrysler Avenue Phase 1 from the 1993 federal fiscal year, fiscal year 1994 was approved for \$1,500,000 to be used on Phase 1 of the Little Blue Expressway and the city has applied for \$2,000,000 in federal funds from fiscal year 1995 allocation to be used for Phase 3 of the Little Blue Expressway. The city will use County Urban Roads System funds allotted to the city for the 20% match.

The availability of City funds for capital projects has also diminished. In fiscal 1987-88 the Council directed that all contributions to the capital budget from the General Fund (which had been as high as \$750,000 per year) be eliminated. Additionally, the revenues (principal, plus interest) from the 1974 Street Bonds was expended upon the completion of the widening of Truman Road between Main Street and M-291 Highway. The absence of revenue from the General and Street Bond Funds significantly impacts the capital budget. Obviously, the City will need to explore alternate means for funding future improvements to its infrastructure.

Project Cost

The estimated project costs summarized

Table 15.21

FINANCIAL RESOURCES
1994-95 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM: SUMMARY
GENERAL FUND and ENTERPRISE FUND PROJECTS

January 26, 1994

REVENUE SOURCES	ESTIMATED REVENUE IN (000'S)						
	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
Street Fund	120	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revolving Public Improvement Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Surface Transportation Program	600	0	0	0	0	0	0
County Urban Road System Allotment	240	547	775	0	0	0	118
General Fund	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
CDBG Fund	287	397	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Grant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State or County Grant	17	0	0	0	0	0	0
Power & Light Fund	14,861	12,306	15,097	9,392	6,274	26,018	2,944
Water Fund	3,647	1,240	977	2,330	17,498	0	0
Sanitary Sewer Fund	250	0	0	0	0	0	0
Storm Drainage Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AVAILABLE REVENUE	20,036	15,990	16,849	11,772	23,772	26,018	3,062
CARRYOVER	160	103	397	397	397	397	397
TOTAL AVAILABLE	20,196	16,093	17,246	12,119	24,169	26,415	3,459
PROJECT COSTS							
Streets	1,218	2,150	775	0	0	0	0
Bridges	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parking Lots	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Storm Drainage	65	0	0	0	0	0	0
Buildings/Other	17	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parks and Recreation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Power and Light	14,861	12,306	15,097	9,392	6,274	26,018	2,944
Water	3,647	1,240	977	2,330	17,498	0	0
Sanitary Sewers	285	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	20,093	15,696	16,849	11,722	23,772	26,018	2,944
CARRYOVER BALANCE							
Street Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revolving Public Improvements Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Surface Transportation Program	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CURS Allotment	160	103	0	0	0	0	118
General Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CDBG Fund	0	0	397	397	397	397	397
Power and Light Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sanitary Sewer Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Storm Drainage Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL CARRYOVER	160	103	397	397	397	397	515

in the middle of Table 15.21 are for those projects listed in Table 15.41 of this report. The entire project cost is shown in the fiscal year in which the project is anticipated to start even though the payout of these costs may extend over more than one fiscal year.

Carryover Balance

The bottom portion of Table 15.21 shows that a minimal amount of funds are available for new projects, i.e. projects other than those shown in Table 15.61. The City Council has either appropriated or allocated all the available Community Development Block Grant capital improvement funds for the 1992 fiscal year carryover and 1993 fiscal year allotment. It is currently estimated that \$397,000 will be available for capital projects from the CDBG fund in the 94-95 fiscal year. In February of 1993 the City Council established a priority list for capital projects using the County Urban Roads System funds. The majority of CURS funds have been allocated to these projects through the six year program. With no new funds available at this time for future projects it is almost impossible to carry on an effective Capital Improvements Program.

Based on present projections it is anticipated that the City will have a limited amount of revenue for future projects other than water, sewer, and power and light. The city will need to explore other funding sources in order to maintain the existing infrastructure and to expand and develop other areas of the community in the future.

15.3 - USE OF FUNDS

Certain revenue sources available for capital projects have restrictions as to their

usage. These restrictions are described below.

Street Bonds

The ballot language set forth the intended use of the 1974 Street Bond funds is as follows:

“Proposition to issue general obligation bonds in the amount of Thirteen Million Nine Hundred Twenty thousand Dollars (\$13,920,000) for the purpose of acquiring rights-of-way, constructing, extending, repairing, and improving streets, bridges and related storm drainage facilities, including but not limited to Sterling Avenue from U.S. Highway 24 to U.S. Highway 40, Lee's Summit-Kiger Road from U.S. 24 Highway to U.S. Highway 40, Chrysler Avenue from 23rd Street North to Truman Road and other Improvements.”

Surface Transportation Program (Replaced the Federal Aid Urban (FAU) Program)

The Federal Aid Urban Program was established for the purpose of expanding the Federal Aid Highway Systems in cities beyond the traditional Federal Primary and Secondary Systems. The funds were used for highway-related construction and improvements on approved routes and could not exceed 75 percent of the total eligible project costs.

The new Surface Transportation Program is similar to the FAU program in serving the same type of highway and street systems which can be improved with these funds. Under this program the federal government will match 80% of the anticipated funds to a local match of 20%. In order for a community to be eligible for matching funds in any particular year it will be necessary to have the required 20%

local match available at the time the project is placed on the priority list. The method for distribution of funds to cities within the Kansas City metropolitan area is similar to the FAU program, which allowed improvements only for streets on the FAU highway system.

County Urban Road System (CURS)

The full text of the agreement between the City of Independence and Jackson County is set forth in Resolution No. 997. The agreement was entered into on June 5, 1974.

The salient points of the agreement are as follows:

a) The County agrees to appropriate, allocate and expend, in the manor hereinafter provided, fifty percent (50%) of certain sums collected from the levy of road and bridge fund taxes assessed as to real estate and tangible personal property within the City in the manner set forth in Section 3,229 and Section 3,230 of Chapter 8 Title III, Jackson County Ordinances, unless as to future years the County fails to levy the road and bridge fund or by ordinance changes the method of disbursing such fund.

b) All funds hereby declared by the County to be allocated to the said County Urban Road System shall be expended by the County in the design, construction and completion of certain road improvement projects, such work to be under the supervision, direction and control of the County. The County shall acquire right-of-way, shall execute engineering design and shall institute condemnation proceedings in connection with projects covered under the terms of this agreement. Any expenses incurred including, but not limited to, planning and engineering done by the County, in connection therewith, shall be reimbursed from the City's refund account. The County shall,

prior to the solicitation of bids for construction, submit to the City's City Council for its advance approval, proposed and final plans and design specification.

c) The monies refunded to the City here under shall be used to improve only those roads which are determined to be a part of the County Urban Road System by the County Legislature or Director of Public Works, in accordance with Ordinance 127. The priority of roads to be improved shall be agreed upon by the parties hereto.

d) The encumbrance of the County road and bridge funds hereunder is exclusively for the construction of road improvements and the County expressly exclude herefrom and does not undertake to perform any maintenance work whatever on any of the City's roads or streets.

e) The County and City shall cooperate to secure the temporary or permanent removal, relocation or adjustment or public utilities facilities public right-of-way as are deemed necessary for the construction of the Urban Road improvement, and the cost thereof shall be borne by such public utilities or the owners of such facilities where City has the Authority to so order. Wherein City-owned facilities require adjustment, removal or relocation, the cost shall be the responsibility of the City, with the exception of the private water line from the first value (defined as the division of the ownership between the City and the property owner) into the building, the cost of which shall be a part of the project cost, and at no cost to the property owner. All utility adjustment on utility easements owned by the utility shall be made as necessary and the cost therefore a part of the project cost.

General Fund

Revenues from the General Fund can be

used for all municipal purposes, including capital projects. These revenues are the least restricted of those discussed in this section of the report.

Community Development Block Grant CDBG

The primary objective of Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, and of the community development program of the City of Independence under the Title is the development of viable urban communities by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanding economic opportunities, principally for persons of low and moderate income. Consistent with this primary objective, not less than 70 percent of CDBG funds received by the City shall be used in accordance with the applicable requirements of HUD's regulations for activities that benefit persons of low and moderate income.

CDBG funds can be used to meet community needs in three broad categories:

- a) Benefits to low and moderate income families,
- b) Prevention of blight and the spread of slums,
- c) Projects certified as having a particular urgent need within the community.

Meeting the needs of low and moderate income families has generally been accomplished through the City's Housing Rehabilitation and Minor Home Repair Programs. Those served by these programs certify that their income is at or below the areas low income standard. This is published by HUD for the Kansas City, Missouri Metro Area.

Congress mandates that entitlement communities certify that CDBG funds may be used for an activity which meets the

identified needs of low and moderate income persons residing in the area where at least 51 percent of the residents are low and moderate income persons.

Prevention of the spread of blight and slum conditions is defined by HUD through the publication of HUD's eligible census tracts for the City. The City selects the boundaries of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Planning Area using these census tracts. In addition the City may identify other areas that qualify.

Under the provisions of this particular block grant program, the City must develop a proposed statement of community development objectives and projected use of funds, including: the community development objectives the City purposes to pursue, and the community development activities the City proposes to carry out with anticipated CDBG funds. The City is required to submit this information to HUD prior to the submission of its Final Statement of Projected Use of Funds. The City is also required to meet the program's citizen participation requirement, which are described on the following page.

A "Citizen Participation Plan" must be included in the City's "Final Statement".

This plan is required to include the following six elements:

- a) Encourage citizen participation with particular emphasis on participation by persons of low and moderate income who are residents of the City's slum blighted areas.
- b) Provide citizens with reasonable and timely access to local meetings, information, and records relating to the grantee's proposed use of CDBG funds.
- c) Provide direct assistance to low and moderate income persons.

Table 15.41

CURRENT PROJECTS
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECTS, REVENUE BY SOURCE
1994-95 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM
 January 26, 1994

FY 93-94 CAPITAL PROJECTS													
PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	GEN.	CDBG	SIF	STATE		CURSA	STP	RPIF	P&LF	WF	SF	SDIF
					FED. GRANT	& CO. GRANT							
<u>STREET IMPROVEMENTS</u>													
9212	Crysler Ave., Phase.1 (39th to S. City Lds.)						150	600					
9012	Independence Ave. (M-291 to Lacy)						147						
9303	Interstate 70 & Noland Rd. Beautification	14											
9315	Jennings Road, Phase 1 Design			18									
9328	River, Truman to U.S. 24, Design			18									
9329	Hub Drive Extension, Benefit District 101				120								
9316	Lexington, East of Bridge, Curbs			31									
9318	Fairmount Strategy Area			120									
TOTAL		14	187	120	0	0	297	600	0	0	0	0	0
STREET I MPROVEMENT TOTAL		1,218											
<u>STORM DRAINAGE</u>													
9330	220 East Farmet, Design			10									
9331	Crysler, South of Truman, Design			10									
9332	Main and White Oak, Design			20									
9333	South Cottage Channel, Phase 2, Design			10									
9334	Willis, South of Maple, Design			15									
TOTAL		0	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
STORM DRA INAGE TOTAL		65											
<u>BUILDINGS/OTHER</u>													
8902	Kritzer House - Historic Preservation						17						
TOTAL		0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BUILDINGS/OTHER TOTAL		17											
<u>POWER & LIGHT</u>													
	Blue Valley RCT									115			
	SubStation I									115			
9048	SubStation J									115			
	SubStation H									115			
9305	Blue Valley Unit No. 1 Overhaul									6,957			
9306	Blue Valley Unit No. 2 Overhaul									4,602			
9307	Blue Valley Unit No. 3 Overhaul									300			
9308	Blue Valley Common Equipment									1,452			
9310	Missouri City Units 1 and 2									1,0990			
TOTAL		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,861	0	0	0
POWER & LIGHT TOTAL		14,861											

(Continued on next page)

Table 15.41 Continued

SANITARY SEWERS												
6430	Sewer Dist. #31 (TC Lea- L.Summit Rd)											68
6444	Sewer Dist. #442 (L.Summit Rd - Sea Ave)											3
9014	Stonewall to 41st Street											179
9317	Berry Street Sanitary Sewer		35									
	TOTAL	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	250
	SANITARY SEWERS TOTAL	285										
WATER												
9032	10 MGD Horiz. Collector Well											3,229
9319	Main Extension Charlton Road											151
9320	Plant Improvement - Van Horn											80
9321	Plant Improvement -Settling Basin											60
9322	Plant Improvement - Lime Slaker											70
9323	Plant Improvement - Battery Replace											32
9324	Plant Improvement - Emergency Power											25
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,647	0
	WATER IMPROVEMENTS TOTAL	3,647										
	TOTAL BY REVENUE SOURCE	14	287	120	0	17	297	600	0	14,861	3,647	250
* TOTAL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993-1994 *												
\$20,093,000												

FY 94-95 CAPITAL PROJECTS													
PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	GEN.	CDBG	STF	STATE			STP	RIPF	P&LF	WF	SF	SDIF
					FED. GRANT	& CO. GRANT	CURSA						
STREET IMPROVEMENTS													
9022	Salisbury Road, Phase 1 (U.S. 24 to M-291)						350						
	Little Blue Expressway, Phase 1						300	1,500					
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	650	1,500	0	0	0	0	0
	STREET IMPROVEMENTS TOTAL	2,150											
POWER AND LIGHT													
	Blue Valley Unit No. 3 Overhaul									12,006			
	Blue Valley Common Equipment									100			
	Missouri City Units 1 and 2									200			
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,306	0	0	0
	POWER AND LIGHT TOTAL	12,306											
WATER													
	Main Extension Lake City Valley Road										118		
	Plant Improv.- Paint Settling Basin #2										80		
	Plant Improv.- Replace Line Slaker #2										70		
	Plant Improv.- Paint 39th St. Reservoir										200		
	Plant Improv.- Replace East, D.C. Balt.										35		
	Plant Improv.- Replace Resv. Telemetry										25		
	Plant Improv.- Rplace Cont. Basin 4 Eq.										80		
	Plant Improv.- Modificat. to meet SWTR										50		
	Well Field Exp.-Pipeline Agree.with MSHD										582		
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,240	0	0
	WATER TOTAL	1,240											
	TOTAL BY REVENUE SOURCE	0	0	0	0	0	650	1,500	0	12,306	1,240	0	0
TOTAL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994-1995													
\$15,696,000													

Table 15.41 Continued

FY 95-96 CAPITAL PROJECTS												
PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	GEN.	CDBG	STF	FED. GRANT	STATE & CO. GRANT	CURSA	STP	RPIF	P&LF	WF	SDIF
STREET IMPROVEMENTS												
9024	Salisbury Road, Phase II & III						775					
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	775	0	0	0	0	0
	STREET IMPROVEMENTS TOTAL	775										
POWER AND LIGHT												
	Blue Valley Unit #3 Overhaul SubStation J									85		
	Missouri City Units 1 and 2									2,655		
	Sub Sta. A & Sub Sta. K, 161 Kv Line									6,270		
	Sub Sta. A, 161 Kv Terminal									1,667		
	Sub Sta. K, 100MVA, 161/69 Transformer									903		
	Phase II-K to Lakewood 161 Kv Line									1,690		
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15,097	0	0
	POWER AND LIGHT TOTAL	15,907										
WATER												
	Main Extension Heidelberger Rd Ph 1 of 3										198	
	Plant Improv.-Paint Settling Basin #3										70	
	Plant Improv.-Replace Lime Slaker #3										75	
	Plant Improv.-Replace Resv. Telemet. V H										25	
	Plant Improv.-Paint Dodgion Water Tower										150	
	Plant Improv.-Replace Cont. Basin 3 Eq.										80	
	Plant Improv.-Modification to meet SWTR										50	
	Well Field Exp.-30" Pipeline on Bridge										329	
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	977	0
	WATER TOTAL	977										
	TOTAL BY REVENUE SOURCE	0	0	0	0	0	775	0	0	15,097	977	0
* TOTAL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996-1997*												
\$16,849,000												

FY 96-97 CAPITAL PROJECTS												
PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	GEN.	CDBG	STF	FED. GRANT	STATE & CO. GRANT	CURSA	STP	RPIF	P&LF	WF	SDIF
STREET IMPROVEMENTS												
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	STREET IMPROVEMENTS TOTAL	0										
POWER AND LIGHT												
	Blue Valley Unit #3 Overhaul SubStation J									1,884		
	Missouri City Units 1 & 2									2,448		
	SubStation I									2,262		
	Phase II - SubSta. K 161 Kv Terminal									2,063		
	MPS Lakewood SubSta. 161 Kv Terminal									210		
	TOTAL									525		
	POWER AND LIGHT TOTAL	9,392										

(Continued on next page)

Table 15.41 Continued

FY 96-97 CAPITAL PROJECTS														
PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	GEN.	CDBG	STP	FED. GRANT	STATE & CO. GRANT		CURSA	STP	RPIF	PLF	WF	SF	SDIF
WATER														
	Main Extension Heidelberger Rd Ph 2 of 3											185		
	Plant Improv.-Paint Settling Basin #4											70		
	Plant Improv.-Paint E. Wash Water Tower											85		
	Plant Improv.-Inspect & Rep. Switchgears											30		
	Plant Improv.-Replace Lime Slaker #1											80		
	Plant Improv.-Replace Cont. Basin 4 Eq.											80		
	Plant Improv.-3 Wells N. of Missouri River											900		
	Water Plant Addition-Engineering Design											900		
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,330	0	0
	WATER TOTAL	2,330												
	TOTAL BY REVENUE SOURCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,392	2,330	0	0
TOTAL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996-1997														
\$11,722,000														

FY 97-98 CAPITAL PROJECTS														
PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	GEN.	CDBG	STP	FED. GRANT	STATE & CO. GRANT		CURSA	STP	RPIF	P & LF	WF	SF	SDIF
STREET IMPROVEMENTS														
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	STREET IMPROVEMENTS TOTAL	0												
POWER AND LIGHT														
	SubStation I											1,885		
	Missouri City Units 1 & 2											1,572		
	Phase II-Sub 161 Kv Terminal											420		
	MPS Lakewood Sub 161 Kv Terminal											840		
	SubSta. M to SubSta. A 161 Kv Line											1,557		
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,274	0	0	0
	POWER AND LIGHT TOTAL	6,274												
WATER														
	Main Extension Heidelberger Rd Ph 3 of 3											268		
	Plant Improv.-Paint Settling Basin #5											70		
	Plant Improv.-Paint N, Main Tower											150		
	Plant Improv.-Replace Lime Slaker #5											80		
	Well Field Exp.-3 Well N./Missouri River											900		
	Automatic Meter Read. Prog. (Pilot Prog.)											30		
	Water Plant Addition & Transmis. Main											16,000		
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17,498	0	0
	WATER TOTAL	17,498												
	TOTAL BY REVENUE SOURCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
* TOTAL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997-1998*														
\$23,772,000														

Table 15.41 Continued

FY 98-99 CAPITAL PROJECTS												
PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	STATE & CO.										
		Gen.	CDBG	STF	FED.GRA	GRANT	CURSA	STP	RIPF	P&LF	WF	SF
STREET IMPROVEMENTS												
TOTAL		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
STREET IMPROVEMENTS TOTAL		0										
POWER AND LIGHT												
	Blue Valley Common Equipment									1,302		
	Missouri City Units 1 & 2									899		
	SubStation H									2,150		
	New 22MW Combust. Turbine Unit Add.									21,587		
TOTAL		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26,018	0	0
POWER AND LIGHT TOTAL		0										
TOTAL BY REVENUE SOURCE		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26,018	0	0
TOTAL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998-1999												
\$26,018,000												

FY 98-99 CAPITAL PROJECTS												
PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	STATE & CO.										
		Gen.	CDBG	STF	FED.GRA	GRANT	CURSA	STP	RIPF	P&LF	WF	SF
STREET IMPROVEMENTS												
TOTAL		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
STREET IMPROVEMENTS TOTAL		0										
POWER AND LIGHT												
	SubStation M 161 Kv (M-A) Terminal									825		
	SubStation A 161 Kv (A-M) Terminal									825		
	Substation H									1,294		
TOTAL		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,944	0	0
POWER AND LIGHT TOTAL		2,944										
TOTAL BY REVENUE SOURCE		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,944	0	0
TOTAL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999-2000												
\$2,944,000												

d) Provide for public hearings to obtain citizen's views and respond to proposals and questions at all stages of the Community Development Program.

e) Provide timely written answers to written complaints and grievances within fifteen (15) days.

f) Provide for the needs of the non-English speaking residents where a significant number of non-English speaking residents can be expected to participate.

An example of a City project that met the "urgent need definition" is the Rock Creek Flood Damage Prevention project (the Rock Creek Buyout Project).

In order to receive its annual CDBG entitlement grant, the City must submit the necessary application forms, certifications satisfactory to the Secretary and a copy of the City's Final Statement of community development objectives and projected use of funds, covering the same items as identified in the presubmission document.

Grants

Historically, grants have been available for special purposes from the Federal, State, and County governments and the City staff has aggressively pursued them. However, most recently, the availability of these grant monies has been minimal. The current capital budget includes \$17,000 from special grant sources.

Table 15.31

<u>Project Type</u>	<u>State Share</u>	<u>City Share</u>
Stormwater Control	33.3%	66.6%
Sanitary Sewer	55.0%	45.0%

State grants (when available) for storm water control and sanitary sewer projects have been awarded on a cost-sharing basis. The basis for this sharing is shown in Table 15.31. The City's share can be either in cash or in-kind services.

15.4 - CURRENT PROJECTS

Table 15.41 lists the projects for the 1993-94 fiscal year Capital Budget approved by the City Council. Appropriations have been made for those projects scheduled to start prior to fiscal year 1994-95. Additionally, resource allocations have been made for several projects scheduled to begin in fiscal years 1994-95 though 1999-2000. This includes streets, water, and power and light projects

For each project listed in Table 15.41 the source(s) of funds are shown, the amount appropriated or allocated and the fiscal year the project is to begin.

The County's engineering designs for current year County Urban Road System projects and future year projects could change the amount estimated to complete those projects. The funds allocated to these projects will be reallocated when appropriate. The projected County Urban Road System funds for fiscal years 1993-94 through 1999-2000 have been allocated by the City Council at this time. Future year projects are required to be approved both by the City Council and the County Legislature.

15.5 - ESTABLISHING PROJECT PRIORITIES

Various criteria have been used to establish the relative ranking of projects for the purpose of establishing funding priorities. Some attempts have been made to use a qualitative methodology in order that the process be as

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

FIGURE 1

STREET RATING SYSTEM

Street Name: Little Blue Expressway

Street Limits: U.S. 40 Hwy. to U.S. 24 Hwy.

Project Number:

<u>Series</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Description of Application</u>
6,000	Planned- New Alignment	Proposed street construction in accordance with Thoroughfare Plan and current design standards, both new alignment and widening of existing to Collector or Arterial design.

<u>Rating Parameters</u>	<u>Remarks</u>	<u>Rating</u>
1. FAU Designate:		
a. On-System	10	
b. Off-System	<u>1</u>	<u>10</u>
2. Cost/Mile (includes construction and right-of-way:		
a. \$1,000,000.00 or less	10	
b. \$1,000,000.00 to \$2,000,000.00	5	
c. Greater than \$2,000,000.00	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
3. Economic Development Impact:		
a. Developing Area	10	
b. Future developing area	5	
c. Fully developed area	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>
4. Convenience and Public Safety- Mitigating High Volumes on Lower Classified Streets:		
a. Little benefit	1	
b. Medium benefit	5	
c. Great benefit	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>
5. Environmental Impact:		
a. No adverse impact	10	
b. Little impact	5	
c. Detrimental	<u>1</u>	<u>10</u>

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

FIGURE1

Page 2 of 5 STREET RATING SYSTEM

<u>Rating Parameters</u>	<u>Remarks</u>	<u>Rating</u>
6. Utilities:		
a. No conflict	5	
b. Medium conflict	3	
c. Great conflict	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>
7. Vehicular Usage:		
a. Greater than 10% trucks	6	
b. 10% or less trucks	3	
c. No trucks (non-truck route)	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>
8. Projected Traffic (ADT) (Year 2000):		
a. Less than 5,000	5	
b. 5,000 to 10,000	10	
c. Greater than 10,000	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>
9. Private Contribution:		
a. None	1	
b. 5% or less	5	
c. 5% to 20%	10	
d. 20% or more	<u>15</u>	<u>5</u>
10. Existing Traffic:		
a. New alignment	1	
b. No problems	1	
c. Problems	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>
11. Area Growth:		
a. None	0	
b. Mild	5	
c. Heavy	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

FIGURE1

Page 3 of 5 STREET RATING SYSTEM

<u>Rating Parameters</u>	<u>Remarks</u>	<u>Rating</u>
12. Future Growth:		
a. Anticipated	5	
b. Not Anticipated	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>
13. Compliance with Land Use:		
a. Compliance	10	
b. Non-compliance	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>
14. Deferred Maintenance:		
a. 1 to 5 years	5	
b. Greater than 5 years	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>
15. Economic Impact:		
a. Positive	10	
b. Medium	5	
c. None	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>
16. Impact on Future Funds:		
a. Significant	0	
b. No impact	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>
	TOTAL	<u>113</u>

Rating Official _____

Rating Date

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

Page 4 of 5 STREET RATING SYSTEM

RATING INSTRUCTIONS

Rating:

1. **FAU Designation** - This rating is based upon the street being on the Federal Aid Urban System as designated by the Mid-America Regional Council.
2. **Cost/Mile** - This rating is based upon the total cost per mile of street construction. This is determined by dividing the total estimated cost by the project length in miles.
3. **Economic Development Impact** - This rating is based on the area in development stage, anticipating future development, or fully developed. Future developed area would be defined as not occurring for a minimum of five years.
4. **Convenience and Public Safety** - This rating is based upon the benefit received by other streets due to the improvements.
5. **Environmental Impact** - This rating is based upon the degree of adverse environmental impact due to the street placement of construction.
6. **Utilities** - This rating is based upon the amount of utility conflict created by the street. Great amount of conflict would be considered when total relocation is required.
7. **Vehicular Usage** - This rating is based upon percent of trucks using the street.
8. **Projected Traffic** - This rating is based upon traffic projections at the year of 2,000 A.D.
9. **Private Contribution** - This rating is determined by the percent of total cost contributed by the private sector.
10. **Existing Traffic** - This rating is determined by the degree that traffic contributes to the project need.
11. **Area Growth** - This rating is determined by the growth along the route experienced within the last five years.
12. **Future Growth** - This rating is based on the anticipated growth within the next five years.
13. **Compliance with Land Use** - This rating is determined by the time the City Thoroughfare and Land Use Plan.
14. **Deferred Maintenance** - This rating is determined by the time the construction will delay maintenance needs.

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

STREET RATING SYSTEM

Page 5 of 5 RATING INSTRUCTIONS

Rating:

15. **Economic Impact** - This rating is based upon the impact on development the street will have along the route and areas served by the street.
16. **Impact on Future Funds** - This rating is based upon the impact of funding this street would have on other capital projects.

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

FIGURE 2

TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Project Number:

Location: Noland Road and Gudgell

Problem Description: Old signal heads are not clear and need replacing

Recommended Correction: Replace all signal heads at this intersection

Estimated Cost to Correct: \$ 7,000

<u>Rating Parameters</u>	<u>Remarks</u>	<u>Rating</u>
1. Average Daily Traffic (ADT):		
a. Less than 5,000	5	
b. 5,000 to 10,000	10	
c. Greater than 10,000	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>
2. Accidents (annual):		
a. 10 or more	15	
b. 5 to 10	10	
c. 1 to 5	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>
3. Geometrics:		
a. Standard	0	
b. Impaired	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>
4. Sight Distance:		
a. Greater than 500'	0	
b. 200' to 500'	3	
c. Less than 500'	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>
5. Community Support:		
a. Petitioned by local citizens	5	
b. Warrants only	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
	TOTAL	<u>27</u>

Rating Official

Rating Date

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

Page 2 of 2 TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

RATING INSTRUCTIONS

General Information:

Project Number - Number assigned by the Engineering Department.

Location - Designates the street intersection or reference from street intersection.

Problem Description - Indicates warrants, accidents, congestion or other basis for signal.

Recommended Correction - Indicates flashing, interlock, timing, left turn or one-way features.

Estimated Cost to Correct - Indicate total cost for renovation, replacement or placement of signal.

Rating

1. **Average Daily Traffic (ADT)** - This rating is based in actual traffic counts averaged for a 24hour period.
2. **Accidents (Annual)** - This rating is based on the average annual recorded accidents over the last five year period.
3. **Geometrics** - This rating is based upon the geometry of intersection approach.
4. **Sight Distance** - This rating is based upon the sight distance at the intersection.
5. **Community Support** - This rating is determined by the existence of petition by citizens of the community.

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

FIGURE 3

BRIDGE PRIORITY RATING

Bridge Number:

Location: The Federal Sufficiency Rating does not indicate a need to replace or repair any bridges at this time.

Bridge Description:

- a. Number of spans
- b. Span lengths
- c. Type: concrete girder _____, concrete slab _____, steel girder _____, timber _____, pony truss _____, overhead truss

Deck Overlay: yes _____, no _____.

Recommended Correction:

Estimated Cost to Correct: \$

Average Daily Traffic (ADT):

Rating Parameters

Rating

1. 100-Federal Sufficiency Rating:

2. Special Industrial or Commercial Needs:

Need:	High	Medium	Low
Rating:	10	7	3

3. Maintenance Frequency:

Frequency:	Annual	1-2 years	2-5 years
Rating:	10	7	3

4. Outside Funding:

Condition:	Available	None
Rating:	5	0

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

FIGURE 3

Page 2 of 3 BRIDGE PRIORITY RATING

Rating Parameters

Rating

5. Emergency Vehicle Access:

Time:	3 min.	5 min.	10 min.
Rating:	1	5	10

6. Access Convenience:

Miles:	0.5 miles	2 miles	5 miles
Rating:	1	5	10

7. Cost per Average Daily Traffic (ADT):

Cost/ADT:	1-50	51-75	76 or higher
Rating:	10	5	1

TOTAL

Rating Official _____

Rating Date _____

CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

Page 3 of 3 BRIDGE PRIORITY RATING

RATING INSTRUCTIONS

General Information:

Bridge Number - The bridge number is assigned by the State.

Location - Identify the street and the facility, creek, river or obstacle being crossed.

Bridge Description - Describe the structure type, number of lanes, roadway width and structure length. Fill in appropriate information for a, b, and c.

Deck Overlay - Indicate if the deck has a bituminous overlay.

Recommended Corrections - Indicate replacement if the structure is to be replaced. Note any repairs needed to bring the structure to minimum standards.

Estimated Cost to Correct - Indicate the replacement cost, including right-of-way, if the recommendation is replacement. Show estimated repair cost if repairs are needed.

Average Daily Traffic (ADT) - This represents the average from traffic counts.

Rating:

1. **100-Federal Sufficiency Rating** - This rating is determined by subtracting the sufficiency rating supplied by the State from 100.
2. **Special Industrial or Commercial Needs** - This rating is determined based upon commercial or industrial traffic being used by the bridge. This is determined by reviewing the area zoning and traffic observation.
3. **Maintenance Frequency** - Bridge maintenance is defined as repairs costing in excess of \$1,000.00.
4. **Outside Funding** - Outside funding would include such sources as FAU, State, grant or donation.
5. **Emergency Vehicle Access** - This rating is based on emergency vehicle time delay due to detours required by closing.
6. **Access Convenience** - This rating is based on detour in miles due to closing.
7. **Cost per Average Daily Traffic (ADT)** - This rating is based on dividing the estimated repair or replacement cost by the average daily traffic.

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

FIGURE 4

STORM SEWER PRIORITY RATING

Project Number: SD-21

Location: Howard Drive North of Salisbury (Phase 1) west of Rogers to Kiger

Problem Description: An inadequate storm sewer floods residential property and streets.

Recommended Correction: Replace the system to Kiger, SD-20 (Phase 2)

Estimated Cost to Correct: \$ 220,000

Watershed Area: 90 Acres

<u>Rating Parameters</u>	<u>Rating</u>
1. Number of Residences Affected:	
Number: 1 2-5 6-15 Above 15	
Rating: 1 5 10 15	<u>15</u>
2. Frequency of Flooding:	
Frequency: 2 years 5 years 10 years	
Rating: 15 10 5	<u>10</u>
3. Watershed Area (acres):	
Area: 1-10 11-20 21-50 Above 50	
Rating: 2 5 8 10	<u>10</u>
4. Correction Cost per Household in \$1,000's:	
Cost: 0-1 1-3 3-5 5-15 Above 15	
Rating: 10 8 6 4 2	<u>4</u>
5. Affect to Adjacent Properties Down or Upstream:	
Affect: None Slight Severe	
Rating: 10 8 3	<u>8</u>

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

FIGURE 4

Page 2 of 4 STORM SEWER PRIORITY RATING

<u>Rating Parameters</u>				<u>Rating</u>
6.	Type of Stream:			
	Type:	City-Owned	Private	
	Rating:	5	2	<u>5</u>
7.	Type of Flooding:			
	Type:	Street	Residence	Yard
	Rating:	10	8	3
				<u>10</u>
8.	Down Stream Benefit:			
	Benefit:	None	Slight	Major
	Rating:	1	3	8
				<u>3</u>
			SUBTOTAL (A)	<u>65</u>
9.	Danger to Life Multiplier:			
	(None , 1.0 x A, Severe 1.2 x A)			
				<u>13</u>
			TOTAL (B)	<u>78</u>

Rating Official

Rating Date

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

Page 3 of 4 STORM SEWER PRIORITY RATING

RATING INSTRUCTIONS

General Information:

Project Number - Project numbers are assigned in the numerical order of project identification.

Location - Identify section and street location.

Problem Description - Identify the general problem and existing condition.

Recommended Corrections - State the recommended correction, identifying pipe and structure proposals.

Estimated Cost to Correct - Provide an estimated contract cost, which includes right-of-way, if appropriate.

Watershed Area - Report watershed area in acres.

Rating:

1. **Number of residences Affected** - This represents the number of residences impacted by the correction project.
2. **Frequency of Flooding** - This is the return flooding frequency based on existing conditions.
3. **Watershed Area** - Determine based on current topography maps in acres.
4. **Correction Cost per Household** - This cost is determined by the total project cost divided by Item No. 1.
5. **Affect to Adjacent Properties Down or Upstream** - This rating is based on a review of existing storm features impacted by the correction.
6. **Type of System** - City-owned is interpreted to mean City maintained by Council acceptance, and located on an easement.
7. **Type of Flooding** - The street flooding would imply flows over the street. Residence flooding would imply stormwater entering the residential structure. Yard flooding would imply flooding onto the residential yard.
8. **Condition of Existing System** - This rating determines the condition of the existing system, if one exists. The rating of non-existent applies if a system was not constructed during the development of the property.

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

Page 4 of 4 STORM SEWER PRIORITY RATING

RATING INSTRUCTIONS

Rating:

9. **Danger to Life Multiplier - A multiplier is used on the subtotal if the flooding is considered a danger to life. This would apply to very high and swift street flooding, or eliminating access to emergency vehicles.**

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

FIGURE 5

SANITARY SEWER PRIORITY RATING

Project Number: SS-31

Location: 44th Street - Noland to Dover

Problem Description: 5,000 lin. ft. of sanitary sewer main - undersized and deteriorated

Recommended Correction: Replace existing main

Estimated Cost to Correct: \$ 225,000

Watershed Area: 115 Acres

<u>Rating Parameters</u>	<u>Rating</u>
1. Number of Residences Affected:	
Number: 1 2-5 6-15 Above 15	
Rating: 1 5 10 20	<u>20</u>
2. Frequency of Overflow and/or Stoppage:	
Frequency: Weekly Monthly Yearly	
Rating: 20 10 5	<u>5</u>
3. Watershed Area (acres):	
Area: 1-10 11-20 21-50 Above 50	
Rating: 2 5 8 10	<u>10</u>
4. Correction Cost per Household in \$1,000's:	
Cost: 0-1 1-3 3-5 5-15 Above 15	
Rating: 10 8 6 4 2	<u>4</u>
5. Major Cause of Problem:	
	Original
Type: Overload Deterioration Construction Infiltration	
Rating: 15 13 12 10	<u>15</u>
SUBTOTAL (A)	<u>54</u>

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

FIGURE 5

Page 2 of 3 SANITARY SEWER PRIORITY RATING

<u>Rating Parameters</u>	<u>Rating</u>
6. Building Surcharge: +10 Per Complaint	<u>30</u>
7. Danager to Health Multiplier (None , 1.0 x A, Severe 2.0 x A)	
TOTAL (B)	<u>168</u>

Rating Official

Rating Date _____

CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

Page 3 of 3 SANITARY SEWER PRIORITY RATING

RATING INSTRUCTIONS

General Information:

Project Number - Project numbers are assigned in the numerical order of project identification.

Location - Identify section and street location.

Problem Description - Identify the general problem and existing condition.

Recommended Corrections - State the recommended correction, identifying pipe and structure proposals.

Estimated Cost to Correct - Provide an estimated contract cost, which includes right-of-way, if appropriate.

Watershed Area - Report watershed area in acres.

Rating:

1. **Number of residences Affected** - This represents the number of residences impacted by the correction project.
2. **Frequency of Overflow and/or Stoppage** - The number of overflow and/or stoppage is based on the maintenance records of Sewer Maintenance or complaints.
3. **Watershed Area** - This number in acres in the total watershed served by the sewer outfall at the project.
4. **Correction Cost per Household** - This cost is determined by dividing the total project cost by Item No. 1.
5. **Major Cause of Problem** - The rating is based upon the problem cause as determined by field investigation. Where more than one cause is determined, the highest rating is used.
6. **Building Surcharge** - This is based on the number of complaints received.
7. **Danger to Health Multiplier** - The multiplier is used on the subtotal when there is infiltration into streams, sewage surfacing or backup into residential basements.

CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

FIGURE 6

BUILDING STRUCTURE RATING

Project Number:

Location: Police Department Building

Problem Description: Sliding door in the detention area

Recommended Correction: Replace existing door.

Estimated Cost to Correct: \$ 5,000

<u>Rating Parameters</u>				<u>Rating</u>
1.	Prevention of Deterioration:			
	Amount:	None	Minor	Substantial
	Rating:	1	5	10
				<u>1</u>
2.	Increased Safety for Work or Visit:			
	Amount:	None	Minor	Major
	Rating:	1	5	10
				<u>10</u>
3.	Increased Handicap Accessibility:			
	Amount:	No	Yes	
	Rating:	1	5	
				<u>1</u>
4.	Extends Useful Life of Historic Structure			
	Amount:	None	Minor	Major
	Rating:	1	5	10
				<u>5</u>
5.	Increase Staff Productivity:			
	Amount:	None	Minor	Major
	Rating:	1	5	10
				<u>10</u>
6.	Improves Public Perception of City:			
	Improvement:	None	Minor	Major
	Rating:	1	5	10
				<u>5</u>

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

FIGURE 6

Page 2 of 4 BUILDING STRUCTURE RATING

<u>Rating Parameters</u>				<u>Rating</u>
7.	Increases Cash Savings:			
	Increase:	None	Minor	Major
	Rating:	1	5	10
				<u>10</u>
8.	Paid by Grant or Matching Funds:			
	Amount:	0-10%	11-50%	Above 50%
	Rating:	1	5	10
				<u>1</u>
9.	Mandated by Law:			
	Mandate:	Yes	No	
	Rating:	1	5	
				<u>5</u>
10.	Cost Versus Value or Utilization:			
	Cost/Value:	High	Medium	Low
	Rating:	1	5	10
				<u>5</u>
11.	Corrects Deficiency:			
	Correction:	Low	Medium	High
	Rating:	1	5	10
				<u>10</u>
			TOTAL	<u>63</u>

Rating Official _____

Rating Date _____

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

Page 3 of 4 BUILDING STRUCTURE

RATING INSTRUCTIONS

General Information:

Project Number - State number assigned by the Public Works/Engineering Department.

Location - State address.

Problem Description - Define problem as elevation, mechanical, structural or deteriorated.

Recommended Corrections - Indicate the proposed correction, identifying specific areas of work.

Estimated Cost to Correct - Indicate total estimated cost for placement of correction.

Rating:

1. **Prevention of Deterioration** - This rating is based on the extent the work will prevent further deterioration.
2. **Increased Safety for Work or Visit** - This rating is based on the degree of increased safety due to the correction.
3. **Increased Handicap Accessibility** - This rating is based upon the correction increasing handicap accessibility.
4. **Extends Useful Life of Historic Site** - This rating is applied to historical sites only, and rates the degree of useful life extension.
5. **Increased Staff Productivity** - This rating is based on the degree of increased staff productivity due to the correction.
6. **Improves Public Perception of City** - This rating is based on the degree of improved public perception due to the condition of the facility being corrected.
7. **Increased Cash Savings** - This rating is based on savings due to the increased efficiency caused by the correction.
8. **Paid by Grant or Matching Funds** - This rating is based on the amount of contribution toward funding the correction.
9. **Mandated by Law** - This rating is based upon corrections required by law.

CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

Page 4 of 4 BUILDING STRUCTURE

RATING INSTRUCTIONS

Rating:

10. Cost Versus Value or Utilization - This rating is based upon the ratio of cost versus building value or added utilization.
11. Corrects Deficiency - This rating is based upon the degree of the improvement correcting a certain deficiency.

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

FIGURE 7

PARKS IMPROVEMENT RATING

Park Name: Van Hook Park

Location: Shrank Road and 35th Street

Park Description: Ball fields, Soccer fields, Picnic area

Proposed Improvement: Slop correction adjacent to stream.

Estimated Cost to Correct: \$ 50,000

<u>Rating Parameters</u>	<u>Rating</u>
1. Improvement Purpose:	
Purpose: Obsolete Deteriorated Unsafe	
Rating: 7 5 10	<u>10</u>
2. Similar Facilities in Area:	
Number: 5 1-4 0	
Rating: 1 5 10	<u>10</u>
3. Percent of Population in Area under age 18:	
Percent: 15 10 5	
Rating: 10 7 5	<u>10</u>
4. Population Growth:	
Growth: Increasing Neutral Decreasing	
Rating: 10 5 2	<u>2</u>
5. Other City Programs Expansion in Area:	
Programs: Yes No	
Rating: 1 5	<u>5</u>

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

FIGURE 7

Page 2 of 3 PARKS IMPROVEMENT RATING

<u>Rating Parameters</u>				<u>Rating</u>
6.	Utilization Rate of Facility:			
	Rate:	High	Moderate	Light
	Rating:	10	7	3
				<u>10</u>
7.	Schools in Area:			
	Number:	3 or more	2	1
	Rating:	5	3	1
				<u>5</u>
8.	Community Support:			
	Support:	10%	1-10%	Above 50%
	Rating:	10	5	0
				<u>5</u>
			TOTAL	<u>57</u>

Rating Official

Rating Date

**CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

Page 3 of 3 PARKS IMPROVEMENTS RATING

RATING INSTRUCTIONS

General Information:

Park Name - The name given to the designated park land.

Location - Reference the park property location to adjacent streets.

Park Description - Indicate type of activities available at the park.

Proposed Improvement - Identify the improvement proposed.

Estimated Cost of Improvement - Indicate the cost of the proposed improvement, including placement costs.

Rating:

1. **Improvement Purpose** - This rating is based upon the reason for the improvement.
2. **Similar Facilities in Area** - This rating is based upon similar facilities within one mile of the park perimeter.
3. **Percent of Population in Area under age 18** - This rating is based upon the percent of youth within a one mile distance from the park perimeter.
4. **Population Growth** - This rating is based upon population growth within one mile of the park perimeter.
5. **Other City Programs Expansion in Area** - This rating is based on whether other city programs are expanding within one mile of the park perimeter.
6. **Utilization Rate of Facility** - This rating identifies park usage.
7. **Schools in Area** - This rating is based upon the number of schools within two miles of the park perimeter.
8. **Community Support** - This rating is based on community support of residences within one mile of the park perimeter.

objective as possible. Unfortunately, however, there is no totally satisfactory manner to analytically combine such factors as:

- a) Cost (Capital, operation, maintenance)
- b) Public convenience, health, safety
- c) Economic development (furtherance of or hindrance to)
- d) Environmental impact (positive or negative)
- f) Staff health, safety, effectiveness.

Figures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 shown on pages 15-12 through 15-35 of this chapter are the rating sheets that were used to provide a numerical rating for streets, traffic control devices, bridges, storm drainage, sanitary sewer, buildings, and parks, respectively. The project priority rating sheets used as an example in this report are for the number one priority of each of these categories.

The Fire Department has assigned a priority rating to their equipment, station repair and other improvements requested. A rating sheet has not been developed for emergency equipment at this time.

15.6 - PROPOSED NEW PROJECTS

There are numerous capital projects located throughout the City for which funding has not been available. These projects are listed in Table 15.61 in priority order. The priorities have been established, in part, using the rating sheets included in Section 15.5 of this chapter. Where no numerical rating methodology was available preferences were given to projects associated with maintaining the current infrastructure, safety and operational needs of the City. Each project category starts with a priority rating of one (1) for the highest rating. Projects that have the same numerical rating were assigned an alphabetical letter after the number in order to give a separate identification for each project.

The project type is abbreviated for quick reference and the project title gives a brief description or location for that project. The estimated cost for each project is based on the 1994-95 fiscal year prices. If projects are assigned to future fiscal year funds the cost estimate will have to be changed to reflect the estimated prices in that particular fiscal year.

As shown in Section 15.2 the resources available for new projects or additional appropriations to existing projects, are very limited. Modest amounts of resources (STP, CDBG and CURS funds) will become available year by year, but this is still not enough to adequately maintain and expand the City's infrastructure.

Before considering any new projects Council should determine whether any changes to the funding of existing projects is required. This is necessary in order to establish the amount (and types) of revenue available for new projects.

Table 15.61 lists the various types of funds that would be applicable to the proposed new projects. Section 15.3 outlines the restrictions of the revenue sources as to their usage.

Table 15.62 indicates the proposed use of County Urban Roads System funds through this six year time period.

Table 15.62

County Urban Road System Priority List

Project No.	Project Description	Estimated Cost
9012	Independence Ave. (M-291 to Lacy)	\$147,000
9125	Crysler Ave. Phase I (S.City Lts.-39th)	\$150,000
9022	Salisbury Rd. Phase I (U.S.24-M291)	\$350,000
9208	Little Blue Expressway	\$300,000
9024	Salisbury Road, Phase II & III	\$775,000

Table 15.61

PROPOSED NEW PROJECTS - APPLICABLE FUNDING SOURCES								
Priority	Project Type	Project Title	APPLICABLE FUNDING SOURCE					
			(in 000,s) Estimated Cost	Gen	CDBG	FAU	STF	CURSA
1a	ST	Overlay & Slurry Seal Program (\$500,000 per/year)	500	X			X	
1b	ST	Little Blue Expressway (U.S. 40 - U.S. 24)	40,000	X		X	X	X
1c	ST	Little Blue Expressway (U.S. 24 to M-291)	4,200	X		X	X	
1d	ST	Jackson Drive (Ringo to M-78)	1,800	X			X	
1e	ST	Pacific (Pleasant to Noland)	1,350	X	X		X	
2	ST	Jackson Drive (39th St. - Bundschu Road)	16,319	X		X	X	
3	ST	Pacific (River to Pleasant)	710	X	X		X	
4	ST	35th Street & Lees' Summit Road Right Turn Lane	40	X			X	
5	ST	Hub Drive Extension North of 23rd Street	800	X			X	
6	ST	39th Street (Noland to Lee's Summit Road)	3,300	X		X	X	
7	ST	Crysler (South of U.S. 40 to Lexington)	6,560	X	X		X	
8	ST	M-291 Frontage Road System	5,600	X		X	X	
9	ST	Crysler (Lexington to Truman)	1,700	X	X		X	
9a	ST	Maywood (23rd to 18th)	700	X	X		X	
10	ST	33rd Terrace Drive (35th Street Extension)	2,700	X			X	
10a	ST	River (Lexington to Pacific)	620	X			X	
11	ST	Gudgell (Kingshighway to Milton Drive)	600	X			X	
12	ST	Cottage at 43rd Terrace	45	X			X	
13	ST	Pacific (Hunter to Trailridge)		X			X	
14	ST	35th Street (West City Limits to Lee's Summit Rd)	12,965	X		X	X	
15	ST	39th Street (West City Limits to Noland Rd)	7,100	X		X	X	
16	ST	Kentucky Road	5,970	X			X	
17	ST	Salisbury Road	6,615	X			X	
18	ST	Jennings Road	2,075	X			X	
19	ST	Westport Road	3,080	X			X	
20	ST	River Blvd.	1,700	X			X	
21	ST	Dickinson Road	3,785	X			X	
22	ST	31st Street Extension	850	X			X	
Total Street Improvements			\$131,684					
1	Traf.S.	Permanent Traffic Loops & Counters	86	X			X	
2	Traf.S.	Noland Road and Gudgell Traffic Signals	7	X			X	
3	Traf.S.	Noland Road and Walnut Traffic Signals	7	X			X	
4	Traf.S.	Noland Road and College Traffic Signals	5	X			X	
5	Traf.S.	39th & Blue Ridge, New Traffic Signals	50	X			X	
6	Traf. S.	Blue Ridge Blvd. & 35th Street Flashing Signals	12	X			X	
7	Traf. S.	Gudgell at Shrank Traffic Signals	60	X			X	
8	Traf.S.	Main and Walnut New Traffic Signals	32	X			X	
Total Traffic Signals			\$259					

Table 15.61 Continued

		PROPOSED NEW PROJECTS - APPLICABLE FUNDING SOURCE		APPLICABLE FUND SOURCE				
Priority	Project Type	Project Title	(in 000,s)	Gen	CDBG	STATE	STF	CURSA
			Estimated Cost					
1	B\O	Police Detention Area Sliding Door	5	X				
2	B\O	Uninterrupted Power System (Computer Room)	53	X				
3	B\O	Animal Control Incinerator #1 Replacement	25	X				
4	B\O	Replacement Police CCTV Surveillance System	25	X				
5	B\O	Old Fire Staion No. 1 Window Replacement	19	X				
6	B\O	Remodel Police Communication Room	3	X				
7	B\O	Airport Eastern Jackson County	132	X				
8	B\O	Old Fire Station #6 Remodel for Paint Shop	50	X				
9	B\O	Police Property Storage Room	15	X				
10	B\O	Animal Control Freezer	9	X				
11	B\O	Salt Storage Dome	104	X				
12	B\O	Warning Siren (Pacific and Savage)	15	X				
13	B\O	Replace Carpet Police Dept.	50	X				
14	B\O	Animal Control Shelter Expansion	107	X				
15	B\O	Public Works Complex Phase 1	500	X				
16	B\O	Computer Services-Personnel-Health Dept. Building	700	X				
17	B\O	Public Works Complex Phase 2	500	X				
18	B\O	Public Works Complex Phase 3	500	X				
19	B\O	Computer System for Animal Shelter	8	X				
		Total Buildings/Other Improvements	\$2,820					
1	Fire	Refurbish Station No. 7 - Rehabilitation	55	X				
2	Fire	Replace Roof Station # 3	15	X				
3	Fire	Renovate Station # 8	55	X				
4	Fire	Purchase New Pumper Truck #3	250	X				
5	Fire	Apparatus Rechassis - Pumper #10	115	X				
6	Fire	Appratus Rechassis - Pumper #8	115	X				
7	Fire	Vehicle Replacement #8968	25	X				
8	Fire	Rescue Truck - Replace No. 2 Rescue #8995	65	X				
9	Fire	Vehicle Replacement #8393	25	X				
10	Fire	Replace Heat & Air System and Renovate Station #1	55	X				
11	Fire	Replace Overhead Doors & Renovate Station #2	65	X				
12	Fire	Renovate Shop at Station #1	25	X				
13	Fire	Purchase New Pumper Truck #4	250	X				
14	Fire	Purchase New Pumper Truck #7	250	X				
15	Fire	Apparatus Rechassis - Pumper #5	115	X				
16	Fire	Vehicle Replacement #8906	20	X				
17	Fire	Vehicle Replacement #8913	20	X				
18	Fire	Vehicle Replacement #8886	20	X				
19	Fire	Vehicle Replacement #8915	20	X				
20	Fire	Renovate Station # 4	55	X				
21	Fire	Renovate Station # 6	50	X				
22	Fire	Purchase New Pumper Truck #6	255	X				
		SubTotal	\$1,920					

Table 15.61 Continued

PROPOSED NEW PROJECTS - APPLICABLE FUNDING SOURCES						
Priority	Project Type	Project Title	(in 000,s) Estimated Cost	APPLICABLE FUNDING SOURCE		
				Gen	CDBG STATE	STF CURSA
23	Fire	Purchase New Pumper Truck - #2	255	X		
24	Fire	Apparatus Rechassis - Pumper #9	120	X		
25	Fire	Vehicle Replacement #9075	80	X		
26	Fire	Vehicle Replacement #8919	21	X		
27	Fire	Vehicle Replacement Shop Truck	25	X		
28	Fire	Replace West Wall and Renovate Station # 5	75	X		
29	Fire	Renovate Station # 3	40	X		
30	Fire	Purchase New Pumper Truck #1	268	X		
31	Fire	Purchase New Pumper Truck #11	268	X		
32	Fire	Apparatus Rechassis - Truck Company #2	120	X		
33	Fire	Vehicle Replacement #8253	22	X		
34	Fire	Vehicle Replacement #9954	21	X		
35	Fire	Vehicle Replacement #9955	21	X		
36	Fire	Vehicle Replacement Shop Van #9086	25	X		
37	Fire	Renovate Station # 9	55	X		
38	Fire	Renovate Station # 10	55	X		
39	Fire	Apparatus Rechassis - Truck Company #1	160	X		
40	Fire	Purchase New Pumper Truck - #8	268	X		
41	Fire	Purchase New Pumper Truck - #10	268	X		
42	Fire	Vehicle Replacement Rescue #1	85	X		
		Total Fire	\$4,199			
1	P/R	Van Hook Park Slope Correction	50	X		
1a	P/R	Van Hook Park Phase III Part 2	170			X
2	P/R	Santa Fe Park Asphalt Backstop	4	X		
3	P/R	Mill Creek Park, Diamond No. 1 Parking Lot	20	X		
4	P/R	Mill Creek Park, Shelter House # 1 & 2 Park. Lots	4	X		
5	P/R	McCoy Park playground equipment	25	X		X
6	P/R	Crysler Stadium, repair & slurry parking lot	3	X		
7	P/R	Santa Fe Park, repair & slurry parking lot & road	6	X		
8	P/R	George Owens Nature Park, repair parking lot & road	3	X		
9	P/R	Little Blue Park, parking lot	10	X		
10	P/R	Crysler Stadium, lights & walkway	55	X		
11	P/R	Fairmount Park, repair parking lot & rd & restrooms	15	X		
12	P/R	Brady Park	5	X		
13	P/R	All Parks - repla. picnic tables & playground. equipment	10	X		
14	P/R	Santa Fe Park Ball diamond lights	100	X		
15	P/R	Crysler Stadium diamond #1 backstop	3	X		
16	P/R	Van Hook soccer fields parking lot	20	X		
17	P/R	Acquisition Annex Area - District Park 50 Ac.	250	X		
18	P/R	George Owens Nature Park	20	X		
19	P/R	Dickinson Park	20	X		
20	P/R	Fairmount Business District Parking Lot	2	X		
21	P/R	Park Maintenance Headquarters	100	X		
22	P/R	Rock Creek Green Belt	30	X		X
		Total Parks and Recreation	\$925			

Table 15.61 Continued

PROPOSED NEW PROJECTS - APPLICABLE FUNDING SOURCES			APPLICABLE FUNDING SOURCE					
Priority	Project Type	Project Title	(in 000,s)	Gen	CDBG	STATE	STF	CURSA
			Estimated Cost					
1a	SD	Howard Drive North of Holder	231	X				
1b	SD	35th and Leslie Phase 1	441	X				
1c	SD	39th and Woodland Detention Basin	130	X				
2	SD	46th and Phelps	74	X				
2a	SD	Salisbury and Holder, Phase II	158	X				
3	SD	Sterling to Hill Park	504	X				
3a	SD	Norton at 32nd to Country Club Park	326	X				
4	SD	South Cottage Channel., Phase 2 and 3	368	X	X			
4a	SD	44th and Osage	262	X				
5	SD	33rd and Crysler	210	X				
5a	SD	44th and Phelps	304	X				
5b	SD	Kendall & Peck	25	X				
5c	SD	Eureka Rd., East of R.D. Mize Road	55	X				
6	SD	27th and Scott	294	X				
6a	SD	Westwood Court Detention Basin	189	X	X			
6b	SD	24th and Harris	189	X				
6c	SD	35th and Leslie Phase 2 (Emery to 35th St.)	252	X				
6d	SD	Coachman at 27th Terrace	105	X				
6e	SD	18th and Coachman	340	X				
6f	SD	30th and Glendale	280	X				
7	SD	Devon and Pearl	116	X				
7a	SD	41st and Forest	882	X				
7b	SD	10509 East 28th Terrace	649	X				
7c	SD	19th and Cedar	330	X				
7d	SD	5116 Willis	231	X				
7e	SD	Crysler South of Truman	715	X	X			
7f	SD	Hocker South of 23rd Street	748	X	X			
7g	SD	11320 East 19th Street	319	X				
7h	SD	Norwood, 23rd to Rock Creek	192	X				
7i	SD	46th and Crysler	200	X				
8	SD	32nd and Crysler	275	X				
8a	SD	5125 Tierney Drive Court	11	X				
9	SD	35th Terrace and U.S. 40 Phase 2	187	X				
9a	SD	18009 East Truman	1,248	X				
9b	SD	14201 East 35th Street	242	X				
9c	SD	2916 Overton	460	X				
9d	SD	1103 West 35th Street	144	X				
9e	SD	3916 Christopher Circle	172	X				
9f	SD	Detention Basin Spring Branch Creek	472	X	X			
9g	SD	1701 Ellison Way	150	X				
9h	SD	8821 Wilson Road	299	X	X			
9i	SD	Bundschu Culvert, East of Missouri 7 Highway	12	X				
9j	SD	34th and Grand	65	X				

Table 15.61 Continued

PROPOSED NEW PROJECTS - APPLICABLE FUNDING SOURCES						
Priority	Project Type	Project Title	(in 000,s) Estimated Cost	APPLICABLE FUNDING SOURCE		
				Gen	CDBG STATE	STF CURSA
9k	SD	Ellison Way, East of Missouri 7 Highway	144	X		
10	SD	Queen Ridge and 40th Street	80	X		
11	SD	William Yates School	391	X		
12	SD	Main, White Oak, Farmer and Noland Road	196	X		
12a	SD	37th and Cottage	230	X		
12b	SD	1800 South Osage	63	X		
12c	SD	12600 East 49th Street	310	X		
12d	SD	Rock Creek Channelization	310	X		
12e	SD	35th Street and Northern Blvd.	276	X		
12f	SD	9901 East 31st Street	230	X		
12g	SD	Colonel Drive at Liberty	115	X		
12h	SD	4719 South Crysler	299	X		
12i	SD	10915 East 8th Street	121	X	X	
12j	SD	12612 East 40th Street	102	X		
12k	SD	40th and Drumn	7	X		
13	SD	2926 Scott	108	X		
13a	SD	4702 South Crysler	132	X		
13b	SD	Willis, South of Maple	132	X		
14	SD	220 East Farmer	210	X	X	
14a	SD	1310 North Pearl	48	X		
14b	SD	Alley between Delaware, Pleasant, Truman, Farmer	360	X	X	
14c	SD	9803 East 26th Terrace	168	X		
14d	SD	3619 Poplar	288	X		
14e	SD	Vista and Truman	78	X		
14f	SD	35th and Grant Underdrain	24	X		
14g	SD	51st and Crysler	78	X		
14h	SD	31st and Overton	96	X		
14i	SD	317 South Crane	85	X		
14j	SD	24th and Lee's Summit Road	100	X		
14k	SD	Truman and Main Roads	90	X		
15	SD	Kansas, Main to Memorial Drive	90	X	X	
15a	SD	501 Speck	108	X		
15b	SD	15700 East 40th Terrace	36	X		
15c	SD	2709 Maybrook	90	X		
15d	SD	Mills Street, South of 44th Street	30	X		
15e	SD	734 Devon	300	X		
15f	SD	607 Leslie	240	X		
15g	SD	Dakota and Apache	66	X		
15h	SD	3420 Denton	102	X		
15i	SD	Willis, South of Maple	140	X		
15j	SD	20th and Overton	50	X		
16	SD	Arlington and Blue Ridge	78	X		
16a	SD	Bellevista North Condos	12	X		

Table 15.61 Continued

PROPOSED NEW PROJECTS - APPLICABLE FUNDING SOURCES							
Priority	Project Type	Project Title	(in 000,s) Estimated Cost	APPLICABLE FUNDING SOURCE			
				Gen	CDBG	STATE	STF CURSA
16b	SD	3018 Sweet Briar	24	X			
16c	SD	2211 North Liberty	10	X			
17	SD	608 Hereford	162	X			
17a	SD	420 Linwood	96	X			
17b	SD	9407 East 14th Street	168	X			
17c	SD	208 Queen Ridge	240	X			
17d	SD	3336 Crisp	216	X			
17e	SD	1107 South Crysler	86	X			
17f	SD	2534 Queen Ridge	54	X			
17g	SD	2005 South Leslie	102	X			
17h	SD	31st and Linwood	96	X			
18	SD	14900 East 46th Street	30	X			
18a	SD	2709 Cochise Druve	36	X			
18b	SD	11609 East 38th Terrace	96	X			
18c	SD	15th Street, East of Vermont	84	X			
18d	SD	42nd and Grand	30	X			
18e	SD	Kensington, West of Crysler	84	X	X		
18f	SD	46th and Willis	24	X			
18g	SD	12519 East 41st Terrace	72	X			
18h	SD	1327 West 30th Street	18	X			
18i	SD	Susquehanna Drive, West of Susquehanna Ridge	60	X			
18j	SD	11218 Sheley	50	X			
18k	SD	46th and Phelps	40	X			
19	SD	1500 Harvard	62	X			
19a	SD	500 South Forest	106	X			
19b	SD	1011 Gudgell	156	X			
19c	SD	27th Terrace and Peck	6	X			
19d	SD	18909 Arrowhead	44	X			
19e	SD	10405 East 34th Street	70	X			
20	SD	35th and Kiger	44	X			
20a	SD	9801 East 33rd Street	15	X			
20b	SD	1717 Waubesa	69	X			
20c	SD	Truman and Turner	44	X			
20d	SD	Ash, South of Winner	75	X			
20e	SD	1803 Hawthorne	175	X			
20f	SD	1533 North Liberty	125	X	X		
20g	SD	2607 Milton	75	X			
20h	SD	9900 East of 36th Street	62	X			
20i	SD	2425 Scott	44	X			
20j	SD	30th and Iva Drive	50	X			
20k	SD	2726 Norwood	56	X			
20l	SD	3733 South Main	70	X			
21	SD	3rd and Morgan	50	X			

Table 15.61 Continued

PROPOSED NEW PROJECTS - APPLICABLE FUNDING SOURCES						
Priority	Project Type	Project Title	(in 000,s) Estimated Cost	APPLICABLE FUNDING SOURCE		
				Gen	CDBG STATE	STF CURSA
21a	SD	1217 East Parker	19	X	X	
21b	SD	College at North West Parkway	38	X	X	
21c	SD	16621 Crackerneck	62	X		
21d	SD	1505 Sterling	3	X	X	
21e	SD	1245 West 30th Street	44	X		
22	SD	1032 Claremont	425	X	X	
22a	SD	3402 North Union	8	X		
22b	SD	14801 Truman Road	19	X		
22c	SD	10422 Sheley	75	X		
22d	SD	17913 Kentucky Road	15	X		
22e	SD	40th Terrace at Spring	12	X		
22f	SD	10614 East 33rd Terrace	44	X		
22g	SD	3404 Shady Bend	212	X		
22h	SD	Bryn Mawr Drive and 32nd Street Court	10	X		
23	SD	3930 South Crysler	50	X		
23a	SD	4316 Greenwich	29	X		
23b	SD	1213 West 26th Street	31	X		
23c	SD	18201 East of 24th Terrace	25	X		
23d	SD	2916 South Forest	50	X		
23e	SD	3204 South Hawthorne	31	X		
23f	SD	3013 Iva Drive	44	X		
23g	SD	1408 North Noland Road	62	X	X	
23h	SD	2022 Northern Boulevard	38	X		
23i	SD	100 East Jones	50	X	X	
23j	SD	912 North Dodgion	50	X	X	
23k	SD	Visa, South of Whitney	20	X		
24	SD	Black Flag Antiques	50	X		
24a	SD	33rd and Claremont	38	X		
24b	SD	3326 Harris	50	X		
24c	SD	25th and Arlington	31	X		
24d	SD	9611 Linwood	6	X		
24e	SD	Bellevista and Pearl	25	X		
25	SD	16901 East 4th Terrace South	31	X		
25a	SD	Salisbury and Lacy	6	X		
25b	SD	14408 East 32nd Street	56	X		
25c	SD	902 North Kiger	62	X	X	
26	SD	Alton Plaza Apartments	106	X		
26a	SD	409 East Elm	56	X		
26b	SD	404 North Speck Avenue	56	X		
27	SD	4216 South Cottage	15	X		
27a	SD	3920 Drumm	62	X		
28	SD	13200 East 49th Terrace	31	X		
28a	SD	45th and Willis	62	X		

Table 15.61 Continued

PROPOSED NEW PROJECTS - APPLICABLE FUNDING SOURCES							
Priority	Project Type	Project Title	(in 000,s) Estimated Cost	APPLICABLE FUNDING SOURCE			
				Gen	CDBG	STATE	STF
29	SD	39th and Elizabeth	25	X			
30	SD	16200 Salisbury		X			
30a	SD	39th and Dodgion		X			
30b	SD	109 Ellisonway		X			
30c	SD	1002 Wilson Road		X	X		
30e	SD	41st at Shoney's		X			
Total Storm Drainage Improvements			\$24,594				