

Public Works Department Parks and Lands Division

Capital Facilities Plan and Project Matrix Development

June 08, 2021

Galina Burley, Parks and Lands Manager



Overview

- Summary to date
- Prioritization Criteria
- Samples
- Ongoing Work
- Further Considerations and PAB Input



Summary to Date

- Parks and Lands Division (PLD) is working to develop a capital facilities plan (CFP), as required by the Growth Management Act (GMA) and as a portion of the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) plan
- PLD has been working on policies to prioritize capital work due to the numerous obligations and deferrals impacting its portfolio (see presentation from April 13, 2021)
- PLD, in concert with Public Works Finance, is developing a database to help prioritize projects by scoring
- Considerations for prioritization will be per the policies to be adopted and will be dependent on the type of project (acquisition, development, or repair)
- Considerations were developed by the PLD; requesting input from PAB; will be adopted through policy by Council



Prioritization Criteria

- **Acquisition**
 - Equity/Inclusion*
 - Environ. Impact
 - PIF Concurrency
 - Levels of Service
- **Development**
 - Equity/Inclusion*
 - Environ. Impact
 - PIF Concurrency
 - Levels of Service
 - Facility Diversity/Improve.
- **Repair**
 - Equity/Inclusion*
 - Environ. Impact
 - Consequences of Failure
 - Likelihood of Failure

Other Factor Impacting Ranking

- Levy
- RCO Requirements
- Council Directives
- Public Access/Route Connectivity
- Public and Outside Agency Support
- Non-County Funding/Partnerships
- Public Health
- Emerging Opportunities
- Geographic Distribution

*Equity/Inclusion comprised of consideration of age, poverty, and demographic diversity



Prioritization Criteria, cont'd.

- Where the County has obligations, these projects will take precedent over other projects within their classification (*i.e.*, acquisition, development, repair)
- Prioritization occurs by ranking the criteria specific to a project on a 1-5 scale, then multiplying these together
- Some criteria are composites of multiple factors (*e.g.*, equity)
- This creates a baseline prioritization score, which can be compared to others
- Other factors impacting rating, such as funding, may necessitate reprioritization

EXAMPLE: An acquisition project scores 4 in equity, 2 in environmental impact, 2 in PIF concurrency, and 3 in level of services, for an overall score of 48.



Capital Repair Prioritization – Sample Matrix

PROJECT NAME	ESTIMATE	Likelihood of Failure	Consequence of Failure	Equity	PRIORITIZATION SCORE	PROJECT YEAR
Captain William Clark Asphalt Repair	\$ 50,000.00	5	4	3	60	2021
Captain William Clark Bank Stabilization	\$ 100,000.00	4	5	3	60	2021
Hazel Dell Reroofing	\$ 55,000.00	3	5	3	45	2021
Klineline Parking Lot Repaving	\$ 120,000.00	4	4	2	32	2021
English Pit Lead Testing	\$ 42,000.00	2	5	3	30	2021
Klineline Shelter Replacement	\$ 150,000.00	5	3	2	30	2021
Lacamas Lake Bridge Replacement	\$ -	5	2	3	30	2021
Vancouver Lake Curb Replacement	\$ 20,000.00	5	2	3	30	2021
Captain William Clark ADA Ramp	\$ 20,000.00	3	3	3	27	2021
Hazel Dell Parking and Path Treatment	\$ 50,000.00	3	3	3	27	2021
Lacamas Lake Caretaker Demo	\$ 70,000.00	3	3	3	27	2022
Orchards Parking Lot Reseal	\$ 15,000.00	3	3	3	27	2022
Vancouver Lake Bank Restoration	\$ 25,000.00	3	3	3	27	2022
Vancouver Lake Picnic Pad Replacement	\$ 25,000.00	3	3	3	27	2022



Capital Improvement Prioritization – Sample Matrix

RANK	Project Name	Phase	Spent to Date	REET 2	PIF	Grant/ Loans	Other	Cost to Complete	Project Total	PIF Area / Shared Funding	Asset Diversity	Level of Service	Equity	Priority Score
OBLIGATED PROJECTS (Defined as: projects that are under design, have final P&E, or under construction)														
A	Lower Daybreak Park Trail (Daybreak drive) Project #: 000206	PE	248,000	0	0	0	0	0	248,000	0	2	4	3	21
		ROW	1,444,566	0	0	0	0	0	1,444,566					
		CN	0	0	0	348,379	12,955	0	443,112					
		Total	1,692,566	361,334			0	2,135,678						
B	Harmony Sports Complex Parking Lot Safety Improvements (1500 NE 192nd Ave, Vancouver, WA) Project #: A28842	PE	111,957	213,358	0	89,649	0	0	414,964	0	5	3	2	25
		ROW	0	2,000	0	0	0	0	2,000					
		CN	0	0	0	1,052,041	0	0	3,224,726					
		Total	111,957	1,357,048			0	3,641,690						
C	Kozy Kamp Neighborhood Park (17410 NE 29th Ave.) Project #: 402296	PE	252,225	20,275	0	0	0	0	272,500	462,000 PIF District 10 Combined	3	4	2	20
		ROW	82	34,918	0	0	0	0	35,000					
		CN	0	835,361	111,000	0	0	0	1,321,250					
		Total	252,307	1,001,554			0	1,628,750						
D	Curtin Creek Community Park (12603 NE 72nd Avenue) Project #: 405762	PE	186,375	643,994	151,631	0	0	0	1,000,000	1,701,744 PIF District 6 Acquisition	3	4	2	20
		ROW	752	82,248	35,000	0	0	0	118,000					
		CN	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,437,000					
		Total	187,127	912,873			0	6,555,000						
E	Felida Community Park Children's Garden and Parking Lot Expansion (3798 NW 122nd St, Vancouver, WA 98685) Project #: 000138	PE	257,924	0	0	0	0	0	257,924	514,999 PIF District 9 Combined	5	3	1	20
		ROW	125	0	0	0	0	0	125					
		CN	0	599,550	256,950	0	0	0	856,500					
		Total	258,049	856,500			0	1,114,549						
F	Hockinson Community Park Disc Golf Course (Parcel 200550000) Project #: 405960	PE	405,074	0	0	0	0	0	405,074	595,674 PIF District 5 Acquisition	5	4	3	67
		ROW	15,400	0	0	0	0	0	15,400					
		CN	0	408,800	175,200	0	0	0	584,000					
		Total	420,474	584,000			0	1,004,474						
Revenue Sources				REET 2	PIF	Grant/ Loans	Other	OBLIGATED Total 13,438,674						
Annual Totals by Funding				2,840,504	729,781	1,490,069	12,955							
Annual Totals by Phase				PE	ROW	CN								
Annual Totals				1,118,907	154,166	3,800,236								
				5,073,309										



Ongoing Work

- Continue work with PW Finance to build prioritization database
- Continue work on policies for prioritization and project selection
- Continue moving forward with obligations while work is being completed
- As asset management is eventually implemented, integrate prioritization and selection processes with asset management software and policies



Further Considerations and PAB Input

- Any additional prioritization criteria to be added? Subsets to existing criteria? (*E.g.*, age to be adjusted to include both >65 as well as current <18)
- Modification to current prioritization scoring methodology?
- Modification to composite scoring?

EXAMPLE: The equity score is a composite of multiple different factors, which means that, on average, it is moderated to the middle of the 1-5 scale. Do we want to set a benchmark by which it is elevated, regardless of the composite?



Questions, comments, suggestions

