

CITY OF OAKLAND

AGENDA REPORT

20070612 11:01:15

TO: Office of the City Administrator
ATTN: Deborah Edgerly
FROM: Public Works Agency
DATE: June 12, 2007

RE: **Update Report on Park Prioritization and Action on a Recommendation That the City Council Establish A Parks Project Prioritization List for City Of Oakland Park Capital Improvement Projects and Authorize the City Administrator, or Her Designee, to Apply for Grants for Projects on the Prioritization List**

SUMMARY

Presented for Council approval is an update report and a recommendation to establish a project prioritization list for City of Oakland parks capital improvement projects and to authorize the City Administrator to apply for, but not accept, grants based on the approved prioritization list without further action by City Council. The City Administrator would continue to request Council approval in advance of grant applications when required by grant agencies or when the approved prioritized list is not used in selecting a project for grant application due to unique circumstances. In all cases, grant awards obtained by staff will be submitted to the City Council for acceptance and appropriation of funds upon grant award.

In October 2004, Council directed the City Administrator to develop a method to prioritize parks capital improvement projects. The purpose of the prioritization is to produce a project ranking list that would be used as the implementation plan by the City Administrator to obtain grants and complete the projects.

The City Administrator presented a report in February 2005 identifying various methodologies to analyze and prioritize parks projects. The report described two processes: 1) a comprehensive process to assess City parks and open spaces involving extensive community outreach leading to development of full program needs, and 2) an alternative, limited process of identifying a selected number of parks and facilities deemed as high priority by its respective District Council person.

Council approved Resolution No. 79638 C.M.S. (December 20, 2005) which implemented the alternative method using a limited process based on a selected number of parks and facilities by the Councilmembers for each of their Council districts, established evaluation criteria for assessing park capital improvement projects, and directed the City Administrator to proceed with development of a prioritized list of parks and open space capital improvement projects.

Item: _____
Life Enrichment Committee
June 12, 2007

On December 19, 2006, the City Administrator presented the results of the evaluation based on selected projects. The proposed prioritized list of 23 projects was presented for Council approval and adoption. Because there are on-going projects that were not incorporated in the evaluation process, Council directed the City Administrator to evaluate and incorporate existing park capital improvement projects, including Measure DD Bond projects, into the process and develop a comprehensive list for review and approval.

A Council-established priority project list will be useful for responding to grant and other funding opportunities for park projects, expedite the process in applying for grant funds, and serve as the guiding plan for implementing Oakland's parks and open space capital improvements.

FISCAL IMPACT

This report recommends that Council establish the parks project prioritization list to be used for grant applications and project implementation. There are no direct fiscal impacts associated with this report until the projects are funded and implemented.

Evaluation of each proposed project includes estimated total project cost and potential operation and maintenance impact based on the proposed scope. Once funds are available to implement a specific project, detailed evaluation of the impact of the project on operation and maintenance costs will be presented to the City Council.

BACKGROUND

In June 1996, the City Council adopted the Open Space, Conservation, and Recreation (OSCAR) Element of the Oakland General Plan. The OSCAR is the official policy document addressing the management of open land, natural resources, recreation services, and parks in Oakland. Park capital improvement project criteria should adhere to OSCAR and address the recommendations provided by the policy. OSCAR outlines a proposed procedure for improvements or changes to Oakland parks but does not offer specific evaluation methods.

In recent years and with the lack of any increase in the Landscape and Lighting Assessment District fund, the operation and maintenance of Oakland's park system faces significant budget and staffing constraints. This has presented a challenge for the City to define and implement projects critical to maintain services and programs for the public. These budget constraints make prioritization more important than ever to provide for a systematic approach in selecting the most critical projects for the limited available funding. Further, because of a lack of discretionary funding within the City's budget, the primary source of revenue for park capital improvement projects has been grants, most of which are competitive.

The priority project list will serve as the guiding plan for pursuing funds that become available either from the City or outside grant sources in order to protect and improve Oakland's treasured open space assets.

KEY ISSUES AND IMPACTS

On July 20, 2004, City Council approved Resolution No. 78747 C.M.S. establishing criteria used to prioritize any capital improvement project for parks and open space. The OSCAR was used as the basis for selection of past projects. The prioritization criteria are:

- Projects that resolve existing health and safety issues, including liability exposure.
- Projects that replace existing deteriorated facilities, fields, tot lots, etc.
- Projects that leverage existing improvements that are already funded, or in design or construction, particularly those that are approved by Citywide vote.
- Projects that are partially funded and suitable for grant-funding opportunities.
- Projects that increase access to existing parks for school children.

With the established criteria, a long-term capital improvement plan is still required to systematically identify and prioritize park projects. On December 20, 2005, Council approved Resolution No. 79638 C.M.S. authorizing funding for staff to contract with a consultant to develop a prioritization plan for a limited set of parks and open space projects. The City tasked Wallace Roberts & Todd to assess, develop concept plans for the selected sites, and prioritize the projects based on Council adopted evaluation criteria to arrive at a project priority list. The list could be used by the City to budget, seek potential funds, and implement projects on a priority basis. The number of projects was set at a maximum of three projects selected by each Council office.

City Council Offices identified a total of 23 projects for prioritization. All 23 projects required existing condition evaluations, scope development, concept plan development, and project budget estimate preparation. The results of the 23 prioritized project list was presented on December 19, 2006 Council meeting. In addition to the 23 prioritized projects, there are other park projects at varying stages of development that require additional funds. Council directed staff to evaluate existing projects and incorporate the results with the 23 prioritized projects to develop final recommendations. **Attachment A** lists the prioritized project results based on total evaluation points from highest to lowest. Alternatively, **Attachment B** lists the prioritized project results based on geographical distribution. **Attachment C** is the individual evaluation forms for each of the evaluated projects. **Attachment D** is a summary list of the projects evaluated.

Prioritization/Ranking Methods Considered:

At the December 19, 2006, Council meeting, Council expressed concerns and directed staff to review the project list after incorporating existing projects and develop alternative methods of prioritizing the list based on the evaluation results. The concerns ranged from geographic disparity of the priority projects, high percentage of green space against population in certain districts that results in less competitive needs and lower priority for the district, inadequately addressing fields as they do not place high in the established evaluation system, lack of LLAD funds impacting on-going maintainability of the projects, and the importance to complete projects called for in the Measure DD program as a voter-approved measure that is intended to be supplemented by other funds.

The park evaluation summary list (Attachment A) ranks the projects based on total points resulting from assessment against the evaluation system and scoring sheet adopted by Council in December 20, 2005. The maximum total point projects represent projects that 1) address public safety or health risks, 2) produce maximum program and service potentials, 3) enable collaborative opportunities, 4) maximize operation and maintenance efficiencies, 5) improve operation and maintenance efficiency, 6) preserve/protect existing cultural/natural/ historical resources, and 7) have available sources of funding to implement the project. The adopted evaluation criteria emphasize preserving existing facilities and do not include new neighborhood needs as a consideration. The resulting list provides a City-wide prioritization list without regards to geographic area.

To address the geographic disparity, staff used the prioritized project list (Attachment A) and arranged the projects into three groups with each group incorporating a project from each Council District (Attachment B). Each group of projects will be implemented and considered for funding opportunities by the order of ranking. However, this prioritizing method does not address citywide projects or multi-district projects. In addition, the Measure DD program, in particular, meets City Council approved Resolution No. 78747 C.M.S. criteria for projects that leverage existing improvements that are already funded, or in design or construction, and those that are approved by Citywide vote. It is recommended that Council consider placing Measure DD projects and on-going citywide projects as the highest priority since the projects within the program provides citywide services and amenities and have existing funding.

Funding Opportunities:

As a grant opportunity becomes available, the Council approved prioritization list will be used to determine the highest ranking project that meets the eligibility requirements of the available grant. The approved ranked prioritization list will allow staff to apply for grants based on adopted ranking without further City Council action. The City Administrator would request Council approval in advance of grant applications whenever grant agencies require such approval by the applicant's governing entity or when the prioritized list is not used in selecting the project

due to unique circumstances. Having the approved prioritization list will enable staff to submit grant applications to meet short grant deadlines. Upon successful application of grants, the City Administrator will request Council acceptance and appropriation of the grant funds. To update the Council, informational reports on the applications submitted for project funding will be presented periodically or as required by the Council.

Grant opportunities in the near future are limited. With the prioritized project list, staff will be able to target project application for suitable grants. The recent passage of Proposition 84 in November 2006 offers potential additional funding opportunities. Once the funding programs are defined for Proposition 84, the prioritized project list can be revisited and presented to Council for direction to match the projects on the list with the appropriate grant programs that meet the eligibility requirements.

A brief update of anticipated grant opportunities is summarized below:

- Federal Saving America's Treasure: 2007 grant application is closed. Information for 2008 grant will not be available until January 2008. Grant is managed by National Park Services. Grant deadlines are typically in spring annually.
- California Integrated Waste Management Grants: Recycled rubber tires grants fund **only** material costs. Grants include Rubberized Asphalt Concrete Use Grants, Targeted Rubberized Asphalt Concrete Incentive Grants, and Tire-Derived Product (TDP) Grants. Grants are annually applied or on an on-going monthly basis.
- State Annual Grants (Recreational Trails Program (RTP), Habitat Conservation Fund (HCF), and Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)): Applicable projects will be submitted for annual grants based on the prioritization list, if approved. RTP grant application deadline is typically on May 1st annually, HCF and LWCF grant application deadline is typically on October 1st annually.
- Proposition 84 - 2006 Safe Drinking Water Bond Act: Pending Legislature action.
- 2006 Housing Bond Act – Proposition 1C: Pending Legislature action.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The park prioritization evaluation process consisted of the following:

1. Identify a maximum of three priority projects by each Council Office for the respective Council district that require assessment and development of project scope.
2. Conduct site evaluation and review program and scope needs. Evaluation and analysis were conducted with the participation of Council Offices and related City departments

- (typically Office of Parks and Recreation and Public Works Agency).
3. Develop preliminary concept plans based on evaluation and analysis (Readiness of project).
 4. Review preliminary concept plans with Council Offices and relevant City departments.
 5. Develop project budget cost estimates and evaluate projects according to the Council adopted criteria evaluation form.
 6. Finalize evaluation based on adopted criteria and rank each project according to evaluation results.
 7. Establish prioritization list based on evaluation results.
 8. Apply for grants based on priority list projects, with highest-ranked projects that meet the specific grant criteria.

SUSTAINABLE OPPORTUNITIES

Environmental: In general, park capital improvement projects will promote environmental goals, conserve natural resources, and maintain existing natural and park assets.

Economic: Park capital improvement projects will improve the economic value of the surrounding neighborhoods by providing open recreational spaces.

Social Equity: Park capital improvement project will provide recreational and open space amenities to youths, seniors, and communities at large.

DISABILITY AND SENIOR CITIZEN ACCESS

There are no direct disability and senior access opportunities associated with this report. However, future projects will provide a direct benefit to the City for improving access to City parks, facilities, and programs for persons with disabilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND RATIONALE

It is recommended that Council select and approve the Attachment A prioritization list as a basis for existing and upcoming grant opportunities as the list represents the results of the evaluation process. If Council desires to achieve greater geographic equity in the prioritization, staff recommends approving Attachment B and placing the Measure DD program and on-going citywide projects as the highest priority before the geographically grouped projects. The prioritization list will be reviewed when future new programs are announced under Proposition 84. Staff will seek Council direction to match appropriate projects on the list with the grant programs.

It is also recommended that the Council direct the City Administrator to use the list and proceed without obtaining Council approval in advance of submitting grant applications. Informational reports would then be presented to Council on applications submitted for project funding. When unique projects arise outside of the prioritization list, Council approval will be sought in advance

prior to applying for grants. Upon award of grants, the City Administrator will request Council acceptance and appropriation of the grant funds.

In addition, the prioritization list will be reviewed by the City periodically to assess the progress the City is making towards managing City assets and providing the level of service essential to the public. The list will be reviewed every two years in conjunction with the budget process and updated as required.

ACTION REQUESTED OF THE CITY COUNCIL

It is recommended that the City Council approve or establish a prioritization project list for proposed park capital improvement projects to implement the City's parks and recreational facilities projects and authorize the City Administrator to apply for grants based on the approved prioritized list without further action by City Council.

Respectfully submitted,



Raul Godinez II P.E.

Director, Public Works Agency

Reviewed by:
Michael Neary, P.E.
Assistant Director, Public Works Agency
Design & Construction Services Department

Prepared by:
Lily Soo Hoo, Project Manager
Project Delivery Division

APPROVED AND FORWARDED TO THE
CITY COUNCIL:


Office of the City Administrator

Attachments: A – Park Prioritization Project List Summary

B – Park Prioritization Project List by Geographic District Groups

C – Individual Project Evaluation Forms

D – Summary List of projects evaluated for Park Prioritization (sorted by District)

ATTACHMENT A

City of Oakland
Park Capital Improvement Project Prioritization Summary
May 2007

Rank	Project Name	District	Estimated Project Budget	Evaluation System						Estimated O&M Cost Increase (Decrease) per annum	
				Public Safety or Health Risk	Maximize Use and Program Services	Collaborative Opportunities	Operation And Maintenance Efficiency	Protection of Existing Resources	Project Funding Status		Total Point
1	Measure DD - Lake Merritt Park	2, 3	\$ 130,250,000	25	17	10	15	14	5	86	\$6,512,500
2	Tassafaronga Rec. Center	7	\$ 3,140,908	25	17	10	15	0	2	69	\$22,000
3	Measure DD - Waterfront Trails	2,3,5,7	\$ 106,000,000	15	11	10	15	15	2	68	\$5,300,000
4	Peralta Hacienda Park - Historic Core	5	\$ 5,814,300	10	17	10	10	15	2	64	\$290,715
5	Leona Lodge Upgrade*	6	\$ 1,424,153	25	7	10	20	0	0	62	\$1,000
5	2496 Coolidge Ave (Peralta Hacienda Historical Park)*	5	\$ 762,480	25	17	10	10	0	0	62	\$6,000
6	Rainbow Recreation Ctr. Expansion	6	\$ 1,439,640	20	17	10	10	0	0	57	\$14,300
7	Moss House*	3	\$ 1,732,320	25	1	0	15	15	0	56	\$21,200
8	City Stables*	6	\$ 17,522,869	20	7	0	10	14	2	53	TBD
9	Morcom Rose Garden	2	\$ 1,988,710	20	1	5	10	14	0	50	\$0
10	Officer Willie Wilkins (Elmhurst) Park	7	\$ 2,520,894	10	17	5	15	0	2	49	\$16,500
10	Raimondi Fields	3	\$ 12,140,000	10	17	10	10	0	2	49	\$607,000
10	Lincoln Square Park Plan	2	\$ 1,944,000	10	17	10	10	0	2	49	\$72,000
11	Jefferson Square Park	3	\$ 2,131,569	10	17	10	10	0	0	47	\$22,700
11	Josie De La Cruz Park - Syn. Turf	5	\$ 625,536	0	17	10	20	0	0	47	\$3,700
12	Measure DD - Lake Merritt Channel	2, 3	\$ 37,000,000	10	1	5	10	15	5	46	\$1,850,000
13	Bushrod Park - General Improvements	1	\$ 2,802,125	10	17	10	5	0	0	42	\$15,400
13	Clinton Park General Improvement	2	\$ 1,825,572	5	17	10	10	0	0	42	\$12,400
13	Brookdale Park	4	\$ 2,079,594	10	17	10	5	0	0	42	\$7,500
13	East Oakland Sport Center	7	\$ 19,670,000	10	17	10	0	0	5	42	\$712,500
13	Glen Daniel King Estates Trails	7	\$ 1,965,490	5	17	5	10	5	0	42	\$7,400
14	Durant Park - Urban Mini Park	3	\$ 479,736	10	16	5	10	0	0	41	\$7,300
14	25th Street Mini Park	3	\$ 680,400	15	16	0	10	0	0	41	\$12,500
15	Leveling Playing Fields	Citywide	\$ 2,663,400	5	17	10	5	0	2	39	\$96,500

ATTACHMENT A

**City of Oakland
Park Capital Improvement Project Prioritization Summary
May 2007**

Rank	Project Name	District	Estimated Project Budget	Evaluation System							Estimated O&M Cost Increase (Decrease) per annum
				Public Safety or Health Risk	Maximize Use and Program Services	Collaborative Opportunities	Operation And Maintenance Efficiency	Protection of Existing Resources	Project Funding Status	Total Point	
				25	17	10	20	15	10	97	
16	Tot Lot Resurfacing	Citywide	\$ 1,748,000	15	10	0	10	0	2	37	\$87,400
17	Madison Square Park Plan	2	\$ 2,818,370	10	11	5	10	0	0	36	\$12,400
17	Montclair Park	4	\$ 1,644,410	10	11	0	15	0	0	36	\$0
18	Bushrod Park - Soccer Field (Washington Elem. School)	1	\$ 3,225,150	5	17	10	0	0	0	32	TBD
19	Dimond Park	4	\$ 726,840	5	17	0	5	4	0	31	\$0
19	Chinese Garden	At Large	\$ 1,289,790	5	11	0	5	10	0	31	\$18,200
20	Caldecott Trail to Skyline Blvd.	1	\$ 1,405,730	5	1	0	10	14	0	30	\$7,900
21	Carter Middle School	At Large	\$ 3,005,298	5	7	10	0	0	0	22	TBD
22	William Wood Park (Dog Park)	5	\$ 1,308,766	10	6	0	5	0	0	21	\$7,100

*O&M cost increase (or decrease) for the site may vary depending on usage and programs for the specific sites.

TBD - The O&M for sites owned by OUSD depends on final real property agreement.

Item: _____

Life Enrichment Committee
June 12, 2007

ATTACHMENT B
City of Oakland
Park Capital Improvement Project Prioritization Summary
May 2007

Rank	Project Name	District	Estimated Project Budget	Evaluation System						Estimated O&M Cost Increase (Decrease) per annum	
				Public Safety or Health Risk	Maximize Use and Program Services	Collaborative Opportunities	Operation And Maintenance Efficiency	Protection of Existing Resources	Project Funding Status		Total Point
				25	17	10	20	15	10	97	
Measure DD projects and Citywide projects:											
1	Lake Merritt Park - Measure DD	2, 3	\$ 130,250,000	25	17	10	15	14	5	86	\$6,512,500
3	Waterfront Trails - Measure DD	2,3,5,7	\$ 106,000,000	15	11	10	15	15	2	68	\$5,300,000
12	Lake Merritt Channel - Measure DD	2, 3	\$ 37,000,000	10	1	5	10	15	5	46	\$1,850,000
15	Leveling Playing Fields	Citywide	\$ 2,663,400	5	17	10	5	0	2	39	\$96,500
16	Tot Lot Resurfacing	Citywide	\$ 1,748,000	15	10	0	10	0	2	37	\$87,400
Group A - Priority Projects by District:											
2	Tassafaronga Rec. Center	7	\$ 3,140,908	25	17	10	15	0	2	69	\$22,000
4	Peralta Hacienda Park - Historic Core	5	\$ 5,814,300	10	17	10	10	15	2	64	\$290,715
5	Leona Lodge Upgrade*	6	\$ 1,424,153	25	7	10	20	0	0	62	\$1,000
7	Moss House*	3	\$ 1,732,320	25	1	0	15	15	0	56	\$21,200
9	Morcom Rose Garden	2	\$ 1,988,710	20	1	5	10	14	0	50	\$0
13	Bushrod Park - General Improvements	1	\$ 2,802,125	10	17	10	5	0	0	42	\$15,400
13	Brookdale Park	4	\$ 2,079,594	10	17	10	5	0	0	42	\$7,500
19	Chinese Garden	At Large / 2	\$ 1,289,790	5	11	0	5	10	0	31	\$18,200
Group B - Priority Projects by District:											
5	2496 Coolidge Ave (Peralta Hacienda Historical Park)*	5	\$ 762,480	25	17	10	10	0	0	62	\$6,000
6	Rainbow Recreation Ctr. Expansion	6	\$ 1,439,640	20	17	10	10	0	0	57	\$14,300
10	Lincoln Square Park Plan	2	\$ 1,944,000	10	17	10	10	0	2	49	\$72,000
10	Raimondt Fields	3	\$ 12,140,000	10	17	10	10	0	2	49	\$607,000
10	Officer Willie Wilkins (Elmhurst) Park	7	\$ 2,520,894	10	17	5	15	0	2	49	\$16,500
17	Montclair Park	4	\$ 1,644,410	10	11	0	15	0	0	36	\$0
18	Bushrod Park - Soccer Field (Washington Elem. School)	1	\$ 3,225,150	5	17	10	0	0	0	32	TBD
21	Carter Middle School	At Large / 1	\$ 3,005,298	5	7	10	0	0	0	22	TBD

ATTACHMENT B
City of Oakland
Park Capital Improvement Project Prioritization Summary
May 2007

Rank	Project Name	District	Estimated Project Budget	Evaluation System							Estimated O&M Cost Increase (Decrease) per annum
				Public Safety or Health Risk	Maximize Use and Program Services	Collaborative Opportunities	Operation And Maintenance Efficiency	Protection of Existing Resources	Project Funding Status	Total Point	
				25	17	10	20	15	10	97	
Group C - Priority Projects by District											
8	City Stables*	6	\$ 17,522,869	20	7	0	10	14	2	53	TBD
11	Jefferson Square Park	3	\$ 2,131,569	10	17	10	10	0	0	47	\$22,700
11	Josie De La Cruz Park - Syn. Turf	5	\$ 625,536	0	17	10	20	0	0	47	\$3,700
13	Clinton Park General Improvement	2	\$ 1,825,572	5	17	10	10	0	0	42	\$12,400
13	East Oakland Sport Center	7	\$ 19,670,000	10	17	10	0	0	5	42	\$712,500
19	Dimond Park	4	\$ 726,840	5	17	0	5	4	0	31	\$0
20	Caldecott Trail to Skyline Blvd.	1	\$ 1,405,730	5	1	0	10	14	0	30	\$7,900
Remaining Projects											
13	Glen Daniel King Estates Trails	7	\$ 1,965,490	5	17	5	10	5	0	42	\$7,400
14	Durant Park - Urban Mini Park	3	\$ 479,736	10	16	5	10	0	0	41	\$7,300
14	25th Street Mini Park	3	\$ 680,400	15	16	0	10	0	0	41	\$12,500
17	Madison Square Park Plan	2	\$ 2,818,370	10	11	5	10	0	0	36	\$12,400
22	William Wood Park (Dog Park)	5	\$ 1,308,766	10	6	0	5	0	0	21	\$7,100

*O&M cost increase (or decrease) for the site may vary depending on usage and programs for the specific sites.
TBD - The O&M for sites owned by OUSD depends on final real property agreement.

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT/MN)

Final Ranking No. 3 Project Name: 2496 Coolidge Ave (Peralta Hacienda) Total Points 62
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

PENDING

Major building repair and restoration

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 564,800
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 5,648
Design	\$ 67,776
Construction Management	\$ 39,536
Inspection/Permits	\$ 11,296
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 33,888
Project Contingency	\$ 39,536
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 762,480

Project Type:

- Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)

- Grant
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annumfor Operations & Maintenance 6,000

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK	Maximum 25 pts.	
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	10
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement, etc.)	5 points	5
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		25
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES	Maximum 17 pts.	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		17
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES	Maximum 10 pts.	
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY	Maximum 20 pts.	
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES	Maximum 15 pts.	
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS	Maximum 10 pts.	
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	
No funding	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____

Life Enrichment Committee

June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project

Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. _____ Project Name: 25th Street Mini Park Total Points 41
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

Improvements are based on previously completed concept plan and cost estimate for park (in 2004).

- * Replace play structure
- * Replace swing
- * Install new Lawn Area
- * New fencing & gates
- * Keep existing curbs

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 504,000
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 5,040
Design	\$ 60,480
Construction Management	\$ 35,280
Inspection/Permits	\$ 10,080
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 30,240
Project Contingency	\$ 35,280
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 680,400

Project Type:

- Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)

- Grant
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum
for Operations & Maintenance

12,500

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	0
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement, etc.)	5 points	5
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		15
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		16
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	0
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	0
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	0
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	0
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	0
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	0
No funding	0 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____

Life Enrichment Committee
June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and RecreationDate: 10/27/2006Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)Final Ranking No. 10Project Name: Brookdale Park

Total Points

42

(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

Council Office plans to conduct further survey and comm. outreach to dev. scope priorities. General improvements to add:

- * Add upper picnic area.
- * Add 1 upper basketball court
- * Add upper tot lot
- * Add terraced garden

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 1,540,440
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 15,404
Design	\$ 184,853
Construction Management	\$ 107,831
Inspection/Permits	\$ 30,809
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 92,426
Project Contingency	\$ 107,831
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 2,079,594

Project Type:

- Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)

- Grant
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum
for Operations & Maintenance7,500**Instruction:**

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK	Maximum 25 pts.	
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement, etc.)	5 points	
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES	Maximum 17 pts.	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		17
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES	Maximum 10 pts.	
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY	Maximum 20 pts.	
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	5
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES	Maximum 15 pts.	
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS	Maximum 10 pts.	
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	
No funding	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____

Life Enrichment Committee

June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and RecreationDate: 10/27/2006Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)Final Ranking No. 10Project Name: Bushrod Park - GeneralTotal Points 42
(Total Points Available - 97)**PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:**

- * Running track at upper Bushrod field
- * Dog park within park space at transition between upper and lower field
- * HC accessible path at Shattuck entry
- * Path improvements from Shattuck entry to Comm. Ctr.
- * Landscaping, picnic area, tree planting, plaza/fountain outside or adjacent to Comm. Ctr.
- * Incorporation of historic structure as kiosk

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 2,075,648
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 20,756
Design	\$ 249,078
Construction Management	\$ 145,295
Inspection/Permits	\$ 41,513
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 124,539
Project Contingency	\$ 145,295
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 2,802,124

Project Type:

- Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)

- Grant
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum
for Operations & Maintenance 15,400**Instruction:**

CRITERIA: <i>The Project will/has</i>	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement etc.)	5 points	
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		17
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	5
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	
No funding	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____

Life Enrichment Committee
June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. 13 Project Name: Bushrod Park - Soccer Field Total Points 32
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

* Create a new joint-use synthetic-turf soccer field with OUSD on adjacent school property (Washington Elem. School).

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 2,389,000
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 23,890
Design	\$ 286,680
Construction Management	\$ 167,230
Inspection/Permits	\$ 47,780
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 143,340
Project Contingency	\$ 167,230
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 3,225,150

Project Type:	Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)	Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance <u>TBD</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Buildings	<input type="checkbox"/> Grant	
<input type="checkbox"/> Parks	<input type="checkbox"/> Bond Measure	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fields	<input type="checkbox"/> General Fund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Playgrounds	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement.etc.)	5 points	
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS (Jack London Soccer Re		17
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	
No funding	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item:
Life Enrichment Committee
June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. 15 Project Name: Caldecott Trail Total Points 30
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

Improve and expand existing trail from North Oakland Sports Field to Skyline Blvd.
 * Provide accessible segment.
 * Provide trail signage describing wayfinding and ecological/cultural conditions

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 1,041,280
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 10,413
Design	\$ 124,954
Construction Management	\$ 72,890
Inspection/Permits	\$ 20,826
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 62,477
Project Contingency	\$ 72,890
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 1,405,730

Project Type: Trail Buildings Parks Fields Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply) Grant Bond Measure General Fund Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance 7,900

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement, etc.)	5 points	
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		1
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	10
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	4
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		14
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	
No funding	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____
Life Enrichment Committee
June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by: City/WRT

Final Ranking No. 16 Project Name: Carter Middle School Total Points 22
Park Conversion (Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

OUSD potential plan to use the building for administration. City & community desire to convert remaining open space to a park/sport fields.

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 2,226,147
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 22,261
Design	\$ 267,138
Construction Management	\$ 155,830
Inspection/Permits	\$ 44,523
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 133,569
Project Contingency	\$ 155,830
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 3,005,298

Project Type: Buildings Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply) Grant Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance TBD
 Parks Bond Measure
 Fields General Fund
 Playgrounds Other: _____

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement etc.)	5 points	
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		7
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	
No funding	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____
Life Enrichment Committee
June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. 14 Project Name: Chinese Garden Total Points 31
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

- * Irrigation & landscape improvements to beautify the site and enhance its use
- * Multi-use plaza/accessible parking and play area for neighborhood uses (PENDING)
- * Entry improvements to buffer front from busy street
- * Pedestrian enhancements to adjacent intersections

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 955,400
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 9,554
Design	\$ 114,648
Construction Management	\$ 66,878
Inspection/Permits	\$ 19,108
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 57,324
Project Contingency	\$ 66,878
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 1,289,790

Project Type:	Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)	Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance <u>18,200</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Buildings	<input type="checkbox"/> Grant	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parks	<input type="checkbox"/> Bond Measure	
<input type="checkbox"/> Fields	<input type="checkbox"/> General Fund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Playgrounds	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement.etc.)	5 points	
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		11
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	5
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	10
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	
No funding	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____
Life Enrichment Committee
June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. 6 Project Name: City Stables Total Points 53
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

PENDING

- * Destination city-wide youth resource for science and natural education
- * Local neighborhood park destination: passive uses, tot lot, seating, picnic area, etc.
- * Maintain some equestrian uses

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 12,979,904
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 129,799
Design	\$ 1,557,588
Construction Management	\$ 908,593
Inspection/Permits	\$ 259,598
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 778,794
Project Contingency	\$ 908,593
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 17,522,869

Project Type:

<input type="checkbox"/> Buildings	<input type="checkbox"/> Grant	Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance <u>TBD</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parks	<input type="checkbox"/> Bond Measure	
<input type="checkbox"/> Fields	<input type="checkbox"/> General Fund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Playgrounds	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	10
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement, etc.)	5 points	
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		20
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	?
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		7
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	10
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	4
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		14
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	2
No funding	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		2

Item: _____
Life Enrichment Committee
June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. 10 Project Name: Clinton Park Total Points 42
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

- * Park redesign and renovation to better meet community needs
- * Relocate pathways
- * Restroom
- * Event stage with electrical
- * Planting and irrigation replacement

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 1,352,275
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 13,523
Design	\$ 162,273
Construction Management	\$ 94,659
Inspection/Permits	\$ 27,046
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 81,137
Project Contingency	\$ 94,659
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 1,825,572

Project Type:	Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)	Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance
<input type="checkbox"/> Buildings	<input type="checkbox"/> Grant	12,400
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parks	<input type="checkbox"/> Bond Measure	
<input type="checkbox"/> Fields	<input type="checkbox"/> General Fund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Playgrounds	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement.etc.)	5 points	
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		17
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	
No funding	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____
Life Enrichment Committee
June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. 14 Project Name: Dimond Park Total Points 31
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

*Various park improvements for access and identity.
*Fruitvale Ave. entry improvements for accessibility and identity
*Access improvements at upper parking lot area
*Wayfinding and directional signage

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 538,400
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 5,384
Design	\$ 64,608
Construction Management	\$ 37,688
Inspection/Permits	\$ 10,768
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 32,304
Project Contingency	\$ 37,688
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 726,840

Project Type: Buildings Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply) Grant Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance _____
 Parks Bond Measure
 Fields General Fund
 Playgrounds Other: _____

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	0
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement, etc.)	5 points	0
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		17
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	0
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	0
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	5
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	0
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	4
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 point	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		4
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	0
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	0
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	0
No funding	0 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____
Life Enrichment Committee
June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. 11 Project Name: Durant Park Total Points 41
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

General park improvements
 * Improve lighting and visibility to rear of park
 * Replace/repair drinking fountain
 * Repair/replace play equipment

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:	
Construction Cost	\$ 355,360
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 3,554
Design	\$ 42,643
Construction Management	\$ 24,875
Inspection/Permits	\$ 7,107
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 21,322
Project Contingency	\$ 24,875
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 479,736

Project Type:
 Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)
 Grant
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance 7,300

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement etc.)	5 points	
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	
SUBTOTAL PTS		16
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	
No funding	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____
 Life Enrichment Committee
 June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: _____ Date: 5/2/2007 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT/MN)

Final Ranking No. _____ Project Name: East Oakland Sports Center Total Points 42
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

* Phase I: New Entry Building with Nadatorium Indoor Pool, Fitness Center, Parking, Use of existing Recreation Center
* Phase II: Gymnasium Expansion, Outdoor Pool, Sports Fields

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:	
Construction Cost	\$ 14,250,000
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 142,500
Design	\$ 1,710,000
Construction Management	\$ 997,500
Inspection/Permits	\$ 285,000
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 855,000
Project Contingency	\$ 1,425,000
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 19,670,000

Project Type:
 Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that applies)
 Grant (Prop. 40)
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance \$ 712,500.00

(* O&M costs based on 5% of estimated construction cost. Final O&M cost is dependent on final project scope)

Instruction: _____

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	0
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement etc.)	5 points	0
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		17
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	0
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	0
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	0
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	0
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	5
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	0
No funding	0 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		5

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. 10 Project Name: Glen Daniel King Estates Trails Total Points 42
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

Trail improvements and first phase environmental restoration

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 1,455,920
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 14,559
Design	\$ 174,710
Construction Management	\$ 101,914
Inspection/Permits	\$ 29,118
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 87,355
Project Contingency	\$ 101,914
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 1,965,490

Project Type: Trails Buildings Parks Fields Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply) Grant Bond Measure General Fund Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance 7,400

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement, etc.)	5 points	
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		17
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	4
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	
No funding	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____

Life Enrichment Committee

June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. 9 Project Name: Jefferson Square Park Total Points 47
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

Park improvements to expand programming and use.
 * Demolition of (e) storage. bldg.
 * Restroom
 * Provide skateboard facility
 * Relocate and enhance existing basketball courts, pathways, etc.
 * Provide improvements to existing baseball field and fencing

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 1,578,940
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 15,789
Design	\$ 189,473
Construction Survey	\$ 110,526
Inspection/Permits	\$ 31,579
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 94,736
Project Contingency	\$ 110,526
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 2,131,569

Project Type:
 Buildings Parks
 Fields Playgrounds
 Other: _____

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)
 Grant Bond Measure
 General Fund Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance 22,700

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement.etc.)	5 points	
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		17
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 point	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	
No funding	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____
 Life Enrichment Committee
 June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. 9 Project Name: Josie de la Cruz Park Synthetic Turf Field Total Points 47
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

Convert existing lawn to synthetic turf field for multi-purpose use.

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 463,360
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 4,634
Design	\$ 55,603
Construction Management	\$ 32,435
Inspection/Permits	\$ 9,267
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 27,802
Project Contingency	\$ 32,435
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 625,536

Project Type:
 Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)
 Grant
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance 3,700

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement, etc.)	5 points	
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		17
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	5
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		20
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	
No funding.	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____
 Life Enrichment Committee
 June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT/MN)

Final Ranking No. 2 Project Name: Leona Lodge Upgrade Total Points 64
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

Update/upgrade existing Facility.
 * Abate potential mold and dry rot issues
 * Seismic study and upgrade
 * ADA upgrade
 * Removal/replacement of damaged/old paneling

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 1,054,928
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 10,549
Design	\$ 126,591
Construction Management	\$ 73,845
Inspection/Permits	\$ 21,099
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 63,296
Project Contingency	\$ 73,845
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 1,424,153

Project Type:
 Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)
 Grant
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance 1,000

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	10
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement.etc.)	5 points	5
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		25
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		7
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	5
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		20
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	2
No funding	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		2

Item: _____
 Life Enrichment Committee
 June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

 DEPT: Parks & Recreation Date: 5/2/2007 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

 Final Ranking No. _____ Project Name: Leveling Playing Fields Total Points 39
 (Total Points Available - 97)
PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

Improve/ upgrade seven existing playing fields throughout the city for use by various groups including schools, Girl's Softball, adult and youth leagues. Fields are Arroyo McConnell, Brookdale, Central Reservoir, Franklin, Golden Gate, King Estates, and Poplar. Scope includes generally:

- * Grading/drainage repair
- * Irrigation repair
- * Installation of new equipment

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 1,930,000
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 19,300
Design	\$ 231,600
Construction Management	\$ 135,100
Inspection	\$ 38,600
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 115,800
Project Contingency	\$ 193,000
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 2,663,400

Project Type:

- Buildings
- Parks
- Fields
- Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that applies)

- Grant
- Bond Measure
- General Fund
- Other: Raiders Surcharge Fund

 Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum
 for Operations & Maintenance \$ 96,500.00

(* O&M costs based on 5% of estimated construction cost. Final O&M cost is dependent on final project scope)

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	0
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement etc.)	5 points	0
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	0
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		17
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	0
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	5
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	0
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	0
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	0
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	0
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	2
No funding	0 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		2

Item: _____

 Life Enrichment Committee
 June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and RecreationDate: 10/27/2006Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. _____

Project Name: Lincoln Square Park

Total Points

49

(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

Improvements have been determined by the Lincoln Square Park master plan May 16, 2006 and generally include:

- better site control and site enclosure
- more and better facilities throughout the site
- possible increase in activity areas
- miscellaneous site improvements to entrances, bus stop, / transit area, Alice path area, and existing activity area
- mitigation of impacts from surrounding development

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 1,440,000
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 14,400
Design	\$ 172,800
Construction Management	\$ 100,800
Inspection/Permits	\$ 28,800
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 86,400
Project Contingency	\$ 100,800
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 1,944,000

Project Type:

- Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)

- Grant
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum
for Operations & Maintenance 72,000(* O&M costs based on 5% of estimated
construction cost. Final O&M cost is dependent
on final project scope)**Instruction:**

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK	Maximum 25 pts.	
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	0
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement etc.)	5 points	0
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES	Maximum 17 pts.	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		17
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES	Maximum 10 pts.	
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY	Maximum 20 pts.	
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES	Maximum 15 pts.	
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	0
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	0
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS	Maximum 10 pts.	
Full project funding available, or	10 points	0
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	0
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	2
No funding	0 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		2

Item: _____

Life Enrichment Committee

June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and RecreationDate: 10/27/2006Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. 12 Project Name: Madison Square Park Total Points 36
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

Long term improvements for community use. Improvement are intended as a placeholder while a community process is conducted and final design recommendations are made.

* Improve play area and other uses for children

* Address safety through additional lighting, visibility

* Expand passive activities such as seating, open lawn, and chess tables and low impact active recreation such as ping pong, tai-chi, etc.

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 2,087,680
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 20,877
Design	\$ 250,522
Construction Management	\$ 146,138
Inspection/Permits	\$ 41,754
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 125,261
Project Contingency	\$ 146,138
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 2,818,370

Project Type: Buildings Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply) Grant Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance 12,400
 Parks Bond Measure
 Fields General Fund
 Playgrounds Other: _____

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK	Maximum 25 pts.	
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement, etc.)	5 points	
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES	Maximum 17 pts.	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		11
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES	Maximum 10 pts.	
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY	Maximum 20 pts.	
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES	Maximum 15 pts.	
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS	Maximum 10 pts.	
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	
No funding	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____

Life Enrichment Committee

June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Parks & Recreation Date: 5/2/2007 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. _____ Project Name: Measure DD - Lake Merritt Channel Total Points 46
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

- * Measure DD Bond - Oakland Trust for clean water and safe parks programs.
- * Improve access to open space for pedestrians and bicyclists by providing continuous paths and reducing conflicts with vehicles.
- * Provide access for personal watercraft between Lake Merritt and the Oakland Estuary.
- * Protect public safety and property by improving the dam and pump control facilities.
- * Restore tidal wetlands and aquatic habitats.

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ -
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ -
Design	\$ -
Construction Management	\$ -
Inspection	\$ -
Project Management/Admin.	\$ -
Project Contingency	\$ -
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 37,000,000

Project Type:

- Buildings
- Parks
- Fields
- Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that applies)

- Grant
- Bond Measure
- General Fund
- Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance \$ 1,850,000

Instruction:

(* O&M costs based on estimated allowance. Final O&M cost is dependent on final project scope)

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	0
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement etc.)	5 points	0
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	0
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	0
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		1
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	10
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	4
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		15
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	0
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	5
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	0
No funding	0 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		5

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Parks & Recreation Date: 5/2/2007 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. _____ Project Name: Measure DD - Lake Merritt Park Total Points 86
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

- * Measure DD Bond - Oakland Trust for Clean Water and Safe Parks Program
- * Improve access for pedestrians and bicyclists by providing continuous paths and reducing conflicts with vehicles.
- * Restore historic buildings, structures, and site elements.
- * Install interpretive historic and ecological signage elements.
- * Create tidal wetlands and aquatic habitats.
- * Improve facilities for youth and adult programs including those serving at-risk youth.

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:	
Construction Cost	\$ -
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ -
Design	\$ -
Construction Management	\$ -
Inspection	\$ -
Project Management/Admin.	\$ -
Project Contingency	\$ -
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$130,250,000

<p>Project Type:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Buildings</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parks</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Fields</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Playgrounds</p>	<p>Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that applies)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grant</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bond Measure</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> General Fund</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>	<p>Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance \$ 6,512,500</p> <p>(* O&M costs based on estimated allowance. Final O&M cost is dependent on final project scope)</p>
---	---	---

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	10
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement etc.)	5 points	5
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		25
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		17
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		15
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	10
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	4
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		14
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	0
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	5
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	0
No funding	0 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		5

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: _____ Date: 5/2/2007 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)Final Ranking No. _____ Project Name: Measure DD - Waterfront Trails Total Points 68
(Total Points Available - 97)**PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:**** Measure DD Bond - Oakland Trust for Clean Water and Safe Parks Program*

* Provide new recreational facilities such as trails, pathways, playgrounds, fields, skate parks, and piers.

* Provide new Bay Trail access for pedestrians and bicyclists by providing continuous paths and reducing conflicts with vehicles.

Create tidal wetlands and aquatic habitats.

* Create connections between inland underserved neighborhoods and new waterfront open space.

* Provide environmental education opportunities.

* Promote waterfront district development opportunities for new developments along the waterfront.

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ -
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ -
Design	\$ -
Construction Management	\$ -
Inspection	\$ -
Project Management/Admin.	\$ -
Project Contingency	\$ -
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$106,000,000

Project Type:

- Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that applies)

- Grant (Prop. 12, Prop. 40, RTP, LWCF, Bay Trails)
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance \$ 5,300,000

(* O&M costs based on 5% of estimated construction cost. Final O&M cost is dependent on final project scope)

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK	Maximum 25 pts.	
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	0
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement etc.)	5 points	5
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		15
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES	Maximum 17 pts.	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	0
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		11
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES	Maximum 10 pts.	
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY	Maximum 20 pts.	
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		15
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES	Maximum 15 pts.	
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	10
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	4
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		15
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS	Maximum 10 pts.	
Full project funding available, or	10 points	0
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	0
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	2
No funding	0 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		2

Item: _____

Life Enrichment Committee

June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. 12 Project Name: Montclair Park Total Points 36
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

Improve multiple access points and circulation within the park. Provide other improvements and school interface to the park.

- * Path from recreation center to school and play areas
- * Moraga Rd. at pedestrian bridge landing to central park area
- * Accessible path from Mountain Road down into park
- * Improve gate between park and school
- * Improve playground for accessibility, safety, drainage, and use

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 1,218,080
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 12,181
Design	\$ 146,170
Construction Management	\$ 85,266
Inspection/Permits	\$ 24,362
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 73,085
Project Contingency	\$ 85,266
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 1,644,410

Project Type:

- Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)

- Grant
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum
for Operations & Maintenance _____

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK Maximum 25 pts.		
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement etc.)	5 points	
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES Maximum 17 pts.		
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		11
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES Maximum 10 pts.		
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY Maximum 20 pts.		
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	5
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		15
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES Maximum 15 pts.		
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 point	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS Maximum 10 pts.		
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	
No funding	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____

Life Enrichment Committee
June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. 7 Project Name: Morcom Rose Garden Total Points 50
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

PENDING

Miscellaneous repairs to park and select site improvements

* Site drainage - engineering study required

* Entry character

* New wedding area at Greater Florentine

* Restroom repair and ADA compliance

* Irrigation system repairs

* Lighting upgrades for safety

* Cistern for rainwater capture

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost \$ 1,473,120

Pre-Design/Planning \$ 14,731

Design \$ 176,774

Construction Management \$ 103,118

Inspection/Permits \$ 29,462

Project Management/Admin. \$ 88,387

Project Contingency \$ 103,118

Estimated Total Proj. Cost \$ 1,988,710

Project Type:

- Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)

- Grant
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum
for Operations & Maintenance _____

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK	Maximum 25 pts.	
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	10
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement etc.)	5 points	
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		20
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES	Maximum 17 pts.	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		1
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES	Maximum 10 pts.	
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY	Maximum 20 pts.	
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	5
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES	Maximum 15 pts.	
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	10
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	4
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		14
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS	Maximum 10 pts.	
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	
No funding	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____

Life Enrichment Committee
June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT/MN)Final Ranking No. 4 Project Name: Moss House Total Points 56
(Total Points Available - 97)**PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:****PROGRAM PENDING**

Architectural assessment/rehabilitation for accessibility and program use.

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 1,283,200
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 12,832
Design	\$ 153,984
Construction Management	\$ 89,824
Inspection/Permits	\$ 25,664
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 76,992
Project Contingency	\$ 89,824
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 1,732,320

Project Type:

- Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)

- Grant
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annumfor Operations & Maintenance 21,200**Instruction:**

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK	Maximum 25 pts.	
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	10
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement etc.)	5 points	5
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		25
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES	Maximum 17 pts.	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	0
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	0
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		1
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES	Maximum 10 pts.	
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	0
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY	Maximum 20 pts.	
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	5
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		15
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES	Maximum 15 pts.	
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	10
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	4
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		15
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS	Maximum 10 pts.	
Full project funding available, or	10 points	0
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	0
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	0
No funding	0 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____

Life Enrichment Committee
June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. 8 Project Name: Officer Willie Wilkins Park Total Points 49
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

Major park renovation and improvements.

- * Play area
- * Restroom and storage
- * Par course, fitness equipment, jogging track course
- * Expanded picnic and gathering area
- * Address safety with lighting, removal of vegetation, open areas
- * Provide park paths
- * Preserve mature heritage trees

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 1,867,329
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 18,673
Design	\$ 224,079
Construction Management	\$ 130,713
Inspection/Permits	\$ 37,347
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 112,040
Project Contingency	\$ 130,713
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 2,520,894

Project Type:

- Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)

- Grant
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum
for Operations & Maintenance 16,500

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK	Maximum 25 pts.	
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	0
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement etc.)	5 points	0
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES	Maximum 17 pts.	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		17
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES	Maximum 10 pts.	
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY	Maximum 20 pts.	
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	5
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	5
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		15
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES	Maximum 15 pts.	
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	10
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	4
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS	Maximum 10 pts.	
Full project funding available, or	10 points	10
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	5
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	2
No funding	0 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		2

Item: _____

Life Enrichment Committee
June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

 DEPT: Parks & Recreation Date: 5/2/2007 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

 Final Ranking No. _____ Project Name: Peralta Hacienda Historical Park - Historic Core Total Points 64
 (Total Points Available - 97)
PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:
 * Master park plan improvements for 'Historic Core' phase of project
 New facilities to support historical education
*** ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:**

Construction Cost	\$ -
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ -
Design	\$ -
Construction Management	\$ -
Inspection	\$ -
Project Management/Admin.	\$ -
Project Contingency	\$ -
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 5,814,300

Project Type:

- Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that applies)

- Grant (Prop. 40, CDBG)
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: _____

 Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum
 for Operations & Maintenance \$ 290,715

 (* O&M costs based on 5% of estimated
 construction cost. Final O&M cost is dependent on
 final project scope)
Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK	Maximum 25 pts.	
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	0
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement.etc.)	5 points	0
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES	Maximum 17 pts.	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		17
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES	Maximum 10 pts.	
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY	Maximum 20 pts.	
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES	Maximum 15 pts.	
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	10
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	4
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		15
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS	Maximum 10 pts.	
Full project funding available, or	10 points	0
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	0
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	2
No funding	0 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		2

 Item: _____
 Life Enrichment Committee
 June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Parks & Recreation Date: 5/2/2007 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)Final Ranking No. _____ Project Name: Raimondl Park Total Points 49
(Total Points Available - 97)**PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:**

Phase One: Park improvements for soccer field, baseball field, field lighting, fencing, putting green, children's play area, ADA improvements for building and site access, limited paving, landscaping and site work.
Phase Two: Perimeter park right-of-way improvements, site work and community elements (turf, picnic area, lighting, landscape, irrigation)
Phase Three: New support building for after school programs and athletic programs

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ -
Design	\$ -
Construction Management	\$ -
Inspection/Permits	\$ -
Project Management/Admin.	\$ -
Project Contingency	\$ -
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 12,140,000

Project Type:

- Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that applies)

- Grant
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: FOPR

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance \$ 607,000

(* O&M costs based on 5% of estimated construction cost. Final O&M cost is dependent on final project scope)

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK	Maximum 25 pts.	
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	0
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement etc.)	5 points	0
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES	Maximum 17 pts.	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		17
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES	Maximum 10 pts.	
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY	Maximum 20 pts.	
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES	Maximum 15 pts.	
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	0
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	0
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS	Maximum 10 pts.	
Full project funding available, or	10 points	0
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	0
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	2
No funding	0 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		2

Item: _____
Life Enrichment Committee
June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

 DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation Date: 10/27/2006 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT/MN)

 Final Ranking No. 5 Project Name: Rainbow Recreation Ctr Expansion Total Points 57
 (Total Points Available - 97)
PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:
 Expand building to accommodate programs. Improve site access and outdoor use.
 * Front entrance redesign to be welcoming
 * Replace windows throughout
 * Create a computer lab room
 * ADA upgrade/access
 * Create an outdoor plaza area for gatherings, BBQ, and access from the parking lot
 * Prove minor vegetative and access enhancements to existing creek channel
ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 1,066,400
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 10,664
Design	\$ 127,968
Construction Management	\$ 74,648
Inspection/Permits	\$ 21,328
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 63,984
Project Contingency	\$ 74,648
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 1,439,640

Project Type:	Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)	Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum for Operations & Maintenance <u>14,300</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Buildings	<input type="checkbox"/> Grant	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parks	<input type="checkbox"/> Bond Measure	
<input type="checkbox"/> Fields	<input type="checkbox"/> General Fund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Playgrounds	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK	Maximum 25 pts.	
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	10
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement, etc.)	5 points	0
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		20
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES	Maximum 17 pts.	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		17
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES	Maximum 10 pts.	
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY	Maximum 20 pts.	
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	0
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES	Maximum 15 pts.	
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	0
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	0
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS	Maximum 10 pts.	
Full project funding available, or	10 points	0
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	0
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	0
No funding	0 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____

 Life Enrichment Committee
 June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and RecreationDate: 10/27/2006Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT/MN)

Final Ranking No. 1 Project Name: Tassafaronga Rec Center Total Points 69
(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

Expand bldg. to accommodate programs and general site improvements
 * Enlarge kitchen
 * Replace gym floor due to water damage
 * Expand facility/program to accommodate. changing neighborhood (new housing)
 * Provide Game room, larger open-space rooms
 * Improve visibility and site control for staff through entry modifications and office location
 * Provide outdoor gathering area with controlled access to housing property

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 2,326,598
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 23,266
Design	\$ 279,192
Construction Management	\$ 162,862
Inspection/Permits	\$ 46,532
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 139,596
Project Contingency	\$ 162,862
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 3,140,908

Project Type:

- Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)

- Grant
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum
for Operations & Maintenance 22,000

Instruction:

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK	Maximum 25 pts.	
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	10
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement, etc.)	5 points	5
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		25
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES	Maximum 17 pts.	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	6
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		17
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES	Maximum 10 pts.	
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	5
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY	Maximum 20 pts.	
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	10
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		15
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES	Maximum 15 pts.	
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS	Maximum 10 pts.	
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	2
No funding	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		2

Item: _____

Life Enrichment Committee

June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: _____ Date: 5/2/2007 Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)Final Ranking No. _____ Project Name: Tot Lot Resurfacing Total Points 37
(Total Points Available - 97)**PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:**

Renovate and replace out-dated tot lot surfaces with new rubberized safety surfaces

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ -
Design	\$ -
Construction Management	\$ -
Inspection	\$ -
Project Management/Admin.	\$ -
Project Contingency	\$ -
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 1,748,000

Project Type:

- Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that applies)

- Grant
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annum
for Operations & Maintenance \$ 87,400(* O&M costs based on 5% of estimated
construction cost. Final O&M cost is dependent on
final project scope)**Instruction:**

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK	Maximum 25 pts.	
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	10
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement.etc.)	5 points	0
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		15
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES	Maximum 17 pts.	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	10
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	0
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES	Maximum 10 pts.	
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	0
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY	Maximum 20 pts.	
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	0
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	5
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	5
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES	Maximum 15 pts.	
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	0
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	0
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS	Maximum 10 pts.	
Full project funding available, or	10 points	0
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	0
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	2
No funding	0 points	0
SUBTOTAL PTS		2

Item: _____
 Life Enrichment Committee
 June 12, 2007

Park Capital Improvement Project Project Prioritization Evaluation System

DEPT: Office of Parks and Recreation

Date: 10/27/2006

Prepared by PWA/OPR/Consultants (WRT)

Final Ranking No. 17Project Name: William Wood Dog Park

Total Points

21

(Total Points Available - 97)

PROJECT SCOPE DESCRIPTION:

Provide a new dog park.

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS:

Construction Cost	\$ 969,456
Pre-Design/Planning	\$ 9,695
Design	\$ 116,335
Construction Management	\$ 67,862
Inspection/Permits	\$ 19,389
Project Management/Admin.	\$ 58,167
Project Contingency	\$ 67,862
Estimated Total Proj. Cost	\$ 1,308,766

Project Type:

- Buildings
 Parks
 Fields
 Playgrounds

Existing Available Funding Sources: (Check all that apply)

- Grant
 Bond Measure
 General Fund
 Other: _____

Increase (Decrease) in cost per annumfor Operations & Maintenance 7,100**Instruction:**

CRITERIA: The Project will/has	Max. Points Available	Rating/Points
PUBLIC SAFETY OR HEALTH RISK	Maximum 25 pts.	
Safety: Correct conditions that are safety and code deficiencies (e.g. seismic upgrade)	10 points	
Health: Remediate environmental health hazard (e.g. lead contamination, asbestos abatement, etc.)	5 points	
Access: Insure access to persons with disabilities.	5 points	5
Security: Provide safety and security of the property and the users (e.g. site lighting, fencing, gate, etc.)	5 points	5
SUBTOTAL PTS		10
MAXIMIZE USE AND PROGRAM SERVICES	Maximum 17 pts.	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for an underserved neighborhood population	10 points	5
Project will improve or expand programs or services to at-risk youth	6 points	
Project will improve or expand programs or services for the city-wide community	1 point	1
SUBTOTAL PTS		6
COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES	Maximum 10 pts.	
Provide new collaborative programs with outside public agencies (e.g. OUSD)	5 points	
Provide new collaborative programs with non-profit organizations.	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY	Maximum 20 pts.	
Provide major repairs/improvements to an existing facility, or	10 points	
Provide minor repairs and/or preventative maintenance to an existing facility	5 points	5
Improvements are expected to reduce on-going maintenance costs	5 points	
Improvements are expected to generate increased revenues for the City	5 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		5
PROTECTION OF EXISTING RESOURCES	Maximum 15 pts.	
Preserve cultural/historical/natural resources	10 points	
Improve/enhance cultural/historical/natural resources	4 points	
Create new cultural/historical/natural resources	1 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0
PROJECT FUNDING STATUS	Maximum 10 pts.	
Full project funding available, or	10 points	
Between 50% to 100% project fund available, or	5 points	
Funds available up to 50% of project cost, or	2 points	
No funding	0 points	
SUBTOTAL PTS		0

Item: _____

Life Enrichment Committee

June 12, 2007

Park Prioritization
Summary List of Capital Improvement Projects for Prioritization Ranking

*Denotes existing CIP projects added to Park Prioritization process.

Projects with strikethrough fonts are projects no longer with funding shortage.

Council District	Project Name	Project Description	Existing Fund Sources	Current Funding Available	Additional Funding Needed
City-wide	* Leveling Playing Fields	Improve/upgrade seven existing playing fields throughout the city for Girl's Softball program use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prop. 40 Youth Soccer & Rec. Grant • Raiders Surcharge Fund 	\$1,164,000	\$ 1,500,000
City-wide	* Tot Lot Re-surfacing	Renovate and replace out-dated tot lot surfaces with new rubberized safety surfaces.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prop. 12 Per Capita Block Grant 	\$148,000	\$ 1,600,000
City-wide	Watershed Preservation/Restoration/Acquisition	Measure DD Bond – Oakland Trust for Clean Water and Safe Parks program (various creeks & watersheds)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure DD 	\$10,000,000	\$ 7,700,000
At Large	Carter Middle School	Convert school site to community park and/or sport field.	None	None	\$ 3,005,298
At Large	Chinese Garden	Access, irrigation & landscape improvements.	None	None	\$ 1,289,790

Attachment D

Council District	Project Name	Project Description	Existing Fund Sources	Current Funding Available	Additional Funding Needed
1	Bushrod Park - General Improvements	Provide park improvements to include elements of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Running track at upper Bushrod Fields • Possible dog park within park space at transition between upper and lower field • HC accessible path at Shattuck entry • Path improvement from Tennis Ct. to Community Center • Landscaping, picnic area, tree planting, plaza outside or adjacent to Community Center • Coffee kiosk along Shattuck Entry. 	None	None	\$ 2,802,125
1	Bushrod Park - Soccer Field (former Washington Elem. School)	Create a new synthetic-turf soccer field with proper drainage. Joint use site on OUSD property.	None	None	\$ 3,225,150
1	Caldecott Trail to Skyline Blvd.	Improve existing trail from North Oakland Sports Field to Skyline Blvd.	None	None	\$ 1,405,730
2	Clinton Park	Update community master plan and implement improvements.	None	None	\$ 1,825,572
2	Clinton Park - Tot Lot	Provide funding to complete additional play equipment.	• Prop. 40 RZH Grant • Workforce Housing Grant	\$275,000	\$ 138,000
2	* Lincoln Square Park	Master park plan improvements for new synthetic turf play area, new tot lot, site access, and basketball courts.	None	None	\$ 2,235,600
2	Madison Square Park	Develop conceptual long-term park plan and improvements.	None	None	\$ 2,818,370

Attachment D

Council District	Project Name	Project Description	Existing Fund Sources	Current Funding Available	Additional Funding Needed
2	Morcom Rose Garden	Improve drainage system, repair PWA era rock wall, and enhance site lighting. And formalize community developed plan for implementation. Address security and visibility of the garden.	None	None	\$ 1,988,710
2, 3	* Lake Merritt and Lake Merritt Channel Projects	<p>Measure DD Bond – Oakland Trust for Clean Water and Safe Parks program. (Evaluate the program as a whole)</p> <p>On-going projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7th Street Flood Control Station • 10th Street Bridge • 12th Street Improvement • Children's Fairyland (independent managed by non-profit org.) • Cleveland Cascade • E 18th St. Pier Restoration • Lakeshore Pergola/Colonnade (proj. complete) • LM - Lakeside Park Central Irrigation Control (proj. in construc) • LM El Embarcadero & Lakeshore Ave. Improvements • Municipal Boathouse (Phase 1 proj. in construc.) • Sailboat House • Snow Park • Other Channel/Shoreline Imp. • LM Pathway Improvement 	• Measure DD	\$ 115,250,000	\$ 52,000,000

Attachment D

Council District	Project Name	Project Description	Existing Fund Sources	Current Funding Available	Additional Funding Needed
2, 3, 5, 7	* Waterfront Trail	<p>Measure DD Bond – Oakland Trust for Clean Water and Safe Parks program. (Evaluate as the whole waterfront project)</p> <p>Some of the on-going projects for information are listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alameda Ave. (construction to begin). • 66th Ave. Gateway (proj. in design) • Cryer Site (proj. in design) • Derby Ave., Oakland Museum Women’s Bd., to Lancaster Street Trail (proj. in design) • Three Bridges – Fruitvale, High St., Park Street (planning phase) • Lancaster St. to Fruitvale Br. Trail • Livingston Pier (proj. to begin design) • Park Street Triangle Traffic Study (Proj. complete) • Pier 29 Restaurant • US Audio/Capture Technologies • Waterfront Environmental. Remediation. - Cryer Site, etc. (Proj. on-going) • Gallagher & Burke and Hanson Aggregate (planning) • Con Agra (planning) • Kennedy St. to Park (planning) 	• Measure DD	\$ 53,000,000	\$ 53,000,000

Attachment D

Council District	Project Name	Project Description	Existing Fund Sources	Current Funding Available	Additional Funding Needed
3	* 25 th Street Mini Park	Park renovation to provide a new tot lot for a small urban park.	None	None	\$ 435,000
3	Durant Park - Urban Mini Park	Park renovation to improve existing play area surface, provide visibility,	None	None	\$ 479,736
3	Jefferson Square Park	Demolition of (e) storage bldg. Conflict in desired park use between community open space vs. skate park interest. OPR scope to combine community desired elements and skateboarder interests. Keep existing ball field, upgrade/replace existing tot lot, continue to have a basketball court, add new restrooms, and provide a skate-park on part of the park property.		None	\$ 2,131,569
3	Moss House	Architectural rehabilitation of existing house for accessibility and program usability at ground floor.	None	None	\$ 1,732,320

Attachment D

Council District	Project Name	Project Description	Existing Fund Sources	Current Funding Available	Additional Funding Needed
3	* Raimondi Park (Project partner FOPR)	<p><u>Phase One</u> (\$7.64 million) - Park improvements for soccer field, baseball field, field lighting and fencing, putting green, children's play area, ADA improvements for bldg. and site access, and limited paving, landscaping and site work.</p> <p><u>Phase Two</u> (\$3.5 million) - Perimeter park right-of-way improvements, site work and community elements (turf, picnic area, lighting, landscape, irrigation)</p> <p><u>Phase Three</u> (\$1 million) -- New support building for after-school programs and athletic programs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prop. 40 MH Grant • CIWMB Recycled Rubber Surf. • Friends of Parks & Rec. Grants • Measure K Ser. D bond • ADA Transition Plan Fund 	\$2,900,000 (City) \$740,000 (FOPR)	\$ 8,500,000
4	Brookdale Park	Council Office's preliminary survey calls for children's play areas, add'l basketball court, picnic and gathering spaces, security lighting and access.	None	None	\$ 2,079,594
4	Dimond Park	Entry way improvements for ADA accessibility.	None	None	\$ 726,840
4	Montclair Park	Provide an accessible path from Mountain Road (Montclair School) to Park area and from Albertsons (Moraga Rd.) to the park area.	None	None	\$ 1,644,410
5	2496 Coolidge Ave (Peralta Hacienda Historical Park)	Renovation of an existing building for partial public access and storage use.	None	None	\$ 762,480

Attachment D

Council District	Project Name	Project Description	Existing Fund Sources	Current Funding Available	Additional Funding Needed
5	Josie De La Cruz Park – Synthetic Turf	Convert existing lawn to synthetic turf field for multi-purpose use.	None	None	\$ 625,536
5	Peralta Hacienda Historical Park	Master park plan improvements for “Historic Core” phase of the project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prop. 40 MH Grant • Comm. Dev. Block Grant (CDBG) 	\$ 814,3000	\$ 5,000,000
5	William Wood Park	Provide a new dog park.	None	None	\$ 1,308,766
6	Carter Gilmore Sports Complex (formerly Greenman)	Renovations to site with upgrades to the existing baseball fields including the installation of new drainage, irrigation, and turf.	State Grants, Measure I, Measure K, Redevelopment Funds	\$ 1,562,000 Fully Funded	\$ 800,000
6	City Stables	Provide conceptual plan to maintain equestrian activities along with community park use elements, such as agriculture/gardening area, nature study and educational centers, potential retreat facilities, picnic areas, children's play areas, etc.	Prop. 12 RZH Grant	\$ 400,000	\$ 17,522,869
6	Leona Lodge Upgrade	Update/upgrade existing facility for ADA access and expansion of existing restroom facilities. Architectural remodeling and seismic upgrade.	None	None	\$ 1,424,153
6	Rainbow Recreation Ctr. Expansion	Renovate and expand existing center for program use and ADA accessibility. Upgrade front entrance, replace windows (for energy efficiency) and create a computer lab room.	None	None	\$ 1,439,640

Attachment D

Council District	Project Name	Project Description	Existing Fund Sources	Current Funding Available	Additional Funding Needed
7	* East Oakland Sports Complex	New sports/recreation complex.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure DD • Measure I • Prop. 40 Grant 	\$ 16,000,000	\$ 37,000,000 (to be confirmed)
7	Glen Daniel King Estates Trails	Trail improvements and assoc. drainage improvements.	None	None	\$ 1,965,490
7	Officer Willie Wilkins (Elmhurst) Park	Renovation to park for better visibility, user- friendliness, relocate and add elements within the park to meet community needs. Possibly adding par course, fitness equipment, track course, new play equipment and upgrade or replace (e) restrooms.	None	None	\$ 2,520,894
7	Sheffield Village Community Center	Tenant improvements to the existing building to comply with ADA regulations, and to expand and renovate the facility.	ADA funds, Pay-go funds, Stop-Waste-Org grant	\$400,000 Fully Funded	\$ 100,000
7	Tassafaronga Rec. Center	Rec. Center upgrades to include enlarging kitchen; replace gym floor due to water damage; expand facility/program to accommodate changing neighborhood need for youth activities, larger open-space rooms; upgrade entry for visibility.	Redevelopment Agency	TBD	\$ 3,140,908