

## CIP SCORING FILE GUIDE

*This document serves as a guide outlining the CIP Selection and Scoring process, which includes project tracking, scoring, and selection. It pertains to an Excel spreadsheet with six tabs that describe and score the various requested improvements to be completed by the Anchorage Parks and Recreation Department.*

### MASTER SHEET

The master tab is intended to project a holistic overview of all the projects that are submitted for capital improvements either through Community Council CIP Survey, Internal Assessment or Need, Elected Officials, or Community Groups.

This master sheet is also the guide for submitting projects to capital budget and program required by code (INSERT CODE), and for Community Council CIP Surveys on an annual basis.

The following are the Definitions of the fields associated with the Master Sheet.

1. **Included in CC CIP Survey:** A “yes” or “no” column that pertains to if the project is included in the annual Community Council CIP Survey. Projects scored over 15 by councils or are ranked within the top 50% in each category are automatically included. Projects receiving significant match or that leverage outside funds should also be included in the CC CIP Survey for members of the public to rank.
2. **Project Type:** The project type is tied to the category under which it will ultimately be ranked.
3. **Project Name:** The name of the project; ideally, this includes the park, trail, or facility to which the improvement pertains.
4. **Project Scope:** The project scope should be short, factual, and outline what funds will be spent on to complete the narrative provided under “Project Need.”
5. **Project Need:** Describes why the project is needed and provides additional background.
6. **Estimated Total Cost:** The estimated cost of the work that needs to be done, which should relate to the work described in the project scope.
7. **Current Funding:** Funding in hand, including grants, capital bond funds, legislative funds, or private funds.
8. **Additional Funds Required:** The difference between estimated total cost and current funding, highlighting the amount of funds needed to complete the project scope.

### RANKING BY PROJECT TYPE

For actual ranking the spreadsheet is broken into five different categories. These categories help provide nuanced ranking for the type of project and help balance and qualify the type of work the department requests funding for on any given year.

1. Planning and Development
2. Capital Improvements
3. Trails
4. Facilities
5. Areawide (ongoing)

The following pages break down the different ranking categories by project type. Please review each ranking criterion and its weight prior to ranking.

## 2026 Proposed Scoring Matrix for Capital Improvement Projects

*Each category is scored from 0 to 10 points based on how well the project aligns with that criterion. The scores can then be totaled to provide an overall score for each project. This scoring matrix not only helps internal staff in evaluating projects but can also be transparently communicated to the public to justify funding priorities based on community needs and support. Last updated 01/31/2025, to be more consistent with PM&E Scoring Criteria.*

### Consistency with Adopted Plan (PM&E #9)

**Category:** Public Process and Opinion | **Points:** 0-10

- 10 points: Fully aligns with adopted master plans, strategic plans, or site plans.
  - 7 points: Partially aligns with adopted plans or addresses identified priorities.
  - 4 points: Limited alignment with existing plans.
  - 0 points: Does not align with any adopted plan or has no existing plan.
- 

### Public Support (PM&E #2)

**Category:** Public Process and Opinion | **Points:** -5 to 5

- 5 points: Strong public advocacy with overwhelming community support (e.g., letters from councils or organizations, challenge grant project).
  - 3 points: Moderate public support with minimal resistance.
  - 0 points: Some support but notable objections exist.
  - -5 points: Significant public opposition.
- 

### Support of the Project by Administration\* and Parks and Recreation Department (PM&E #3)

**Category:** Public Process and Opinion | **Points:** -5 to 5

- 5 points: This project has virtually unanimous support.
- 2 points: Some members of the staff or Administration support this project.
- 0 points: The staff and Administration is neutral towards the project.
- -2 points: The Administration and/or staff have a low opinion of the project.
- -5 points: The Administration and staff are opposed to the project .

---

## Support of Project by Community Council and Elected Officials\*\* (PM&E #4)

**Category:** Public Process and Opinion | **Points:** -5 to 5

- 5 points: The project has virtually unanimous support and is identified as a top priority in a recent community survey (scores top 3 of overall requests on the CIP CC Survey).
- 3 points: The project has some support and is mentioned in community survey (CIP CC) as a desired improvement.
- 0 points: No evidence of community survey support through CIP.
- -3 points: There is considerable opposition by most of the community council and or elected officials.
- -5 points: There is overwhelming opposition to the project.

---

## Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Impact (PM&E #10)

**Category:** Budget and Operations | **Points:** -5 to 15

- 15 points: Significantly reduces O&M costs.
- 10 points: Minimally increases O&M efficiency or has neutral impact.
- 0 points: No O&M cost impact anticipated.
- -5 points: Substantially increases O&M costs.

---

## External Funding or Partnerships

**Category:** Budget and Operations | **Points:** 0 to 5

- 5 points: Existing external funding or partnerships. In addition to funding, this includes existing or proposed maintenance agreements with user groups and stakeholders.
- 3 points: Moderate potential for external support.
- 1 point: Limited prospects for external contributions.
- 0 points: No identified opportunities for external funding.

---

## Environmental Impact

**Category:** Infrastructure and Environment | **Points:** 0 to 10

**Points:** 0-10

- 10 points: Project is contained to existing footprint, avoids sensitive environmental areas entirely or restores landscape to natural condition.
  - 7 points: Minimizes impacts but some concerns remain.
  - 4 points: Moderate impact on sensitive areas.
  - 0 points: Significant negative environmental impact.
- 

### Support for Existing Infrastructure

**Category:** Infrastructure and Environment | **Points:** 0 to 10

- 10 points: Focuses on maintenance and improvement of existing infrastructure.
  - 7 points: Primarily maintains existing infrastructure with minor expansions.
  - 4 points: Includes both new construction and limited maintenance.
  - 0 points: Focuses solely on new construction without addressing existing assets.
- 

### Property Ownership MOA or Parkland

**Category:** Infrastructure and Environment | **Points:** 0 to 10

- 10 points: This project is on dedicated MOA Parkland, or on a dedicated easement.
  - 5 points: This project is on undedicated MOA Parkland or HLB land, or similar/equivalent.
  - 0 points: This project is not on MOA property or MOA Parkland.
- 

### Severity of Need (PM&E #1, #7)

**Category:** Infrastructure and Environment | **Points:** 0 to 10

- 10 points: Clearly serves an underserved group or meets urgent Health, Safety, Welfare (HSW) needs.
  - 7 points: Serves a moderately underserved group or addresses HSW.
  - 4 points: General benefit to the broader community.
  - 0 points: No clear evidence of addressing community or HSW needs.
- 

### Population Served and Park Type\*\*\* (PM&E #6)

**Category:** Infrastructure and Environment | **Points:** 0 to 5

- 5 points: Significant contribution to the development or improvement of a larger natural resource use park, community-use facility, park, trail, or other asset that would benefit a larger section of the population.
  - 2 points: Supports local facility, park, trail, or other asset enhancements to benefit a localized section of the population.
  - 0 points: No contribution to facility, park, trail, or other asset and serves a very minimal share of the MOA's population.
- 

### **Total Scoring**

- Maximum points:
  - Projects are ranked based on their total score, with higher scores indicating a stronger alignment with Parks and Recreation priorities and community needs.
- 

### **Notes**

\*Administration indicates the current mayor and staff of the mayor.

\*\* Elected Officials includes members of the Alaska State Legislature and Anchorage Assembly.

\*\*\* Note AR 2024-323(S)