



**Capital Improvement Plan
Project Development and Proposal
2015/2016 -2016/2017**

Project Title: Citywide Fiber Optics Installation **Project Number:**

Project Category: Economic Development

Project Location:

Project Description: Installation of underground fiber optic conduits throughout the City for future technological use. An annual design/construction budget must be allotted to complete the entire project.

Project Justification: The purpose of the project is to bring high speed cable and internet access throughout the City of San Pablo to increase core service levels.

Staff has begun incorporating the installation of fiber optics to one of the CIP projects. In the process, design and construction estimates has been established and thus feasibility/coverage of the installation can be approximately determined with a given project budget.

Quality of life balanced with core service levels (under Amenities/ Quality of life Item D) - FY 2013-15 City Council adopted Work plan update (final).

| PROJECT COST ESTIMATE | Notes | Amount | PROJECT FUNDING | Notes | Amount |
|---------------------------|-------|---------------------|-----------------------|-------|---------------------|
| Expenditure Category: | | | Grants: | | |
| Environmental: | | | | | |
| Design/Plan Review: | | 30,000.00 | | | |
| Administration: | | | | | |
| Right of Way: | | | | | |
| Construction: | | 67,500.00 | | | |
| Inspection + Management : | | 30,000.00 | | | |
| Contingency: | | 22,500.00 | | | |
| Total Cost: | | \$150,000.00 | Economic Devel. Corp. | | |
| | | | Rule 20A: | | |
| | | | Measure C/J: | | |
| | | | Measure WW: | | |
| | | | General Fund: | | 150,000.00 |
| | | | City of Richmond: | | |
| | | | Contra Costa County: | | |
| | | | Other: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | Total Funding: | | \$150,000.00 |
| | | | Future: | | |

| Rating Criteria | High | | Medium | | Low | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|----------|
| SCALE | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | Rank |
| Public Health | The project eliminates a current and present public health. | Reduces a current and present public health. | Mitigates a potential public health. | Has little impact on public health. | Has no impact on public health. | Degrades public health. | 2 |
| Public Safety | The project eliminates a current and present public safety. | Reduces a current and present public safety. | Mitigates a potential public safety. | Has little impact on public safety. | Has no impact on public safety. | Degrades public safety. | 4 |
| Environmental Impact | The project substantially improves the city's environment. | Alleviates an ongoing degradation to the environment. | Cleans up past degradation or prevents future degradation. | Has little impact on environment which is mitigated. | Has no impact on environment which is mitigated. | Has negative impacts on the environment that cannot be mitigated. | 2 |
| Federal or State Mandates | The project is required to meet a state or federal permit or other enforceable requirement. | Is needed to bring a system component up to federal or state standards. | Supports state or federal standards that apply to this project. | Provides little progress toward meeting state or federal standards. | Does not make any progress toward meeting state or federal standards. | Moves the system further away from state or federal requirements. | 3 |
| Livability/Vitality Enhancements | The project improves city wide livability/vitality for all segments. | Improves city wide livability/vitality for most segments. | Improves livability/vitality for some segments. | Improves livability/vitality for few segments. | Does not improve livability/vitality for few segments. | Decreases livability/vitality. | 5 |
| Council Goals or interest | The project is listed specifically as a Council goal. | Is needed to reach at least one Council goal. | Indirectly relates to reaching one Council goal. | Indirectly related to a Council Goal. | Does not relate to any Council goals. | Is contrary to a Council goal. | 3 |
| Community Interest | The project has wide community support. | Project has mixed reaction with most of the community in support. | Project has mixed support with an even split of support and opposition. | Project has little support and opposition. | People do not have a opinion (do not care) about the project. | Many people oppose the project. | 5 |
| Cost Effectiveness | The project will pay for its self over less than five years in reduced cost to the city | Will pay for its self in less than five years in reduced cost to citizens | Adds to operational cost but is the least life cycle cost alternative. | Adds operational cost but the cost is paid for with increased operational revenue. | Adds to operational cost without revenue offset. | Adverse impact to operational cost. | 4 |
| System Reliability | Alleviates a risk that threatens life or would result in irreparable harm | Alleviates a risk that results in severe property loss. | Alleviates a risk that results in minor loss of property. | Has no impact on system failure | Alleviates a risk of system failure but causes inconvenience to the city staff | Results in some system failure. | 3 |
| Implements a Master Plan | The project fully implements at more than one recommendation in an adopted master plan. | Fully implements at least one recommendation in an adopted master plan. | Makes progress toward meeting master plan goals. | Makes slight progress toward meeting master plan goals. | Does not implement a recommendation in an adopted plan or is not anticipated in a master plan. | Is not consistent with any adopted system plan. | 4 |
| Economic Development | The project provides significant incentive for economic development. | The project provides substantial incentive for economic development. | The project provides same incentive for economic development. | The project provides little incentive for economic development. | The project provides no incentives for economic development. | The project adversely impacts incentives for economic development. | 5 |
| Maintenance / Facility Utilization | The project significantly reduces long term operating cost, alleviates standard condition or extends useful life. | The project substantially reduces long term operating cost, alleviates standard condition or extends useful life. | The project reduces some long term operating cost, alleviates standard condition or extends useful life. | The project slightly reduces long term operating cost, alleviates standard condition or extends useful life. | The project has no impact on long term operating cost, substandard condition or extends useful life. | The project adversely impacts long term operating cost and useful life. | 5 |
| Litigation | The project addresses pending or noticed lawsuits > \$250,000 | The project addresses pending or noticed lawsuits < \$250,000 | The project addresses possible future lawsuits. > \$250,000 | The project addresses possible future lawsuits. < \$250,000 | The project has no impact overall liability. | The project adversely impacts overall liability. | 2 |
| Damage to Public or Private Property | The project adverts high probability of severe damage. > \$250,000 | The project adverts high probability of moderate damage. < \$250,000 | The project adverts potential probability of severe damage. > \$250,000 | The project adverts potential probability of moderate damage. < \$250,000 | The project provides no impact of overall damage. | The project adversely impacts overall damage. | 3 |
| Legal Requirement | The project implements non-deferrable legal requirements (e.g. ADA, NPDES). | The project implements deferrable (short term < 5 years) legal requirements. | The project implements deferrable (long term > 5 years) legal requirements. | The project implements locally adopted codes or ordinances. | The project implements local standards or General plan objectives. | The project adversely impacts ability to implement local standards and General Plan goals. | 3 |
| STATUS | | | | | | | |
| Readiness to Proceed | The project is fully funded, CEQA is completed, design is done, permits and right of way have been secured. | The project is funded but has little if any initial work has been completed. | Is partially funded, CEQA completed, design is done, permits and right of way have been secured. | Has no funding, CEQA completed and design is done but no permits or right of way have been secured. | Has no funding and is in the beginning phases of CEQA or design | Has no funding and no initial work has been completed. | 2 |
| Funding Partnerships | The project has grant funds awarded and will lose them if it does not proceed. | Is listed for a grant and is likely to receive funding during the budget cycle. | Is funded by a low interest loan that are time sensitive, or is eligible for a future grant. | Has multiple funding sources which are not time sensitive. | Is only funded from city resources. | N/A | 1 |

Citywide Fiber Optics Installation

