

**BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS  
MEMBERS**

**STEVE S. KANG**  
PRESIDENT

**JENNY CHAVEZ**  
VICE PRESIDENT

**JOHN GRANT**  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

**FAITH I. MITCHELL**  
COMMISSIONER

**ERNESTO CARDENAS**  
COMMISSIONER

**TJ KNIGHT**  
ACTING EXECUTIVE OFFICER

# CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA



**KAREN BASS**  
MAYOR

**DEPARTMENT OF  
PUBLIC WORKS**

**BUREAU OF  
ENGINEERING**

**CRYSTAL LEE**  
PE, MSCE, ENV-SP, SHRM  
CITY ENGINEER

1149 S. BROADWAY, SUITE 700  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90015-2213

<http://engineering.lacity.gov>

July 9, 2026

The Honorable City Council  
c/o Patrice Lattimore, City Clerk  
Office of the City Clerk  
Room 360, City Hall

## **COUNCIL FILE NO. 25-0752 – Capital Improvement Plan / Project Intake Process / Project Selection and Prioritization**

### **SUMMARY**

Executive Directive 9 (Bass Series) establishes a Capital Planning Steering Committee (CPSC) for the purposes of reorganizing how the City of Los Angeles plans, constructs, operates, and maintains public infrastructure. ED9 envisions new processes, roles and responsibilities, and centralized systems to support more strategic and efficient infrastructure planning. This report updates the City Council on work done to date by the CPSC, including publication of the 2026 Capital Infrastructure Program (CIP) on May 4, 2026. The 2026 CIP includes 10 recommendations to establish robust capital planning practices, including governance reforms, process and systems improvements, and new investments. This report advances three specific reforms directed by the subject Motion (CF 25-0752) and consistent with the 2026 CIP report, including project intake reform, project scoring and prioritization, and CIP governance via changes to the Los Angeles Administrative Code.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the City Council, subject to the approval of the Mayor,

1. APPROVE the Capital Project Intake Process and DIRECT all non-proprietary departments to submit all capital projects through this process for consideration in the citywide CIP;
2. ADOPT the seven Guiding Principles for capital infrastructure and DIRECT the Bureau of Engineering to report with a refined program-based scoring methodology, subject to approval by the Capital Planning Steering Committee; and

3. REQUEST that the City Attorney prepare and present an ordinance amending LAAC Sections 5.43 and 5.44, and other sections as needed, to implement a citywide CIP, as described in this report.

## **BACKGROUND**

On May 4, 2026, Mayor Bass released the 2026 Capital Infrastructure Program (CIP) report, which is available at <http://dpw.lacity.gov/cip>. This report is the culmination of work to date under ED9 and includes proposed governance reforms to codify and formally establish a CIP, background on current and previous capital planning practices, proposed Citywide Guiding Principles for infrastructure, a new project intake process, project scoring and prioritization, asset condition reports by asset class, an initial capital project list focused on the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games, and a discussion of infrastructure funding policies.

Multiple recommendations in the 2026 CIP report require action by Council to effectuate. The subject Motion (CF 25-0752) initiated legislative action on three specific components of capital planning reform:

1. Establishing a formal capital projects intake process to clarify project scopes, funding needs, and roles and responsibilities between operating departments and delivery agencies;
2. A project scoring system to aid in project selection and prioritization based on objective criteria; and
3. Proposed revisions to the Los Angeles Administrative Code (LAAC) to establish a CIP outside of the annual budget process.

These components implement 2026 CIP recommendation #6 Project Intake Reform, #7 Project Scoring and Prioritization, and #4 Confer Authority to the Bureau of Engineering, respectively.

## **DISCUSSION**

An effective CIP requires a robust planning process that can investigate infrastructure needs, develop potential project ideas, evaluate those project concepts for inclusion into a work plan and prioritization, and align this project pipeline with staffing levels and reasonably foreseeable funding. As the primary capital project delivery agency for the City of Los Angeles, the Bureau of Engineering (BOE) is best positioned to manage this aspect of capital planning. BOE relies on active and engaged planning and asset management agencies to regularly assess the condition of existing assets to identify those in need of rehabilitation, replacement, or expansion and work with BOE to forecast capital investment needs across their infrastructure assets.

## ***Project Intake Process***

Project Intake is the point at which a capital project concept is formally introduced into the CIP framework. Today, projects can originate from a variety of sources with no consistent practices for development, vetting, and prioritization of project concepts. The purpose of the new intake process is to create a single point of entry for all capital improvement project ideas, capture basic comparable information for each project, and allocate early-stage resources appropriately to confirm the project is viable before advancing further.

The project intake process is intended to evaluate specific project ideas to determine their deliverability. The foundational elements of successful project delivery include:

- 1) A clear purpose and need that the project addresses
- 2) Active participation by the client agency (asset owner)
- 3) A reliable path to funding

The process outlined below relies on planning and/or asset management agencies to identify which ideas should enter intake based on their own internal processes. For example, the recently completed Parks Needs Assessment would guide the Department of Recreation in Parks leadership to determine which potential park projects should be initiated in what order. Similarly, the Department of Transportation's (LADOT) Mobility Action Plan breaks down Mobility Plan 2035 into discrete actionable transportation projects and determines their relative priority for implementation by LADOT and/or DPW. Outside of a citywide planning process, an asset manager would use their asset condition data to forecast when rehabilitation or replacement is warranted and initiate a project accordingly. Once the asset manager has determined the need for a capital project, they would complete the project request form to initiate consideration of a proposed project for the citywide CIP.

Upon adoption of this report, the following steps in the new project intake process will be added to BOE's Project Delivery Manual and mandatory for all non-emergency capital improvement projects under BOE's authority.

### ***Step 1: Initiation Phase***

To initiate consideration of a capital project, a planning or asset management agency will submit a Project Request form to BOE via the City's Universal Project Reporting System (UPRS). Other entities (e.g. elected offices) wishing to initiate a project will work with the relevant agency having jurisdiction over the asset to submit the form. BOE generally expects asset managers to consult with planning agencies prior to submission (e.g. BSS submitting proposed resurfacing to LADOT for transportation corridors).

The Project Request form will include:

- Program and Project categories (using new CIP taxonomy)
- Project title
- Clear purpose and problem statement
- Initial requested scope of work

- Project location
- Client information and requesting agency, including client's investigation priority
- Related asset information
- GIS mapping in UPRS with required attributes
- Anticipated cost range
- Requested start and completion dates
- Proposed delivery agency

Upon receipt, BOE will work with the requesting agency to verify incomplete or unclear submissions. Valid requests will be referred to the appropriate BOE program (e.g. Mobility, Clean Water, Public Buildings and Open Space) for investigation. The Project Request form will be available year-round with projects proceeding to the next step as investigation resources allow. BOE will maintain a list of projects awaiting investigation.

### *Step 2: Investigation Phase*

Once initiated, BOE will perform a project investigation consisting of a standardized analysis intended to ensure that every project has a clear objective, viable scope, and acceptable delivery risk. The investigation process will include a site visit (if needed), review of asset condition and other relevant data, and preliminary engineering review for feasibility. The investigation will consider significant regulatory requirements that may affect scoping, such as Measure HLA. This phase concludes with the publication of a Project Investigation Report, including:

- Engineer's opinion of cost, or Class O Estimate
- Proposed schedule for Pre-Design, and estimated durations for subsequent Phases.
- Delivery resource (staff/consultant) analysis needed to proceed with Pre-Design
- Preliminary project score (see scoring discussion below) and policy screening

Within each program, BOE will dedicate staff time to project investigations on an ongoing basis. Decoupling initiation and investigation from an annual calendar cycle (e.g. budget process) or grant cycle allows time for diligent review and risk assessment. Simpler or routine projects can proceed expeditiously while more complex projects have a clear process for advancement and interim milestones to work toward. BOE anticipates that only projects that have already cleared project investigation will be ready to apply for implementation grants upon notice of funding availability. Early investigation of potential projects will allow time for coordination with other conceptual projects early in development before schedule and budget pressures constrict opportunities.

### *Approval Gate: Oversight Review*

The 2026 CIP establishes a new staff-level Capital Planning Oversight Group (CPOG) working under the direction of the executive-level Capital Planning Steering Committee (CPSC). The CPOG includes representation from the Mayor's Office, Chief Legislative Analyst, City Administrative Officer, and infrastructure departments. The CPOG will work to achieve consensus, with any disputes to be escalated to the CPSC.

Upon completion of the Project Investigation Report, a project will be referred to the CPOG. The CPOG will validate and approve proposed project score and either:

- Recommend placement of project into the CIP during the next update, or
- Recommend project not advance; client agency would need to rethink project and resubmit for future consideration

Approval by CPOG triggers creation of project-specific work order. Dedicated project funds for staff and/or consultants are required prior to additional work beyond this point. At the time of addition to the CIP, the project will be indicated for delivery by BOE or direct delivery by the asset owner.

### *Step 3: Pre-Design*

Projects approved by CPOG and provided funding for further development will proceed into the Pre-Design Phase. Per BOE's Project Delivery Manual, Pre-Design includes:

- Formal alternatives analysis
- Assessment of property needs
- Geotechnical constraints
- Environmental and regulatory screening
- Measure HLA and Interagency MOU checklists
- Conceptual (15%) design
- Project risk assessment/fatal flaw analysis

The Pre-Design Report addresses some of the same subjects as the Project Investigation Report, but in much greater detail. The Pre-Design Report will include a Class C cost estimate and recommended delivery timeline for financial and staff resource planning. A project that has completed Pre-Design is considered ready for full funding and/or grant application.

### *Approval Gate: Project Confirmation*

Upon completion of the Pre-Design Report, and before submission of any implementation grant applications, CPOG will review and approve the report, assess the capacity of the delivery program, and approve the project's sequence in the delivery schedule. CPOG will establish funding assumptions for the project, including the commitment of City-controlled funds and/or an instruction to pursue funding from specified grant programs (i.e. strategic unfunded project). Strategic unfunded projects with foreseeable grant delivery timelines may be placed on the master schedule to reserve delivery capacity.

The outcome of Project Confirmation is a committed project schedule with future funding and delivery resources assigned to the project within the 5-year planning horizon. Confirmed projects will be formally added to the citywide 5-year CIP on a regular cadence, subject to Mayor and Council approval. Resource commitments across all confirmed projects will be rolled up into citywide funding and staff needs for annual budget planning purposes. With each CIP update, BOE will identify any significant misalignments between

forecasted staffing levels, capital funding, and project commitments and work with the City Administrative Officer (CAO) to ensure the 5-year CIP is financially feasible.

### *Transition to New Project Intake Process*

BOE has anticipated the implementation of a project intake process since the issuance of Executive Directive 9 and taken steps to integrate it into UPRS for seamless project management. BOE will launch a Project Request form within UPRS this summer.

Implementing this process will require BOE to refine its master scheduling procedures to ensure they are able to support resource forecasting for each program. BOE is already in the practice of regularly reporting master schedules to various oversight committees and anticipates providing annual master schedule updates to CPOG, at a minimum.

This process will implement a new citywide capital project taxonomy to appropriately categorize projects by type and service. Individual projects are expected to be nested under a Program Category, Program Name, and Project Category reflecting how the public would look for capital project information. This new taxonomy may or may not influence future organizational realignment to clarify responsibility for delivery of projects within each category.

In order to develop a resource-constrained 5-year CIP, BOE will need to review current deferred and inactive projects for continued relevancy and priority. Active projects will require reconfirming delivery resource assumptions. Schedules may need to be adjusted to align with available delivery resources. Dormant projects will be canceled, deferred beyond the term of the CIP, or recommended for reevaluation by resubmitting them into the project intake process to validate their objectives and scope.

At the direction of the Mayor's office, BOE anticipates publication of a baseline citywide CIP in early 2027. Until the publication of the baseline CIP, BOE will need to use investigation resources to reconfirm existing projects. Therefore, BOE will hold any new project requests in queue until after the release of the baseline CIP. During this transition period, Client departments will not be able to initiate projects and therefore will only be allowed to seek grants for existing projects.

Once all City projects are reflected in UPRS later this year, BOE will review each program with the relevant planning and/or asset management department to ensure that the 5-year baseline CIP aligns with their priorities. Projects in programs with gaps in funding or delivery resources, or any other major delivery risks, will need to be evaluated prior to establishing delivery commitments.

Moving forward, planning and/or asset management departments will be expected to review their own priorities for future projects and engage with BOE to move their top priorities through the project intake process. BOE will support client departments during this transition to ensure that a realistic number of priorities are undergoing investigation at any time.

### ***Project Scoring and Prioritization***

An objective scoring methodology is an essential component of screening and prioritizing potential projects within a CIP. The 2026 CIP report includes seven Guiding Principles intended to establish a unified vision for infrastructure investment in Los Angeles that can guide both programmatic investment decisions and individual project selection. The seven Guiding Principles are:

- Health and Safety
- Connectivity
- Accessibility
- Equity
- Preservation
- Sustainability and Resiliency
- Economic Investment

The 2026 CIP report identifies the need to prioritize projects by both policy value and operational considerations. In general, policy value should drive selection of which projects are included within a 5-year CIP, while operational considerations should drive scheduling within the 5-year period to account for factors like project readiness, coordination with other projects, etc. This framework emphasizes transparency in project value and pragmatism in project scheduling.

As part of the project intake process outlined above, projects will have the opportunity to improve their policy scores during project development. A project will receive a baseline score at the end of the Investigation phase, with potential opportunities to improve this score identified as part of the Project Investigation Report. If the project is advanced by CPOG, the project will be rescored at the time of Project Confirmation based on how the project matured during Pre-Design. Any significant scope changes may cause the project to be rescored.

While the policy scoring rubric will determine the value of each project, the following factors will also be considered during prioritization:

- Legal or Regulatory Mandates
- Project Readiness
- Funding Readiness
- Asset Condition
- Corridor Coordination (“Dig Once”)

For the creation of the first citywide 5-year CIP, the early years will most likely emphasize preexisting project commitments since these are the projects with the highest degree of readiness and often have funding deadlines. Projects with a high policy score but lower degree of readiness would most likely be prioritized for later in the 5-year period.

A specific proposed scoring rubric is included in Appendix 8.4 of the 2026 CIP report. This proposal has not yet been adopted by CPSC and requires additional input from

department staff. A final scoring system must be consistent across agencies, replicable, and scalable across a universe of thousands of projects. BOE recommends that the rubric be fully vetted by CPSC prior to consideration by the City Council.

### ***CIP Administration***

The 2026 CIP report designates the Bureau of Engineering (BOE) as the lead agency for CIP development, working in partnership with planning agencies, asset managers, and the City Administrative Officer (CAO) to identify capital infrastructure priorities, align funding and staff resources, and determine project delivery timelines. As part of this transition, the Mayor proposes to decommission the existing CAO-led Annual Capital and Technology Improvement Expenditure Program (CTIEP), which lacks the policy focus, long-term orientation, and technical rigor of the proposed 5-year CIP. The current CTIEP process is codified in Los Angeles Administrative Code (LAAC) § 5.43 and 5.44.

The Charter Reform Commission recommended the establishment of a Capital Infrastructure Program and prepared draft Charter and LAAC language to effectuate it. As proposed by the Commission, the Charter would mandate the creation of a Capital Improvement Program and establish the Department of Public Works as the lead agency for preparing all program plans. The CAO would be responsible for certifying that the program plan is fiscally feasible. The City Council voted to approve the Commission's recommendation, with minor amendments.

The Charter Reform Commission included a detailed draft CIP ordinance in their report appendix (attached) that provides a strong foundation for instructions to the City Attorney for changes to LAAC § 5.43 and 5.44. The draft ordinance complements the proposed Charter language but could be advanced independent of Charter changes.

The current CTIEP includes technology projects, in addition to capital projects. Multi-year technology projects bear strong resemblance to capital projects in that they require upfront resources for investigation and scoping, multiyear funding commitments for implementation, and ongoing maintenance investment. BOE envisions that technology projects would continue to be included in the City's CIP framework and be initiated and prioritized through an analogous process to the capital project intake process described in this report. However, BOE and the Information Technology Agency (ITA) will need to establish roles, responsibilities, and procedures for project investigation and management specifically tailored for technology projects. As such, BOE recommends including technology projects in the proposed CIP ordinance, with definitions and procedures to be developed in consultation with ITA.

BOE recommends that Council instruct the City Attorney to prepare and present an ordinance repealing LAAC § 5.43 and 5.44 and replacing them with an ordinance modeled after the Charter Reform Commission appendix, with the following additional instruction:

- The ordinance should provide that the CIP process is led by the City Engineer.\*

- The ordinance should authorize the City Engineer to promulgate procedures for the administration of the CIP.
- The ordinance should include a definition of a capital project and a definition of a technology project subject to the procedures within the ordinance, including a provision for emergency projects eligible for streamlined approval.
- The ordinance should provide that the CIP shall be adopted either in advance of or concurrently with the regular City budget and that the CIP shall form the basis for capital project funding appropriations during the budget process. The budget process shall not be used to initiate or reprioritize projects outside of the CIP. Budget actions shall be limited to adjusting funding amounts for the CIP from eligible sources.
- The ordinance should explicitly authorize the Board of Public Works to award construction contracts against funding commitments included in the 5-year CIP.
- The ordinance should establish the City Engineer's authority to manage program contingencies within appropriated amounts, in consultation with the CAO.
- The ordinance should establish the City Engineer's authority to create new accounts for newly initiated projects.
- The ordinance should establish the CPSC's oversight role over project selection/prioritization, scheduling, funding, and project delivery, and discontinue other capital oversight committees, such as the Street and Transportation Project Oversight Committee. The Municipal Facilities Committee's purview should be modified to exclude capital project oversight.
- The ordinance should clarify various concepts and definitions, in consultation with BOE, ITA, and the CAO.
- The ordinance should establish a mandatory appropriation equivalent to one percent of the annual General Fund contribution to CIP projects into a new CIP Technology and Training Fund under the control of the City Engineer to support software licensing, consultant services, staff development, and related costs associated with capital planning.

*\*The City Council voted to place before voters in November 2026 a measure that would reestablish the role of Director of Public Works, among other Charter reforms. This report assumes that any authority given to the City Engineer in a CIP ordinance would be exercised under the supervision of the Director of Public Works.*

BOE further recommends that the City Attorney be instructed to present the draft ordinance to the CPSC for input prior to transmittal to the City Council.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

Approval of this report will have no direct fiscal impact. The report outlines new roles and responsibilities for capital planning that will require realigning staff resources and greater investment in systems and technology to support new processes. The availability of staff for project investigations will determine the pace of evaluation of new project requests. These resource needs should be considered as part of the development of the FY2027-28 Budget.

Respectfully submitted,



boxSIGN 4L7KX8JK-19RXKVKZ

Crystal Lee, PE, MSCE, ENV-SP,  
SHRM  
City Engineer

CL/KD:av:eb

Attachment

cc: Randall Winston, Office of the Mayor  
Andrea Greene, Office of the Mayor  
Steve S. Kang, Board of Public Works  
Matt Szabo, City Administrative Officer

## A CIP Ordinance

**The commission recommends that the following section be implemented by ordinance:**

### **Section 1. Multi-Year Capital Planning and Funding Commitment.**

#### **(a) Planning Horizon.**

The CIP shall cover a minimum of five (5) fiscal years

The CIP shall be adopted biennially in conjunction with the adoption of the two-year operating budget. In the alternating year in which a new CIP is not adopted, the City Council shall conduct a public review of the existing CIP and may adopt technical adjustments consistent with subsection (b).

#### **(b) Binding First Year; Committed Out-Years.**

1. The first and second fiscal year of the CIP shall be adopted as part of the biennial budget and shall constitute a legal appropriation.
2. Fiscal years three through five shall constitute approved capital commitments for projects designated as funded. Projects designated as partially funded or planned but unfunded in the out-years may be reprioritized or deferred during biennial updates or alternating-year technical reviews without triggering Section 5(c), provided that such changes are publicly disclosed. This should occur similar to the Financial Status Report (FSR) process.
3. Projects designated as funded in years three through five may not be removed or materially altered except as provided in Section 5 of this Article. This should occur similar to the Financial Status Report (FSR) process.

#### **(c) Identified Funding Sources.**

Each project shall identify specific funding sources, including but not limited to general obligation bonds, revenue bonds, dedicated taxes, grants, development impact fees, enterprise funds, or pay-as-you-go revenues.

Projects may be included in the CIP as fully funded, partially funded, or planned but currently unfunded, provided that the funding status is clearly disclosed.

Unfunded or partially funded projects shall identify potential or anticipated funding strategies where feasible.

**(d) Fiscal Sustainability Certification.**

Prior to adoption, the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) shall certify that the CIP is fiscally sustainable within the City's long-term financial forecast.

Fiscal sustainability certification shall include analysis of projected debt ratios, operating cost impacts, reserve policy compliance, and consistency with adopted financial policies.

**Section 2. Lifecycle Cost and Operating Impact Requirements.****(a) Full Lifecycle Cost Disclosure.**

No capital project shall be included in the CIP without a documented estimate of:

1. Total project delivery cost (design, land acquisition, construction, contingencies);
2. Annual operating and maintenance costs;
3. Major maintenance and capital renewal costs over the useful life of the asset;
4. Estimated replacement timeline and cost;
5. Decommissioning or disposal costs, if applicable.

**(b) Operating Budget Integration.**

Any project that creates new or expanded facilities, services, or infrastructure shall include a five-year projection of operating impacts. The Capital Planning Steering Committee (CPSC) shall not recommend implementation or appropriation of any project unless sufficient operating revenues are identified or planned to sustain the asset.

Projects may be included in the CIP for planning or design purposes prior to full identification of operating revenues, provided that construction or implementation shall not proceed without demonstrated operating sustainability.

Operating impact projections shall specifically identify costs within each year of the two-year adopted operating budget and the projected impacts in the subsequent forecast years.

**(c) Asset Management Alignment.**

All capital planning shall prioritize maintenance and replacement of existing assets before expansion, except where otherwise justified.

**Section 3. Alignment with Operating Budget and Long-Term Financial Plan.**

**(a) Coordinated Budget Adoption.**

The first two years of the CIP shall be adopted concurrently with the City's biennial operating budget.

**(b) Long-Term Financial Forecast.**

The CIP shall be supported by a rolling five-year financial forecast demonstrating:

1. Revenue capacity;
2. Debt affordability;
3. Operating impacts;
4. Reserve policy compliance.

**(c) Prohibition on Unfunded Mandates.**

No capital project shall be appropriated for construction or full implementation without identification of a funding source sufficient to complete the project and sustain ongoing operations. The inclusion of a project in the CIP shall not, by itself, constitute authorization for construction or financial obligation beyond the level of funding appropriated in the adopted biennial budget.

**Section 4. Transparent Criteria for Project Inclusion, Prioritization, and Removal.****(a) Objective Evaluation Criteria.**

All proposed capital projects shall be evaluated by the Capital Planning Steering Committee (CPSC), chaired by the Director of Public Works, using publicly adopted criteria, which shall include, at minimum:

1. Public health and safety impacts;
2. Legal or regulatory mandates;
3. State of repair and asset condition;
4. Alignment with the Comprehensive Plan and adopted strategic plans including the Mobility Plan, Parks Needs Assessment, and Community Plans;
5. Equity and geographic distribution considerations;
6. Environmental sustainability and climate resilience;

7. Operating cost implications;
8. Availability of external funding;
9. Community benefit and service impact.

**(b) Public Scoring and Ranking.**

Each project shall receive a documented score based on the adopted criteria. Scores and rankings shall be published prior to CIP adoption.

The CIP shall clearly categorize projects as: (1) Fully Funded; (2) Partially Funded; (3) Planned but Unfunded.

Such designation shall be published alongside project scores and rankings.

**(c) Addition or Removal of Projects.**

A project may be added, removed, or materially modified outside of biennial adoption CIP process only by ordinance and only upon:

1. Written fiscal impact analysis;
2. Public hearing;
3. Recommendation from the Capital Planning Steering Committee established in Section 7;
4. Statement of findings explaining the reason for deviation from prior rankings or commitments.

**Section 5. Phased and Conditional Project Authorization.**

**(a) Phasing for projects**

Capital projects may be approved in phases, including planning, design, property acquisition, or construction phases.

Appropriation for a subsequent phase shall require confirmation of available funding for that phase.

Inclusion of a later construction phase in the CIP shall not obligate the City to appropriate funds until funding is secured and operating impacts are certified.

**(b) Strategic Opportunity Projects**

The CIP may include a category of “Strategic Opportunity Projects” for projects that are contingent upon receipt of grants, voter authorization of bonds, public-private partnerships, or other external funding. Such projects shall not proceed without formal funding approval by ordinance and appropriation in the adopted biennial budget.

## **Section 6. Capital Planning Steering Committee (CPSC).**

### **(a) Establishment.**

A Capital Planning Steering Committee (“CPSC”) is hereby established.

### **(b) Convening Authority.**

The CPSC shall be convened and chaired by the Director of Public Works.

### **(c) Membership.**

The CPSC must include representatives from all departments and bureaus that:

1. Plan for physical assets, infrastructure, and buildings;
2. Construct or deliver capital projects;
3. Maintain or operate public facilities and infrastructure;
4. Conduct long-range land use planning;
5. Prepare financial forecasts or manage municipal debt.

The Mayor and City Council may designate additional members as necessary to ensure cross-functional coordination.

### **(d) Duties.**

The CPSC shall:

1. Develop and maintain standardized capital project submission requirements;
2. Require full lifecycle cost analysis for all proposed projects;
3. Conduct outreach and engagement including public hearings;
4. Evaluate operating impacts and long-term maintenance obligations;
5. Ensure consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and long-range land use plans;
6. Review project readiness and feasibility;

7. Apply the adopted project evaluation criteria described in Section 5;
8. Prepare a recommended, fiscally constrained draft CIP for public review. The draft CIP may include unfunded or partially funded projects for planning, sequencing, or strategic purposes, provided that funding status is clearly identified and fiscal impacts are disclosed;
9. Recommend a prioritized CIP to the Mayor and City Council;
10. Review proposed amendments to the CIP.

**(e) Asset Management Integration.**

The CPSC shall prioritize maintenance, rehabilitation, and replacement of existing assets before expansion of new facilities, except where otherwise justified.

**(f) Transparency.**

The CPSC shall publish its scoring methodology, project evaluations, and draft recommendations prior to submission.

**Section 7. Transparency and Public Reporting.**

**(a) Public Access.**

The CIP, scoring criteria, project rankings, lifecycle analyses, funding sources, and status reports shall be published on the City's website in a searchable format and include a regularly updated GIS enabled map of all CIP projects.

The city shall make sure public facing CIP material and outreach materials also includes multilingual information and wayfinding support to affected cultural neighborhoods.

**(b) Quarterly Reporting.**

The Director of Public Works shall provide quarterly reports detailing:

1. Project status;
2. Budget performance;
3. Schedule performance;
4. Change orders;
5. Emerging fiscal risks.

**(c) Performance Metrics.**

The CIP shall include measurable performance indicators for major projects.

Emergency amendments shall be limited to projects directly related to the declared emergency and shall not be used to reprioritize unrelated capital projects. Emergency amendments require declaration and approval by the Mayor or City Council.