



FOR IMMEDIATE STAFF USE AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION

September 20, 2016
Office of the Alexandria Mayor
Alexandria, Louisiana

SUMMARY BRINGHURST REPORT #2

Budgeting Ranges

- 1) The following are “loose” estimates or ranges to consider for various uses and facility needs as you think about the feasibility of various projects at Bringhurst Park.
 - a. The Item (5) estimates are imprecise and constitute what might be termed as “informed dashboard estimates,” meaning they come from comparable projects and previous feasibility by private firms about the known needs and associated costs at Bringhurst.
 - b. The estimates contain objective breakdowns undergirding the numbers provided, but do not account for unknowns, yet to be considered by actual bids. The estimates are consistent with Lose’s findings and budget estimates.
- 2) If you adopt by resolution one or several of the following in Item (5), as more highly rated or desired, the Administration will direct City engineering to conduct actual cost estimating at the bid document level.
- 3) Alternatively, the Council can authorize a new RFP or RFQ process based on the specific aims and goals undergirding the short descriptions in Item (5) and its sub-items.
- 4) Item (3) will still require other security address of the facility.
- 5) The following different options should be compared for return on investment, financial, operational, and demand feasibility:
 - a. Basic Secure Site \$100,000
 - b. Full Secure Site/Mothball/Preservation \$250,000
 - c. Demolition/Simplest Green space \$50,000 - \$100,000
 - d. (c) + core-area redesign and park \$250,000 - \$500,000
 - e. (d) + Multi-Use (simple form) \$1,000,000 - \$2,000,000
 - f. (d) – Baseball Park \$3,000,000 - \$5,000,000*
 - g. (d) – Multi-Use (Complex form) \$2,000,000 - \$5,000,000*



SUMMARY BRINGHURST REPORT-draft

Budgeting Ranges

*Sub-items (f-g) require massive parking solutions, not included in the budgets, here. In addition, significant operations/maintenance dollars are without currently committed or known programming interest.

- 6) In conjunction with Item (5), the following questions might help the Council determine the best avenue—i.e., these questions are the heart of a feasibility analysis at the policy maker's end:
 - 7) What are the primary logistical and site needs of the Bringhurst site?
 - a. First, is it baseball, passive park activity, multi-use and/or mixed-use activity, historic preservation and some combination of the others, demolition and green space, and/or whether to create public-private partnering, etc.?
 - b. What are the community's desires and needs? Explain these needs and square footage, space requirements, parking, special requirements.
 - 8) What are the secondary logistical and site needs of the old or proposed facility?
 - a. Explain needs regarding safety, visibility, accessibility, parking, etc.
 - 9) How can the development goals of the City be integrated into and achieved in conjunction with questions (7) and (8)?
 - 10) What are the transit needs for the project—particularly Masonic Drive ingress/egress, etc.?
 - 11) What are the additional professional-service needs to design and implement a plan?
 - 12) Can the project serve, and be assimilated into, a larger regional and city plan to use multiple assets in combination, optimizing all, and establish a world-class facility?
 - 13) Is the project sufficiently budgeted given its scale? If not, why not? If not, how will additional capital funds be provided?
 - 14) What are the expected project completion dates? What are the phases of completion? How will this affect feasibility?
 - 15) Are Operations/Maintenance funding and other revenue projections on target and sufficient to meet project needs?

SUMMARY BRINGHURST REPORT-draft

Budgeting Ranges

- 16) Compared with every feasible alternative, what is the best option taking into consideration timing and all circumstances, such as environmental and/or other fatal flaws? What other alternatives were considered?
- 17) In the past, thinking about ballpark use, the City asked potential partners to demonstrate their understanding of “ballpark business,” specifically addressing the ways in which the firm is uniquely qualified to meet the following goals and expectations of the City of Alexandria:
- **Significantly increasing regional use of the park and increasing public participation and buy-in, including, in addition to ball play, other bookings, concerts, and multi-day events.**
 - **Developing and executing a marketing strategy that augments (not merely relocates) existing local “little league”-style youth ball activity in the area of the stadium and adjacent ballparks.**
 - **Reasserting the park as a leading regional recreation/sports destination reflecting the rich history of the ballpark and league play in Alexandria.**
 - **Better integrating existing assets and establishing partnerships with local and regional institutions, cultural destinations, and local hotel and motel operators.**
 - **Enhancing value, both tangible and intangible, for the Masonic Corridor and the Alexandria community and metro area/region.**
 - **Assisting city government and other governmental bodies to ensure a coherent and consistent message and plan of action.**

Those questions may be relevant to your determinations, here. Of course, you may modify them in the case of funding for a project not fully committed to baseball as a primary or exclusive use. In addition, all Capital Projects are vetted as follows:

PRIORITY ONE (I)

Priority I (P-I) projects historically included SPARC, R.I.V.E.R. Act projects (pertaining to the Community College Initiative), and drainage projects, funded in the fiscal year as primary projects, followed by utilities, drainage and transportation projects of high need and city-wide, multi-district application. These priorities would include projects such as drainage, utility transmission, and Project ABC needs. Several bridges connecting primary infrastructure are in need totaling several million dollars in requests.

The City’s Five-Year Capital Improvements Plan must contain 51% or more in P-I projects for the fiscal year.

There shall be \$500,000 in contingency in P-I to commence the fiscal year. Further best planning practices, in compliance with the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), “Principles for Infrastructure Stimulus Investment,” are those projects supported by economic stimulus investment criteria, such as:

SUMMARY BRINGHURST REPORT-draft

Budgeting Ranges

- Projects must create and sustain employment increases;
- Investments must provide long term benefits to the public (such as congestion relief or drainage needs);
- Long term maintenance and upkeep needs of all infrastructure projects, existing and new, must be taken into account; and
- To ensure accountability and transparency, auditing programs should be able to establish measurable stated outcomes.

In order to ensure the above criteria are met, the following principles will influence Priority I selection decisions:

- The project should deliver measurable improvements in public health, safety and quality of life;
- The project should provide substantial, broad-based economic benefit;
- The project should be designed and built in a sustainable and cost-effective manner, and proper consideration must be given to life-cycle costs; and
- The project should have a significant environmental benefit such as area restoration, improved air quality through reduced congestion and better watershed management through eliminating vulnerabilities in a system.

While funds in P-I may be re-allocated as such projects are matched with other funds or become certified to be economically feasible, this Priority should exhaust itself before considering Priority II or III, and the P-I category shall allow the transfer into it from P-II as P-Is are completed or de-prioritized, subject to the minimum 51% rule.

P-IIs, however, should be funded and prioritized simultaneously with P-Is since P-IIs that are readily feasible may be of high value as economic development projects and not otherwise on a P-I track.

PRIORITY TWO (II)

Projects in this category would be prioritized as P-Is but are not because of one or more of the following reasons:

- The project is awaiting a funding match from another entity.
- The project is a high value economic development project, but is not strictly speaking a project meeting P-I requirements.
- The project does not involve public safety, drainage, or high ASCE ratings.
- The project can be independently phased in different priorities.

SUMMARY BRINGHURST REPORT-draft

Budgeting Ranges

- The project is a “stand alone” phase completing already-finished other phases, which were of greater import.

PRIORITY THREE (III)

Other projects provided for in the Five-Year Capital Improvements Plan shall be considered prioritized here, and these projects may move into P-I or P-II status generally in order, but not necessarily, depending on funding availability or other feasibility determinations. These projects may be categorized and listed in the Five-Year Capital Improvements Plan, but may not be actively worked by the City Planning Division. P-IIIs shall be reviewed, however, at least twice yearly for priority assessment, along with P-Is and P-IIs, to ensure proper oversight and movement toward completion. City Council members shall be advised of the status of these projects on a more often basis as requested.

PRIORITY Indeterminate (P-ind)

All remaining projects shall be grouped as P-ind and may be in the Five-Year Capital Improvements Plan or capital budget of the City, or may be included on a master needs list maintained by the City Planning Division. These projects are neither scheduled for regular review nor given priority, but are instead a list of requested projects that have been initially vetted or requested by the City Council or public based on preliminary feasibility, efficacy and need.

- 18) Public Participation Policy. It is the City's goal to minimize the level of public financial participation in a project and to attain the most distinctive, highest-quality and marketable project possible. Preference should be given to those developers who minimize the use of public financing, emphasize private sector financing and/or participation and provide the greatest economic opportunity for the City.
