

CRC Infrastructure Sub-Committee

Project Identification Template and Instructions

Project Identification Template

Instructions: Please complete all of the information requested with the best information you have available. Limited attachments are acceptable if necessary to adequately describe the project but the **total length should be limited to 6 pages** one-sided (including attachments). This Identification Template is intended as a preliminary mechanism by which proposals and projects to improve the resiliency of Coastal Alabama are solicited and captured with some consistency of format, scope definition, and project benefits and impact. **This is only a first step: proposals and projects will not be funded based upon this submittal. Further information and details will be solicited at such time as the screening and funding process is more fully defined.**

Responses should be received by **December 7, 2010**, to be included in the appendix the Coastal Recovery Commission Report to the Governor to be submitted December 15, 2010. Submittals after that date will be accepted for consideration but will not be included in the Project Appendix.

Completed Templates may be submitted:

- Electronically (.pdf preferred) to: crcalabama.templateresponse.com.
- By US mail to: Coastal Recovery Commission.

P.O. Box 881, Mobile, AL 36601-0881

I. What – Project Information/Basic Facts

1. Project Scope Reconstruct Broad St./Beauregard St. – US 90 to Water St.
2. Project duration or schedule by phase and status of any work in progress 24-36 months (Total)
6-9 months (Planning Engineering) 18-24 months (Construction)
 - 2.1. Conceptual and Feasibility Planning, Engineering, Construction See above
3. Estimated Cost (plus or minus 30%) \$7.7 Million
 - 3.1. Indicate level of confidence in accuracy of these estimates 85%

II. Why – Project Description relative to Impact and Criteria

1. Identify what need, threat or opportunity that this project, study, or recommendation will address This is a major US Route that is in an advanced deteriorated state (drainage, access, green space, pedestrian features are all in poor condition).
2. How does this project or recommendation address and impact the recommended evaluation criteria:
 - 2.1.1.Coastal Recovery This is one of the City's major drainage collector/outfalls and is a major evacuation route.
 - 2.1.2.Resiliency This project is part of a major road system for evacuation
 - 2.1.3.Transformational This project could encourage redevelopment
 - 2.1.4.Regionalism Being a major traffic corridor, this project affects the entire region
 - 2.1.5.Economic Diversification Would increase the tax base with higher property values and redevelopment.
3. Project Economics The estimated cost of this project is \$7,700,000
4. Identify Direct Project benefits to Coastal Alabama, including avoided costs, consequence of "No Build" alternative. "No build" equals continued deterioration, greater maintenance cost. Direct project benefits include improved access management, improved use during rain events, improved green space and pedestrian features.
 - 4.1. Impact on employment, job training and development, both short term and permanent Immediate engineering/construction jobs, long term redevelopment opportunities for a stronger tax base
 - 4.2. Oil spill mitigation outside of claims process _____
5. Identify Indirect benefits and costs
 - 5.1. Collateral Benefits to the objectives of Healthy Environment, Healthy Economy and Healthy Society (subjective responses allowed) Rebuilding of this piece of public infrastructure will positively impact all (environment, economy, community)
 - 5.2. Collateral Costs or impacts to the objectives of Healthy Environment, Healthy Economy and Healthy Society (subjective responses allowed) All positive impacts
 - 5.3. Connectivity and Linkage to other projects or initiatives: Does this project complement or compete with other projects? What other projects would be precluded if this project is funded? This project stands on its own merit

III. Who/How – General Information

1. Name and contact information for Entity, Collaboration or Person submitting project or recommendation nomination. City of Mobile – Nick Amberger, PE, City Engineer 205 Government St., Mobile, AL 36633, 251-208-7426, nick.amberger@cityofmobile.org City of Mobile would collaborate with the Alabama Department of Transportation.
 - 1.1. *Entities and communities sharing a common threat or need are encouraged to collaborate for a joint/combined project submittal to raise the profile of the issue and solution to be addressed. Also please indicate the level of community support or resistance and hurdles to collaboration.*
2. Identify Sponsoring Entity for oversight and accountability if different from above.
 - 2.1. Existing or to be created? Same as above
 - 2.1.1. If to be created, what parties or interests must be involved and what level of effort is required to do so? _____
 - 2.2. Describe governance, organizational capacity, availability of skills, experience of sponsoring entity to implement the Project City of Mobile Engineering Department & Alabama Dept. of Transportation; both entities highly capable
 - 2.3. Project complexity: Hurdles and barriers to project implementation, completion and sustainability. Identify regulatory issues. Little or none – this is a rebuild of an existing facility
3. Identify any known or anticipated administrative, regulatory, or legislative action that would be required at either the local, state, or federal governmental level. None
4. Requested funding from Coastal Recovery Fund (CRF) \$7.7 Million
5. Identified potential funding sources other than the CRF Cost have historically been too great to use capital improvement dollars or other grant funding; this section of roadway is a municipal connecting link and could be funded either through the state or the city or both. Historically it has not received either because of the cost.
 - 5.1. Leverage or multiplier on CRF investment: matching funds, public or private _____
 - 5.2. Public Private Opportunities, user fees, Federal funds, private foundation grants, bonding capacity, etc. Possibility of federal assistance
6. Forecast of ongoing maintenance or operating costs and source of funding if not self sustaining To be handled by existing owners (City of Mobile & ALDOT)