

# STRATEGIC GROWTH COUNCIL EXECUTIVE REPORT

Executive Report		October 6, 2014
Strategic Plan Reference #		<i>Status and Next Steps</i>
<p><b>1</b></p> <p><b>Coordinate among State Agencies</b></p> <p><i>“Identify and review activities and funding programs of member agencies that may be coordinated”</i></p> <p>PRC 75125 (a )</p>	<p><b>STATUS:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><u>Statewide Implementation.</u> Since coming on board at SGC as the Senior Advisor for Environmental Science and Policy, Dr. Grossman has framed the scope and vision of RAMP within the context of Integrated Regional Planning (IRP) and is developing agreements with key agencies and consortia to further develop and implement IRP at the project, regional and statewide level. He is also defining the information resources and tools that will be required for the efficient implementation of IRP and RAMP at the regional and statewide level. Strategic pilot demonstration projects are being identified to apply these methods and tools to improve the implementation efficiency of priority development projects through the protection of regionally defined conservation priorities.</p> <p><u>Financial Analysis.</u> Two Caltrans led studies to explore the types of financial mechanisms required to fund mitigation in advance of projects are ongoing. An additional study sponsored by the California Transportation Commission and conducted by U.C. Davis considers potential funding and implementation strategies for earlier, more comprehensive environmental mitigation, shifting project planning and delivery from a single-project approach to a multi-project, regional approach. The study examines the extent to which early regional mitigation needs assessment and advance planning for habitat-level impacts from multiple infrastructure projects may promise such potential benefits as (1) reduced project delays, (2) reduced mitigation and transaction costs, and (3) improved mitigation quality.</p> <p><u>High Speed Rail.</u> HSR is beginning to apply the emerging IRP and RAMP methods, along with the information, and partnerships to advance their current project needs. Specific HSR sections have been selected to test specific components of this process, coordinate the development of environmental review processes, and develop strategic conservation and mitigation plans. A High Speed Rail Update for Administration Environmental Leaders on September 30 provided an update of HSR commitment to implement this advanced approach for environmental planning.</p> <p><u>Schools.</u> No updates to report since last Executive Report to the Council on June 3, 2014. Opportunities exist to reach out to the Division of School Facilities at the California Department of Education and the Office of Public School Construction to receive feedback on the draft Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program guidelines and how to integrate and align sustainability goals around schools.</p>	
<p><b>2</b></p> <p><b>Barriers to Infill</b></p> <p><i>“Provide, fund, and distribute data and information to local governments and regional agencies that will assist in</i></p>	<p><b>STATUS:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><u>Infill Finance Options.</u> Complete. SGC engaged Economic and Planning Systems (EPS) to analyze challenges to financing infill and recommend strategies to reduce risk and support new or existing financing mechanisms. The</p>	

	<p><i>developing and planning sustainable communities”</i></p> <p>PRC 75125 ( c )</p>	<p>final report has been posted to the SGC website.</p> <p><u>Infill Development Technical Assistance.</u> Pending. Leveraging SGC’s completed Infill Finance Options report with other State efforts related to infill development (e.g. General Plan Guidelines, pending CEQA guidelines, etc.); staff proposes convening a series of technical assistance workshops to local communities to address barriers to infill.</p>
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>Infrastructure Planning</b></p> <p><i>“At a minimum the council shall review and comment on the five year infrastructure plan developed pursuant to Article 2 (commencing with section 13100) of chapter 2 of part 3 of division 3 of the Government Code and the State Environmental Goals and Policy Report pursuant to Section 65041 of the Government Code”</i></p> <p>PRC 75125 ( a )</p> <p><i>Criteria and priorities used to identify and select the infrastructure it does propose to fund, including criteria used to identify and select infrastructure that by January 1, 2005, shall be consistent with the state planning priorities</i></p> <p>GC 13102 ( c ) ( 1 )</p>	<p><b>STATUS:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><u>Five Year Infrastructure Plan.</u> An internal SGC Sustainable Infrastructure working group met with the Department of Finance to discuss the 2014 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan, resulting in the Department’s release of budget letter #14-20 on August 22<sup>nd</sup>. Budget letters are released to update agencies and departments on the requirements of budget requests for the following year. This letter requests additional information from departments regarding the plans, programs, directives or policies that they use to screen infrastructure proposals for consistency with the state's planning priorities. This advice, when executed, will provide the SGC with significant information on the alignment of budget requests and the state’s planning priorities. It marks the next step in the creation of a systematic, sustainable and transparent approach to the SGC’s review of the Five Year Infrastructure Plan.</p> <p><u>Research.</u> The working group expanded its partnership with the California Research Bureau to study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current and potential alternate definitions of “infrastructure” as defined in the 29 separate State Codes and Office of Administrative Law’s California Code of Regulations.</li> <li>• The state’s critical infrastructure networks as defined by State agencies and departments’ plans, policies and priorities.</li> <li>• Innovative legislation, policies, practices, processes, and metrics used by other states that are at the forefront of managing infrastructure spending that focuses on resiliency, and fundamental environmental, social, and economic goals.</li> </ul> <p><u>Additional Research.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaborating with the State Controller’s Office, the working group is in the process of identifying and reporting on infrastructure expenditures for fiscal year ending June 30, 2015. Since almost three-fifths<sup>1</sup> of the state’s total infrastructure spending over the last decade was distributed to and administered by local agencies, staff will review local assistance funds, in addition to capital outlay funds, to understand which expenditures represent investments in infrastructure.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> A [Ten-Year Perspective: California Infrastructure Spending](#), LAO, August 2011

		<p><u>Attachments:</u> Working Group Activities Summary, DOF Budget Letter #14-20.</p>
<p><b>8</b></p>	<p><b>SB 375 Implementation</b>  PRC 75125 (a )</p>	<p><b>STATUS:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><u>MPO Self-Assessment:</u> A draft report has been submitted to the SGC from the Consultant. In addition to the MPO Self-Assessment, staff has proposed state agency and stakeholder feedback of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) process to complement the MPO self-assessment and provide a broader perspective on the development of the SCSs. This activity may generate possible recommendations for SGC and member agency support for more effective SCS processes in the future. SGC facilitation of future stakeholder feedback of the SCS process is pending availability of staff resources.</p> <p><u>UrbanFootprint:</u> UC Davis has developed a draft training curriculum and recruited a small group of MPO and city planning participants to pilot test this in a class that will result a revised user guide and refined curricula. Training is expected to begin Fall 2014.</p> <p><u>UrbanFootprint Public Health:</u> SGC has convened experts in the public health, epidemiology, transportation, and planning fields to discuss methodologies associated with the depiction of potential activity-based health impacts in scenario planning models. In collaboration with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), SGC convened this Technical Advisory Committee to address data and methodological issues and recommend new practices. The advisory committee meeting was held in July 2014 and resulted in recommendations for data use and statistical analysis. These recommendations are expected to result in improved analysis. A test of this refined process is underway using SACOG modeling and planning scenarios. A Technical Advisory and Policy Committee Meeting will be convened in Fall 2014 to review how the proposed methodology and updated datasets performed when applied to SACOG land use scenarios.</p> <p><u>State Agency-MPO Coordination.</u> Pending. SGC staff proposes support of the State Agency/MPO SB 375 Implementation Working Group, an existing interdisciplinary partnership between the State, represented by the SGC, and MPOs to share progress and challenges to SB 375 implementation. Logistical and technical support for this Group would enable increased collaboration and information sharing specific to transportation and land use scenario planning models, data coordination, regional conservation strategies, and infill development.</p>
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>Geospatial Data Coordination</b>  <i>Provide, fund, and distribute data and information to local governments and regional agencies that will assist in</i></p>	<p><b>STATUS:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p>SGC entered into a contract with UC Davis to support the convening of the GIS Collaborative to support statewide coordination of GIS data and policy issues with federal, state, regional, and local partners. The GIS Collaborative is serving as the basis for reconvening the California GIS Council. The Council continues to meet on a regular</p>

	<p><i>developing and planning sustainable communities.</i></p> <p><b>PRC 75125 ( c )</b></p>	<p>basis and has developed and is using listserv technology to exchange views on a broad variety relevant topics.</p> <p>Workgroups consisting of specialists in each of the major fields of spatial data interest to the SGC have been formed and they will be used to advise the SGC and the State Geographic Information Officer on matters of technology, policy and priority data development.</p>
<p><b>7</b></p>	<p><b>Grants</b></p> <p><i>“Manage and award grants and loans to support the planning and development of sustainable communities</i></p> <p>PRC 75125 ( d )</p>	<p><b>STATUS:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><u>Sustainable Communities Planning Grant and Incentives Program.</u> The Council awarded \$16.2 million in Round Three of the Sustainable Communities Planning Grants Program to 33 applicants at the June 3, 2014 Council Meeting. The Department of Conservation is currently executing grant agreements with the grantees.</p> <p><u>Urban Greening Project and Planning Grants.</u> The Council awarded \$22.9 million in Round Three of the Urban Greening Planning and Project Grants Program. Grants were made to 37 applicants at the June 3, 2014 Council Meeting. The California Natural Resources Agency is currently executing grant agreements with the grantees.</p> <p><u>Sustainable Communities Implementation Program.</u> In July 2014, the Budget Act of 2014 appropriated \$130 million from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) for the FY 2014-15 budget to the SGC to develop and administer the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program. Accompanying legislation, SB 862, apportions 20 percent of the GGRF’s proceeds on an annual basis to the AHSC program beginning in FY 2015-16.</p> <p>There are two key components of the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program: 1) the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program which contains the housing, transportation and infrastructure components of this program, and 2) the Sustainable Agricultural Lands Conservation (SALC) Program, which contains the agricultural lands conservation component of the program.</p> <p>At its July 10 Council Meeting, the Council approved the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) within the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing (BCSH) Agency to implement the housing, transportation and infrastructure components of this program, and the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) or Department of Conservation (DOC) to implement the agricultural lands conservation component. CNRA, with support from DOC, is administering the agricultural lands conservation component, now called the Sustainable Agricultural Lands Conservation (SALC) Program.</p> <p>Both programs are currently in guideline development phase, and have released draft guidelines for public comment on September 23, 2014. Both programs will hold public workshops on the two components in late October. For more information, please refer the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Staff Report (Agenda Item #8).</p>

<b>10</b>	<b>Outreach</b>	<p><b>STATUS:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><u>Local Outreach and Sustainable Communities Learning Network.</u> No updates to report since last Executive Report to the Council on June 3, 2014. Agreement complete.</p> <p><u>SGC Outreach to Grantees.</u> SGC continues to communicate with our grantees and the general public through our listserv. The SGC website is in transition to a new format. The format is now operational and the site is being populated with important announcements, information, and links to valuable resources.</p> <p><u>SGC Local Implementation.</u> This Council supported project will evaluate how first round of SCPGIP grantees completing “physical development plans” have succeeded in moving forward towards shovel ready projects that promote community equity, and creates safe, healthy communities with strong economies and protected natural resources. Work is scheduled to begin in December, 2014 and be completed by July, 2015.</p>
<b>5</b>	<b>Health in All Policies</b> PRC 75125 ( a )	<p><b>STATUS:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><u>Attachment.</u> A two-page summary of up-to-date HiAP efforts follows this report. HiAP Staff will provide its annual update of implementation plans at the September 18, 2014 SGC meeting.</p>
<b>6</b>	<b>HSR Community Planning /Sustainability</b> PRC 75125 ( c )	<p><b>STATUS:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p>SGC staff is in the process of identifying planning and coordination opportunities in communities along the high-speed rail corridor. One of the goals is to leverage the development of high-speed rail to achieve local sustainability, economic, and real estate development objectives and to align local planning with state planning goals; identify gaps in local and regional resources (including information needs, capacity gaps, opportunities for policy change, and funding); and work with State agencies, SGC, and other stakeholders throughout the state and nation to fill these resource gaps and develop new best practices in high-speed rail community planning.</p>
<b>9</b>	<b>Funding Wizard</b> PRC 75125 ( a )	<p><b>STATUS:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><u>Funding Wizard:</u> No updates to report since last Executive Report to the Council on June 3, 2014. This ARB managed project received \$50,000 in SGC funding to continue developing and refining a unified site for institutions seeking grant awards to get information on state granting programs. Specific efforts focus on engagement, training, and outreach; Tool development to enhance the user experience; and, expanded analytics and metrics to track overall success. Work will continue through December 2015.</p> <p>This program has become the second most popular place on the “Cool California” website. The Funding Wizard received over 18,000 unique page views constituting almost 19% of all site traffic. It does not contain an exhaustive inventory of such programs but it is working its way in that direction.</p>

11

**Data Contracts**

PRC 75125 ( c )

**STATUS:** Ongoing.

Parcel Data Contract. The California Department of Technology and UC Davis with support from the SGC have completed the first seamless, border-to-border parcel data set in California's history. The second round of parcel data collection from California counties is preceding but not without significant problems. Unfortunately the Assessors of several major California Counties have refused to collaborate without the payment of large fees. It is their opinion that California law only requires them to deliver parcel boundary data to the public at the cost of reproduction. The Assessors contend that all other data they collect can be sold for the cost of development, production, storage, retrieval and reproduction resulting in requested recharges of over \$10,000 in at least one county. Council staff is seeking legal guidance on this matter.

A map depicting the status of Round 2 data collection can be found

at: <http://ucdsoftware.maps.arcgis.com/apps/OnePane/basicviewer/index.html?appid=6a7e3ee924584d98bf103176f2fc3022>

Vegetation Mapping Contract. A new Interagency Agreement with California State University, Chico Research Foundation was executed to map high priority areas within the proposed corridor of the California High Speed Rail (HSR) over Tehachapi Pass at the southern end of the Sierra Nevada Mountains in Kern County. Work started on this project on February 14, 2014 and will be completed on January 31, 2016. This project continues to be on schedule.

Protected Lands Contract. Completed Summer 2014. Developing a GIS database of protected lands in California that will be available free of charge along with guidelines for updating, sharing and maintaining this data. This GIS database will include the spatial representation and attribution of fee owned lands (California Protected Areas Database) and privately held conservation easements (California Conservation Easement Database). More information is available at: [www.CALands.org](http://www.CALands.org)

Healthy Community Indicators Contract. Ongoing. CDPH staff are working with UCSF and have identified 56 indicators and data sources, and are consistent with indicators proposed by other SGC-funded indicator projects (Regional Progress Report, SANDAG transportation indicators, EGPR). The project has developed methods to construct indicators, and has completed statewide data files for 21 indicators in collaboration with county health departments, MPOs, and other stakeholders. Excel files, templates for maps, graphs, tables, and explanatory text, including metadata, for indicators at census tract, place, county, MPO regions, and the state are posted at the CDPH website: <http://www.cdph.ca.gov/programs/Pages/HealthyCommunityIndicators.aspx>.

Some HCI files have also been posted at the Health and Human Services Open Data Portal (<https://health.data.ca.gov/>), where the Socrata platform allows data visualization tools.

Staff are preparing the final project deliverables, due October 31, 2014:

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How-To Manual and Illustrative Guide (~60 pages)</li> <li>2. Technical Manual on construction of 56 indicators (~300 p)</li> <li>3. Plan for Centralized Collection, Analysis, and Reporting (~30 pages)</li> </ol> <p>UCSF has contracted with Echo Technology Solutions to start development of a non-public demonstration website that can dynamically present an interactive data dashboard and single drill-down views of indicators tables, graphs, maps, and explanatory text based on user supplied criteria of geography, time period, and population characteristic (e.g. race/ethnicity, income, transportation mode). Technical documentation for the website is being developed and is included as a deliverable.</p> <p><u>Technology Support for Development and Implementation of the SGC's Sustainability Objectives.</u> Pending Council Approval. SGC planning projects have common requirements for data access, aggregation, management, analysis, presentation and reporting. This contract will support SGC staff and grantee needs with a customized web-based information management platform that would address the data requirements for the development, implementation, monitoring and reporting of awarded projects. This platform would allow for stronger projects by ensuring that data are being appropriately used to address complex issues and changing priorities in greenprints, sustainability planning, energy planning, climate action, and other components of integrated regional planning. Analytical and reporting tools will be linked to the system, and new functions would be constructed to support the development and implementation of SGC Projects and Integrated Regional Plans.</p>
<p><b>12</b></p>	<p><b>Regional Progress Report</b> PRC 75125 ( c )</p>	<p><b>STATUS:</b> Pending identification of resources.</p> <p><u>Regional Progress Report.</u> SCG staff received draft recommendations for the 2013 Regional Progress Report update from consultants in May 2013. These recommendations are available on the SGC website. Ongoing efforts to produce the report are pending additional funding.</p> <p><u>Indicator Coordination.</u> SGC is working with OPR, CDPH, and others to coordinate data and indicator projects throughout the State. Current efforts focus on recommending indicators for the State's Environmental Goals and Policies.</p>

## **Health in All Policies Task Force Update to the Strategic Growth Council June 2014 - October 2014**

The California Health in All Policies (HiAP) Task Force was charged by Executive Order S-04-10 in 2010 to identify priority programs, policies, and strategies to improve the health of Californians while also advancing the goals of the Strategic Growth Council (SGC). The Task Force consists of representatives from 22 State agencies, departments, and offices, who contribute their time to this initiative. The Task Force is facilitated by the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) and staffing is provided through a partnership with the Public Health Institute (PHI), with funding from multiple sources. The mandate that created the Office of Health Equity (OHE), housed within CDPH, requires the office and Task Force to work collaboratively to advance health equity in California. This update report shares highlights of Task Force work for the period of activity from June through October of this year. Progress continues on 8 implementation plans endorsed by the SGC.

### **Highlights of Task Force work and interagency projects:**

- The HiAP Task Force held its **fall quarterly meeting** on September 3<sup>rd</sup>. Task Force members used the meeting to review commitments and finalize language for the Active Transportation action plan and identify priority topics for future exploration, pending available resources.
- Between August and September, HiAP staff conducted **annual one-on-one meetings** with sixteen out of twenty-two HiAP Task Force member organizations. These meetings provide an opportunity for Task Force members and staff to stay informed of each organization's current priorities and goals, touch base on existing projects, explore emerging opportunities for collaboration, and discuss any barriers that have been encountered.
- The HiAP Task Force has created a new 2014 **Active Transportation** action plan, which represents significant commitments to advancing active transportation infrastructure, policy, and safety. This plan was created through a collaborative effort between more than fifteen government agencies and departments, with input from a variety of community stakeholders, and has been approved by the Task Force. The action plan includes a wide variety of collaborative commitments and specific action steps to promote active transportation over the next two years. Please see the plan itself for more details.
- HiAP staff partnered with the Local Government Commission to hold public input sessions and create a **Crime Prevention through Environmental Design** Guidebook for community planners. The guidebook is currently under review and is anticipated to be released within the year.
- Promoting **Access to Healthy Food** remains a priority for the Task Force. HiAP staff are collaborating with the Department of Food and Agriculture, the Department of Education, and CDPH to explore creating a new scope of work for the Farm-to-fork Office. The HiAP staff team also placed a graduate intern within the Farm-to-Fork office to execute projects related to improving the availability of locally grown food in the school environment.
- HiAP staff and Task Force members will collaborate with the Office of Planning and Research to conduct outreach to stakeholders once the updated **General Plan Guidelines** are ready for public comment.

### **Highlights of infrastructure and capacity development for the Task Force:**

- Several Task Force representatives are engaged in the SGC's Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program Work Group and Steering Committee, and are bringing their expertise in HiAP and co-benefits to the development of program guidelines and processes.

- The OHE Advisory Committee includes one HiAP Task Force representative, who serves as a liaison between the Task Force and the OHE strategic planning and implementation process.

**Highlights of HiAP external capacity building and outreach:**

- The California HiAP Task Force continues to be a model for other states and communities in California, and staff frequently receive requests for presentations. For example, staff:
  - Facilitated a roundtable discussion on Health in All Policies during the National Network of Public Health Institute's (NNPHI) 2014 conference in New Orleans in June
  - Gave an update on the Task Force to the County Health Executives Association of California in Sacramento in August, and
  - Gave a presentation on HiAP to the Reforming States Group of the Milbank Memorial Fund in Chicago, also in August.
- The Institute of Medicine just released a report "Applying a Health Lens to Decision Making in Non-Health Sectors - Workshop Summary," which includes a summary of a presentation made in September 2013 by Dr. Connie Mitchell and Dr. Linda Rudolph on HiAP and the California Task Force.
- CDPH cited the HiAP Task Force's active transportation recommendations as part of their successful case to secure resources to pilot an employee bicycle sharing program.

For further information please see [http://www.sgc.ca.gov/s\\_hiap.php](http://www.sgc.ca.gov/s_hiap.php) or contact [hiap@cdph.ca.gov](mailto:hiap@cdph.ca.gov).

## ACTIVITIES SUMMARY - APRIL THROUGH SEPTEMBER, 2014

**Purpose:** Collaborate with the Department of Finance (DOF) to explore how the Five-Year Infrastructure planning process can better address the State's Planning Priorities and the Strategic Growth Council's objectives; and to develop a set of optional future initiatives for the Council's consideration creating leadership and direction to member agencies about investing in infrastructure that is sustainable and resilient to the impacts of climate change.

**Working Group Members:** Louise Bedsworth, OPR; Kate White, CalSTA; Nicolas Heidorn, CalEPA; and Liz Grassi, SGC.

### Objectives:

1. Review California's 2014 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan and offer DOF suggestions for improvements.
2. Depict total expenditures paid by the State for infrastructure projects during fiscal year 2012-13.
3. Develop a set of options resulting in increased State investments in sustainable infrastructure for the Council to consider.

### Work Plan:

1. Review and comment on California's 2014 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan, and develop suggestions for DOF to consider that would improve the 2015 edition of the Plan.
2. Acquire fiscal year 2012-13 data from the State Controller's Office (SCO), analyzing and categorizing funds expended for state- and locally owned infrastructure.
3. Collaborate with the California Research Bureau (CRB) on research that results in:
  - A summary of how California defines "infrastructure" through statutes and policies.
  - In-depth interviews with senior staff in other states that have adopted statutes or implemented statewide policies prioritizing climate resiliency as a condition for funding infrastructure investments.
  - An outline of California's critical infrastructure network (e.g. hospitals, emergency response facilities, trade routes, natural systems, etc.) as identified by State agencies and departments.
4. Develop options that build collaboration among member agencies, and promote infrastructure investments that prioritize sustainable practices and resiliency to the impacts of a changing climate for Council consideration.

### Outcomes:

- ❖ DOF and the Legislative Analyst's Office collaboration for the initial review of the Five-Year Infrastructure Plan.
- ❖ Engaging with the SCO to acquire and understand the data necessary to analyze infrastructure expenditures.
- ❖ An internal review of the 2014 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan and a set of draft recommendations on how the State can better communicate its success with aligning infrastructure investments with the Planning Priorities.
- ❖ A CRB workplan describing the work to be performed, a timeline for completion, and final products.
- ❖ DOF Budget Letter (BL 14-20), dated 8/22/2014, requesting departments to list policy documents, guidance, or processes for assessing consistency with California's Planning Priorities in department infrastructure plans.
- ❖ Four (4) draft options developed for coordinating more sustainable infrastructure:
  - Improving the Five-Year Infrastructure Plan.
  - Infrastructure investment project review and approval.
  - Comprehensive statewide infrastructure planning.
  - Prioritizing infrastructure investments that are resilient to the effects of climate change.
- ❖ A document outlining efforts in six (6) other States to advance statewide statutes or policies that prioritize resiliency to climate as an essential component for investing in infrastructure.

# BUDGET LETTER

		NUMBER: 14-20
SUBJECT: CAPITAL OUTLAY FIVE-YEAR INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN BUDGET SUBMISSION FOR 2015-16, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF FINANCIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR CALIFORNIA (FI\$CAL)		DATE ISSUED: August 22, 2014
REFERENCES: STATE ADMINISTRATIVE MANUAL SEC 6821, ET. SEQ. AND AB 1473 (CHAPTER 606, STATUTES OF 1999)		SUPERSEDES: BL 11-09

TO: Agency Secretaries  
 Department Directors  
 Department Budget and Accounting Officers  
 Department of Finance Budget and Accounting Staff

FROM: DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

**NOTE: Budget Officers are requested to forward a copy of this Budget Letter to the Department's Facilities Manager as well as program personnel with capital outlay infrastructure needs.**

<i>Deadlines and Deliverables</i>	
September 2, 2014	Five-Year Infrastructure Plans, including all required supporting documentation, due to your Department of Finance budget analyst.
October 1, 2014	Deferred Maintenance Information.
	FI\$CAL Capital Outlay Instructions

This Budget Letter (BL) provides detailed instructions and due dates for submitting Major and Minor Capital Outlay Budget Change Proposals (COBCPs), Five-Year Infrastructure Plans, and deferred maintenance information. This BL also provides information regarding FI\$Cal that affects all departments with capital outlay programs.

Major COBCPs; detailed Minor COBCPs and a summary Minor COBCP, if applicable; and Five-Year Infrastructure Plans are due by **September 2, 2014**, as indicated in BL 14-05. Deferred maintenance information is due by **October 1, 2014**. Any state agency with capital outlay needs in 2015-16 through 2019-20 must submit a Five-Year Infrastructure Plan, including the necessary COBCPs and/or Capital Outlay Concept Papers (COCPs) as detailed in this BL.

## 1. Submittal of the 2015 Five-Year Infrastructure Plans, COBCPs, and COCPs.

### A. FIVE-YEAR INFRASTRUCTURE PLANS

The Governor is required to annually submit a Five-Year Infrastructure Plan in conjunction with the Governor's Budget. The 2014 Infrastructure Plan evaluated the state's infrastructure needs in the overall context of available funding sources, what the state could afford, and how the state could grow in the most sustainable way possible. The 2014 Infrastructure Plan focused the limited available resources on core state responsibilities. The 2015 Infrastructure Plan will update the 2014 Infrastructure Plan keeping the same principles in mind. The 2014 Infrastructure Plan can be

found at the following link: [http://www.dof.ca.gov/capital\\_outlay/reports/documents/2014-Infrastructure-Plan\\_WEB.pdf](http://www.dof.ca.gov/capital_outlay/reports/documents/2014-Infrastructure-Plan_WEB.pdf). As stated in the 2015-16 Budget Policy Letter (BL 14-12), in order to maintain a structurally balanced budget, departments' ability to submit COBCPs for the 2015-16 Budget remains limited, regardless of funding source. COBCPs should only be submitted for the 2015-16 Budget that are either for (a) existing or ongoing capital outlay projects, or (b) new capital outlay projects, if critical, such as fire/life safety, or court ordered projects.

In addition to the required COBCPs and COCPs described in more detail below, departments are reminded they also need to submit, as part of their plans, the following narrative information to their Finance budget analyst if they have a capital outlay need:

- Department's mission and program responsibilities
- Description of the department's existing facilities
- Summary of the department's drivers of infrastructure need
- Summary of the department's proposal, and
- Description of how their plan is consistent with AB 857 (Chapter 1016, Statutes of 2002) Planning Guidelines.

Departments included in the 2014 Infrastructure Plan are not required to submit a revised narrative for mission and program responsibilities, description of its existing facilities, and drivers of need if there are no changes or required updates from what was included in the 2014 Infrastructure Plan.

Departments not included in the 2014 Infrastructure Plan should use the 2014 Infrastructure Plan as a guideline when developing their narrative sections. The narrative document should be emailed to their capital outlay Finance budget analyst by September 2, 2014.

**AB 857 Planning Guidelines:** All Five-Year Infrastructure Plans must consider the state planning priorities, as required by Government Code section 65041.1, including, but not limited to the following:

- Promote infill development by rehabilitating existing infrastructure.
- Protect environmental and agricultural resources by protecting and preserving the state's most valuable natural resources.
- Encourage efficient development patterns by ensuring that infrastructure associated with development, other than infill, support efficient use of land and is appropriately planned for growth.

All state entities are required to provide a narrative explanation of how these planning priorities have been incorporated into their five-year infrastructure plan on a statewide basis as it relates to programmatic drivers and infrastructure needs as reported in the Five-Year Infrastructure Plans. If your department has policy documents, guidance, or processes for assessing consistency with California's Planning Priorities that are useful in designing and selecting projects to implement your infrastructure plan requests, list these instruments and web links in the narrative section of your infrastructure plan.

Because these planning priorities are most relevant at the project level, **the COBCP includes a section to describe how each project is or is not consistent with these statewide planning priorities.** Additional justification must be provided for projects that are not consistent with these statewide planning priorities to be considered for funding.

## B. MAJOR CAPITAL OUTLAY

All COBCPs and COCPs for all *major* capital outlay projects proposed for the 2015-16 Governor's Budget and the 2015 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan must be submitted to Finance no later than **September 2, 2014**.

**Reminder**—State agencies requesting new or expanded facilities must clearly demonstrate how existing facilities do not meet programmatic needs and keep in mind the Administration's desire to fund critical core state infrastructure within limited available resources.

- **Documents Required to Request Capital Outlay Funds:**
  - ✓ For budget year and project specific out-year proposals included in the Five-Year Infrastructure Plan: COBCP(s) as described in Attachment 1 and Fiscal Impact Worksheet (FIW) as described in Attachment 4.
  - ✓ For conceptual proposals: COCP(s) as described in Attachment 3 and FIW as described in Attachment 4.
  - ✓ For **ALL** proposals: COBCPs, COCPs, and FIWs **must be submitted electronically as Word documents or Excel spreadsheets to the appropriate Finance capital outlay budget analyst.**
  - ✓ All documents submitted to Finance must also be provided in hard copy.
- **When to Prepare a COBCP:** Complete COBCPs are required for all new projects or capitalized leases (See Attachment 1) proposed for inclusion in the 2015-16 Governor's Budget. For continuing phases of previously funded projects, departments must submit a complete COBCP and FIW; *any* changes to the cost or scope of the project must be clearly identified and justified.
- **Requesting Budget Packages:** Budget packages are used to verify feasibility, scope, and costs of projects. Finance may utilize infrastructure planning funds for budget packages when Finance determines a budget package is required for a specific project and funding is not otherwise available. Departments may submit requests to Finance to fund specific budget packages or utilize departmental support funds to contract with the Department of General Services (DGS), Real Estate Services Division, prior to submission of COBCPs. However, use of support funds does not guarantee future funding of a project, so departments are advised to check with Finance prior to initiating their own budget package.
- **Agency Review and Distribution:** Five-Year Plans, including COBCPs and COCPs must be approved by the Agency Secretary, as applicable, *prior to* submission to Finance. After agency approval, submit:
  - ✓ Three copies to: Department of Finance, Capital Outlay Unit, 915 L Street, Ninth Floor. (Submit *four* copies to the Capital Outlay Unit for projects based on enrollment/caseload/population changes, program workload adjustments, or program policy changes [the additional copy will be given to the Finance support analyst]).

These copies are in addition to any copies that the Agency Secretary may require.

- **Major Capital Outlay Budget Reminders:**
  - ✓ A capital outlay appropriation is required for the acquisition of real property or any lesser interest in real property (includes, but not limited to, capitalized leases, easements, purchase options, and rights-of-way), except as otherwise authorized.
  - ✓ All major capital outlay projects are subject to the administrative oversight of the State Public Works Board (PWB) unless specifically exempted. Departments must follow PWB and

Finance administrative requirements when implementing projects. Questions on these requirements should be directed to the Finance Capital Outlay Unit at (916) 445-9694.

- ✓ Augmentations to capital outlay appropriations may be made by the PWB in accordance with GC section 13332.11, through the Budget Act, or through special legislation.
- ✓ Project scope may **not** be altered except in conformance with GC section 13332.11. Finance determines which project changes are classified as scope changes. Project managers and departments must review potential scope changes with the Finance Capital Outlay Unit. **Unapproved scope changes may result in project termination.** To avoid project termination, it is recommended that departments exercise caution and discuss any potential scope changes with Finance **before** proceeding with those changes.
- ✓ Funds may not be transferred between major capital outlay projects, unless specifically authorized in the Budget Act or by other statute.
- ✓ Capital outlay appropriations and reappropriations are generally available for three years. However, appropriations for preliminary plans and working drawings are only available for encumbrance for one year. Construction appropriations are available for encumbrance for up to three years, but revert at the end of the first year of appropriation if Finance has not allocated the funding through fund transfer or approval to proceed to bid (see Section 1.80 of the 2014 Budget Act for current availability periods for all project phases).

### C. MINOR CAPITAL OUTLAY

Minor capital outlay is any project under **\$634,000** which has been specifically budgeted as a minor project and which a department has been authorized to implement directly pursuant to Public Contract Code section 10108. Resources Agency capital outlay projects up to \$872,000 may be budgeted as minor projects with the concurrence of Finance. Departments may not circumvent the budget process by “piecemealing” larger projects through several minor projects.

- **Deadlines and Distribution:** Minor capital outlay projects are included in the five-year program as a lump sum for each of the five years. A single summary COBCP is also required for minor projects. Send two copies to Finance and two copies to DGS.
  - ✓ **Augmentations:** A minor capital outlay project is not subject to PWB oversight, and by practice the PWB does not augment projects not subject to its approval. However, Finance may authorize increases to the amount approved for a minor project by redirection within the department’s minor program within the same fiscal year if the increase does not result in a project that exceeds the minor capital outlay limit as set forth in Public Contract Code section 10108.

## 2. DEFERRED MAINTENANCE

For the first time, the 2014 Infrastructure Plan highlighted the state’s deferred maintenance need that is traditionally funded as part of a department’s operations budget. The 2014 Infrastructure Plan estimated the statewide deferred maintenance need to be \$64.6 billion. The 2015 Infrastructure Plan will update this estimate.

Departments are required to provide a detailed list of their identified deferred maintenance need, if one exists, to their capital outlay Finance budget analyst by **October 1, 2014**. The list should include the following information: department name, project location, project title/description, and estimated project cost. To the extent possible, the projects should be in priority order. This information should be submitted in an Excel format consistent with the template provided in Attachment 5. This template can be emailed to each department upon request. Please note that the identified deferred maintenance

needs of each department should be reviewed and approved by their respective agencies prior to submittal to Finance.

While Finance is collecting this information for the 2015 Infrastructure Plan, it is not known at this time if any additional funding will be available in the 2015-16 Governor's Budget to address these needs. Regardless, departments must submit their estimated deferred maintenance needs to their capital outlay Finance budget analyst, recognizing that these needs will be considered along with other Administration priorities during the budget development process.

### **3. FISCAL Capital Outlay Update Instructions**

As noted in BL 14-07, Wave 1 departments are not anticipated to have capital outlay projects. All other departments (non-Wave 1) with a capital outlay request are required to submit signed hard copies and electronic copies of their COBCPs, COCPs, and FIWs. The electronic and hardcopies will be used by Finance staff to enter the project data into FISCAL.

Departments can submit their requests on the existing COBCP, COCP and FIW forms available prior to this BL or the slightly modified forms provided with this BL and available on Finance's website. Any COBCPs included in the 2015 Infrastructure Plan will need to be on the new forms prior to January 5, 2015. Program, Project, and Subfund information can be found at the following link: [http://www.dof.ca.gov/FISCAL\\_Resources/view.php](http://www.dof.ca.gov/FISCAL_Resources/view.php).

If you have any questions, please contact your Finance capital outlay budget analyst at (916) 445-9694.

/s/ Karen Finn

Karen Finn  
Program Budget Manager

Attachments

## CAPITAL OUTLAY BUDGET CHANGE PROPOSALS

A Capital Outlay Budget Change Proposal (COBCP) is required for all capital outlay projects (both major and minor) proposed for the Governor's Budget and for certain capitalized leases that do not have prior legislative authority. This attachment provides:

- An overview of the purpose of the COBCP.
- Additional information on when a COBCP is required.
- A sample of the required COBCP format. *An electronic copy of the COBCP form and instructions for completion with illustrations are available on the Department of Finance (Finance) website at: [http://www.dof.ca.gov/html/budletr/forms/fin\\_form.htm](http://www.dof.ca.gov/html/budletr/forms/fin_form.htm).*

**Purpose of the COBCP:** In broad terms, the COBCP justifies the funding request. Specifically, the COBCP must:

- Define the department's problem and establish its significance.
- Provide basic background and detail of alternatives considered.
- Demonstrate that the department has explored all reasonable alternatives to solving the problem and offered the most logical and cost-effective solution.
- Provide detailed documentation for the proposed solution and its cost.
- Explain how the project supports the department's strategic plan.

Finance will consider only those proposals that **convincingly** meet all five of these requirements.

### A COBCP (or an updated COBCP) is required for:

- **Any request for a capital outlay appropriation**, whether for acquisition of land, structures, or construction, including minor projects. A COBCP is also required for project augmentations that exceed the State Public Works Board's (PWB's) augmentation authority (i.e., over 20 percent).
- **Requests for Finance Letters** to adjust an existing project proposal, whether for technical or policy reasons, or to add an urgent new proposal.
- **Requests to enter into a lease-purchase agreement for capital assets.** Although no capital expenditure is made under a lease-purchase agreement, a capital acquisition does occur. If the authorization for a lease-purchase is sought through the Budget Act, the department must submit a COBCP comparing alternatives to meeting its space requirements and demonstrating, through a cost-benefit analysis, that a lease-purchase agreement is the most cost-beneficial method of project delivery.
- **Exercising a purchase option on capital assets.** Exercising a purchase option (even a \$1 purchase option) requires a capital outlay appropriation. An updated COBCP must be submitted showing that the proposed acquisition is still cost-beneficial considering any possible changes in program need, lease market conditions, and state construction alternatives.
- **Entering into any other lease which meets the definition of *capitalized lease*.** A lease agreement is a capitalized lease (in substance, a purchase) when substantially all of the risks and benefits of ownership are assumed by the lessee. If a lease meets *any one of the following conditions*, it is a capitalized lease:

1. Ownership of the leased asset is transferred to the state at the end of the lease period.
2. The lease gives the lessee the option of purchasing the leased asset at a nominal value at some point during or at the end of the lease period.
3. The period of the lease (a *single* term of a lease, not including renewals) is 75 percent or more of the estimated useful life of the leased asset.
4. The present value of the minimum lease payments is 90 percent or more of the fair value of the leased asset (i.e., the lease payments over a *single* term of the lease are substantially the same as the purchase price).

Unless existing statute authorizes a capitalized lease, the lease requires specific legislative authority. If the Budget Act will be used to provide that authority, a COBCP is required whether or not a capital outlay appropriation is needed.

- **Modulars and trailers.** The purchase of modular buildings or trailers (temporaries) where the temporary is intended as a permanent facility must be submitted as a COBCP. Requests for modular buildings intended as an interim solution for a permanent facility or housing need must be submitted as a support budget request. In any event, both the Finance support and capital outlay analyst will concurrently review requests for temporaries to determine if the proposal is the most cost effective resolution to the identified problem.

- **Minor alterations projects authorized by Control Section 6.00 of the Budget Act.** Section 6.00 authorizes the use of support funds for some minor alteration projects (i.e., those costing less than \$634,000), subject to Finance approval and legislative notification for projects costing more than \$100,000. Requests must be submitted for review to the Finance Capital Outlay Unit with substantially the same information as required in a COBCP. Finance approval is required prior to the encumbrance of funds.

Note: Acquisition projects funded via section 6.00 are subject to the same acquisition oversight requirements (e.g., State Public Works Board) as would be required for an acquisition funded via a capital outlay appropriation.

Additionally, if a support budget increase is needed as a result of a capital outlay project—including rent increases pursuant to a lease—a separate support BCP must also be submitted concurrent with the COBCP to the appropriate Finance support unit.

- **Group 2 equipment phases of projects.** Group 1, fixed equipment, is incorporated into or attached to the facility and therefore is included in the construction phase of a project. Group 2, movable equipment, is budgeted as a separate phase. For a COBCP requesting the Group 2 equipment phase of a project, provide the project appropriation history, including the project name, Budget Act items, and project code. Definitions of Group 1 and Group 2 equipment are provided in SAM section 6855.

For Group 2 equipment, identify how funding needs were determined. Show *all* items of equipment to be placed in a particular space, indicating whether the item is to be purchased by the agency or transferred from another building or location. Account for all equipment currently available in buildings to be replaced by the new structure. Final approval of equipment lists generally follows approval of preliminary plans. Exceptions to this rule are discussed in SAM section 6855.

Movable equipment that does not meet the definition of capital outlay per SAM section 6806 is not a capital outlay expenditure. These costs are proposed and funded in the state operations appropriation (i.e., additional funding may be requested via a support budget change proposal).

- **Coordination of STD. 9s with COBCPs and BCPs.** Departments submit space action requests (STD. 9s) for:
  - ✓ New or additional space (including swing space), lease extensions, or renewals desired by an agency in non-institutional buildings—whether state-owned or leased.
  - ✓ Re-locatable buildings and trailers.

Finance approval of a STD. 9 does not constitute approval for a support budget increase or a capital outlay appropriation, or approval to include authorization language for a lease-purchase, purchase option, or option execution in the Budget Act. If any of these is required, either a support BCP or a COBCP (or both) must be submitted to Finance. SAM section 6453 provides additional information.

- **Architectural and Engineering (A&E) fees.** A&E fees (basic and non-basic) are charged for architectural and engineering work performed either by the department or by consulting professionals. Expenses may also include project-related construction management support, such as construction inspection, travel, bidding expenses, and drawings. Contact DGS for assistance with budgeting A&E fees.
- **Swing space for capital outlay projects.** Swing space (i.e., temporary accommodations during a facility remodel) is a state operations cost that must be noted as informational on the COBCP but requested separately as a support BCP.
- **Allowable cost indices.** Departments must use the California Construction Cost Index (CCCI). Use of any other index requires Finance concurrence. **Budget Letter 10-15** outlines the current process for establishing the base CCCI for a project and how to estimate future construction costs (currently 0.42 percent per month to the start and midpoint of construction).

<b>STATE OF CALIFORNIA</b> <b>CAPITAL OUTLAY</b> <b>BUDGET CHANGE PROPOSAL (COBCP)</b> <b>COVER PAGE (REV 08/14)</b>	<b>DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE</b> <b>915 L Street</b> <b>Sacramento, CA 95814</b> <b>IMS Mail Code: A15</b>
<b>BUDGET YEAR 2015-16</b>	

ORG CODE: \_\_\_\_\_ COBCP NO. \_\_\_\_\_ PRIORITY: \_\_\_\_\_ PROJECT ID: \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Business Unit/Entity)* *(15 digits; for new projects, leave blank)*

DEPARTMENT: \_\_\_\_\_

PROJECT TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

TOTAL REQUEST (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS): \$ \_\_\_\_\_ MAJOR/MINOR: \_\_\_\_\_

PHASE(S) TO BE FUNDED: \_\_\_\_\_ PROJ CAT: \_\_\_\_\_ CCCI/EPI: \_\_\_\_\_

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL:

HAS A BUDGET PACKAGE BEEN COMPLETED FOR THIS PROJECT? (E/U/N/?): \_\_\_\_\_

REQUIRES LEGISLATION (Y/N): \_\_\_\_\_ IF YES, LIST CODE SECTIONS: \_\_\_\_\_

REQUIRES PROVISIONAL LANGUAGE (Y/N) \_\_\_\_\_

IMPACT ON SUPPORT BUDGET: ONE-TIME COSTS (Y/N): \_\_ FUTURE COSTS (Y/N): \_\_

FUTURE SAVINGS (Y/N):\_\_ REVENUE (Y/N):\_\_

DOES THE PROPOSAL AFFECT ANOTHER DEPARTMENT (Y/N): \_\_\_\_\_ IF YES, ATTACH  
 COMMENTS OF AFFECTED DEPARTMENT SIGNED BY ITS DIRECTOR OR DESIGNEE.

**SIGNATURE APPROVALS:**

PREPARED BY \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_ REVIEWED BY \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_ AGENCY SECRETARY \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*

**DOF ANALYST USE**

DOF ISSUE # \_\_\_\_\_ PROGRAM CAT: \_\_\_\_\_ PROJECT CAT: \_\_\_\_\_ BUDG PACK STATUS: \_\_\_\_\_

ADDED REVIEW: SUPPORT: \_\_\_\_\_ OCIO: \_\_\_\_\_ FSCU/ITCU: \_\_\_\_\_ OSAE: \_\_\_\_\_ CALSTARS: \_\_\_\_\_

PPBA: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>STATE OF CALIFORNIA</b> <b>CAPITAL OUTLAY</b> <b>BUDGET CHANGE PROPOSAL (COBCP)</b> <b>NARRATIVE PAGE (REV 08/14)</b> <b>BUDGET YEAR 2015-16</b>	<b>DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE</b> <b>915 L Street</b> <b>Sacramento, CA 95814</b> <b>IMS Mail Code: A15</b>
---	---

ORG CODE: \_\_\_\_\_ COBCP NO. \_\_\_\_\_ PRIORITY: \_\_\_\_\_ PROJECT ID: \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Business Unit/Entity)* *(15 digits; for new projects, leave blank)*

*Using the attached page, follow the format outlined below and fully address all of the items. Use additional pages as needed. Certain projects may require additional information. Questions should be referred to DOF.*

- A. PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT: (problem, program need, infrastructure deficiency)
- B. RELATIONSHIP TO THE STRATEGIC PLAN: (relevance of problem/need to mission and goals)
- C. ALTERNATIVES: (for each, describe the proposed alternative and provide a brief summary of scope, cost, funding source, program benefits, facility management benefits, and impact on support budget)
- D. RECOMMENDED SOLUTION:
1. Which alternative and why?
  2. Detail scope description.
  3. Basis for cost information.
  4. Factors/benefits for recommended solution other than the least expensive alternative.
  5. Complete description of impact on support budget.
  6. Identify and explain any project risks.
  7. List requested interdepartmental coordination and/or special project approval (including mandatory reviews and approvals, e.g., technology proposals).

NARRATIVE, PAGE \_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_

E. Consistency with Government Code section 65041.1:

1. Does the recommended solution (project) promote infill development by rehabilitating existing infrastructure and how? Explain.
2. Does the project improve the protection of environmental and agricultural resources by protecting and preserving the state's most valuable natural resources? Explain.
3. Does the project encourage efficient development patterns by ensuring that infrastructure associated with development, other than infill, support efficient use of land and is appropriately planned for growth? Explain.

## CAPITAL OUTLAY BUDGET CONCEPT PAPER

A Capital Outlay Budget Concept Paper (COCP) is required for all conceptual capital outlay proposals included in the Five-Year Infrastructure Plan. This attachment provides:

- An overview of the purpose of the COCP.
- Information on when a COCP is required.
- A sample of the required COCP format. *An electronic copy of the COCP form and instructions for completion are available on the Department of Finance's (Finance) website at: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/budgeting/forms/view.php>.*

**Purpose of the COCP:** The COCP has been developed for use in place of the traditional COBCP for those needs that cannot be described as a specific project. To the extent possible, the COCP must justify the funding request. Specifically, the COCP must:

- Define the department's problem and establish its significance.
- Provide basic background and detail of alternatives considered.
- Demonstrate that the department has explored all reasonable alternatives to solving the problem and offered the most logical solution.
- Provide assumptions/methodology for the proposed solution and its cost.

**A COCP (or an updated COBCP) is required for:**

- **Any request for inclusion in the Five-Year Infrastructure Plan**, whether for acquisition of land, structures, or construction, including minor projects.

## Capital Outlay Concept Paper

**Plan Year:** (Year for which capital outlay plan is proposed)

**Department:** (Name of Department)

**Org. Code:** (Budget Unit/Entity)

**Program Category:**

**Program Subcategory:**

**Project Title:**

**Project ID:** (15 digits; existing projects only, for new projects leave blank)

**Funding Source:** (Fund Name and Code)

**Impact on Support Budget:**

Yes     No

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
<b>Cost</b>	\$\$\$	\$\$\$	\$\$\$	\$\$\$

	ASF/USF	GSF
New Construction		
Reconstruction		

1. Summary of Proposal:
2. Problem Identification:
3. Alternative Solutions Considered:
4. Detailed Project Description/Recommended Solution:
5. Summary of Space Standards/Methodology:
6. Summary of Cost Methodology:

<b>Approval:</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Printed Name</b>	<b>Date</b>
Preparer:			
Budget Officer:			
Department Director:			
Agency Secretary:			

## FISCAL IMPACT WORKSHEET

A Fiscal Impact Worksheet (FIW) is required for ALL capital outlay proposals, conceptual and project specific, included in the Five-Year Infrastructure Plan. This attachment provides:

- An overview of the purpose of the FIW.
- A sample of the required FIW format. *An electronic copy of the FIW form and instructions for completion are available on the Department of Finance (Finance) website at: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/budgeting/forms/view.php>*

**Purpose of the FIW:** The FIW serves as the source data of fiscal information for each project request. **IT IS CRITICAL TO FOLLOW THIS FORMAT.**

### **DO NOT ADD OR DELETE ROWS OR COLUMNS.**

- The Fiscal Impact Worksheet (lines 1 through 50 of the COBCP spreadsheet) is used to report a project's cost and funding data, schedules, and project specific codes.
- The Fiscal Detail Worksheet (lines 51 through 100 of the FIW) is used to collect detail information to support the cost/benefit analysis for the project.
- The Scope Worksheet (lines 101 through 111) is used to summarize the scope language related to a project.
- Dollars are to be displayed in thousands (**do not use whole dollars**).

**An FIW is required to be included with any request for inclusion in the Five-Year Infrastructure Plan.**

A separate FIW is to be completed for each project. All FIWs are to be submitted to the Finance capital outlay budget analyst electronically (one workbook containing all FIWs with tabs clearly labeled with each project's name) in addition to the hardcopy included in the COBCP.

