

**MOORPARK CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA REPORT**

TO: Honorable City Council

FROM: Yugal Lall, City Engineer/Public Works Director
Prepared by Ken Gilbert, Public Works Consultant 

DATE: July 20, 2006 (CC Meeting of 08/16/06)

SUBJECT: Underground Utility Project Priorities

BACKGROUND

1. This item was scheduled for City Council consideration at the August 2, 2006, meeting. Due to other lengthy items on the agenda, this matter was continued to the August 16, 2006, meeting.
2. The City Council Goals and Objectives include the following: ***“Evaluate funding sources and priorities for undergrounding of utility lines throughout the City.”***
3. In March of 2005, the City Council received a report which set forth a list of candidate “undergrounding” projects. The matter was referred to the Public Works, Facilities and Solid Waste Committee [Mayor Pro Tem Mikos and Councilmember Parvin], herein the “Committee”, for review and recommendation.
4. The initial recommendations of the Committee were presented to the City Council on January 18, 2006. At that meeting the City Council made certain suggested changes and referred the matter back to the Committee for further study.
5. The Committee has met on several occasions since January, to discuss the subject priority list. This report presents the most recent Committee recommendations on the matter.

DISCUSSION

A. City Council Direction: January 18, 2006

At its meeting of January 18, 2006, the City Council discussed the subject matter and then referred it back to the Committee for further review, with the following suggestions:

"DEVELOP A NEW WORK PLAN PRIORITIZING RESIDENTIAL OVER COMMERCIAL AND INCREASING POINTS ASSIGNED FOR SAFETY AND PROXIMITY TO SCHOOLS AND PARKS".

B. Location of Candidate Undergrounding Projects

Attached as Attachment 1 is a map showing all of the overhead electrical transmission and distribution lines in the City except the tall high voltage towers. These facilities identified on Attachment 1 have been grouped into twenty three separate candidate "undergrounding" projects, identified as Projects A thru T. The map also identifies the type of overhead utility lines on the poles: a) distribution; b) distribution & transmission; or c) transmission only. The attached maps also shows the location of all parks and schools.

C. Description of Candidate Projects

Attached as Attachment 2, is a chart which briefly describes the limits and scope of each of the twenty three candidate projects.

D. Estimated "Undergrounding" Costs

Attached as Attachment 3, is a chart which provides a preliminary cost estimate for each of the candidate projects. The total estimated cost for all of the projects listed is about \$56.7 million. It should be noted that these cost estimates are very preliminary in nature. Although the unit prices cited in Attachment 3 were derived based on staff's experience and input from the Southern California Edison Company (SCE), there has been no effort made to ask SCE to perform preliminary engineering and to develop cost estimates for any of these projects. It is likely, therefore, that cost estimates developed by such a more in depth and site specific process, would yield a different cost estimate. Accordingly, the costs listed in Attachment 3 are merely "ballpark" figures.

E. Evaluation Criteria

1. **Evaluation Criteria:** The following criteria was considered in evaluating and ranking the projects:
 - a. Land Use: Land Use is a good measure of community and “people” impact.
 - b. Type of Street: The type of street is also an indicator of “people” impact. Arterial streets were given the highest, followed by collector streets and then residential streets.
 - c. Safety: Two points are given for poles located on a street and another two points are given if the project runs past a school or a park.
 - d. Aesthetics: One to three points are given to certain projects for aesthetic impacts and/or proximity to sensitive areas.

2. **Cost:** Project cost was not considered in evaluating and ranking the projects. Small projects and larger more expensive projects compete on equal footing. In this way the availability and amount of funding does not affect the priority ranking.

F. Project Evaluation and Ranking

1. **Two Alternative Methodologies:** The Committee’s previous recommendation gave Commercial Land Use the highest priority followed by Residential, Industrial and Open Space. At the January 2006 City Council meeting, the Committee was asked to review an option giving Residential Land Use a higher priority. Both methods are discussed below.

2. **Commercial Land Use Priority:** Designating Commercial Land Use as the higher priority, yields the following scoring criteria:

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Scoring Factor</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Highest Score</u>
Land Use	Commercial	4	4
	Residential	3	
	Industrial	2	
	Open Space	1	
Type of Street	Arterial	3	3
	Collector	2	
	Residential	1	
Safety	School/Park and Street	4	4
	School/Park	3	
	Street only	2	
Aesthetics	Proximity to a sensitive area	1 - 3	3

Note: Attachment 4 sets forth preliminary project scoring and ranking using this scoring system.

3. **Residential Land Use Priority:** Designating Residential Land Use as the higher priority, yields the following scoring criteria:

Criteria	Scoring Factor	Score	Highest Score
Land Use	Residential	4	4
	Commercial	3	
	Industrial	2	
	Open Space	1	
Type of Street	Arterial	3	3
	Collector	2	
	Residential	1	
Safety	School/Park and Street	4	4
	School/Park	3	
	Street only	2	
Aesthetics	Proximity to a sensitive area	1 - 3	3

Note: Attachment 5 sets forth preliminary project scoring and ranking using this scoring system.

G. Committee Recommendations

The recommendation of the Public Works, Facilities and Solid Waste Committee is similar to that presented to the City Council last January. It is the view of the Committee that “undergrounding” projects in commercial districts should be given a higher priority than projects in residential districts (the ranking set forth in Attachment 4). This view is based, in large part, on the conclusion that the aesthetic benefits of such a project would have a greater impact in “higher traveled” commercial areas.

It should be noted that, in comparing the rankings in Attachments 4 and 5, the top five projects are almost identical.

The committee recognizes that even with an established priority list that funding will be a continuing challenge and the City will face potential situations where the Council may want to deviate from its established list. These may include locations where the City could leverage money contributed by a private developer or combine work in conjunction with a private development requirement, or a public improvement project could be enhanced by making undergrounding a part of such project. Two current projects that are examples of possible exceptions to a priority

list are the proposed Essex Project/Civic Center Expansion and Poindexter Park Expansion.

H. Project Funding Sources

The aforementioned citation from the City Council Goals and Objectives direct staff to evaluate both project priorities and possible project funding sources.

1. **List of Possible Sources:** The following is a list of possible funding sources for future utility undergrounding projects:
 - a. Rule 20A: The City only accrues about \$65,000 per year in PUC Rule 20A allocations. Currently our Rule 20A accrual is approximately \$15,000 as of January 1, 2006.
 - b. City Funds: If deemed appropriate, the City Council could consider using monies from the General Fund or Endowment Fund for this purpose.
 - c. Land Development: Development Agreements crafted for future land development projects could include payment of fees for future "undergrounding" projects.
 - d. Improvement Assessment Districts: An improvement assessment district could be formed to fund an "undergrounding" project. Formation of such an assessment district would require approval of the assessed property owners, as required by Proposition 218.
 - e. Moorpark Redevelopment Agency (MRA): If found to be consistent with the purposes and objectives of the Redevelopment Plan, the Redevelopment Agency could fund an "undergrounding" project located within the Redevelopment Project Area, or benefiting the Project Area.
2. **Recommended Sources:** No recommendations regarding preferred funding sources are being provided at this time. Discussion of funding for Project C (Los Angeles Avenue – Shasta Avenue to Moorpark Avenue) is discussed below.

I. Ongoing/Upcoming Developer Projects

- a) Pardee Homes: As part of this development, a portion of Project R from High Street to Charles Street will be underground. Additionally, Pardee is currently undergrounding Project G1 along their project frontage.

- b) William Lyon Homes Tract 5187/5405: As part of this development, undergrounding is currently under construction for Project G1 along their project frontage of Walnut Canyon Road from Pardee Development (Tract 5045) to William Lyon Development (Tract 5405) (High Density Development).
- c) Suncal Tract 5130: As part of this development, undergrounding will be constructed for Project G1 from William Lyon Development (Tract 5405) (High Density Development) to Casey Road.

J. Project C: Los Angeles Avenue: Shasta Ave. to Millard St.

Project C calls for the “undergrounding” of the high voltage lines along the frontage of the City’s central business on Los Angeles Avenue between Shasta Avenue and Moorpark Avenue. That project is ranked number one in both Attachment 4 and Attachment 5. A project of similar scope and purpose was added to the Capital Improvement Budget a number of years ago, prior to these efforts to identify and priorities possible “undergrounding” projects. Consistent with City Council direction at that time, staff had been working with SCE on efforts to form a new Underground Utility District for the purpose of undergrounding the high voltage transmission lines along Los Angeles Avenue. The funding strategy for the project identified at that time, was to use of available funds from Improvement District 92-1: Mission Bell Plaza (approximately \$427,000), certain MRA monies and future Rule 20A accruals. Work on the project was deferred until after the City Council considers these “underground project priorities”.

It should be noted that the FY 2006/07 Budget provides funding for this project as follows:

<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Prior Years Costs</u>	<u>FY 06/07 Budget</u>	<u>Total Project</u>
2330: AD92-1	0	426,447	426,447
2501: L A Ave AOC	240	299,761	300,001
Total	240	726,208	726,448

The actual project costs, including the degree and amount of funding by SCE from Rule 20A monies, has not yet been determined. A rough estimate places total project costs at approximately \$2 million.

K. Work Plan

The following is a suggested work plan for proceeding with development and implementation of utility “undergrounding” projects:

1. Approve a Project Priority List.

2. Direct staff to continue to work with the developers of properties in the vicinity of Los Angeles Avenue and Miller Parkway on efforts to “underground” the overhead utilities on Los Angeles Avenue west of Science Drive.
3. Should the Priority List approved by the City Council warrant it, direct staff to re-initiate efforts with the Southern California Edison Company (SCE) to develop the design and project cost estimate for Project C: Los Angeles Avenue – Shasta Avenue to Moorpark Avenue, and report back to the City Council project scope, cost and timing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approve the Work Plan set forth in Section K of this report.

Attachments:

- Attachment 1: Project Location Map
- Attachment 2: List [Description] of Projects
- Attachment 3: Project Cost Estimates
- Attachment 4: Project Priority List – Commercial Land Use Priority
- Attachment 5: Project Priority List – Residential Land Use Priority

Attachment 2: List of Candidate Undergrounding Projects

Page 1

The Underground Projects shown on Attachment 1 are listed and described as follows:

Note: T = Transmission & D = Distribution		
Area	Description	Type
A	Los Angeles Avenue west of Tierra Rejada Road	T/D
B	Los Angeles Avenue: Shasta Ave. to Gabbert Rd.	T
C	Los Angeles Avenue: Moorpark Ave. to Shasta Ave.	T
D	Los Angeles Avenue: Millard St. to Moorpark Ave.	T
E	Los Angeles Avenue: Spring Rd. to Millard St.	D
F1	Poindexter Avenue: Gabbert Road to Gisler Road	T/D
F2	Poindexter Avenue: Gisler Road to Chaparral School	T/D
F3	From Chaparral School north then east to Charles Street, then East on Charles to Spring Road, then north and east to the Route 118 Freeway, then east along the freeway and the railway to the easterly City Limit	T/D
G1	Walnut Canyon Road: Casey to City Limit	D
G2	Moorpark Avenue: High Street to Casey Road	D
H	Tierra Rejada Rd from a point about 700' west of Spring Road easterly to the east side of the freeway {Note: Some of these poles are not within the City Limits.}	T/D
I	Peach Hill Line from Los Angeles Ave. south to the south City Limit.	T/D
J	Maureen Ln. / Beltramo Ranch Rd. neighborhood	D
K	Shasta Ave. / Sierra Ave. neighborhood	D
L	Leta Yancy Rd.	D

Attachment 2: List of Candidate Undergrounding Projects
 Page 2

Note: T = Transmission & D = Distribution		
Area	Description	Type
M	Downtown neighborhoods south of the rail tracks: Harry Ave. to Cornett Ave.	D
N	Everett St. and the lines at the rear of lots on the north side of High St.	D
O	Princeton Avenue from High Street easterly to the freeway	D
P	Virginia Colony	D
Q	L. A. Ave. at the Arroyo Simi bridge	D
R	Spring Rd. from L. A. Ave. south to the Arroyo Simi	D
S	Bella Vista neighborhood	D
T	Spring Road north of Los Angeles Ave.	D

Project Cost Estimate

Area	Trans	Dist	Total LF	Cost Per LF (\$)	Total Cost (\$)	Total Cost By Area (\$)
A L A Ave West of T. R. Rd.	x		3,250	550	1,787,500	2,697,500
		x	3,250	280	910,000	
B L A Ave: Shasta to Gabbert	x		3,000	550	1,650,000	1,650,000
C L A Ave: Mrpk to Shasta	x		3,200	550	1,760,000	1,760,000
D L A Ave: Millard to Mrpk Ave	x		1,000	550	550,000	550,000
E L A Ave: Spring to Millard		x	1,250	280	350,000	350,000
F1 Poindexter: Gabbert > Gisler	x		3,750	550	2,062,500	3,112,500
		x	3,750	280	1,050,000	
F2 Poindexter: Gisler to School	x		750	550	412,500	622,500
		x	750	280	210,000	
F3 Chap. School to East C. L.	x		24,500	550	13,475,000	20,335,000
		x	24,500	280	6,860,000	
G1 Walnut Canyon Road: Casey Rd. to City Limit		x	7,300	280	2,044,000	2,044,000
G2 Moorpark Ave.: High St to Casey Road		x	1,200	280	336,000	336,000
H Tierra Rejada Rd: East of Spring Rd	x		6,000	550	3,300,000	4,980,000
		x	6,000	280	1,680,000	
I Peach Hill Line L A Ave to South C. L.	x		6,500	550	3,575,000	5,395,000
		x	6,500	280	1,820,000	
J Maureen / Beltramo		x	4,000	280	1,120,000	1,120,000
K Shasta Neighborhood		x	7,000	280	1,960,000	1,960,000
L Leta Yancy Rd		x	1,000	280	280,000	280,000
M Downtown South of RRTracks		x	19,000	280	5,320,000	5,320,000
N Downtown: N/O Rail Tracks		x	4,500	280	1,260,000	1,260,000
O Princeton Ave E/O High to Freeway		x	3,000	280	840,000	840,000
P Virginia Colony		x	3,000	280	840,000	840,000
Q New L A Ave Birdge		x	1,000	280	280,000	280,000
R Spring Rd S/O L A Ave		x	1,000	280	280,000	280,000
S Bella Vista Tract		x	1,750	280	490,000	490,000
						56,502,500

Attachment 4 (Page 1)
Underground Project Ranking
Commercial Land Use Priority

Criteria	Points Allowed			
	Land Use	Street Type	Aesthetics	Safety
Commercial	4			
Residential	3			
Industrial	2			
Open Space	1			
Type of Street:				
Arterial		3		
Collector		2		
Local		1		
Safety:				
Street plus School or Park frontage exceeding 500 feet				4
Street plus School or Park frontage less than 500 feet				3
Street Only				2
Proximity to Sensitive Areas			1 - 3	
Highest Score	4	3	3	4

Ranked by Alpha Code

Project	Description	Score			
		Land Use	Street Type	Aesthetics	Safety
A - L A Ave W/O T R Rd	Res. - Ind. / Arterial / City Entry / Street	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.0
B - L A Ave: Shasta to Gabbert	Res. - Ind. / Arterial / City Corridor / Street	2.5	3.0	1.0	2.0
C - L A Ave: Shasta to Moorpark Ave	Commercial / Arterial / Commercial Core / Street	4.0	3.0	3.0	2.0
D - L A Ave: Moorpark Ave to Millard St	Residential / Arterial / City Corridor / Street	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0
E - L A Ave: Millard to Spring Rd	Residential / Arterial / City Corridor / Street	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0
F1 - Poindexter - West	Res. - Ind. / Collector / Nil / Street	2.5	2.0	0.0	2.0
F2 - Poindexter Park to Chaparral School	Residential / Collector / Nil / Street plus School & Park (500'+)	3.0	2.0	0.0	4.0
F3 - Chpri Sch to Charles to E. City Limit	Res. - OS / Local / OS - Fwy Exposure / Part Street	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
G1 - Walnut Canyon Rd: Casey to City Lir	Com. - Res. - OS / Arterial / Civic Center / Street	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.0
G2 - Moorpark Ave: High St to Casey Rd	Com. - Res. - OS / Arterial / Civic Center / Street	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.0
H - Tierra Rejada: W/O Spring to Freeway	Res. - Open Space / Arterial / Open Space / Part in street	2.0	3.0	3.0	1.0
I - Peach Hill Line	Residential / Collector / nil / Street plus Park (500'+)	3.0	1.0	0.0	4.0
J - Maureen	Residential / No Street / nil / no street, Park only	3.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
K - Shasta / Sierra	Residential / Local / nil / no poles on a street	3.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
L - Leta Yancy	Residential / Local / nil / Street plus Park	3.0	1.0	0.0	3.0
M - Downtown, s/o rail	Residential / Local / nil / Street plus School (500'+)	3.0	1.0	0.0	4.0
N - Everett	Residential / Local / nil / Street plus future Park	3.0	1.0	0.0	3.0
O - Princeton	Ind. - Res / Arterial / Connector Corridor / street	2.5	3.0 *	1.0	2.0
P - Virginia Colony	Residential / Local / nil / Street plus Park	3.0	1.0	0.0	3.0
Q - L A Ave @ Bridge	Commercial / Arterial / Business District / street	4.0	3.0	3.0	2.0
R - Spring Rd at Bridge	Com. - Res / Arterial / part in Business Dist. / street	3.5	3.0	2.0	2.0
S - Bella Vista	Residential / Local / nil / no street	3.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
T - Spring Rd: N/O L A Ave	Res. - Ind. / Arterial / Police Station / street	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.0

***: Collector on Circulation Element

Attachment 4 (Page 2)
 Underground Project Ranking
 Commercial Land Use Priority

7/19/06

Criteria	Points Allowed			
	Land Use	Street Type	Aesthetics	Safety
Land Use: [Note: Less than 10% not recognized]	4			
	3			
	2			
	1			
Type of Street:		3		
		2		
		1		
Safety:				4
				3
				2
Aesthetics:			1 - 3	
	4	3	3	4
				14

Ranked by Total Score

Project	Description	Score			
		Land Use	Street Type	Aesthetics	Safety
C - L A Ave: Shasta to Moorpark Ave	Commercial / Arterial / Commercial Core / Street	4.0	3.0	3.0	2.0
Q - L A Ave @ Bridge	Commercial / Arterial / Business District / street	4.0	3.0	3.0	2.0
G1 - Walnut Canyon Rd: Casey to City Lir	Com. - Res. - OS / Arterial / Civic Center / Street	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.0
G2 - Moorpark Ave: High St to Casey Rd	Com. - Res. - OS / Arterial / Civic Center / Street	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.0
R - Spring Rd at Bridge	Com. - Res. / Arterial / part in Business Dist. / street	3.5	3.0	2.0	2.0
T - Spring Rd: N/O L A Ave	Res. - Ind. / Arterial / Police Station / street	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.0
A - L A Ave W/O T R Rd	Res. - Ind. / Arterial / City Entry / Street	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.0
D - L A Ave: Moorpark Ave to Millard St	Residential / Arterial / City Corridor / Street	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0
E - L A Ave: Millard to Spring Rd	Residential / Arterial / City Corridor / Street	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0
F2 - Poindexter Park to Chaparral School	Residential / Collector / Nil / Street plus School & Park (500'+)	3.0	2.0	0.0	4.0
H - Tierra Rejada: W/O Spring to Freeway	Res. - Open Space / Arterial / Open Space / Part in street	2.0	3.0	3.0	1.0
B - L A Ave: Shasta to Gabbert	Res. - Ind. / Arterial / City Corridor / Street	2.5	3.0	1.0	2.0
O - Princeton	Ind. - Res / Arterial / Connector Corridor / street	2.5	3.0 *	1.0	2.0
I - Peach Hill Line	Residential / Collector / nil / Street plus Park (500'+)	3.0	1.0	0.0	4.0
M - Downtown, s/o rail	Residential / Local / nil / Street plus School (500'+)	3.0	1.0	0.0	4.0
L - Leta Yancy	Residential / Local / nil / Street plus Park	3.0	1.0	0.0	3.0
N - Everett	Residential / Local / nil / Street plus future Park	3.0	1.0	0.0	3.0
P - Virginia Colony	Residential / Local / nil / Street plus Park	3.0	1.0	0.0	3.0
F1 - Poindexter - West	Res. - Ind. / Collector / Nil / Street	2.5	2.0	0.0	2.0
F3 - Chprl Sch to Charles to E. City Limit	Res. - OS / Local / OS - Fwy Exposure / Part Street	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
J - Maureen	Residential / No Street / nil / no street, Park only	3.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
K - Shasta / Sierra	Residential / Local / nil / no poles on a street	3.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
S - Bella Vista	Residential / Local / nil / no street	3.0	1.0	0.0	0.0

** : Collector on Circulation Element

Attachment 5 (Page 1)
 Underground Project Ranking
 Residential Land Use Priority

7/19/06

Criteria	Points Allowed			
	Land Use	Street Type	Aesthetics	Safety
Land Use:	Residential			
[Note: Less than 10% not recognized]	Commercial	4		
	Industrial	3		
	Open Space	2		
	Arterial	1		
Type of Street:	Collector		3	
	Local		2	
	Street plus School or Park frontage exceeding 500 feet		1	
Safety:	Street plus School or Park frontage less than 500 feet			4
	Street Only			3
Aesthetics:	Proximity to Sensitive Areas		1 - 3	2
	Highest Score	4	3	4

Ranked by Alpha Code

Project	Description	Score			
		Land Use	Street Type	Aesthetics	Safety
A - LA Ave W/O T R Rd	Res. - Ind. / Arterial / City Entry / Street	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
B - LA Ave: Shasta to Gabbert	Res. - Ind. / Arterial / City Corridor / Street	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0
C - LA Ave: Shasta to Moorpark Ave	Commercial / Arterial / Commercial Core / Street	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0
D - LA Ave: Moorpark Ave to Millard St	Residential / Arterial / City Corridor / Street	4.0	3.0	1.0	2.0
E - LA Ave: Millard to Spring Rd	Residential / Arterial / City Corridor / Street	4.0	3.0	1.0	2.0
F1 - Poindexter - West	Res. - Ind. / Collector / Nil / Street	3.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
F2 - Poindexter Park to Chaparral School	Residential / Collector / Nil / Street plus School & Park (500'+)	4.0	2.0	0.0	4.0
F3 - Chprl Sch to Charles to E. City Limit	Res. - OS / Local / OS - Fwy Exposure / Part Street	2.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
G1 - Walnut Canyon Rd: Casey to City Lir Com.	Res. - OS / Arterial / Civic Center / Street	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.0
G2 - Moorpark Ave: High St to Casey Rd	Com. - Res. - OS / Arterial / Civic Center / Street	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.0
H - Tierra Rejada: W/O Spring to Freeway	Res. - Open Space / Arterial / Open Space / Part in street	2.5	3.0	3.0	1.0
I - Peach Hill Line	Residential / Collector / nil / Street plus Park (500'+)	4.0	1.0	0.0	4.0
J - Maureen	Residential / No Street / nil / no street, Park only	4.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
K - Shasta / Sierra	Residential / Local / nil / no poles on a street	4.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
L - Leta Yancy	Residential / Local / nil / Street plus Park	4.0	1.0	0.0	3.0
M - Downtown, s/o rail	Residential / Local / nil / Street plus School (500'+)	4.0	1.0	0.0	4.0
N - Everett	Residential / Local / nil / Street plus future Park	4.0	1.0	0.0	3.0
O - Princeton	Ind. - Res / Arterial / Connector Corridor / street	3.0	3.0 *	1.0	2.0
P - Virginia Colony	Residential / Local / nil / Street plus Park	4.0	1.0	0.0	3.0
Q - LA Ave @ Bridge	Commercial / Arterial / Business District / street	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0
R - Spring Rd at Bridge	Com. - Res / Arterial / part in Business Dist. / street	3.5	3.0	2.0	2.0
S - Bella Vista	Residential / Local / nil / no street	4.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
T - Spring Rd: N/O LA Ave	Res. - Ind. / Arterial / Police Station / street	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0

***: Collector on Circulation Element

Attachment 5 (Page 2)
Underground Project Ranking
Residential Land Use Priority

Criteria	Points Allowed			
	Land Use	Street Type	Aesthetics	Safety
Residential	4			
Commercial	3			
Industrial	2			
Open Space	1			
Type of Street:				
Arterial		3		
Collector		2		
Local		1		
Safety:				
Street plus School or Park frontage exceeding 500 feet				4
Street plus School or Park frontage less than 500 feet				3
Street Only				2
Aesthetics:				
Proximity to			1 - 3	
Sensitive Areas				
Highest Score	4	3	3	4

Ranked by Total Score

Project	Description	Score			
		Land Use	Street Type	Aesthetics	Safety
C - L A Ave: Shasta to Moorpark Ave	Commercial / Arterial / Commercial Core / Street	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0
Q - L A Ave @ Bridge	Commercial / Arterial / Business District / street	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0
T - Spring Rd: N/O L A Ave	Res. - Ind. / Arterial / Police Station / street	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0
G1 - Walnut Canyon Rd: Casey to City Lir	Com. - Res. - OS / Arterial / Civic Center / Street	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.0
G2 - Moorpark Ave: High St to Casey Rd	Com. - Res. - OS / Arterial / Civic Center / Street	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.0
R - Spring Rd at Bridge	Com. - Res / Arterial / part in Business Dist. / street	3.5	3.0	2.0	2.0
A - L A Ave W/O T R Rd	Res. - Ind. / Arterial / City Entry / Street	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
D - L A Ave: Moorpark Ave to Millard St	Residential / Arterial / City Corridor / Street	4.0	3.0	1.0	2.0
E - L A Ave: Millard to Spring Rd	Residential / Arterial / City Corridor / Street	4.0	3.0	1.0	2.0
F2 - Poindext Park to Chaparral School	Residential / Collector / Nil / Street plus School & Park (500'+)	4.0	2.0	0.0	4.0
H - Tierra Rejada: W/O Spring to Freeway	Res. - Open Space / Arterial / Open Space / Part in street	2.5	3.0	3.0	1.0
B - L A Ave: Shasta to Gabbert	Res. - Ind. / Arterial / City Corridor / Street	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0
I - Peach Hill Line	Residential / Collector / nil / Street plus Park (500'+)	4.0	1.0	0.0	4.0
M - Downtown, s/o rail	Residential / Local / nil / Street plus School (500'+)	4.0	1.0	0.0	4.0
O - Princeton	Ind. - Res / Arterial / Connector Corridor / street	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0
L - Leta Yancy	Residential / Local / nil / Street plus Park	4.0	1.0	0.0	3.0
N - Everett	Residential / Local / nil / Street plus futute Park	4.0	1.0	0.0	3.0
P - Virginia Colony	Residential / Local / nil / Street plus Park	4.0	1.0	0.0	3.0
F1 - Poindexter - West	Res. - Ind. / Collector / Nil / Street	3.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
F3 - Chprl Sch to Charles to E. City Limit	Res. - OS / Local / OS - Fwy Exposure / Part Street	2.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
J - Maureen	Residential / No Street / nil / no street, Park only	4.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
K - Shasta / Sierra	Residential / Local / nil / no poles on a street	4.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
S - Bella Vista	Residential / Local / nil / no street	4.0	1.0	0.0	0.0

** : Collector on Circulation Element