

City of Auburn FY2027 Capital Improvement Program

Independent Research Notes

Primary source	City of Auburn FY2027 Mayor & Council Budget Presentation Binder
Source pages	Binder pages 78-88 / Capital Improvement Program
Binder inspected	August 31, 2026
Status	Independent companion notes based on requested / working capital material

These notes identify what the capital-program section supports, where the presentation is useful, and where the available material leaves questions unanswered. A request, estimate, quote, rollover, funding note, contract award, and actual expenditure are treated as different things.

What the binder documents clearly

- The CIP presentation is organized as a working budget-book reference and explicitly mixes new requests, rollover projects, prior-year items, and supporting quotes.
- Large road requests include \$840,000 for Parks Mill Road and \$536,000 for Apalachee Church Road.
- Stormwater projects include cost ranges and TBD amounts, including Heatherwood Drive, Shackelford Park stream-bank stabilization, and Honeysuckle Terrace culvert replacement.
- The Police CAD/technology project identifies a \$60,000 Auburn Foundation donation and a requested City share of \$57,000.
- The parks section contains both budget requests and backup vendor material, including a \$319,812.73 playground quote and multiple separate dog-park component quotes.
- The final page itself includes budget-book review notes calling for confirmation of TBD estimates, rollover status, funding sources, and separation of vendor backup from summary pages.

Main gaps and weak points

- TBD and range estimates: Several projects lack a single final estimate. Those figures should not be converted into firm project costs without later records.
- Quote versus project total: Dog-park amounts come from separate vendors and alternatives. Adding every quoted amount together would overstate the project because some quotes are competing options or component alternatives.
- Funding status: Some rows identify rollover, GC SPLOST, insurance, donations, or requested City shares, but the binder does not provide a complete funding ledger showing which sources were finally approved.
- Procurement status: Vendor quotes and budget requests are not evidence of contract award, purchase authorization, or completed procurement.
- Rollover status: The binder itself calls for confirmation of which rollover projects should remain active in FY2027 and which should be closed or reclassified.
- Project scope changes: Roads, stormwater, parks, and facility projects could change materially after engineering, code review, bidding, or site investigation.

What should not be concluded

- A listed estimate should not be described as money already spent.
- A vendor quote should not be described as an awarded contract unless an award or purchase record confirms it.
- TBD projects should not be assigned an inferred cost from nearby or prior-year projects.
- The presence of a rollover label does not establish that the project remained funded in the final adopted FY2027 budget.
- The \$300,000 GC SPLOST note for the Shackelford Park connection bridge should not be treated as the complete project cost because the project cost is shown as TBD.

Records most likely to resolve the open questions

- Final adopted FY2027 capital-improvement schedule and project appropriations.
- Engineering estimates, bid tabs, purchase orders, contracts, and change orders for the major road and stormwater projects.
- Funding-source schedules showing General Fund, Water/Stormwater, SPLOST, grant, donation, and insurance allocations.

- Final dog-park scope and procurement records identifying which quoted alternatives were selected.
- Final playground purchase/installation contract and any surfacing or site-work change orders.
- Insurance settlement and demolition records for the Lions Club building.
- Rollover reconciliation identifying which FY2025/FY2026 projects carried into FY2027.

Working assessment

This section is useful because it does more than list projects: it shows rough cost levels, rollover status, project purpose, selected funding notes, and some vendor backup. Its main limitation is that the material is still a planning package. The strongest figures are the specific quoted amounts and clearly labeled budget requests; the weakest are TBD items, cost ranges, and any line where funding or procurement status is not shown.

The binder also warns against over-reading it by including its own review checklist. That checklist is important evidence that final estimates, rollover classifications, funding sources, and supporting procurement documents were still expected to be cleaned up before the final budget book.