

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
City of Missoula CIP Project Request Form FY 2009-2013

Program Category:	Project Title:	07 Project #	08 Project #	09 Project #
Public Safety	Police Facility - GO Bond Issue	PS-11	PS-11	PS-01

Description and justification of project and funding sources:
 This project first appeared in the CIP budget in FY2001-2005. A general fund expenditure of \$35,000.00 was approved in FY'05 to conduct a joint space needs analysis with Missoula County for a combined facility, including the Sheriff's Office, DES, 9-1-1 and a regional training center. (City Hall renovation in FY 2012 will be \$2,000,000).

The current Police Department facilities were evaluated in a 1996 assessment and it was noted at that time the police department was "critically overcrowded, with narrow corridors, inadequate security and inadequate office, storage and support spaces."

The new assessment just completed by Wilson-Estes Police Architects has identified current space needs and projections for 20 years out. The assessment report identifies multiple options for joint and separate facilities. Requirements of a City police facility in a stand-alone option are identified at 30,036 s.f. and for 20 year growth needs rise to 39,278 s.f.. The present space being occupied 11,535 s.f., inclusive of our indoor firearms range and Academy area.

Present discussion are leaning to purchase of finished space from developers of the Millsite project adjacent to the civic stadium. Costs are being determined and would include adequate space and parking based on the needs analysis mentioned above. Upon relocation of the police department, City Hall will require renovations to properly re-use and distribute space to other departments presently experiencing crowding.

Is this equipment prioritized on an equipment replacement schedule?	Yes	No	NA
		x	

Are there any site requirements:
 Suitable for 22,000 s.f. building footprint, plus parking requirements. Ideally requires 178,835 s.f. area. (4.1 acres)

REVENUE	How is this project going to be funded							Funded in Prior Years
	Funding Source	Accounting Code	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	
General Fund								35,000
GO Bond Issue 11/2008				16,000,000				
Fox Site Sale/Exchange				2,700,000				
			-	18,700,000	-	-	-	35,000

EXPENSE	How is this project going to be spent:							Spent in Prior Years
	Budgeted Funds	Accounting Code	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	
A. Land Cost								
B. Construction Cost				14,700,000		2,000,000		
C. Contingencies (10% of B)					1,200,000			
D. Design & Engineering (15% of B)				120,000				
E. Percent for Art (1% of B)					550,000	85,000		
F. Equipment Costs			45,000					
G. Other			45,000					
			45,000	14,820,000	1,750,000	2,085,000	-	35,000

OPERATING BUDGET COSTS	Does this project have any additional impact on the operating budget:							Spent in Prior Years
	Expense Object	Accounting Code	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	
Personnel								
Supplies								
Purchased Services					75,000	150,000	150,000	
Fixed Charges								
Capital Outlay				1,685,000	1,685,000	1,685,000	1,685,000	
Debt Service								
			-	1,685,000	1,760,000	1,835,000	1,835,000	-

Description of additional operating budget impact: The new facility will have normal operating costs associated with maintenance and utilities, and there will be a voted operating levy to support these costs. Anticipated General Fund Impact will be zero due to voted levy.

Responsible Person:	Responsible Department:	Date Submitted to Finance	Today's Date and Time	Preparer's Initials	Total Score
Mark Mulr	Police	2/29/2008	11/17/2008 14:47	MM	49

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Project Rating

(See C.I.P. Instructions For Explanation of Criteria)

Program Category:	Project Title:			09 Project #	
Public Safety	Police Facility - GO Bond Issue			PS-01	
Qualitative Analysis		Yes	No	Comments	
1. Is the project necessary to meet federal, state, or local legal requirements? This criterion includes projects mandated by Court Order to meet requirements of law or other requirements. Of special concern is that the project be accessible to the handicapped.			x		
2. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contractual requirement? This criterion includes Federal or State grants which require local participation. Indicate the Grant name and number in the comment column.			x		
3. Is this project urgently required? Will delay result in curtailment of an essential service? This statement should be checked "Yes" only if an emergency is clearly indicated; otherwise, answer "No". If "Yes", be sure to give full justification.			x		
4. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or public safety? This criterion should be answered "No" unless public health and/or safety can be shown to be an urgent or critical factor.			x		
Quantitative Analysis		Raw Score Range	Comments	Weight	Total Score
5. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?		(0-3) 3	It is believed that the maximum benefit for the community is to keep Police operations in a downtown vicinity. From a strictly dollar investment perspective, these costs are higher than moving to the Detention center site.	5	15
6. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its maximum effectiveness?		(0-3) 3	The costs for construction keep rising with inflation and in the past ten years this project budget has grown four fold.	4	12
7. Does the project conserve energy, cultural or natural resources, or reduce pollution?		(0-3) 2	This facility will be designed and built to United States Green Building Council LEED standards to reduce use of water, fossil fuels and material resources. The energy savings and healthier working environment will recoup the up front costs associated with building green.	3	6
8. Does the project improve or expand upon essential City services where such services are recognized and accepted as being necessary and effective?		(0-2) 2	A new Police operations facility will improve the departments service through efficiency and improvement in communication with the public, between employees and dramatically improve the security of persons and information within the Department.	4	8
9. Does the project specifically relate to the City's strategic planning priorities or other plans?		(0-3) 2	The City of Missoula Strategic plan identifies under the Goal of Organizational Management that we strive to be efficient in our operations. This new facility is vital to improving the efficiency of service and effectiveness in providing quality police service to the community.	4	8
Total Score					49

**Police Facility
CIP Request**

In 1995, the City and County conducted a Facility Assessment concluding with a 1,5 and 20 year Master Plan. At the time the assessment was conducted, the "old fire station" was vacant and the police department was using the building as general and vehicle storage. At the time of the assessment, the police department had 83 FTE's, today we have 119 FTE's, plus many volunteers also spending time in the building who require space.

At the time of the assessment, the primary Problem/Observation made by the assessment team was "the police department is critically overcrowded, with narrow corridors, inadequate security and inadequate officer, storage and support space." Since this observation, 36 FTE's have been added plus many volunteers.

The importance of an efficient and effective police facility is emphasized by the inclusion of a study for a new facility in Goal #1 of the FY2004 City Strategic Plan. Lack of proper space is conducive to a poor work environment, precludes the ability to conduct private conversations with the public on very sensitive matters, wastes valuable employee time by trips from one floor to another and presents a poor image to the public.

Police management has attended several facility planning seminars since the fall of 1999. Some issues that have come from those seminars included:

- Needs analysis: while a needs analysis was conducted in 1995, it was superficial in terms of real police needs. The needs of the Missoula Police Department have now been re-evaluated by specialists in police planning.
- The design of a new police facility should include sufficient space for a 20 year life span.
- Co-location with the sheriffs department is desirable, but can also have political drawbacks. Generally, co-location is not a cost saving factor to be considered. In our case, it may be very desirable due to the cost of the land, but the community desire to keep the Police department in a downtown location has been strong.
- A police facility, meeting the needs of the department and the community should include:
 - physical fitness/workout facilities and equipment
 - meeting room available to the public
 - growth capability for 20 years.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
City of Missoula CIP Project Request Form FY 2009-2013

Program Category:	Project Title:	07 Project #	08 Project #	09 Project #
Public Safety	Fire Hydrants			PS-02

Description and justification of project and funding sources:

Request funding for the installation of nine new fire hydrants in the Franklin-to-Fort neighborhood.

When major portions of the Franklin-to-Fort area were annexed by the City in the mid 1990s, a serious deficiency in hydrants was noted. The City planned to install additional fire hydrants and bring the area into compliance with fire code requirements. More recently, the fire department, Mountain Water Company, and the Franklin-to-Fort neighborhood council developed an installation plan to add additional hydrants over a three year period. The plan was implemented in 2005 when six new fire hydrants were installed by Mountain Water.

The plan stalled with the rate case involving Mountain Water. With the resulting Public Service Commission ruling to charge ratepayers / users for maintenance and fire flow costs, Mountain Water is no longer willing to absorb the costs of installing new hydrants.

This proposal will complete the hydrant installation plan and provide necessary infrastructure in the Franklin-to-Fort area. Costs are based upon preliminary estimates provided by Mountain Water Co. on March 23, 2007, and include hydrants, valves, piping, design and installation. We have added 5% / year for inflation.

Is this equipment prioritized on an equipment replacement schedule?	Yes	No	NA

Are there any site requirements:

How is this project going to be funded:

REVENUE	Funding Source	Accounting Code	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	Funded in Prior Years
	GENERAL FUND			30,224	37,943			
COMM. DEV. BLOCK GRANT (CDBG)			31,715					
NEW DEVELOPMENT			10,054					
			71,993	37,943	-	-	-	-

How is this project going to be spent:

EXPENSE	Budgeted Funds	Accounting Code	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	Spent in Prior Years
	A. Land Cost							
B. Construction Cost								
C. Contingencies (10% of B)								
D. Design & Engineering (15% of B)								
E. Percent for Art (1% of B)								
F. Equipment Costs								
G. Other			108,129					
			108,129	-	-	-	-	-

Does this project have any additional impact on the operating budget:

OPERATING BUDGET COSTS	Expense Object	Accounting Code	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	Spent in Prior Years
	Personnel							
Supplies								
Purchased Services								
Fixed Charges								
Capital Outlay								
Debt Service								
			-	-	-	-	-	-

Description of additional operating budget impact:

Responsible Person:	Responsible Department:	Date Submitted to Finance	Today's Date and Time	Preparer's Initials	Total Score
TOM STEENBERG	FIRE		11/17/2008 15:00	CS	48

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Project Rating

(See C.I.P. Instructions For Explanation of Criteria)

Program Category:	Project Title:			09 Project #	
Public Safety	Fire Hydrants			PS-02	
Qualitative Analysis	Yes	No	Comments		
1. Is the project necessary to meet federal, state, or local legal requirements? This criterion includes projects mandated by Court Order to meet requirements of law or other requirements. Of special concern is that the project be accessible to the handicapped.		X			
2. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contractual requirement? This criterion includes Federal or State grants which require local participation. Indicate the Grant name and number in the comment column.		X			
3. Is this project urgently required? Will delay result in curtailment of an essential service? This statement should be checked "Yes" only if an emergency is clearly indicated; otherwise, answer "No". If "Yes", be sure to give full justification.		X			
4. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or public safety? This criterion should be answered "No" unless public health and/or safety can be shown to be an urgent or critical factor.		X	Fire hydrants are essential infrastructure that provide for public health and safety. They provide a water supply necessary to control and extinguish fires.		
Quantitative Analysis	Raw Score Range	Comments		Weight	Total Score
5. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	(0-3) 2	The cost of the additional hydrants is minimal compared to the value of the property they are used to protect. The ten hydrants proposed will provide fire suppression water supply for approximately 500 properties. Please see notes for additional cost benefit analysis.		5	10
6. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its maximum effectiveness?	(0-3) 3	This area has been in need of additional hydrants since it was annexed into the City. As Fire Station 3 will be out of service from April through October, response times to this area are impacted and there is a heightened need for speedy implementation.		4	12
7. Does the project conserve energy, cultural or natural resources, or reduce pollution?	(0-3) 2	Adequate fire flows are essential for effective fire suppression and property conservation.		3	6
8. Does the project improve or expand upon essential City services where such services are recognized and accepted as being necessary and effective?	(0-2) 2	Additional hydrants are required to meet NFPA-1 UFC requirements for hydrant spacing. This standard has been adopted by the City and is met throughout the urban area.		4	8
9. Does the project specifically relate to the City's strategic planning priorities or other plans?	(0-3) 3	Yes. This project specifically relates to the City's strategic planning goals under both Community Livability (planning & infrastructure) and Community Involvement (citizen concerns). The need for additional hydrants in annexed areas is also referenced in the 2006 Comprehensive Fire Master Plan.		4	12
Total Score					48



MOUNTAIN WATER COMPANY

P.O. Box 4826 • 1748 West Broadway • Missoula, Montana 59806 • Phone (406) 721-8870

ARVID M. MILLER
V.P. and General Manager
(406) 721-3570

March 23, 2007

Mr. Bob Rajala, Fire Marshall
Missoula City Fire Dept.
625 E. Pine
Missoula, MT 59802

Re: New fire hydrant installation estimates in the Franklin-to-Fort area

Dear Bob:

Here are my estimates for the remaining hydrant installations we had agreed upon for this area. As indicated in our email communications, several of these have no design information. Bids and actual costs may vary substantially from these estimates. I have estimated these by the three major components by which we keep our property records but these costs are intended to include design, materials, and installation. As I mentioned in an earlier email, if MWC chooses to add a main valve(s) at any of these sites for enhanced system operation, those costs will be covered by MWC.


1. Fairview & Schilling	
a. Hydrant	\$6,500.00
b. Valve	1,500.00
c. Lead pipe	1,575.00
	<hr/>
	\$9,575.00
2. Strand & Eaton	
a. Hydrant	\$3,500.00
b. Valve	2,000.00
c. Lead pipe	1,260.00
	<hr/>
	\$9,060.00
3. Mount West of Reserve	
a. Hydrant	\$6,600.00
b. Valve	1,800.00

March 23, 2007
Page - 2 -

5. S. 12 th W. & Kemp	
a. Hydrant	\$7,000.00
b. Valve	2,020.00
c. Lead pipe	3,675.00
	<hr/>
	\$12,965.00
6. S. 7 th West of Reserve	
a. Hydrant	\$7,000.00
b. Valve	1,900.00
c. Lead pipe	2,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$10,900.00
7. Eaton & Sumner	
a. Hydrant	\$6,500.00
b. Valve	2,000.00
c. Lead pipe	1,680.00
	<hr/>
	\$10,180.00
8. S. 7 th & Johnson	
a. Hydrant	\$6,300.00
b. Valve	1,950.00
c. Lead pipe	2,100.00
	<hr/>
	\$10,350.00
9. South Ave. & 27th	
a. Hydrant	\$6,750.00
b. Valve	1,700.00
c. Lead pipe	2,100.00
	<hr/>
	\$10,550.00
10. S. 3 rd & Margaret	
a. Hydrant	\$6,300.00
b. Valve	2,000.00
c. Lead pipe	1,900.00
	<hr/>
	\$10,200.00

If you have any questions or concerns, please let me know. (I will be out of the office the week of March 26, returning to work on April 3.)

Sincerely,


Robert E. Hicks
Engineering

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
City of Missoula CIP Project Request Form FY 2009-2013

Program Category:	Project Title:	07 Project #	08 Project #	09 Project #
Public Safety	Fire Station #6 Land Purchase	PS-08	PS-05	PS-03

Description and justification of project and funding sources:
 This project will provide a two acre site for future Fire Station #6. It is located to the west of Missoula.
 In the past, revenues have been set aside to purchase property and construct fire stations. This strategy has not proven successful, as these funds were expended on other items. A more prudent strategy may be to consider purchasing property before development increases the cost.

Is this equipment prioritized on an equipment replacement schedule?	Yes	No	NA

Are there any site requirements:
 2.0 acres of land for construction of Fire Station #6.

		How is this project going to be funded:						Funded In Prior Years
		Funding Source	Accounting Code	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13
REVENUE	IMPACT FEES			300,000				
				300,000	-	-	-	-
		How is this project going to be spent:						Spent In Prior Years
		Budgeted Funds	Accounting Code	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13
EXPENSE	A. Land Cost			300,000				
	B. Construction Cost							
	C. Contingencies (10% of B)							
	D. Design & Engineering (15% of B)							
	E. Percent for Art (1% of B)							
	F. Equipment Costs							
	G. Other			300,000	-	-	-	-

		Does this project have any additional impact on the operating budget:						Spent In Prior Years
		Expense Object	Accounting Code	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13
OPERATING BUDGET COSTS	Personnel							
	Supplies							
	Purchased Services							
	Fixed Charges							
	Capital Outlay							
	Debt Service			-	-	-	-	-
		Description of additional operating budget impact:						

Responsible Person:	Responsible Department:	Date Submitted to Finance	Today's Date and Time	Preparer's Initials	Total Score
TOM STEENBERG	FIRE		11/17/2008 15:04	CS	42

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Project Rating

(See C.J.P. Instructions For Explanation of Criteria)

Program Category:	Project Title:				09 Project #
Public Safety	Fire Station #8 Land Purchase				PS-03
Qualitative Analysis		Yes	No	Comments	
1. Is the project necessary to meet federal, state, or local legal requirements? This criterion includes projects mandated by Court Order to meet requirements of law or other requirements. Of special concern is that the project be accessible to the handicapped.			X		
2. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contractual requirement? This criterion includes Federal or State grants which require local participation. Indicate the Grant name and number in the comment column.			X		
3. Is this project urgently required? Will delay result in curtailment of an essential service? This statement should be checked "Yes" only if an emergency is clearly indicated; otherwise, answer "No". If "Yes", be sure to give full justification.			X		
4. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or public safety? This criterion should be answered "No" unless public health and/or safety can be shown to be an urgent or critical factor.			X		
Quantitative Analysis		Raw Score Range	Comments	Weight	Total Score
5. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?		(0-3) 3	This project results in a great benefit to the community by providing a site for a fire station in the northwest portion of Missoula. Purchasing land now will save future dollars as land costs continue to increase. 100% leveraged with impact fees.	5	15
6. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its maximum effectiveness?		(0-3) 2	Land should be purchased at current prices; future development may preclude purchasing land at ideal locations for Station 6.	4	8
7. Does the project conserve energy, cultural or natural resources, or reduce pollution?		(0-3) 1	A future fire station to the west would reduce energy costs as well as provide protection for natural and cultural resources.	3	3
8. Does the project improve or expand upon essential City services where such services are recognized and accepted as being necessary and effective?		(0-2) 1	A future station will be necessary as Missoula continues to grow and expand to the west and service demand increases. This project provides a basic infrastructure requirement.	4	4
9. Does the project specifically relate to the City's strategic planning priorities or other plans?		(0-3) 3	This project is consistent with the guiding principles and strategies of the City's Strategic Plan. The Wye Mullan Plan notes that response times in this area do not meet our goals with current levels of service. The 2006 Comprehensive Fire Master Plan identifies the need for a future fire station in the Wye Mullan area.	4	12
Total Score					42

2007 MARKET ANALYSIS OF PARCEL SALES WITHIN WYE-MULLAN AREA (AS OF 1/19/07)

	HIGH	LOW	AVERAGE	MEDIAN
LIST PRICE:	\$799,000	\$155,000	\$367,572	\$250,000
SOLD PRICE:	\$712,000	\$155,000	\$350,636	\$240,000

Source: Prudential Montana Real Estate

*Parcels sold in 2007 varied in size and ranged in price from \$76,000 to \$107,000 per acre.

**11 parcels included in sample

2008 WYE-MULLAN AREA LAND PRICES PER ACRE (AS OF 2/22/08)

	HIGH	LOW	AVERAGE	MEDIAN
PRICE PER ACRE:	\$177,000	\$120,000	\$148,000	\$150,000

Source: Prudential Montana Real Estate

**5 parcels included in sample

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
City of Missoula CIP Project Request Form FY 2009-2013

Program Category:	Project Title:	07 Project #	08 Project #	09 Project #
Public Safety	Mobile Data Computers	PS-06	PS-03	PS-04

Description and justification of project and funding sources:

Information systems for fire apparatus.

Mobile Data Computers (mdcs) on apparatus will provide firefighters accessible data relative to: dispatch, fire & emergency preplans, hazardous material location, hydrant locations, and owner/occupant information.

We propose to purchase ten mdcs.

This project was originally proposed in FY 1998; the current fire administration has brought this forward through the CIP since FY04. It was delayed as we awaited infrastructure improvements to the 911 center. 911 now has the ability to transmit dispatch information, and we plan to directly access information within our Fire-house database. As this proposal appears to have a slim-to-none chance of being funded through the CIP, we are requesting matching funds to allow our department to submit a county-wide grant for mdcs.

Is this equipment prioritized on an equipment replacement schedule?	Yes	No	NA

Are there any site requirements:

How is this project going to be funded:								
REVENUE	Funding Source	Accounting Code	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	Funded in Prior Years
	GENERAL FUND		3,333					
	IMPACT FEES		28,867					
	ASSISTANCE TO FIREFIGHTER GRANT		130,000					
			160,000	-	-	-	-	-

How is this project going to be spent:								
EXPENSE	Budgeted Funds	Accounting Code	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	Spent in Prior Years
	A. Land Cost							
	B. Construction Cost							
	C. Contingencies (10% of B)							
	D. Design & Engineering (15% of B)							
	E. Percent for Art (1% of B)							
	F. Equipment Costs		160,000					
	G. Other							
			160,000	-	-	-	-	-

Does this project have any additional impact on the operating budget:								
OPERATING BUDGET COSTS	Expense Object	Accounting Code	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	Spent in Prior Years
	Personnel							
	Supplies							
	Purchased Services			6,000				
	Fixed Charges							
	Capital Outlay							
	Debt Service							
						-	-	-

Description of additional operating budget impact: Verizon wireless cards, software licensing and support contracts.

Responsible Person:	Responsible Department:	Date Submitted to Finance	Today's Date and Time	Preparer's Initials	Total Score
TOM STEENBERG	FIRE		11/17/2008 15:09	CS	46

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Project Rating

(See C.I.P. Instructions For Explanation of Criteria)

Program Category:	Project Title:			09 Project #	
Public Safety	Mobile Data Computers			PS-04	
Qualitative Analysis	Yes	No	Comments		
1. Is the project necessary to meet federal, state, or local legal requirements? This criterion includes projects mandated by Court Order to meet requirements of law or other requirements. Of special concern is that the project be accessible to the handicapped.		X			
2. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contractual requirement? This criterion includes Federal or State grants which require local participation. Indicate the Grant name and number in the comment column.		X			
3. Is this project urgently required? Will delay result in curtailment of an essential service? This statement should be checked "Yes" only if an emergency is clearly indicated; otherwise, answer "No". If "Yes", be sure to give full justification.		X			
4. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or public safety? This criterion should be answered "No" unless public health and/or safety can be shown to be an urgent or critical factor.		X			
Quantitative Analysis	Raw Score Range	Comments		Weight	Total Score
5. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	(0-3) 3	Immediate access to response information will reduce response time, increase safety of firefighters and the public, reduce property loss. We plan to apply for grant funding to offset the costs of this proposal. Matching funds in the amount of \$30,000.00 will be required under terms of the grant. Substantial leveraging with grant and Impact fees.		5	15
6. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its maximum effectiveness?	(0-3) 2	Immediate access to response information on an emergency scene will provide for firefighter and public safety. Missoula is one of the last cities in the state to adopt this technology.		4	8
7. Does the project conserve energy, cultural or natural resources, or reduce pollution?	(0-3) 1	Reduces the need for paper pre-plan documents.		3	3
8. Does the project improve or expand upon essential City services where such services are recognized and accepted as being necessary and effective?	(0-2) 2	Significantly improves essential fire and emergency service delivery by providing immediate access to dispatch info, street maps, building preplans, hazardous materials and owner/occupant info.		4	8
9. Does the project specifically relate to the City's strategic planning priorities or other plans?	(0-3) 3	Specifically referenced in both the City Strategic Plan and the 2006 Fire Master Plan. Missoula is the only major city in Montana without this technology.		4	12
Total Score					46

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100