



2018 BOND DEVELOPMENT QUESTION

Response to Request for Information

DEPARTMENT: PWD/ATD

REQUEST NO.: 11

REQUESTED BY: Kitchen

DATE REQUESTED: 06/14/18

DATE POSTED: 6/18/18

REQUEST: Please clarify if there is any duplication of projects amongst projects already funded through the 2016 Mobility Bond

RESPONSE:

This question was addressed in detail in an [April 16th memo](#). As stated in that memo, in a majority of the programs there really is no overlap since the funding from each source addresses different elements of our Transportation Infrastructure. In 2016, staff developed several alternatives ranging from \$250 million to \$720 million for Council's consideration for Bond funding. All of the alternatives included a mix of Capital Renewal projects/programs and Mobility projects/programs. The "Capital Renewal" projects/programs generally focused on renewing existing transportation infrastructure that is beyond the scope of repair and maintenance techniques and thus needs capital funding while the "Mobility" projects/programs generally focused on enhancing existing corridors or adding new infrastructure with the goal of improving mobility and providing congestion relief through capacity improvements for all transportation modes. Working within the financial constraints at that time, staff developed 2 alternatives for the \$720 million bonding level. The first was a "blended alternative" that would have dedicated \$100 million to "Regional Mobility", \$344.5 million for "Corridor Mobility", and \$275.5 million to "Local Mobility" (with \$180 million of the Local Mobility funding for Capital Renewal). Staff's "enhanced corridor alternative" would have dedicated \$93.5 million to "Regional Mobility", \$471.5 million for "Corridor Mobility", and \$155 million for "Local Mobility" (with \$67 million of the Local Mobility funding for Capital Renewal). The voters ultimately approved a version more focused on "Mobility" than "Capital Renewal" with \$101 million for Regional Mobility, \$482 million for Corridor Mobility, and \$137 for Local Mobility (with only \$11 million of the Local Mobility funding dedicated specifically for Capital Renewal).

The table below summarizes the funding allocation described above.

2016 Bond Package Alternatives

Alternative	<u>Regional Mobility</u>	<u>Corridor Mobility</u>	<u>Local Mobility</u>
Staff "Blended"	\$100M	\$344.5M	\$275.5M (\$180M for Capital Renewal)
Staff "Enhanced Corridor"	\$93.5M	\$471.5M	\$155M (\$67M for Capital Renewal)
Voter Approved Bonds	\$101M	\$482M	\$137M (\$11M for Capital Renewal)



The 2016 Mobility Bond approved by the voters dedicates the \$11 million Capital Renewal funding for the preliminary engineering and design (no funding for construction) for two projects (Fallwell Lane and the William Cannon Drive Bridge over the Union Pacific Railroad) and 9 sub-standard street projects. So, the package that the Council ultimately chose to put forward for voter consideration in 2016 was primarily focused on mobility needs rather than capital renewal needs. With this very small funding for Capital Renewal in the 2016 Mobility Bond, staff is now again requesting funding for the core maintenance functions termed “Capital Renewal” for the 2018 Bond.