Financial and Payment Assistance Options *Draft* Timeline October 2013 • Council Directive to City Manager, Resolution 20131024-055 Presentations to Advisory Committee November - Presentations to Council Committee December 2013 Stakeholder Input Sessions Presentation to Council on Options and Recommendations • Council approved following options: 3rd Party Independent January 2014 Loan, City-funded 3rd Party Loan, Quick Pay (QP), Mobilization Prompt Pay (MPP), and later Cash Flow **Enhancement (CFE)** •External Team to explore 3rd Party Independent Loan and City funded 3rd Party Loan options February 2014 Internal Teams to explore QP, MPP, and CFE •External Team: Stakeholder Roundtable Internal Team: Draft program processes and changes to May 2014 contract documents Both teams: Identify funding needs Internal Team: Draft program processes and changes to contract documents June 2014 Both teams: Budget preparation; identify as Unmet Needs for City-funded 3rd Party Loan (funding and staffing) and CFE (staffing) options July 2014 •Internal Team: Brief MBE/WBE and Small Business External Team: Budget funding not included for 3rd Party Loan option September 2014 Both Teams: Budget funding not included for staffing requests October 2014 •Internal Team: Rollout of QP and MPP if not complete November -• External Team: finalize MOA for 3rd Party Independent Loan December 2014 option Program implementation for 3rd Party Independent Loan

Program development and possible implementation for CFE

option

January 2015

^{*} September- January activity largely contingent upon budget approval; modifications will be made accordingly.

Staff will update both the MBE/WBE and Small Business Council Committee and the MBE/WBE and Small Business Advisory

Committee monthly on the process of the timeline.

	Potential Financial and Payment Assistance Programs	City contracts	Ch. 380 contracts
1)	City approaches 3 rd party financial institutions to offer independent loan program	х	X
•	Lenders voluntarily offer loans with more flexible criteria than traditional commercial loans		
•	Lenders have expertise in making credit decisions		
•	Concerns that interest rate will be too high; the funds will still be inaccessible; the traditional		
	lending process moves too slow		
•	City costs: None; no City funding would be necessary; the City could choose to dedicate 1 FTE		
	for education and outreach		
2)	City contracts with a 3 rd party administrator and funds a loan pool	X	Х
•	City could require financial institution to match City's funds		
•	City would continue to fund for a period (likely 2-3 years, subject to annual appropriation).		
	Annual funding could decrease as the loan pool grows		
•	During the procurement process, the City can establish the parameters of the loan program and		
	the eligibility requirements		
•	City funds potentially at risk of default, which could deplete the pool		
•	City costs: Dependent on City's preferred program scope & size		
	 Funds paid to financial institution for program administration, Grant/seed money for 		
	revolving loan pool (\$250K-\$1M), 1 or more City FTEs to serve as Contract		
	Administrator. This funding has been included as an unmet need in the Budget Process		
3)	City establishes Quick Pay Program (QP)	Х	
•	Prime contractor invoices City for "Quick Pay" funds. Subcontractors would apply for QPP		
	program and perform the work. Subcontractor then invoices the prime as work is completed		
	and is paid by the prime from the "Quick Pay" funds within 10 days of the work being accepted		
	and approved. The prime would then invoice the City on the next regular pay application.		
•	Similar to program used on new City Hall construction		
	Payment occurs once work is performed which reduces risk for the City; easy to implement for		
	COA projects City Costs: No additional staffing resource peeds have been identified at this time. May result in		
•	City Costs: No additional staffing resource needs have been identified at this time. May result in higher overall bid/contract price.		
1)	City establishes Mobilization Prompt Pay Program (MPP)	V	
•,	Prime contractors can submit pay applications twice a month, rather than monthly, at critical	X	
	mobilization points during the project (typically the first few months of work)		
	Subcontractors can receive payments more quickly during critical mobilization phase		
	May cost the COA more contractually due to increased general conditions cost for primes and		
	may also increase staff charges to capital projects due to review and processing of extra pay		
	applications		
	City Costs: No additional staffing resource needs have been identified at this time.		
5)	City establishes Cash Flow Enhancement Program (CFE)	х	
•	Prime contractor invoices City for "CFE" funds. Subcontractors would apply for CFEP. If	~	
	approved, prime would advance funds (up to 5% of the subcontractor's contract amount) to		
	fund mobilization expenses. The loan would be paid through deductions from progress		
	payments. (Similar to program used on Convention Center expansion)		
•	Subcontractors can receive access to funding during critical mobilization phase. Administration		
	as an internal City of Austin program helps ensure funding is accessed in a timely fashion		
•	Higher risk option as project funds are loaned out in advance of performance of work		
•	City Costs: a Lending Specialist to facilitate the review and approval process of loans and a		
	contract administrator to monitor the activities and payments. May result in higher overall		
	bid/contract price. This funding has been included as an unmet need in the Budget Process.		