



**The Case for Capital Improvement Planning, Programming and
Budgeting for Oldham County**

An Oldham Ahead White Paper

February 27, 2006

By Douglas L. Wampler, Executive Director, Oldham Ahead

www.oldhamahead.org

The Case for Capital Improvement Planning, Programming and Budgeting for Oldham County

Oldham County has accomplished quite a lot the last five years in managing and accommodating the growth of one of the fastest growing counties in Kentucky and the nation. Oldham County is currently the 4th fastest growing county in Kentucky and was the 164th fastest growing county in the nation (out of 3,141) during the 1990's, according to the 2000 Census.

The past and projected rate of growth for the county necessarily means there are near and long-term needs for facilities, infrastructure and other capital expenditures to support the county's rapidly growing population. These requirements must be planned, programmed, coordinated and budgeted to ensure infrastructure requirements support future growth. Moreover, the requirements and budget projections should be transparent and available for the public to view in public documents and forums.

It is important to acknowledge the accomplishments of the County Government, Fiscal Court, and the Planning and Zoning Commission and staff, the past several years. Achievements include the adoption of a new comprehensive plan (Outlook 2020, February 2002); the passage of several infrastructure related capacity planning ordinances in 2005 and 2006 (School, Stormwater and Wastewater respectively); the finalization of a Road Capacity Ordinance; and the drafting of supporting subdivision regulations that should be finalized later this year.

Much appreciation should be given to the local county leaders, citizens, businessmen, non-profit quality of life organizations and developers who have expended significant personal time and effort in a collaborative manner to draft the ordinances and regulations that support the Comprehensive Plan. Special credit should be given to Planning and Zoning Commission Chairman who has skillfully shepherded often contentious issues through a formalized staffing process and forged a consensus that all interests can live with. This coordination and cooperation will help ensure the future quality of life and economic prosperity of Oldham County.

Slowly, but surely, the county is gathering the pieces to the puzzle to provide the Planning and Zoning Commission and staff adequate tools to implement the Goals and Objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. Adoption of these tools and regulations provide predictability for residents and developers alike, and help ensure that community facilities and services are planned and developed in a coordinated, tax efficient manner.

One key piece of the puzzle that is missing is the adoption of Capital Improvement Planning, Programming, and Budgeting—a key element of the Land Use and Community Facilities Goals of Outlook 2020, the county's Comprehensive Plan. Adopting the use of that tool will in turn allow for and assist in the development of master plans for the county's eight planning areas—also called for in Outlook 2020.

What are Capital Improvement Planning, Programming and Budgeting and why is the process critical for Oldham County? A Capital Improvement Planning, Programming, and Budgeting process is a tool to bring all of the major county government and public service players together to develop a working process to identify future capital expenditures and their sources of funding for the benefit of the county. The CIP budgeting process is integral to successful implementation of Outlook 2020 and needs to be adopted as soon as possible.

A Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is:

- A multi-year (five-to-six-year) policy guide used to identify needed capital projects and to coordinate the financing and timing of public improvements.
- A useful tool to help prioritize major expenditures and identify corresponding operational and personnel annual costs.
- A dynamic plan that can be changed as circumstances change, and updated as needed.

A Current CIP can:

- Involve and inform citizens and officials.
- Prevent "crisis management" and shape development.
- Promote economic development and intergovernmental cooperation.
- Streamline the annual budget process.
- Ensure budgets are looking out at least 5-6 years with respect to revenues and planned capital expenditures
- Encourage cooperation and coordination from all infrastructure providers and stakeholders, from Fiscal Court, Planning and Zoning; Oldham County School Board; Oldham County Economic Development Authority; Sewer and Water Districts; Fire and Ambulance Districts; Library Board; other utilities; and state, regional, and federal agencies.
- Secure financing through bonds or taxation/assessment districts as well as with grants and loans.
- Focus programming and budgeting thinking from a short-term one fiscal-year-at-a-time view to a more mid or long-range perspective.

The purpose of the CIP is to collectively forecast and plan for the funding of the County's long-term capital improvement needs to maximize the delivery of service to our citizens. It is broad and far reaching versus narrow and detailed. It establishes a framework for overall County capital planning, identification of funding sources, and an analysis of the impact of long-term capital improvements on future operating revenue and expenses.

This does not take planning, programming and budgeting responsibilities away from their present "owners" and centralize them in one body—namely the office of the Judge-Executive and Fiscal Court. Rather, the process asks each entity to plan their capital improvement needs as far out as possible, and share the results of their planning and programming with one coordinating body that will assemble, update, and disseminate the

collective plan to all parties to help county budgeting as a whole. This will ensure infrastructure funding and timing is optimized to protect the interests of all taxpayers.

In short, capital improvement plans help a community save money by figuring out the order, timing and financing of major community investments. The information in a capital improvement plan helps decision makers from all concerned agencies coordinate services for greater efficiency and assess the short-term financing requirements in the context of long-term fiscal needs and constraints.

Capital improvement planning, programming and budgeting are integral to federal and state budgeting processes, and has been incorporated by many counties and cities across the country. In the Commonwealth of Kentucky, Kentucky Revised Statute (KRS) 7A.120(3) directs that in each odd-numbered year each state agency is to submit information about its facilities and facilities-related needs to the Capital Planning Advisory Board. Kentucky has a six-year statewide capital plan and local utilities and Board of Education provide input to that process.

Advantages of Capital Improvement Planning, Programming and Budgeting

A systematic, organized approach to planning capital facilities provides a number of real and practical advantages:

- **Promotes the wise use of taxpayer monies:** Advance planning and scheduling of community facilities provided by multiple government entities and service providers may avoid costly mistakes. The effort put into deliberate assessment of the need for repair, replacement or expansion of existing public works, as well as careful evaluation of the need and timing of new facilities can provide many savings. Project timing may be improved to better use available personnel, expensive equipment and construction labor by scheduling related major activities over a longer period. Coordination of construction of several projects may effect savings in construction costs (a newly paved street may not have to be torn up to replace utility lines). Overbuilding or under-building usually can be avoided. Needed land can be purchased at lower cost well in advance of construction.
- **Promotes the focusing on community needs and capabilities.** Public works projects and other capital expenditures should reflect the community's needs, objectives, expected growth and financial capability. Given the county's limitations for funding capital facilities, planning ahead will help assure that high priority projects will be built first and that marginal projects are eliminated.
- **Allows community input and support.** Citizens tend to be more receptive toward projects which are part of a community-wide analysis. A high priority project which is part of an overall plan is less suspect as being someone's "pet project". Where the public participates in the planning of community facilities the citizens are better informed about the community needs and the priorities. A capital facilities program reduces the pressure on elected officials to fund projects or make large purchases which may be of low priority. One of the primary benefits of a community capital improvements program is that because citizens

participated (or were allowed the opportunity), they are more willing to support bond issues, rate increases, and other funding methods impacting taxpayers.

- **Encourages economic development.** Typically, a firm considering expansion or relocation is attracted to a community which has well planned and well managed facilities in place. A capital facilities program allows private investors to understand a community's tax loads and service costs, and reflects the fact that the community has done some advance planning to minimize the costs of capital facilities. Keeping planned projects within the financial capacity of the community helps to preserve its credit and bond rating and makes the area more attractive to business and industry.
- **Promotes county-wide coordination of all government bodies, departments, and commissions.** Coordination of capital facilities construction, both within a jurisdiction and among city, county and special districts, can reduce scheduling problems, conflicts and overlapping of projects. Also, work can be scheduled more effectively when it is known in advance what, where and when projects are to be undertaken. While county planners do effect coordination between agencies, a more formalized process will ensure routine, comprehensive views of all major projects and expenditures and allow for the de-conflicting of issues on at least an annual basis.
- **Positions the county for Federal and state grant and loan programs.** A capital improvements program places the community in a better position to take advantage of federal and state grant programs, because plans can be made far enough in advance to utilize matching funds, both anticipated and unanticipated. Most federal and state grant/loan programs either require prior facilities planning, or favor, in ranking applications, applicants which have conducted such planning. The process itself, which forces elected and selected officials to look at least five or six years in future, will allow the county to consider the out-year operational and personnel impacts of capital projects funded by grants.
- **Allows information from the CIP to be integrated into the county's Geographic Information System (GIS).** Planning and programming data can be input into the county's sophisticated mapping and planning system to allow planners to visualize the future in each geographic area of the county, synchronize projects and address inconsistencies before conflicts occur.
- **Provides critical information for citizens in the County's eight planning areas to develop their area master plans.**

The Challenge for Oldham County

The Kentucky Constitution and Revised Statutes have split budgeting and governing responsibilities within counties, making it difficult for both county officials and citizens to see one cohesive, synchronized view of future needs and requirements—both in the short and the long term.

A typical tax bill in the county will reflect at least seven different taxing jurisdictions (state, county, school, library, health, ambulance and fire). Each has capital improvement requirements and plans and separate budgeting processes. Additionally, there are multiple

local utilities that service the county divided into multiple water and sewer districts—each with defined service areas. Each of agencies has separate budgeting requirements and capital improvement plans that impact the growth in the county and impact the collective amount of taxes and fees citizens pay.

Further compounding budgeting challenges at the county level is Kentucky’s fiscal policies that result in a massive redistribution of public resources from the urban areas where over half of all state government taxes and fees are collected towards sparsely populated rural areas. The urban areas, which include Oldham County, have the most capital expenditure requirements but receive about one-third of state expenditures.¹

University of Louisville Economist Dr. Paul Coomes and Barry Kornstein documented the current fiscal dilemma in their November 2004 report, *Kentucky’s Economic Competitiveness, A Call for Modernization of the State’s Fiscal Policies*. They write: “State government absorbs most of the state *and* local public resources available statewide, but tends to spend the dollars in sparsely populated areas. It has codified spending formulas that require billions of dollars to be spent annually in areas with little population or economic activity. And it has fostered an unhealthy and unsustainable culture throughout the state, whereby residency entitles one to K-12 schools, community colleges, universities, roads, police service, health care, recreation facilities, and basic infrastructure – at little or no cost to the individual or the local community. Urban residents and workers, on the other hand, are taxed twice – once to pay for their own public services, and again to pay for services to those who live in the rest of the state.”²

For Oldham County government bodies, this means that the scarce public funds available to improve quality of life required capital improvements must be carefully prioritized to ensure high priority programs are funded. The reality is county government does not have the wherewithal to adequately address all requirements and it cannot rely on funding from the state to make up even a significant amount of shortfalls.

What the county lacks to deal with these fiscal and structural challenges is a single mechanism or tool to capture *all* of these programs in a single program or document to allow for their collective review and synchronization to ensure they mutually support the county’s goals and objectives with the limited funding available.

Implementing the Process

The first step in preparing a CIP is to develop a county-wide consensus that a CIP process is needed and that the Judge-Executive and Fiscal Court should most likely lead the effort. Because of the fractured system of multiple governing bodies, boards, and utilities within the county, the Judge-Executive or Deputy should lead the effort and designate its key planning agency, Planning and Zoning, as the coordinating body to collect, assemble,

¹Kentucky’s Economic Competitiveness, A Call for Modernization of the State’s Fiscal Policies, by Paul Coomes, Ph.D, Professor of Economics, and National City Research Fellow and Barry Kornstein, Senior Research Analyst, University of Louisville, 2004, p. 1.

²Ibid, p. 1.

de-conflict, and disseminate information in a CIP. Planning and Zoning would act as a clearinghouse to collect input for a plan and would coordinate the assembly of information into a coherent overall plan. It would have no authority other than that provided by the Judge-Executive and Fiscal Court to request and assemble approved plans from each body and then to maintain them over time for use by all county decision makers.

The second step is to develop a set of fundamental policies in place. These policies should define the players and their roles, define a "capital improvement", determine the length of the plan and develop a priority system. Since several county entities currently provide input to the State's Capital Improvement Program, it would be logical to review their input criteria and adopt it as much as possible to preclude additional work on their parts.

A wide range of public facilities and equipment should be considered in capital planning. While there are no hard and fast rules, capital planning deals with the purchase or construction, land, major repair, reconstruction or replacement of capital items such as: buildings, utility systems, roadways, bridges, parks, landfills, and heavy equipment which are of high cost and have a useful life of several years. Many communities also include studies whose cost exceeds \$5,000 and related major equipment, furnishings and improvements that exceed a stated dollar amount.

A CIP should show **at least** five years of capital planning. The CIP of projected projects will be reviewed once a year and another year will be added on. Known capital plans beyond the specified length should also be reflected on the plan.

A process to prioritize projects should be established. Many communities use a point system to assist the prioritization process.

Once a good baseline is established and any resulting issues are identified and resolved, each responsible budgeting agency (Fiscal Court and other county agencies) can proceed with their own programming and budgeting with a high degree of confidence that their respective programs are coordinated with all county programs. Importantly, this will also help avoid instances where a well meaning capital improvement optimizes the objectives of a county entity or utility but may be out of synch with the overall county goals and will actually sub-optimize county planning and result in wasted expenditures and higher taxes.

The implementation of a CIP process is actually relatively easy and painless once it is designed and implemented the first time. The planning effort involves the establishment of an annual process and calendar for soliciting input, evaluation and prioritizing of capital project requests, as well as coordinating projects in order to minimize conflicts and to maximize funding opportunities. Planning representative from each budgeting agency should participate in routine scheduled reviews of the CIP to share information and adjust dates and projects as necessary.

As with any programming and budget system, the participants must establish dollar thresholds for capital improvement inclusion into the process, determine types of capital expenditures to include, and determine an objective as a priority system to measure projects relative value. The degree of detail for identification of revenue streams must be considered. Finally, the output devices must be agreed upon. A simple Excel spreadsheet can be developed to capture the information, or more complex tools can be adopted to include the use of the county's GIS system.

Capital expenditures can occur by way of an expenditure of cash reserves, current operating revenue, or proceeds from debt financing. A CIP allows decision makers to anticipate those expenditures and conduct a cost benefit analysis as to the best way to fund the project and corresponding future operational and personnel costs given available revenues.

In summary, the steps for each governing body include:

- Identifying the needs for facilities and capital improvements, the timing, costs and means of financing for each project;
- Preparing a financial analysis of the jurisdiction's capacity to pay for new facilities;
- Setting priorities among the proposals;
- Seeking review and comment by the public on the recommended projects and priorities;
- Preparing a final capital facilities program showing projects, priorities, schedule of completion and methods of funding each project;
- Adopting the capital facilities program by each and adopting first year's projects as a capital budget as part annual budget;
- Providing the output to Planning and Zoning staff to consolidate into a county-wide CIP
- Participate in reviewing the county-wide CIP for potential conflicts, and develop strategies to resolve and synchronize identified issues;
- Reviewing the capital facilities program annually.

Oldham County has taken the initial step to implement the transportation elements of a CIP that could lead to full implementation later. Judge-Executive Mary Ellen Kinser announced in the February 7, 2006 Fiscal Court meeting that the county is applying for a \$70,000 grant from the Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency to develop a local five-year transportation improvement program that establishes the principles for ranking transportation projects within the county. The program would be designed to be a model that could be exported to other counties within the Commonwealth.

Oldham Ahead applauds this first step and encourages all county officials to move the CIP process forward. We suggest that Oldham County should review examples of best CIP government practices and adopt the best practices and processes for complete implementation of the CIP process to meet the county's. We believe the County can establish realistic milestones that result in full implementation within the next 12 months.

Included are six appendixes to illustrate key elements of a typical Capital Improvements Program and how the narrative and tabular data flow in a logical manner. The data used in the appendixes are from the City of Flagstaff, AZ CIP and represent a typical city or county program. (Some tables have been “cropped” in order to fit on these pages.)

Appendix A: Sample Introduction to a Capital Improvements Plan

Appendix B: Sample Universal Prioritization Criteria (for use by all Divisions and Departments)

Appendix C: Sample Project Funding Detail (Extract) from one Division or Department

Appendix D: Sample Project Funding Roll-Up (Extract) from one Division or Department Reflecting Programs and Sources of Funding Summary by Fiscal Year

Appendix E: Sample Summary Statements of Each Funded Project with Operations and Maintenance Impacts

Appendix F: Sample Summary Statements of Each Unfunded Project with Operations and Maintenance Impacts

Appendix A: Sample Introduction to a Capital Improvements Plan

CITY OF FLAGSTAFF

Five Year Capital Improvement Program

Introduction:

The Capital Improvement Division (CID) is responsible for the development of a Five Year Capital Improvement Program in which coordination of the City's overall capital needs are identified and prioritized. The Five Year Capital Improvement Program includes Transportation/Streets, Utilities, Public Works, Recreation, Stormwater, Environmental Services, Planning and all other departments and divisions having responsibility for public infrastructure and facility needs.

The process of identifying and assessing the long-term capital needs of the community is critical to the implementation of publicly developed goals and objectives. The development and adoption of a comprehensive Five Year Capital Improvements Program provides the guidance necessary for coordinating the funding and expenditures associated with community infrastructure investments.

The CID has documented a defined and repeatable process for the planning and programming of the various elements of the City's capital improvements. The development of a Five-Year Data Base, including all anticipated capital needs, serves as a basis of a comprehensive capital program that is integrated within the City organization and with our local partners and other agencies.

Process:

The planning effort involves the establishment of an annual process and calendar for soliciting input, evaluation and prioritizing of capital project requests, as well as coordinating projects in order to minimize conflicts and to maximize funding opportunities.

During the fall of each year, CID staff notifies all appropriate Divisions city wide that the CIP Data Base is available for the input of capital project requests. Utilizing the Data Base request forms, project input is typically scheduled for 3-4 weeks. After the input period, the Data Base is closed and the Finance Division is provided with the project requests for their review of the anticipated project expenditures. An analysis of available revenues is projected over the Five-Year project period and notification is then provided to the requesting Divisions of any revenue/expenditure conflicts or discrepancies.

CID concurrently reviews the projects for completeness, potential conflicts, coordination opportunities and initiates the mapping effort. A revision period is established to resolve any conflicts and project prioritization is evaluated using established criteria and presentations are given by the requesting Divisions to CID and the CIP Committee. A "Draft" CIP Summary is then provided for a series of presentations and meeting reviews by the various Committees and Commissions that oversee the respective Divisions' activities, (i.e. Water Commission, Airport Committee, Traffic Commission, Parks and Recreation Commission, Planning and Zoning Commission, etc.).

The "Draft" CIP Summary is edited after the review process and a special CIP/Budget Committee meeting is held, generally in January or February, for staff review and acceptance of the draft capital program. Presentation to the City Council is scheduled for review and acceptance and the finalized CIP report is distributed and becomes available to the public after City Council adoption.

The review process provides an objective process for identifying project priorities. The result of this process and the information synthesized is the basis for the Five Year Capital Improvement Program. The process has established a standard for consistency in the prioritization of all future city-wide capital projects.

Public Involvement:

Each Department submitting capital project requests is also responsible for presenting their proposals at public meetings of the Council appointed Commission, Committees and Advisory Task Force groups to increase community awareness of the Capital Improvement Program and generate public support of proposed expenditures while soliciting public input for additional projects. The numerous public meetings held with City Committees and sub-committees and City Council affords many opportunities for public input. As an example, the transportation portion of the Five Year Capital Improvements Program is reviewed and endorsed by the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee. Additionally, all 2004 Bond funded capital projects have solicited public review and comment through the Bond Advisory Task Force efforts.

Planning and Programming:

The Planning and Programming effort within CID, which provides the management of the Citywide Capital Improvement Program has been enhanced by upgrades made to the Data Base system. The maintenance of the Data Base and capital planning process will allow for coordination with the annual budgeting cycle. The synthesized Data Base information is the basis for the Five Year Capital Improvement Program.

The Data Base system which serves as the source document for all anticipated capital needs over the next five years has been made more user friendly, allowing the sharing of information between all City divisions and departments requesting capital projects. The Data Base is now capable of producing reports and queries in categories specific to the users needs. This advent has improved the uniformity of project information, allows for coordination with the annual budgeting cycle and ensures a more dynamic and integrated capital program and project delivery.

Over the next five years, the city's commitment to infrastructure and facilities include over 150 individual projects anticipated to total more than \$ 200 million.

Appendix B: Sample Universal Prioritization Criteria (for use by all Divisions and Departments)

1. Economic Feasibility (0-20 Points):

Dedicated Funding Sources – A measure of funding available for the improvements.

Other Funding Sources – A measure of funding opportunities that may exist on a specific basis that are available for use for limited duration such as Grants, Developer Contributions, and Inter-Agency Funding.

O&M Reduction – A measure of a project's ability to reduce on-going Operations and Maintenance costs.

Life Cycle Costs – A measure of annual and replacement costs that are incurred as a result of making an improvement.

2. Public Safety (0-20 Points):

This will be used to determine if the project has an impact on an existing or potential physical threat such as accidents, injuries, sickness, fire or flooding damages or reductions in legal liability. Impacts to emergency responsiveness are also to be considered.

3. Project Relationships (0-20 Points):

This is a measure of compatibility and connectivity of projects within the CIP. This will be used to measure linkages of projects, enhancements to existing systems, potential benefits or impacts to/from other projects, completion of adopted plans, connections to existing systems and effects on other agency's programs.

4. Policy and Public Support (0-20 Points):

Considerations should include: existing policy documents such as the General Plan, Mater Plans, IGA's, and Approved Staff Summaries; direction from the City Council; citizen requests/complaints; Committee/Commission/Board Actions; and potential impacts to neighborhoods and businesses.

5. Delivery Certainty (0-10 Points):

The ability to realistically delivery the project within the 5-year CIP proposed timeframe. Consideration should be given to the certainty of obtaining required Council authorization, right-of-way, permits, agreements, and public support.

6. Value Added Benefit (0-10 Points):

Discretionary category to consider quality-of-life issues such as environmental benefits, aesthetic enhancements, creating an affordable community for our citizens, tourism, economic development, and cultural issues.

Appendix C: Sample Project Funding Detail (Extract) from one Division or Department



*City of Flagstaff
Capital Improvements Division
Capital Improvements Program*

Division Project Funding Detail (Tabular View)

for Divisions: '37', and Fund Years: '04/05', '05/06', '06/07', '07/08', '08/09',

Division: 37 -- AIRPORT CAPITAL DIVISION -- AIRPORT

Project Title: CONSTRUCT BOX HANGARS, SHADE AND T-HANGARS.

| Fund Source | 03/04 | 04/05 | 05/06 | 06/07 | 07/08 | 08/09 | 09/10 | 10/11 | 11/12 | 1 |
|------------------------------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Operating Revenues - Airport | | | | | | | | | | |
| Loans | | \$2,557,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Project Totals | | \$2,557,000 | | | | | | | | |

Project Title: ACCESS ROAD CONSTRUCTION

| Fund Source | 03/04 | 04/05 | 05/06 | 06/07 | 07/08 | 08/09 | 09/10 | 10/11 | 11/12 | 1 |
|------------------------------|-------|-------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Grants - Federal | | | \$0 | \$2,458,620 | \$728,480 | | | | | |
| Grants - State | | | \$360,000 | \$120,690 | \$35,760 | | | | | |
| Operating Revenues - Airport | | | \$40,000 | \$120,690 | \$35,760 | | | | | |
| Project Totals | | | \$400,000 | \$2,700,000 | \$800,000 | | | | | |

Project Title: AIRPORT ARFF FACILITY

| Fund Source | 03/04 | 04/05 | 05/06 | 06/07 | 07/08 | 08/09 | 09/10 | 10/11 | 11/12 | 1 |
|------------------------------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Grants - Federal | | \$1,821,200 | | | | | | | | |
| Grants - State | | \$89,400 | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Revenues - Airport | | \$89,400 | | | | | | | | |
| Project Totals | | \$2,000,000 | | | | | | | | |

Project Title: AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

| Fund Source | 03/04 | 04/05 | 05/06 | 06/07 | 07/08 | 08/09 | 09/10 | 10/11 | 11/12 | 1 |
|------------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Operating Revenues - Airport | | \$16,760 | | | | | | | | |
| Grants - Federal | | \$341,480 | | | | | | | | |
| Grants - State | | \$16,760 | | | | | | | | |
| Project Totals | | \$375,000 | | | | | | | | |

Friday, August 06, 2004

Appendix D: Sample Project Funding Roll-Up (Extract) from one Division or Department Reflecting Programs and Sources of Funding Summary by Fiscal Year



*City of Flagstaff
Capital Improvements Division
Capital Improvements Program*

Division Project Funding Detail (Tabular View)

for Divisions: '37', and Fund Years: '04/05', '05/06', '06/07', '07/08', '08/09',

Division: 37 -- AIRPORT CAPITAL DIVISION -- AIRPORT

Project Title: TAXILANE/APRON - GENERAL AVIATION

| Fund Source | 03/04 | 04/05 | 05/06 | 06/07 | 07/08 | 08/09 | 09/10 | 10/11 | 11/12 |
|------------------------------|-------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Operating Revenues - Airport | | | | \$25,000 | \$89,400 | \$22,350 | | | |
| Grants - Federal | | | | | \$1,821,200 | \$455,300 | | | |
| Grants - State | | | | \$225,000 | \$89,400 | \$22,350 | | | |
| Project Totals | | | | \$250,000 | \$2,000,000 | \$500,000 | | | |
| Division Totals | | \$11,519,500 | \$8,087,500 | \$3,450,000 | \$3,050,000 | \$750,000 | | | |

| | | | |
|--------------|------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Fund Source: | Grants - Federal | \$18,822,108 | 6 records |
| Fund Source: | Grants - State | \$4,190,946 | 8 records |
| Fund Source: | Loans | \$2,557,000 | 1 record |
| Fund Source: | Operating Revenues - Airport | \$1,286,946 | 9 records |
| | Total for Division: | \$26,857,000 | 24 records |

Appendix E: Sample Summary Statements of Each Funded Project with Operations and Maintenance Impacts

AIRPORT PROGRAM – FUNDED DIVISION: 37

Division 37 – Airport Capital

Construct Box Hangars, Shade and T-Hangar

Design and build six (6) 60'X60' and up to fourteen (14) 50'X50' box hangars to accommodate larger aircraft. Also construct one 10-unit shade hangar. Annual O&M costs estimated to be \$5,000.

Access Road Construction

JWP extension to Lake Mary Road.

Airport ARFF Facility

Airport rescue/fire facility – a 4,800 square foot equipment bay and 1,700 square foot administrative area, access road, parking lot, fencing, drainage, apron and utility. Annual O&M costs estimated to be \$10,000.

Airport Master Plan

Complete new 20-year master plan to include environmental assessments and noise study.

Coat Wildcat Digestors

Apply protective coating to interior walls of two digestors. Includes raising the floating covers.

Construct Runway Extension

Extend runway north 1,200'-1500'. Build 1,000' safety area. Build associated taxiway and security fencing. Annual O&M costs estimated at \$5,000.

JWP/Pulliam Widening

Design and construction of curb/gutter sidewalk and road widening – FUTS trail.

Land Acquisition

Acquire 640 acres of land in proximity to the Airport.

Pavement Preservation

Maintenance of existing airport pavement surface.

Taxilane/Apron – General Aviation

Design and construct taxilane and apron for new general aviation hangar area. Annual O&M estimated to be \$5,000.

Appendix F: Sample Summary Statements of Each Unfunded Project with Operations and Maintenance Impacts

GENERAL GOVERNMENT – UNFUNDED DIVISIONS: 21, 24, AND 26

Division 21 – Fire

Fire Training Center/Tower Relocation

A multi-purpose training center that provides the opportunity for firefighters to train and enhance skills. Operations and Maintenance costs estimated to be \$50,000.

Division 24 – General Fund Capital

New City Shop Facility

The existing shop facility is outdated; over crowded and has little available parking. Annual O&M costs are estimated to be \$250,000.

Cemetery Entrance

Construct new entrance – add turn lane on Lone Tree Rd., bridge over the Sinclair wash, curb & gutter, gates, landscaping and signage. Estimated Annual O&M costs are \$3,000.

Cemetery Office Addition

Add 24' X 38' building addition for new office, family meeting area, employee break room, showers and restrooms. Annual O&M costs estimated to be \$4,000.

City Court Facility

New 15,000 sq. ft. City Court Facility

City Hall Annex

10,000 sq. ft. of additional city office space.

Downtown Gateway West Parking Garage

New parking garage for Downtown that will serve new developments, existing downtown businesses and City Hall.

Division 26 – Parks Division

Arroyo Park Improvements

Develop existing acreage to include lighting an existing ball field and adding paved parking, playground, courts, picnic area, walkways, etc. Annual O&M costs estimated to be \$16,720.

Buffalo Park Improvements

Pave parking area, entryway improvement; build permanent restrooms, additional picnic areas. Annual O&M costs estimated to be \$8,360.

Bushmaster Park Land Acquisition/Expansion

Acquire north side (Lockett) street frontage property/lots. No O&M costs anticipated at this time.

Cheshire Park Improvements

Develop approximately 8 acres of park to include turf/soccer field, walkways, Ramada, playground, and parking lot. Annual O&M costs estimated to be \$58,520.

Christensen Park Land Acquisition/Expansion

Acquisition of USFS land to provide park access and visible frontage – approximately 5 acres. O&M costs estimated to be \$250 annually.

Clay Basin West Park Development

Development of community Park, including Soccer fields, Ramadas, Picnic Areas, Playgrounds, Walkways, Nature Trails, Parking, etc. Annual O&M costs estimated to be \$85,800.