

Street Maintenance and Reconstruction Committee Final Report

January 8, 2015

Following appointment of the 11 member Street Maintenance and Reconstruction Committee (Hereafter called “the committee”) in February 2014, the committee held its initial meeting on March 13, 2014, at the Taylor Public Library. Ed Komandosky was unanimously elected chair with Mrs. Delores Garza elected vice chair. City staff provided support as needed and recorded minutes.

Interim City Manager Jeff Straub guided the committee during its first and several succeeding meetings including outlining the expectations of the City Council. The city’s consulting engineer Casey Sledge presented an overview of the Pavement Management Report completed in 2012 and designed to be a tool for the committee to develop a plan to include funding options, goals, prioritization, and how street maintenance and reconstruction can be addressed.

The committee agreed to meet every two weeks on Thursdays when the council was not meeting for up to one year or until the plan was completed. Copies of all committee minutes are available.

One of the major objectives of this committee and the council was to assist in educating the public on street maintenance and reconstruction issues. To accomplish this the committee opted to conduct a survey of residents’ opinions on this issue and engage citizens in public neighborhood-area meetings to obtain their feedback regarding streets.

A survey formulated by committee member Jose Orta was first used at Zest Fest, then at the six community meetings and finally put in monthly city utility statements and online. Section one of this report put together by the subcommittee on finance gives some historical background on our city streets and a summary of the survey results. Section two of this report, subtitled “Biggest Bang for the Buck,” is a program put together by the subcommittee on priorities. Section three, completed by the subcommittee that dealt with public works and other issues, recommends that a full-time street maintenance department be created within city government.

The committee was composed on the following:

- Ed Komandosky, Chairman

Finance subcommittee:

- Jose Orta, John Nelson, Eric Weiner

Priorities subcommittee:

- Joe Naizer, Dolores Garza (also vice chair of the overall committee), Erwin Stauffer

Public works subcommittee:

- Lonnie Zycha, Dave Bogan, Andrew Gonzales, Mary Flores

Summary of Recommendations

Overall recommendations:

1. That street maintenance and reconstruction be listed as a line item in all future city of Taylor budgets;
2. That a full-time on-going educational effort be made to fully inform all citizens of the street improvement efforts.

Section 1: Finance recommendations:

1. That a reasonable street maintenance fee be added to the city's monthly utility statement, the funds collected to be used only for street maintenance.
2. That the city continues to pursue Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) to be used in street reconstruction projects.
3. That the city allows the development of a voluntary street assessment program so that citizens of a given neighborhood or on a specific street are allowed to fund a street maintenance and/or reconstruction program/project for their specific area.
4. That the city council consider issuing Certificates of Obligation or call a bond election to secure funding for major street reconstruction.
5. That the current city budget be scrubbed for efficiency to determine if other funds for street maintenance may be freed up.

Section 2: Street Improvement Priorities recommendations:

1. All projects for street, water, sewer, drainage and other city efforts are closely coordinated into a 10-year plan, to be reviewed annually.
2. Assume CDBG funding will be available for the foreseeable future and that a coordinated east-west, north-south street reconstruction plan be developed for the next 10 years.
3. Use a weighted system as proposed to prioritize street reconstruction projects.

Section 3: Public works recommendations:

1. Establish an in-house city street maintenance department staffed with trained personnel and equipped with necessary tools and equipment.
2. Consider the use of alternatives to sole use of asphalt in street maintenance and reconstruction.

Other recommendations:

1. As the City of Taylor grows and needs a fulltime engineering staff, consider the employment of a full-time in-house city engineer.
2. Form a "forward looking" Capital Improvements Projects review committee to bring citizens input to the table.
3. Including sidewalks in any street reconstruction project should be an objective.

Section 1. Report of the Finance Committee:

The condition of Taylor's 105 miles of streets has been an ongoing concern for many years. Our black land soil conditions contribute greatly, and the age of Taylor's downtown streets, many built in the early 1900s contribute to the problem. Articles in the Taylor Daily Press report political candidates promising to "Fix our Streets" over 75 years ago. It seems that promise could never be funded properly until recently. The rebuilding of Davis, Howard, and Sloan are signs of progress. The 2012 Report "Pavement Management Report" prepared by Sledge Eng. indicates that 52.2 % of Taylor's streets are failed or in "poor" condition. The city currently has budgeted \$5.2 million to a program that will upgrade the "fair" streets to "good". Actual cost of this program is now estimated to be approximately \$2.6 million and should fulfill maintenance needs for approximately 3 years. This will leave approximately \$2.6 million from the original budget for other work.

Addressing the street problems in Taylor cannot be funded, nor completed, in a short time frame. A long term, sustained program is more practical and doable. The Street Committee recommends that the program become an ongoing effort by the City, funds be earmarked annually, and that Street Maintenance become a separate line item in the budget. It is estimated that approximately one million is needed annually for continued maintenance, once all the streets are fixed.

Potential Funding Sources:

The Finance Subcommittee has reviewed the following potential sources of revenue to fund a long term, sustained program. Each source has been studied and the Pros and Cons noted.

1. Property Tax Increase:

Pros:

- Funding burden will be shared by the majority of those that use the streets.
- Once these funds are publicly dedicated to street maintenance, it will be unpopular for future councils to redirect.

Cons:

- Increased property tax will be burdensome for residents, especially those on fixed income. This could be offset by an increased homestead exemption for those over 65.
- Are a large percentage of real estate tax payers > 65 yrs. old?

2. Sales Tax Redistribution:

Pros:

- Revenue source includes contributions from those living outside Taylor.

Cons:

- Limited dollar amount available since City receives only 2 % of the total 8.25% collected.
- Taking a portion of the money dedicated to lowering city property tax would violate what voters were promised when they agreed to raise the local sales tax. The City must be trustworthy so voter confidence is maintained.
- Taking a portion of sales tax dedicated to lowering city taxes would require an increase in the local property tax to replace the funds used.
- Many in the community believe that it is necessary to reallocate the portion of the sales tax dedicated to the Taylor Economic Development Corporation (TEDC) towards fixing our streets. However, also many believe this will be counterproductive in that fewer new companies or additional employment at existing companies would not occur. Taylor's fundamental economic problem is that we are among the poorest of all the communities in Williamson County as noted in the average family income reported in the census. Money spent fixing our streets would not address this critical problem while the TEDC and Main Street focus is to create more, better paying jobs. Ultimately, this is a City Council decision.
- Any change to redirect the Sale tax would require voter approval

Eric added the following comment “TEDC funds—I don’t think it is our place to make a recommendation on this subject since it is a political issue. Ultimately, council members and voters will need to make a decision. I do think the City could focus more on encouraging absentee and rental owners to maintain their properties. There is some thought that it is deliberate to keep taxes low—, which again doesn’t help our revenue to improve streets.

3. Community Development Block Grants (CDBG):

Pros:

- Grant money originates outside the City of Taylor.
- Taylor has historically been successful in obtaining CBDG grants
- CBDG grant money could supplement local funds; seems to be consistent enough to incorporate into plans

Cons:

- Limited funds provided through annual grants, therefore limited street work could be finished each year.
- City is required to match.

4. Voluntary Street Assessment Fee :

This approach allows a citizen, plus his cooperating neighbors, a mechanism to address fixing his street immediately. The program would be completely voluntary in that the citizen, plus his neighbors, would request an estimate cost, from the City to fix his street. If the citizen and his neighbors agree to the cost and agree to move forward with

the repair, the city would do the repairs and then bill the citizens for the estimated cost by increasing their property tax to recover the street repair cost over an extended period, say 10 years.

Citizens who participate in paying to fix their local street would also pay any new fees/taxes associated to fixing streets city wide, since they will also use the community streets.

All, or a majority, of the homeowners on the street would have to participate in order for the work to move forward.

This is a complicated process but does provide a choice to those who are impatient with the process.

Pros:

- Addresses neighbor street needs immediately and is voluntary.
- Frees City funds to address other local street needs
- Allows citizens the ability to participate in the decision process

Cons:

- Potential source of disagreements between neighbors, where some want to fix the street in front of their house, but others are opposed to spending the money.
- Seems to be very divisive; people might wonder why their paying a street fee when fair to good streets did not contribute to the expensive of their repairs.
- People on a fixed income would be forced to participate but will resent having to pay more taxes.
- May require Charter amendment election

5. Monthly Fee on Utility Bill dedicated to Street Maintenance.

Pros:

- Fee Burden shared by all who live in Taylor, property owners and renters.
- Once dedicated to Street maintenance it would be unpopular for future Councils to redirect.

Cons:

- Businesses and residents pay the same fee
- Could be divisive if on a tier system to address road impact usage

6. Certificates of Obligation

These funds would be typically used for one time projects, such as the repair of one street.

Pros:

- Can be sought at the discretion of the Council, so amounts can be set by Council and dedicated to specific projects
- C.O.s do not require Voter approval
- C.O.s generally have the same term and interest rate as General Obligation Bonds

Cons

- Citizens are left out of the process. Since repairing our street is a significant expenditure for the City, it is critical that the final solution have agreement and support from the majority of the Community.

7. General Obligation Bonds

These funds would be typically used for one time projects, such as the repair of one street, i.e. the same as C.O.s

Pros:

- Require voter approval and thus reflect the will of the Community.

Cons:

- Require voter approval, and therefore uncertain.

8. Municipal Drainage Fee, Water and Wastewater Funds

Since these fees and funds are dedicated to other needs, they could not be used for Streets.

However, since drainage water is one of the major causes of street erosion, it is suggested that the cost of proper drainage associated with street repair be paid by this fee. In addition, installation of modern water and wastewater lines be installed when streets are repaired and this cost be funded by the water and waste water funds.

9. State Funding:

State funding is available for major State highways that traverse the City, but not for city streets. It is our understanding that Second Street is now the responsibility of the City after it was rebuilt. However, State Highway 95, i.e. Main Street is still a state highway, and thus the state's responsibility.

10. County Funding:

County Commissioner Ron Morrison said there are no county funds available for City streets. However, he recalled an earlier conversation with the City in which he indicated that he would support expansion of the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) area so more streets would be eligible for TIF funds.

Suggestion by Eric: We encourage the city staff and Council to continue to request money, as they did on Second Street.. it will also benefit County tax collections.

11. Community Growth:

Although discussed frequently, and little dramatic result achieved, the acknowledged solution to funding the Street program is growth of the tax base. Growth is critical since

it impacts the economy of the Community. Many envision economic growth only as the addition of high paying jobs, however, even increasing the number of low paying jobs is important. Consider how many Taylor residents commute to Austin daily to work at low paying jobs; if those jobs were in Taylor, the benefits to the family would be a shorter work day due to less commute time, more time to help children with their school work, thus preparing the future generations for a better paying job.

Some growth is required to maintain equilibrium i.e. the business property tax base decreases annually due to depreciation. When Taylor’s population, both residential and business, grows significantly, the property and sales tax revenue will increase. Obviously, the need for basic safety services, police and fire, will also grow. However, if the City can limit other service growth, additional new funds from growth can be used to address the Street problem.

It is critical that funds specifically dedicated to encourage growth be continued. Thus using TIF and TEDC funds for street maintenance is not only short sighted, but also decreases our chance to achieve a long term solution. The street committee strongly recommends that TIF and TEDC funds not be used to address the street problem. (Eric comments that it is not our place to make this recommendation because it is a political issue ultimately, council members, and voters will need to make a decision)

12. RE-allocate Current Budget items:

The Street Committee recommends that the Council thoroughly explore all options to insure we are operating City services as efficiently as possible before asking citizens to fund additional money for street work. Perhaps Taylor should hire an “Efficiency Consultant” to study the entire operating structure, comparing Taylor’s operating metrics to other similar communities e.g. how many police officers , firefighters, library workers do we have per thousand, etc. When possible we recommend any staff reductions required be addressed through attrition to reach target levels.

13. Community Input via Surveys:

The citizens of Taylor completed 607 surveys indicating their preferred approaches to fixing Taylor Streets. The surveys were gathered from the Zest Fest, survey forms included in the utility bills, neighborhood meetings, and responses to the poll on the city web site. A summary of the survey results and analysis is included in Appendix A.

In addition, the City conducted an on-line poll asking how would residents be willing to fund repairs or maintenance, 193 responded, the results were:

- | | | |
|---|----------|-----------|
| 1. Increase property tax? | 13.0% or | 25 people |
| 2. Add a street utility fee to water bills? | 40.9 %or | 79 people |

3. Not in favor of any fees or tax increase. 46.1% or 89 people

It is also the Committees understanding that the TEDC, in partnership with the City, is rebuilding Allison Drive and hopes to consider the Terra Pave product in this project. Savings realized could result in speedier program accomplishments for the funds allocated. See Appendix B for details.

Section 2. Biggest Bang for the Buck

As we discussed the basic design of this proposal, we saw that by looking holistically, much more could be accomplished than one project at a time. We cannot attribute all the costs of improving the streets to just streets. Our water, sewer, and drainage infrastructure have a significant impact on our streets and those funds should be prepared to fully participate in the overall improvement effort.

The pros to consider:

- Improving water and sewer failure independent of street work solves several problems along the way, such as replacing leaking water lines results in less maintenance, less street damage, lower cost of water to the water fund.
- Replacing damaged or deteriorated sewer lines results in less maintenance to clean lines, less maintenance to repair damaged lines, reduced potential for health impact.

This proposal is reminiscent of the ideology presented in the business book; “Quality is Free” by Philip B. Crosby. The premise in the book is “get the money and time wasters out of the way and you will be able to use those resources to pay for your improvements.”

We titled our proposal Biggest Bang for the Buck to mirror the frugal spending habits of our citizens. The overall question was: How can we effectively make a logical decision to improve streets in an orderly fashion? We settled on a model formula, which takes the Pavement Management Report as the base. From that, it became a process of determining how much funding resources are available and what is the most distance that funding will cover tempered with some grading factors.

1. All projects for Street, Sewer, Water, Drainage, CDBG, etc. must work in coordinated efforts under a 10 year plan, revisited every year.

2. CDBG - Assume CDBG funds will be available for the foreseeable future (10 years).
 - A. Designate 4 to 6 streets, which will be rehabilitated or reconstructed under the CDBG funding plan for the ten year time (The Pool)
 - B. Annually, Designate other City resources to provide matching or other funding
 - C. Use the following decision model to prioritize. (See Appendix C)
 - i. From designated streets in “A” select the longest street in the Pool (over time, several streets will be considered)

- ii. Separate any water or sewer costs, which can be funded by those sources.
 - iii. Can Drainage Fund provide any resources?
 - iv. Can EDC provide any funds?
 - v. Identify available City resources to use as matching funds
- D. Consider factors in #4 below

3. Rehabilitating or reconstructing streets -

- a) How much money is available - borrowing capacity, funds from other sources(see funding committee report)
- b) Separate out sewer and water system costs in the proposed projects. How much can the water and sewer funds contribute? Consider borrowing capacity of water and sewer funds, how much rate increase is tolerable?
- c) Can the Drainage Fund provide resources?
- d) Is there funding from EDC which can be used?
- e) Is there funding from other sources?
- f) What is the longest length that can be rehabilitated or reconstructed utilizing all the resources above?
- g) Continue by considering factors in #4 below

4. Once the available funding and resources in # 2 & # 3 for 4 to 6 longest length streets have been identified, consider other factors for Health & Safety; Traffic Safety and Mobility/Thoroughfare. Each of these factors will carry a weight factor between 1 and 3, and are identified as Health & Safety = 3, Traffic Safety = 2, Mobility, Thoroughfare, Sidewalks, etc. = 1. Health & Safety is defined as possible contaminants to water supply, contamination from deteriorated sewer lines, standing water for propagating mosquitoes and obstacles caused by large flows of rain water. Other Traffic Safety is defined as ability of two vehicles to advance in opposite directions without a collision or intrusion off the roadway. Mobility, Thoroughfare, Sidewalks, a Short connection to an already improved street(s) etc. is defined as the major corridors, signal light intersections, loops and bypasses plus a long range indication of where the next corridor, loop, signal lighted intersection or bypass could be built.

- a) Mobility plan - Weighing Factor 1
- b) Repair leaking water lines - Weighing Factor 3
- c) Repair/replace deteriorated sewer lines - Weighing Factor 3
- d) Traffic volume - Weighing Factor 2
- e) School bus routes - Weighing Factor 2
- f) Walking neighborhoods - Weighing Factor 1
- g) For each of the 2 or 4 longest length streets being considered, sum the weighing for factors "a" through "f" above
- h) Highest sum of weighting factors of the 3 - 4 proposed projects could be considered best fit for next project

5. The type of build is an engineering and Council decision based on soil conditions, drainage requirements, traffic volume and mobility/thoroughfare plan, etc.

Future Planning -

Street planning for thoroughfares should minimize direct on/off from business or residence (Mallard is closest to meeting this, TH Johnson partially). The benefit would be to reduce the gauntlet effect building on Main and 2nd Streets.

In addition, street planning should provide for continuous right turn lanes at signal lighted intersections which are currently needed at North Main @ Carlos G. Parker Loop, West bound and South bound; Mallard @ Carlos G. Parker North bound and East bound; Carlos G. Parker East bound @ South bound among others.

Section 3. Public Works Recommendations:

A graduated introduction of a City Streets Crew / change of current organization could be managed. Modify/Model Taylor's Public Works to be similar to Belton's. Initially there will be Capital investment for equipment and training. We already have a budget that could be adjusted to be managed accordingly.

Revenue sources would come from City Council decisions regarding additional taxes, Municipal Fees/Transportation User Fee for all households (equitable distribution of debt), and/or Bond debt – something that will be needed under any circumstances to fix the streets. The funds generated can be managed on the 10 year plan that is being recommended.

The tree trimming/lawn mowing services could be contracted out on an annual basis by taking bids each year, and/or City Ordinances could be adjusted to make property owners/businesses responsible/liable for maintaining their tree trimming/yard clippings. A landlord of private/business rental properties could adjust their lease documents to include requirement (cost of doing business).

Possible alternatives to 100% use of asphalt: Research feasibility of using:

Enviroflex Global Paving (970) 759-5681/ info@enviroflexgps.com;

Terra Pave International (254) 414-5885 / www.terrapaveinternational.com

Pros:

- Community Survey supports an in-house team
- Responsible to investment – utilizes tax dollars more efficiently
- Quality of life – better streets = better image for the city
- Improved response time in having repairs completed
- Attraction for new business -
- Positive visual for visitors

Cons:

- Not what the survey indicates
- Lack of implementation plan
- Loss of response time
- Problem becomes worse (time-lapse)
- Out of house becomes more costly
- Lack of quality control
- Not taking ownership
- Increase in payroll/budget items for employee benefits, training.
- Initial purchase of capital equipment needed
- Additional storage space may be required: City might need to purchase land, build structures for storage of the additional capital equipment

Sample/Info provided for support of above recommendation:

City of Belton (Pop: 18,216 from 2010 Census) – Mike Huber, Public Works Department (254-933-5823)

Department's primary responsibilities are to oversee and support infrastructure planning, design and construction, as well as maintenance operations for water/sewer, roads, city facilities, and vehicles. Public Works Department includes:

- Engineering
- Facilities and Fleet Maintenance
- Parks Maintenance
- Streets and Rights-of-Way
- Utility Operations

Survey done and data given 9-14-2014: Found that 14% of roads are in poor or facility condition.

Any project over \$200,000.00 is contracted out. Contracted out any lay down and hot mix work (did not spend the money on equipment to do these things because of cost).

Budget is for a crew of 9 members (1 superintendent and 8 workers such as heavy equipment operator 1&2, maintenance worker 1&2)

Equipment currently being used (Belton):

- 2 backhoes - \$80,000.00 each
- 2 Dump trucks - \$105,000.00 each
- 1 Grader - \$125,000.00
- 1 Loader - \$80,000.00
- 1 Roller - \$30,000.00

**Taylor has some of this equipment already.

Belton's FY-2015 Budget (1.2 million) includes:

- Salaries (includes health/Worker's Comp, etc..)	\$540,000.00
- Supplies (Office/Chem's/Tools/Small Equip.)	\$ 60,000.00
- Facilities Maint (Routine maint./Chip Seal/Signs/Sidewalks)	\$206,000.00
- Maintenance of Equipment	\$ 32,000.00
- Capital outlay (no ongoing)	\$ 53,000.00

Funds from a mixture of sources:

- o Bond \$1.5mil
- o Tax Reinvestment Zone (excess property taxes)
- o Drainage Utility Fees – Curb/gutter is included in impervious cover area
- o Transportation User Fee for street maintenance - \$8.00 per month on utility bill so that all residents having a utility bill pay – not just property/business owners. (**Austin/Bryan/Corpus Christi are three other cities that have this fee.)

A summary of the survey questions, and the results follows:

1. Taylor is doing a good job in maintaining the streets?
70% replied that they disagreed with this statement.
2. Needs to repair the worst streets first.
68% agreed with this statement.
3. Taylor needs to repair the high traffic streets first.
57% agreed with this statement.
4. Preventative maintenance of good streets is important.
84% agreed with this statement.
5. Taylor should consider an In-House Maintenance program.
.61% agreed with this statement.
6. Taylor should outsource the street Maintenance program.
_Only 20% agreed with this statement, 9% disagreed and 32% were neutral.
7. I'm willing to pay more in property tax to fix our streets
41% disagreed, 29 % agreed while 23 % were neutral.
8. I'm willing to pay a Street Maintenance fee as part of my utility bill.
34 % disagreed, 33 % agreed while 20% where neutral
9. The street I live on is in good condition .
48% agreed, 34% disagreed while 16% were neutral

From: Sean Stockard [<mailto:seanstockard@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, January 1, 2015 3:48 PM
To: John Nelson
Cc: sean.stockard@tayloredc.org
Subject: TEDC and Allison Drive Project

The Taylor Economic Development Corporation (TEDC) is looking at partnering with the City of Taylor to rehabilitate the entry and exit point to the Durcon and Accurate facilities known as Allison Drive in Taylor, Texas. This drive is both privately owned as well as a portion being owned by the City of Taylor. The exact breakdown is not yet known and will be determined later during the surveying process of the project.

The TEDC is a Type A Economic Development Corporation formed under the 1979 Economic Development Act. As such, it has the ability, under certain circumstances, to use its funding to participate in various infrastructure projects that will enhance or increase local industry's ability to grow and remain a healthy part of the local economy. The Allison Drive project is such a case.

The TEDC has contracted with BSP Engineering and Sledge Engineering (to serve as an oversight entity to protect the TEDC's interests) to put together and release the appropriate bid documents for contractors to put together comprehensive bids on what it will cost to rehabilitate Allison Drive.

As part of the bid documents, BSP has been authorized to include products developed by Terra Pave, a local company, as allowable alternatives to be used in the place of traditional asphalt products for this project. It will be up to the contractors bidding on the project to determine the viability of using the Terra Pave product(s). There is no requirement for the Terra Pave product to be used.

Prior to the bid documents being released, BSP will have an opportunity to meet with Terra Pave representatives to ask questions and become familiar with their product.

It is important to note that caution should be extended to anyone that may want to disseminate such information to the Street Committee or the general public that any authority available to the TEDC to provide such funding for roads is subject to strict parameters that would greatly limit, if not outright prohibit, the use of TEDC resources for most ordinary street construction, maintenance and/repair projects.

Section 501.103 of the Texas Local Government Code provides in relevant part that an acceptable "project" "includes expenditures that *are found by the board of directors to be required or suitable for infrastructure necessary to promote or develop **new or expanded business enterprises**, limited to: (1) streets and roads,...*" (emphasis added). Under these conditions, any retail and residential street projects would be excluded immediately. Further, the "business" in question would have to show that by the TEDC expending funds on said street it would result in said business expanding and hiring additional employees; a

scenario that is highly unlikely.

Further, it is likely that should the TEDC Board make such a determination as outlined under Section 501.103 of the Texas Local Government Code, their determination would be subject to review under an abuse of discretion standard (*see Texas Attorney General LO-95-072(1995)*)

Therefore, it would be arguably disingenuous to publish a naked statement that TEDC funds are available for street construction, maintenance and repairs without clearly pointing out the strict qualifications that must be met before those funds could be used.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	CDBG Example						
2	Street name	1	2	3	4	5	6
3							
4	Street length in ft	2,000	1,200	3,000	4,000	500	2,500
5							
6	Water system replacement costs	\$ 500,000	\$ -	\$ 200,000	\$ 350,000	\$ -	\$ 250,000
7							
8	Sewer system replacement costs	\$ 300,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 400,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000
9							
10	Street replacement/repair costs	\$ 400,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 300,000
11							
12	Total Example Costs	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 850,000
13							
14	Drainage Fund contribution	\$ -	\$ 200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
15							
16	EDC potential funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
17							
18	Water System Funds Available (includes available debt financing)	\$ 500,000		\$ 200,000	\$ 350,000	\$ -	\$ 250,000
19	(assumes borrowing \$3,000,000 for several projects)						
20							
21	Sewer System Funds Available (includes available debt financing)	\$ 300,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 400,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000
22	(assumes borrowing \$3,000,000 for several projects)						
23							
24	Other City resources for matching funds	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000
25							
26	City Funds Available	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 850,000	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 850,000
27							
28	Required Additional Funds	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000	\$ -	\$ -
29							
30	CDBG Grant Request	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 450,000	\$ 600,000	\$ -	\$ 450,000
31							
32	Weighing Factors						
33	Safety & Health - Sewer	3	3	3	3	0	3
34							
35	Safety & Health - Water	3	3	3	3	0	3
36							
37	Traffic Safety	2	0	2	2	0	0
38							
39	Mobility, Thoroughfare, etc.	0	0	1	1	0	1
40							
41		8	6	9	9	0	7