City of Alexandria, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

DATE: OCTOBER 30, 2009

TO: THE HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL

FROM: JAMES K. HARTMANN, CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: CITY COUNCIL RETREAT – REPORT ON FY 2011 – FY 2020 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

APPROVED FY 2010 – FY 2015 CIP OVERVIEW

The FY 2010 – FY 2015 CIP was approved by City Council in May 2009. This capital plan was constructed placing a heavy emphasis on providing the necessary funding to maintain the City’s existing public infrastructure. The six-year funding total for this plan is $398.4 million, including $80.0 million in FY 2010 and $85.9 million in FY 2011. The single biggest shortcoming of the FY 2010 – FY 2015 CIP is that it is not a balanced plan over the six years. Fiscal Years 2012 – 2014 include $72.6 million of unfunded projects. These unfunded projects are not specifically identified, but rather the plan is balanced assuming expenditure reductions to be determined at a future date. Furthermore, this year Departments have identified another $51.5 million worth of capital projects that are specifically not funded in the six-year plan. Altogether, this represents a funding shortfall of $124.1 million.

Despite these major funding issues that continue to loom on the horizon, the FY 2010 – FY 2015 CIP does manage to provide funding for many critical projects. The single largest project in the plan is the new Police Facility scheduled to open in late calendar year 2011. Although the project is an expensive undertaking at over $78 million, by moving APD from leased space to City-owned space the City can anticipate saving more than $100 million over the life of this facility. The FY 2010 CIP also included funding for four major fire station projects over the next six years, including expansion of Station 203 (Cameron Mills Road), renovation or replacement of Station 206 (Seminary Road), and construction of new Stations 209 (Potomac Yard) and 210 (Eisenhower Valley). One other major capital expenditure is the City’s contribution to the WMATA capital expenditure program, which totals $63.3 million over six years.
CITY MANAGER’S PROPOSED FY 2011 – FY 2020 CIP

As has been the case in the last two budget processes, the City Manager’s FY 2011 CIP will place a heavy emphasis on maintenance of existing public infrastructure. This means the process and plan will focus on properly measuring the results of and fully funding ongoing capital maintenance programs. Secondly, this CIP will strategically plan and prioritize major renovation projects. Finally, the proposed plan will include new capital initiatives only where they support Strategic Plan goals and objectives as they are developed, and when the City can afford the investment. Priority will be given to any project specifically included in the City Council Strategic Plan.

CHANGES TO THE FY 2011 CIP PROCESS

In response to the funding shortfalls in the FY 2010 CIP, as well as the comments by City Council during the FY 2010 budget process, City staff has started developing the FY 2011 plan using some different prioritization and planning mechanisms. The first major change is the extension of the capital improvement program from a six- to a ten-year plan. The sheer number of current projects and requests for additional projects greatly exceed what could be realistically implemented over the next six years. In order to plan more accurately for project start dates, ten program years will be planned. These ten years will likely include six years of “hard programmed” projects and the final four years of softer, less certain project totals. These final four years may appear in a separate, long range capital planning chapter of the CIP, rather than within the project sections themselves so as not to overstate the level of certainty about specific project implementation and final cost.

Another change City staff has implemented is the manner with which Departments categorize and prioritize projects. This year, Departments have categorized their project requests into three distinct groupings. Group 1 includes ongoing, regular capital maintenance programs that are required on an annual basis in order to take care of the City’s existing public infrastructure. This group of projects is considered the highest priority and should not be regularly competing for funding with other, non-Group 1 projects. Discussion of these projects by the staff-level CIP Steering Committee, the City Manager and City Council will ideally focus on the quantifiable data that justifies these annual funding levels and the specific types of maintenance activities that are covered through these programs. Some examples of Group 1 projects are the Capital Facilities Maintenance Program, Playground Renovations, and Bridge Repairs.

The second group of projects also provides for capital maintenance, but Group 2 projects are large, stand-alone maintenance or renovation efforts with a definite start and stop date. The beginning assumption of the CIP Steering Committee is that projects in this group are the second highest priority. Some examples of Group 2 projects are the Public Safety Center Slab Project, Madison/Montgomery Streets Reconstruction, and City Marina Dredging.
The third and final project group is comprised of capital projects that provide a new or greatly expanded level of service. Because these projects would be adding to the baseline of existing public infrastructure, they will begin the process as the lowest priority. While these projects are often strongly supported by the community, the CIP Steering Committee expects to recommend to the City Manager including them in the proposed CIP only when funding allows and where the projects support the Strategic Plan goals and objectives, or are specifically included as a Strategic Plan initiative. Examples of Group 3 projects are the Eisenhower Avenue Fire Station (#210) and the DASH Bus Fleet Expansion project.

For the FY 2011 – FY 2020 CIP, the CIP Steering Committee will prioritize individual projects over the entire ten program years and recommend a plan to the City Manager that balances expected available revenues with expenditures in each fiscal year. All projects that are requested but which cannot be funded within that ten year window will be listed in an appendix to the CIP with a short project description and approximate cost estimates when available.

**SUMMARY OF INITIAL FY 2011 – FY 2020 PROJECT REQUESTS**

City Staff is currently assembling the initial CIP requests by the managing departments. At this time, updated Alexandria City Public Schools, Other Regional Contributions, and IT Plan requests have not been included in the totals because they are not yet available. For that reason, the following figures include the Approved FY 2010 CIP plus an assumed extension of similar funding levels through FY 2020.

The ten-year total request for City funding in FY 2011 – FY 2020 is $667.3 million, including $92.7 million in FY 2011 and $83.3 million in FY 2012 (see Attachment 1). The total requests for the first six years of the CIP are $485.7 million. Compared to the six year approved funding levels in the FY 2010 – FY 2015 CIP of $383.9 million, the CIP Steering Committee is starting with requests that are likely in excess of funding levels by approximately $124 million. The CIP Steering Committee thus will need to reprogram more than $100 million worth of projects into the final four years (Long Range Capital Plan) of the CIP, or not include them in the actual plan. Any projects not appearing in the ten program years would be listed in an appendix to the CIP with a short description.

Managing departments have also categorized the project requests for all ten CIP years into the new project Groups (see Attachment 2). Because the submissions for ACPS, Other Regional Contributions, and the IT Plan have not yet been finalized, those figures have not yet been classified. Of the other submissions, $276.7 million, or 40.8%, are included in Group 1 (ongoing maintenance programs). The Group 2 total is $49.7 million, or 7.3%, and the Group 3 total is $223.5 million, or 32.9%. As a part of the CIP Steering Committee prioritization process, projects may be moved from one Group to another if the Committee determines that such a move is merited.
City Staff has also completed an initial categorization of the ten-year project requests by City Council Strategic Plan Goal (see Attachment 3). Over the ten years, Goal 3 – Integrated, Multimodal Transportation System has the largest project requests at $246.9 million, or 35.8% of total all-funds requests. It is important to note that Goal 3 also contains the projects that typically leverage the most non-City funds, and that the $12.4 million in outside revenues displayed in Attachment 3 all belong to Goal 3. Goal 6 – Public Safety has the second largest share of the requests at $99.2 million, or 14.4%. Goal 2 – Public Health and Environment is the third largest goal area with $98.2 million (14.2%). The CIP Steering Committee will also look at this categorization of project requests and will likely have some changes prior to publication of the City Manager’s Proposed FY 2011 – FY 2020 CIP.

The fourth attachment to this document is a list of most of the major, standalone project requests that were submitted for the FY 2011 – FY 2020 plan. These major projects account for $294.1 million of the total $667.3 million in requests for City funding (44.1%). Most of these project requests ask for funding in the first six years of the ten-year plan. However, with the substantial funding shortfalls in those first six years (totaling $123.8 million), a major undertaking of the CIP Steering Committee, City Manager, and then City Council will be to decide which of these projects can and should be planned for the last four CIP years, and which should be removed from the ten-year plan altogether. While this will not be an easy undertaking, ultimately the City cannot afford to fund all of these requests.

**FY 2011 – FY 2020 CIP FUNDING AVAILABILITY**

The total funding planned in the FY 2010 – FY 2015 Capital Improvement Program was $398.4 million. Approximately 74.5% of that funding came from the planned issuance of general obligation bonds, while 24.5% was from City and other outside cash sources. The FY 2011 plan included $85.9 million in funding, of which $84.0 million were City funds. That $84.0 million included a planned $4.0 million in cash capital contributions from current FY 2011 General Fund revenues and $73.3 million in General Obligation Bonds. City staff does not anticipate at this time any increases to the $84.0 million in City funds, but decreases may be more likely than increases with the declining General Fund revenue situation.

A consistent goal of the City is to increase the annual cash capital contribution to the CIP in order to limit the amount of borrowing needed. The FY 2010 – FY 2015 CIP assumed a steady increase in this contribution over the six years to top out at $12.0 million in FY 2015. While this will continue to be the goal in FY 2011, declining revenue estimates may determine that a less aggressive growth pattern in cash capital contributions is necessary.

Another key revenue item in the CIP is sanitary sewer fee revenue. The FY 2010 – FY 2015 CIP included a total of $28.1 million in sewer fee revenue over the six years, with the highest single year being FY 2012 at $5.3 million. The Transportation and Environmental Services department submissions for FY 2011 – FY 2020 include $70.1 million in projects over the ten years, with the highest single year being FY 2013 at $16.5 million. With such a substantial increase in investment identified for the sanitary sewer system, potential increases to the current sanitary
sewer fees are likely to be considered.

The FY 2011 – FY 2020 requests also include a total of $12.6 million in requests for various storm sewer system projects. The City continues to study the possibilities of a stormwater utility fee being implemented in the near future. If such a fee structure is in place, some or all of this $12.6 million in project funding could be freed up for other capital projects.

When facing a shortage of revenues in the CIP, one potential solution is to issue more general obligation bonds. However, there are several reasons to be careful about additional debt issuance. The first and foremost reason is that if the City increases the issuance of General Obligation Bonds, the General Fund operating budget will need to provide for additional debt service payments. In order to address this, the City would likely need to reduce expenditures and service levels or increase the real estate tax rate. Even without an increase in planned borrowing levels, the City faces a very difficult task in FY 2012 and FY 2013. The planned CIP spending levels (assuming the funding shortfalls are eliminated) will result in a debt service increase of $4.5 million in FY 2012 and $3.9 million in FY 2013. If the planned build-up of cash capital in FY 2013 is also approved, the increase to the operating budget in that year is $5.9 million. Even with the relatively conservative borrowing assumed in the current CIP, it will be difficult to pay for this with General Fund increases. Additional assumed borrowing only increases the difficulty of this task.

The second reason to be careful about additional debt issuance is that the City has three key debt policy guidelines which are set at very conservative levels: Ratio of Debt Service to General Government Expenditures; Outstanding Debt as a Percentage of Assessed Real Property Value; and Debt per Capita as Percentage of Per Capita Income. In the FY 2010 – FY 2015 Approved CIP, while below the limits, the City was already at or exceeding the target in two of the three City-set guidelines (Debt as % of Personal Income, Debt as % of Assessed Real Property), and quickly approaching the target in the third (Debt as % of General Government Expenditures). Since the adoption of the FY 2010 CIP, declining real estate assessments have hurt the ratio of debt to real property assessed value. The target for this guideline is 1.1% and the limit is 1.6%. In FY 2010 the City is at 1.11% for this measure, but climbs to 1.19% in FY 2011 and peaks at 1.36% in FY 2012. The City’s debt as a percent of personal income target is 3.2%, with a ceiling of 4.5%. The FY 2010 CIP results in ratios just above this target, with an annual high of 3.5% in FY 2012. While there is little risk of approaching the limit for this measure, a potential decline in average personal income levels in the next year would hurt this ratio. The City is not in any immediate danger of exceeding the target for percentage of general government expenditures (8% target, 10% limit).

Overall, the FY 2011 – FY 2020 CIP will have many of the same funding issues that the past two capital plans have experienced. However, with some new project prioritization techniques, a longer range plan, and the total balancing of expenditures and revenues, the City anticipates producing a new CIP that is more transparent, establishes more realistic expectations, and is more useful to City Council and the community as a planning and financial management tool.
ATTACHMENTS:
1 - FY 2011 – FY 2020 CIP Department Requests by Section
2 - FY 2011 – FY 2020 CIP Department Requests by Project Group
3 - FY 2011 – FY 2020 CIP Department Requests by Strategic Plan Goal
4 - FY 2011 – FY 2020 CIP List of Major Project Requests

STAFF:
Bruce Johnson, Chief Financial Officer
Michael Stewart, Analyst, Office of Management and Budget
# Attachment 1

## FY 2011 - FY 2020 CIP Department Requests by Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria City Public Schools</td>
<td>$3,957,739</td>
<td>$16,600,714</td>
<td>$14,974,499</td>
<td>$8,112,534</td>
<td>$8,780,659</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
<td>$61,216,345</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
<td>$95,216,245</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>1,877,000</td>
<td>835,000</td>
<td>3,894,000</td>
<td>760,000</td>
<td>910,000</td>
<td>$9,126,000</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>760,000</td>
<td>910,000</td>
<td>860,000</td>
<td>3,910,000</td>
<td>$15,566,000</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>1,522,346</td>
<td>3,809,500</td>
<td>4,447,500</td>
<td>11,007,500</td>
<td>5,487,500</td>
<td>3,847,500</td>
<td>$30,121,846</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>$2,447,500</td>
<td>$2,497,500</td>
<td>$2,547,500</td>
<td>$2,977,500</td>
<td>$40,321,846</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Buildings</td>
<td>52,073,200</td>
<td>21,660,000</td>
<td>23,620,000</td>
<td>27,885,000</td>
<td>21,750,000</td>
<td>8,550,000</td>
<td>$154,938,200</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>8,550,000</td>
<td>3,550,000</td>
<td>3,550,000</td>
<td>3,550,000</td>
<td>$175,138,200</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Traffic Control</td>
<td>14,600,000</td>
<td>26,425,000</td>
<td>16,715,000</td>
<td>19,815,000</td>
<td>20,415,000</td>
<td>18,750,000</td>
<td>$116,730,000</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>21,610,000</td>
<td>21,910,000</td>
<td>15,360,000</td>
<td>15,500,000</td>
<td>$192,170,000</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets, Bridges, &amp; Non-Motorized Transport</td>
<td>3,853,584</td>
<td>4,182,543</td>
<td>4,352,543</td>
<td>4,192,533</td>
<td>11,591,533</td>
<td>4,091,533</td>
<td>$32,264,269</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4,091,533</td>
<td>4,091,533</td>
<td>4,091,533</td>
<td>4,091,533</td>
<td>$54,630,041</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewers</td>
<td>16,095,699</td>
<td>8,464,342</td>
<td>21,829,342</td>
<td>15,900,500</td>
<td>7,400,500</td>
<td>3,320,000</td>
<td>$73,010,353</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>2,420,000</td>
<td>2,420,000</td>
<td>2,420,000</td>
<td>2,420,000</td>
<td>$82,690,353</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Regional Contributions</td>
<td>632,866</td>
<td>625,806</td>
<td>617,860</td>
<td>612,059</td>
<td>606,594</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>$3,695,185</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>$6,095,185</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Plan</td>
<td>4,510,000</td>
<td>2,723,500</td>
<td>2,741,000</td>
<td>2,749,500</td>
<td>2,693,500</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>$17,667,500</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>$28,467,500</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ACPS will formally present their FY 2011 CIP to the School Board in November; these figures have not been updated from the FY 2010 Plan, but an estimated funding stream has been programmed in FY 2016 - FY 2020 for display purposes.

2. City Staff has not received the new requests from these regional organizations; these figures have not been updated from the FY 2010 Plan, but an estimated funding stream has been programmed in FY 2016 - FY 2020 for display purposes.

3. The IT Steering Committee has not received all project requests for FY 2011-FY2020 at this time; these figures have not been updated from the FY 2010 Plan, but an estimated funding stream has been programmed in FY 2016 - FY 2020 for display purposes. Also, an additional $1.0 million has been added to FY 2011 for the purchase of a HR/Financial ERP system.

## Comparison to FY 2010 - FY 2015 Approved CIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010 Funded</td>
<td>$72,295,573</td>
<td>$84,009,883</td>
<td>$52,889,301</td>
<td>$50,591,119</td>
<td>$54,946,999</td>
<td>$59,196,366</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$383,919,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011 Requests (First Six Years)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$92,655,404</td>
<td>$83,253,405</td>
<td>$88,977,744</td>
<td>$92,213,726</td>
<td>$78,330,286</td>
<td>$50,279,033</td>
<td>$485,749,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP Shortfall (Approved Funding less Requests)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$8,845,021</td>
<td>$30,364,104</td>
<td>$28,386,625</td>
<td>$37,286,727</td>
<td>$19,133,920</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$123,836,897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The total all funds expenditures and revenues in this table differ from Attachments 1 and 2 for this reason.

Departments were not required to categorize projects by Group that are entirely funded with non-City money so these projects are not comparable with other projects.

Consideration by the CIP Steering Committee.

Current figures for ACS, Other Regional Contributions, and the IT Plan have not been categorized by Group at this time, but will undergo the same process before.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal Requests</th>
<th>Less 9% Fund Revenues</th>
<th>Total Expenditure Requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$25,691,716.00</td>
<td>$2,503,425.00</td>
<td>$23,188,291.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2,604,264.00</td>
<td>17,583,527.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,691,716.00</td>
<td>$2,503,425.00</td>
<td>$23,188,291.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 - Ongoing Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 - Standard Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 - New Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 - Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Total: FY 2011 - FY 2020
## FY 2011 - FY 2020 CIP DEPARTMENT REQUESTS BY STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Land Use &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$98,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$1,320,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Health &amp; Environment</td>
<td>$16,995,669</td>
<td>$9,511,342</td>
<td>$22,754,342</td>
<td>$19,884,500</td>
<td>$8,250,500</td>
<td>$4,320,000</td>
<td>$101,716,353</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>$3,270,000</td>
<td>$3,420,000</td>
<td>$3,370,000</td>
<td>$6,420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Transportation</td>
<td>$18,453,584</td>
<td>$30,607,543</td>
<td>$21,067,543</td>
<td>$24,007,533</td>
<td>$32,006,533</td>
<td>$22,851,533</td>
<td>$148,904,269</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>$25,701,533</td>
<td>$26,001,533</td>
<td>$20,451,533</td>
<td>$19,651,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Children, Families, &amp; Youth</td>
<td>$4,004,471</td>
<td>$17,027,446</td>
<td>$15,111,231</td>
<td>$8,249,366</td>
<td>$8,917,391</td>
<td>$8,636,732</td>
<td>$62,036,837</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>$8,636,732</td>
<td>$8,636,732</td>
<td>$8,636,732</td>
<td>$8,636,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5: Administration &amp; Management</td>
<td>$6,495,000</td>
<td>$4,833,500</td>
<td>$7,251,000</td>
<td>$12,259,500</td>
<td>$12,203,500</td>
<td>$4,210,000</td>
<td>$47,252,500</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>$4,210,000</td>
<td>$4,210,000</td>
<td>$4,210,000</td>
<td>$4,210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 6: Public Safety</td>
<td>$49,024,472</td>
<td>$14,079,212</td>
<td>$7,731,266</td>
<td>$6,640,465</td>
<td>$7,700,000</td>
<td>$3,993,406</td>
<td>$89,218,821</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>$5,993,406</td>
<td>$993,406</td>
<td>$993,406</td>
<td>$993,406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Expenditure Requests                      | $98,095,404| $86,498,405| $90,132,744| $93,368,726| $79,485,286| $51,279,033| $498,769,598|            | $52,679,033| $47,179,033| $41,629,033| $44,039,033| $64,295,730|
| Less Total Revenues                             | $5,400,000| $2,155,000| $1,155,000| $1,155,000| $1,155,000| $1,000,000| $13,020,000|            | $1,000,000| $1,000,000| $1,000,000| $1,000,000| $17,020,000|
| Subtotal Requests                               | $92,695,404| $83,343,405| $88,977,744| $92,213,726| $78,430,286| $50,279,033| $485,749,598|            | $51,679,033| $46,179,033| $40,629,033| $43,039,033| $667,755,730|
|-------------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Total Major Project Requests              | $6,075,000 | $6,100,000 | $6,125,000 | $6,150,000 | $6,175,000 | $6,200,000 | $6,225,000 | $6,250,000 | $6,275,000 | $6,300,000 |
| Total Sanitary Sewer Projects             | $1,189,000 | $1,200,000 | $1,211,000 | $1,222,000 | $1,233,000 | $1,244,000 | $1,255,000 | $1,266,000 | $1,277,000 | $1,288,000 |
| Total City Fund Projects                  | $550,000 | $555,000 | $560,000 | $565,000 | $570,000 | $575,000 | $580,000 | $585,000 | $590,000 | $595,000 |

**Sanitary Sewers (fee-funded)**

- **FY 2011**
  - School & Water System: $1,000,000
  - Key Cuts: $1,000,000

- **FY 2012**
  - School & Water System: $1,020,000
  - Key Cuts: $1,020,000

- **FY 2013**
  - School & Water System: $1,040,000
  - Key Cuts: $1,040,000

- **FY 2014**
  - School & Water System: $1,060,000
  - Key Cuts: $1,060,000

- **FY 2015**
  - School & Water System: $1,080,000
  - Key Cuts: $1,080,000

- **FY 2016**
  - School & Water System: $1,100,000
  - Key Cuts: $1,100,000

- **FY 2017**
  - School & Water System: $1,120,000
  - Key Cuts: $1,120,000

- **FY 2018**
  - School & Water System: $1,140,000
  - Key Cuts: $1,140,000

- **FY 2019**
  - School & Water System: $1,160,000
  - Key Cuts: $1,160,000

- **FY 2020**
  - School & Water System: $1,180,000
  - Key Cuts: $1,180,000

**CIP Section**

**FY 2011 - FY 2020 CP List of Major Project Requests**

**Attachment 4**
FY 2011 – FY 2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Development

- FY 2010 – FY 2015 CIP Overview
- Three Fundamental Changes to the CIP
- Initial FY 2011 – FY 2020 Project Requests
- CIP Financing

FY 2010 – FY 2015 Approved CIP Overview

- Six-year plan totals $383.9 million in City-funded expenditures
- FY 2010 City-funded CIP is $72.3 million and the FY 2011 planned City share is $84.0 million
- The new APD Headquarters ($78.1 million over three fiscal years) is the largest project in the multiyear FY 2010 – FY 2015 CIP.
- Other major items include four fire station projects and the City's capital contribution to WMATA ($63.3 million)
Three Fundamental Changes to the CIP

- The new CIP will feature a balanced budget in each fiscal year
  - Other projects not programmed within the ten years will be included in an appendix to the CIP
- The 6-year capital improvement program will be extended to a 10-year plan
- Projects will be categorized into three groups: (1) ongoing capital maintenance programs; (2) major stand-alone maintenance projects; and (3) new, expanded capital initiatives

Initial FY 2011 – FY 2020 Project Requests

- FY 2011 – FY 2020 requests from Departments total $667.3 million
- The first 6 years of new requests (FY 2011 – FY 2016) total $485.7 million
- Ongoing Maintenance Program Requests (Group 1) total $276.7 million, or about 41% (see Attachment 2)
- Major projects account for $294.1 million (see Attachment 4)
- FY 2011 requests total $92.7 million (estimated shortfall of $8.7 million)
Ability to Issue More Debt

- The City’s ability to issue more debt is limited mostly by its impact on future operating budgets
- Debt Service costs are estimated to increase under the current Approved CIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Debt Service</td>
<td>$37,418,514</td>
<td>$37,816,775</td>
<td>$42,448,788</td>
<td>$48,360,406</td>
<td>$48,945,433</td>
<td>$54,578,433</td>
<td>$57,778,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from Prior Year</td>
<td>$5,261,909</td>
<td>$4,508,197</td>
<td>$4,532,013</td>
<td>$3,911,618</td>
<td>$2,566,033</td>
<td>$5,632,994</td>
<td>$3,195,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approved CIP FY 2010-2015
Debt Service as Percent of General Government Expenditures
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Approved CIP FY 2010-2015
Debt as Percent of Real Property Assessed Value
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