



**TO:** Mayor and Council Members

**Cc:** Marc A. Ott, City Manager

**From:** Robert Goode, P.E., Assistant City Manager

**DATE:** June 21, 2016

**SUBJECT:** Responses to City Council questions from June 16 Council Meeting – Mobility Funding

---

This memorandum provides responses to questions the City Council posed to during and in follow up to the June 16, 2016 meeting of the City Council regarding developing and funding transportation projects. Responses to questions about the seven key corridors will be included in a subsequent memorandum.

**Q1: What impact would Council action on a 2016 Bond have on future bonding capacity in 2017/2018?**

Debt capacity assumptions reviewed by Financial Services Department staff looked at an 8-year capacity for new bond programs. This 8-year forward look allows for a Mobility Bond election in 2016 as well as a comprehensive bond election in 2018. The debt capacity scenario for a 2016 bond election allows for the constant tax rate to be held at a \$300M capacity level; a 1-cent increase over current tax rate at the \$500M capacity level; a 2-cent increase over current tax rate at the \$720M capacity level. This would preserve \$200M for a 2018 bond election at the constant debt-service tax rate. An additional tax rate increase would be needed for a 2018 bond election larger than \$200M. For more information, please refer to the June 1, 2016 briefing at the Council Budget Work Session.

**Q2: Can the previously stated \$500M capacity be divided evenly between a 2016 bond and a 2018 bond election?**

The debt capacity presented on June 1st showed that there was \$500 million in new bond capacity over the next eight years at the constant debt service tax rate – with \$300 million allocated to a potential 2016 bond program and \$200 million preserved for a potential 2018 general bond program. Changing this allocation to \$250 million for each of the potential programs, would result in \$50 million less for 2016. To restore this \$50 million (to reach a \$300 million bond package) would require approximately ¼ cent tax rate increase. The revised table below summarizes the tax rate / new capacity scenarios, with this new allocation:

Tax Rate Impact	2016 Election: New Capacity
Constant	\$250 million
1 ¼ cent	\$500 million
2 ¼ cent	\$720 million

**Q3: What amount of funding remains to be spent from the 2012 bond program?**

As of the second quarter of fiscal year 2015-16 the city has obligated \$81,820,444 in Proposition 12 Transportation and Mobility funds. Obligations are the sum of funds expended plus encumbered. \$61,474,556 will be obligated for remaining projects already programmed in 2012 Bond Proposition 12. See **Attachment 1** for further breakdown.

**Q4: What is the City Manager's suggested approach for Safe Routes to School program funding?**

The City Manager recommends that specific and separate funding be identified for the purposes of Safe Routes to School. An updated spreadsheet of staff funding packages was presented to the Council Mobility Committee on June 14, 2016 showing a Safe Routes to School line item and where funding was reduced to create this new item. See **Attachment 2**.

As stated in the "Update to the Sidewalk Master Plan/ADA Transition Plan" MEMO to Mayor and Council on June 13, 2016:

"Safe Routes to School: During the public review process there have been some concerns expressed that flexibility in allocating resources is needed to ensure that safe routes to school are adequately addressed. While the prioritization matrix includes schools, staff recommends that specific and separate funding be identified for this purpose. This would allow flexibility to fund the necessary infrastructure supporting safe routes to school such as sidewalks, Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons (PHBs), enhanced traffic medians, urban trails, bicycle facilities, or a combination of any of these. This funding would not replace the prioritization matrix, but could provide an additional allocation to create context-specific solutions for areas that have needs that are not rated as "high" or "very-high" priority sidewalks. As we do now, staff would work closely with the school districts and each school-specific Campus Advisory Council to determine the appropriate locations for needed safe routes to school."

**Q5: Is there a staff project identified for Manchaca Road?**

TxDOT has a project on Manchaca (FM 2304) from Ravenscroft Drive to FM 1626. This segment is currently TxDOT roadway. TxDOT has conducted preliminary engineering and the estimated cost for completion of design and construction of improvements is approximately \$10 million. The project would reconstruct the roadway from an existing 3 lane section to a 5 lane urban roadway.

**Q6: Is there a staff project identified for South 1<sup>st</sup> Street?**

South First Street is recommended for a future Corridor Mobility Development Program Preliminary Engineering Report in a future funding round, but is not included in the current staff funding packages. In addition, staff has not identified named projects along this corridor outside of department ongoing programs.

**Q7: Which of the Substandard Street projects teed up by staff in the June 1, 2016 briefing and spreadsheet increase capacity or address reconstruction of the roadway to bring up the roadway to current standards?**

- The Cooper Lane project would improve the current condition of the pavement and adhere to the City's Complete Streets Policy, thereby increasing connectivity and capacity for all roadway users (drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists).
- Ross Road would increase multimodal connectivity and capacity by constructing drainage improvements that would then allow for the construction of sidewalks. This project does not include pavement improvements. There may be subsequent opportunities during project development to coordinate this project with additional mobility improvements to meet the Austin Metropolitan Area Transportation Plan (AMATP).
- Circle S would increase pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and capacity by constructing drainage improvements that would then allow for the construction of sidewalks that could be used as a shared-use path/urban trail. While specific capacity enhancements would be identified during the Preliminary Engineering phase, as a two-lane undivided roadway, it is recommended that, at a minimum, improvements should include turn lanes at intersections where right-of-way is available and further operational studies are done during design, which would increase capacity for all roadway users.

- Meadow Lake Boulevard is a proposed new street connection that would be built in adherence with the Complete Streets Policy, thereby increasing connectivity and capacity for all roadway users (drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists).
- Jain Lane is a proposed roadway expansion to be built in adherence with the Complete Streets Policy, therefore increasing capacity for all roadway users (drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists).

Note that substandard streets are publically owned roadways within the Full Purpose Jurisdiction that do not meet current City of Austin criteria. Substandard streets may include streets with pavement in good condition, but do not meet current criteria such as shorter pavement width and no sidewalks. The Street Reconstruction, Street Rehabilitation, and Utility Participation Street Improvements programs are capital renewal programs because these programs address streets with poor (D-rated) or failed (F-rated) pavement.

Recommend updating Cooper, Ross and Circle S to reflect multi-modal connectivity (including intersection capacity) as an emphasis when addressing sub-standard streets. Said another way, streets are substandard with regard to pavement conditions and capacity, so both should be addressed with upgrades.

**Q8: What roadways, for which staff has teed up projects in the staff funding packages, are currently TxDOT roadways?**

The following projects identified in staff funding packages fall within current TxDOT roadways:

- Parmer Lane
- Loop 360
- 620 at 2222
- North Lamar
- Burnet Road (segment north of US 183)
- Airport Blvd (segment from US 183 to FM 969/MLK)
- FM 969/MLK (segment from Airport Blvd eastward)
- South Lamar (segment from Cesar Chavez to Ben White; with City maintenance agreement)
- FM 1626
- FM 1826
- South Congress (segment just north of Stassney Lane to Slaughter Lane)

Additional roadways identified in City Council questions addressed in this MEMO are:

- Manchaca (segment from just south of William Cannon to FM 1626)
- South First Street (not a TxDOT roadway)

**Q9: There is a \$4 million difference in the recommended funding level for Loop 360 between the \$500M package (\$46 million recommended for Loop 360) and both \$720M packages (\$50 million recommended for Loop 360). What additional improvements are addressed with the \$4M delta?**

See response in the “Responses to City Council questions” memo issued June 16, 2016. The Loop 360 corridor improvements have been estimated by TxDOT to be around \$250-\$300 million. Each additional increment of funding will enable staff to work with TxDOT to design and or construct more of the project. TxDOT initially indicated that their priority projects including the grade separated interchanges at Westlake and Courtyard. Staff has identified similar phases of work to be done at both funding levels, with additional funding for construction and project contingency in both \$720 packages.

**Q10: Has staff evaluated the cost of improving Jain Lane per typical City estimating procedures? If so, what is the estimated cost of construction?**

Staff has not conducted an independent cost estimate for Jain Lane, but has reviewed the estimates provided by the developer. Staff believes that a conceptual cost estimate for the project to be \$4 million using the developer provided information as a base and adding on inflation, additional street surface course, sidewalk and ADA construction and other costs such as project contingency, project management and bond issuance fees.

**Q11: What is the cost to perform Preliminary and Design Phase only for the seven key corridors?**

Preliminary and Design Phase work is typically in the range of approximately 20% - 25% of the overall project budget of the seven key corridors. Using this rule of thumb, the amount necessary to fund these phases is as follows for each funding package:

- \$250M package and \$300M package:
  - Approx. \$30M - \$40M for Preliminary and Design phases (out of the \$156M)
- \$500M package and \$720 Blend package:
  - Approx. \$50M - \$60M for Preliminary and Design phases (out of the \$243M)
- \$720M Prioritize Corridors Package:
  - Approx. \$90M - \$112M for Preliminary and Design phases (out of the \$448M)

In addition, as per “Responses to City Council questions” MEMO dated June 16, 2012, to build out all the improvements identified in the reports, additional costs for project management and delivery, project contingency, bond issuance fees and inflation costs need to be added. Staff estimates the cost to implement the full improvements within City limits to be approximately \$1.5 billion. The total buildout cost estimates are at a conceptual level, based on available information at this point in time. Proposed project budgets reflect Level 5/”Conceptual” cost estimates (+/- 30%-100% in budget and scope). Approved projects will be coordinated with City departments, partnering agencies, and private work to maximize dig-once coordination opportunities and mitigate any potential conflicts.

Cost estimates can increase or decrease as further program development and implementation planning occurs. Conceptual level estimates must allow for a sufficient contingency to account for any unknown costs associated with project delivery as well as escalation of project costs to account for increasing market costs for work that occurs in the future. As indicated by staff during the February 3 Mobility Committee presentation, sufficient time is required for needs assessment refinement and cost estimation as part of a robust capital needs assessment process. The total buildout cost estimates presented here were performed over a more condensed timeframe.

**Q12: What drainage or other utility work might need to be done on the seven key corridors? Is there a conceptual cost estimate available at this time?**

Watershed Protection Department (WPD) staff reviewed the seven key transportation corridor studies for potential drainage costs. Given the tight timeframe, present estimates are necessarily rough and would benefit from further refinement.

- Three of the seven corridors appear to have estimated drainage costs that are on par with WPD’s preliminary estimates. These are **N. Lamar, Burnet Rd., and Airport Blvd.**
- The **East Riverside Drive** and **MLK/FM 969** corridor studies have drainage estimates lower than WPD’s preliminary calculations. More funding will likely be needed for these areas than presently indicated in the reports.
- The **South Lamar Blvd.** corridor is in close proximity to significant flooding problem areas. These flooding problems are identified in Council Resolutions 20140501-042 and 20141120-102 for the S. Lamar Neighborhood Mitigation Plan. The cost to resolve these drainage problems will depend on the level of solution desired by the community and Council and will be further determined during the bond program implementation and project initiation phase.

- There is only limited information on the **Guadalupe Street** corridor and more analysis is required to make a final drainage funding determination.

As part of the implementation planning and project development phase after bond funding is authorized by the voters, staff will work closely with city utility departments such as the Watershed Department, Austin Water and Austin Energy as well as private utility providers to understand if any utility work may be associated with proposed improvements. Staff will work with these entities to determine any necessary utility work and to determine if additional funding may be required.

**Q13: Is there a breakdown of SIDEWALK/ADA projects to be implemented should funding be made available for the Sidewalk program?**

A detailed sidewalk implementation list was not prepared as part of the recently approved Sidewalk Masterplan Update. The Sidewalk Master Plan identifies the need for the City’s ADA-Transition Plan (rehabilitating existing sidewalks to meet ADA-compliance) as well as new sidewalks to be constructed to complete the network. The Plan’s Appendices C, D, and E identify the amount of Absent Sidewalks by Council District, Existing Sidewalks by Council District, and Existing Sidewalks Condition Assessment by Council District, respectively.

Staff recommends that the “bucket” of sidewalk improvement funding would be allocated based on the percent of missing high and very high sidewalks in each district per the approved prioritization matrix in the Sidewalk Master Plan. The sidewalk ratings are identified in Appendices C, D, and E of the Sidewalk Master Plan Update. See **Attachment 3**: Sidewalk/ADA Master Plan Update Appendices C-E.

**Q14: Is there a breakdown of BICYCLE projects to be implemented should funding be made available for the Bicycle program?**

A detailed bicycle facility implementation prioritization was not prepared as part of the recently approved Bicycle Master Plan (BMP). The top infrastructure recommendations in the BMP are the All Ages and Abilities Network, **Attachment 4**, and existing network barrier removal, **Attachment 5**. The Austin Transportation Department Active Transportation Program will create an implementation plan, vetted through a public process with input from each council office. Flexibility within this framework is critical to leverage coordination opportunities as they arise and consider input through public processes at the time of project delivery.

**Q15: Is there a breakdown of URBAN TRAIL projects to be implemented should funding be made available for the Urban Trails program?**

Named projects from the Urban Trails program included in staff funding packages include (also see Attachment 2 of this MEMO):

- Country Club Creek Trail Phase 2, 3 (\$1.5M for design phase only in all packages)
- Northern Walnut Creek Trail Phase 2 (\$3M for design phase only in all packages)
- Shoal Creek Trail (\$2M for design phase only in all packages)
- La Loma Trail (\$500K for preliminary Engineering only in all packages) n
- Northern Walnut Creek/Kramer Station (\$1M for the \$500M package and both \$720M packages only)

In addition, the Urban Trails projects will be implemented via the Urban Trails Master Plan for Tier 1 trails (\$6.5M in the \$500 package and both \$720 Packages). A map of those trails is available on *page vi* in the Executive Summary of the Urban Trails Master Plan. The mobility connector trails “bucket” (\$1.5M for construction in the \$300 package and the \$720 Prioritize Corridors package; \$2M for construction in the \$500 and \$720 Blend packages) would be for those neighborhood connections to the larger urban trails, schools, or other unforeseen connections identified as coordination opportunities with other work.

**Q16: What would it take to accelerate bond program implementation and delivery, regardless of what funding amount is involved? Timing, resources, etc.? What additional resources are included in bond funding and what else needs to be considered?**

The timeframe for bond program implementation depends upon several factors that staff must assess and consider as part the implementation planning phase after voters approve the bond propositions. Some of the factors that impact program and project implementation include the following:

- Staffing and resource planning for bond program and project delivery, including staff dedicated to pursuing and acquiring potential Grant funds;
- Coordination with partner agencies such as Capital Metro and Texas Department of Transportation for work to occur in the corridors;
- Coordination with private development and land use considerations;
- Review of related plans and city priorities that could be positively impacted through implementation of bond programs and projects;
- Internal coordination among City departments with other capital improvements in the corridors, such as water, drainage and other projects that could be needed to accommodate improvements – additional funding may be required at a future date to address these issues.
- Assessment of any existing “on the ground or below the ground” conditions that could impact project and program implementation;
- Public engagement and communications strategy for bond program implementation is in place and carried out at the project and program levels;
- Project phasing and work sequencing so as to minimize potential impacts to traffic and other mobility during the implementation of the program;
- Procurement scheduling that coincides with work planning and sequencing;
- Economic factors such as availability of design consultants, contractors and other external resources needed to deliver bond projects.

If funding is approved, the anticipated timeframe for implementation of corridor improvements, given existing staffing and project delivery resources is approximately 8-10 years for the \$250 million to \$300 million packages, approximately 10-12 years for the \$500 million package, and approximately 12-15 years for the \$720 million package. During those timeframes, some projects would be completed in a shorter period of time and some would take longer to develop, design, and construct. For example, near-term improvements such as sidewalks and on-street bicycle facilities can often be delivered in shorter timeframe than larger scale improvements.

The estimated timeframes for completion could be further accelerated if the following items can be effectively addressed as part of implementation:

- Additional staff resources are made available for efficient project delivery;
- Additional staff resources are made available for effective program management and coordination;
- Procurement process and project delivery methods are explored for most efficient delivery options;
- Additional resources related to program and project implementation and delivery as deemed necessary through implementation planning;
- Consistent and continued focus of multiple City department resources on bond program implementation and delivery throughout the implementation phase.

Traditionally, additional staff needed at the project delivery, sponsor department and program management levels would be identified during the project implementation planning phase after a successful bond election. Based on the information available to staff, there is an expectation that additional staff would be needed in those areas. The anticipated resources needed at different funding levels (based on bond packages currently under consideration) to accelerate implementation, as well as estimated accelerated timeframes are the following:

ACCELERATED IMPLEMENTATION: ESTIMATED RESOURCES AND TIMEFRAME		
\$300 Million Funding Level	\$500 Million Funding Level	\$720 Million Funding Level
Additional staff (20-25)	Additional staff (25-30 or more)	Additional staff (25-30 or more)
Sustained focus on implementation	Sustained focus on implementation	Sustained focus on implementation
Streamlined implementation processes	Streamlined implementation processes	Streamlined implementation processes
	Enhanced options for procurement and/or alternative delivery	Enhanced options for procurement and/or alternative delivery
		Additional resources for program/project delivery as needed
<b>Est. Timeframe w/Acceleration:</b> 4-6 years	<b>Est. Timeframe w/Acceleration:</b> 6-8 years	<b>Est. Timeframe w/Acceleration:</b> 8-10 years

- Staffing can be phased over FY17 and FY18, with added staff front-loaded in FY17. **Project delivery staff** (project managers, inspectors, design consultants, etc.) are included in the project estimates already estimated and would be funded by bonds. **Program management staff and sponsor department staffing requirements have traditionally been funded through their respective Operating Budgets.** Absent more refined analysis and information that would be developed during implementation planning, staff estimates that 60 to 70 percent of additional staffing requirements for accelerated bond program implementation would be funded through the bond program. Additional staffing resource planning will need to be done, including assessment of existing resources and existing capacity to deliver, and what additional would be needed to accelerate as part of implementation planning.

Bond program planning, program implementation, and monitoring and oversight follows this general schedule:

- Bond Program Planning (3 to 5 months following bond program voter approval)
- Mid-Year Budget Amendment (March to May following bond program voter approval)
- Bond Implementation, Monitoring, and Oversight (Typically beginning during the summer following bond program passage and continuing through the life of the bond program)

**Q17: How can City Council be assured that a bond program and their associated projects approved by Council and put to the voters will be implemented as intended if voter approval is attained?**

Bond program implementation, monitoring, and reporting can begin once implementation planning is complete and initial bond funding is provided through action by Council. As implementation progresses, the Capital Planning Office (CPO) works with all departments involved to make sure that projects and programs included in the bond package by Council and approved by the voters stays on track to be completed as expected.

Once Council develops a list of projects and programs for a bond package, and voters approve that package, CPO takes the list and uses it as the basis for implementation planning, benchmarks and metrics development, and establishing reporting mechanisms for the Bond Oversight Commission and Council. The Budget Office, in coordination with CPO, also uses the list of projects and programs as well as the corresponding funding amounts included in the package to develop the funding allocations and appropriations schedule as part of bond program

initiation and implementation. CPO works with Public Works and sponsor departments to ensure alignment of project phasing, sequencing and outcomes to the bond package approved by Council and approved by the voters.

The **City Council** is involved throughout bond program implementation. The Council ensures that bond programs are implemented as intended by:

- Appointing the Bond Oversight Commission, which provides public oversight of the City's implementation General Obligation Bond Programs
- Approving annual bond appropriations and sales as part of the annual Capital Budget
- Approving solicitations and delivery methods for individual projects
- Approving contract negotiation and execution for professional services and construction of bond projects
- Approving annual funding for operations and maintenance of bond-funded projects once infrastructure is operational
- Receiving briefings on bond programs status and progress as deemed appropriate by Council

The **Bond Oversight Commission (BOC)** is a Council-appointed body that is charged with oversight and monitoring of implementation for voter-approved bond programs to ensure that Council and voter expectations for bond programs implementation are met. City staff provides the BOC periodic reports and briefings on the progress of bond projects and receives questions and input from the BOC in this regard.

The **Capital Planning Office** manages and oversees voter-approved GO Bond Programs by providing a structure for coordination, change management, and performance reporting to internal and external stakeholders during the bond implementation phase. The Capital Planning Office uses Project Management Institute (PMI) standards and best practices for program management strategies and tools as it provides program-level management, oversight, and reporting for the City's GO bond programs. The Capital Planning Office also works closely with City sponsor departments that have primary responsibility for bond projects outcomes and with the Public Works Department who is responsible for capital projects management and delivery.

The CPO conducts regular coordination meetings with City departments responsible for bond projects delivery and outcomes, reviews progress of program work and checks adherence to the bond package expectations set by Council and the Austin voters for that particular bond program.

CPO also provides periodic updates, briefings and reports to the BOC and the public on status and progress of bond program implementation. Active bond project lists can be found on the CPO web site as well as the city's data portal. Projects can be seen in a map view through the CIVIC portal, available on the CPO web site as well.

#### **Q18: Why is flexibility necessary in bond proposition language if the Council has already passed a bond package of specific programs and projects to be funded?**

The reality of implementing capital projects such as those funded through bond programs is that several factors can and often do affect the ability to effectively deliver projects as intended, such as:

- Changes in market conditions that can affect availability and cost of contractors, consultants;
- Coordination of projects or partnerships with other entities that can impact implementation;
- Discovery of "on the ground or below the ground" conditions or issues that can impact timelines, cost, or feasibility of completing project as intended;
- Barriers to real estate acquisition required to complete a project as intended can occur;



- Significant cost increases related to real estate, labor, materials, or other cost items that can impact the project budget, thereby affecting ability to deliver the total scope of project and/or availability of funding to complete other projects that are included in the bond program.
- There may be other unforeseen factors that impact the cost, timeline or feasibility of implementation that cannot be taken into account and planned for as part of implementation planning or project development.

It is nearly impossible to estimate all the costs that will occur and all the factors that will come into play when implementing several diverse capital projects over a number of years. This is the reason that high-level, conceptual project estimates are given during the bond development process. Project budget estimates become more accurate as the project moves from project planning and development, through design and into the construction phase.

Based on the number of projects and programs being considered, the level of complexity in work sequencing and phasing, and the amount of coordination with other processes and entities that will be required for successful delivery of bond programs, staff strongly recommends that sufficient flexibility in bond proposition language be maintained to allow for adjustments to be efficiently made as implementation occurs. Such adjustments will be necessary to achieve the priorities, outcomes and community benefits that Council establishes for the bond program and that are expected by the voters who authorize its implementation.

As implementation occurs, there are several mechanisms in place for monitoring and overseeing the successful completion of the projects and programs that Council includes in the approved bond package. Please refer to the “General Obligation (GO) Bond Implementation and Oversight” MEMO sent to Mayor and Council on June 13, 2016 for more information.

xc: Assistant City Managers  
 Elaine Hart, Chief Financial Officer  
 Greg Canally, Deputy Chief Financial Officer  
 Ed Van Eenoo, Deputy Chief Financial Officer  
 Mike Trimble, Capital Planning Officer  
 Rob Spillar, Director, Austin Transportation Department  
 Robert Hinojosa, Acting Director, Public Works Department

Attachments:

- Attachment 1: 2012 Bond Program Spending Summary for FY16 Q2
- Attachment 2: June 14, 2016 Staff Funding Packages spreadsheet
- Attachment 3: Sidewalk/ADA Master Plan Update Appendices C-E
- Attachment 4: Bicycle Master Plan - All Ages and Abilities Network Map
- Attachment 5: Bicycle Master Plan - Bicycle Network Barriers Map

**Attachment 1: 2012 Bond Program Spending Summary for FY16 Q2**

Proposition	Allocated	Appropriated	Expended	% Exp.	Encumbered	% Enc.	Obligated*	% Obl.	Programmed**	% Prgm.
2012 Prop 12	\$143,295,000	\$139,645,000	\$ 57,980,066	40%	\$23,840,378	17%	\$ 81,820,444	57%	\$ 61,474,556	43%
2012 Prop 13	\$ 30,000,000	\$ 30,000,000	\$ 29,804,226	99%	\$ -	0%	\$ 29,804,226	99%	\$ 195,774	1%
2012 Prop 14	\$ 77,680,000	\$ 73,240,000	\$ 16,093,002	21%	\$ 5,986,563	8%	\$ 22,079,565	28%	\$ 55,600,435	72%
2012 Prop 16	\$ 31,075,000	\$ 30,475,000	\$ 3,263,057	11%	\$ 3,645,983	12%	\$ 6,909,040	22%	\$ 24,165,960	78%
2012 Prop 17	\$ 11,145,000	\$ 11,145,000	\$ 2,323,431	21%	\$ 1,478,700	13%	\$ 3,802,130	34%	\$ 7,342,870	66%
2012 Prop 18	\$ 13,440,000	\$ 12,035,000	\$ 1,030,771	8%	\$ 1,153,600	9%	\$ 2,184,371	16%	\$ 11,255,629	84%
<b>2012 Bond Program</b>	<b>\$306,635,000</b>	<b>\$296,540,000</b>	<b>\$110,494,552</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>\$36,105,224</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>\$146,599,776</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>\$160,035,223.87</b>	<b>52%</b>

\*Obligated funds are the sum of expended plus encumbered dollars.

\*\*Programmed funds for projects teed up during bond development, but not yet obligated.