

MEMORANDUM

May 3, 2016

TO: Transportation, Infrastructure, Energy & Environment Committee

FROM: ^{GO} Glenn Orlin, Deputy Council Administrator

SUBJECT: FY17 Operating Budget: Transportation—follow-up;
FY17-22 Capital Improvements Program—Executive’s April 21 revisions NDA
Supplemental appropriations and amendments to the FY15-20 CIP:
\$1,500,000 for Resurfacing: Primary/Arterial Roads
\$2,315,000 for Residential and Rural Road Resurfacing
\$5,500,000 for Resurfacing: Residential/Rural Roads

Those anticipated to attend this worksession include:

Al Roshdieh, Director, Department of Transportation (DOT)
Emil Wolanin, Deputy Director, DOT
Carolyn Biggins, Chief, Division of Transit Services, DOT
Richard Dorsey, Chief, Division of Highway Services, DOT
Bruce Johnston, Chief, Division of Transportation Engineering, DOT
Fred Lees, Chief, Division of Traffic Engineering, DOT
Jose Thommana, Chief, Division of Parking Management, DOT
Alicia Thomas, Budget Analyst, DOT
Brady Goldsmith, Budget Analyst, Office of Management and Budget (OMB)

I. FY17 Operating Budget follow-up

Tobytown Service. Councilmember Berliner requested DOT to provide cost and revenue estimates for the Tobytown service to be extended to weekends. The following table shows the cost and revenue in FY17 (9 months of service) and FY18 (the first full year of service) for: (1) weekday peak periods (the Executive’s recommendation); (2) weekday peak periods and midday; (3) adding Saturdays; and (4) adding Sundays and holidays:

| | Daily Riders | FY17 Cost | FY17 Revenue | FY18 Cost | FY18 Revenue |
|-------------------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| Peak only (6-9:30am;3:30-7pm) | 30 | \$160,000 | \$6,000 | \$213,000 | \$8,000 |
| Peak + midday (6am-7pm) | 48 | \$304,000 | \$9,900 | \$405,000 | \$13,000 |
| Saturday (6am-7pm) | 30 | +\$52,000 | +\$1,000 | +\$70,125 | +\$1,350 |
| Sundays & Holidays (6am-7pm) | 24 | +\$57,375 | +\$875 | +\$76,500 | +\$1,175 |

The cost recovery from fares would be 3.75% for the weekday peak-period service (the Executive's recommendation), 3.26% for weekday all-day service; 1.92% for Saturday service, and 1.53% for Sunday service. The Ride On's overall cost recovery from fares is 21.9%.

Seniors Ride Free. Councilmember Berliner requested what the cost would be for extending the hours of Seniors Ride Free from the current 9:30am-3:00pm weekdays to include all day weekdays, and all day every day (including weekends and holidays). The following table shows the annual cost (reimbursement to WMATA for lost revenue) and revenue lost to Ride On for all three options:

| | Cost | Revenue | Net Cost |
|---|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| Off-peak weekdays: 9:30am-3:00 pm (Exec's recommendation) | \$196,503 | (\$591,703) | \$788,206 |
| All day weekdays | \$846,510 | (\$1,337,294) | \$2,183,804 |
| All day weekdays plus weekends and holidays | \$1,034,487 | (\$1,539,143) | \$2,573,630 |

Silver Spring and Wheaton Parking Lot Districts (PLDs). Councilmember Berliner wanted staff to explore options that would loan funds from the Silver Spring PLD to the Wheaton PLD in FY17, with the idea that those funds could be transferred to the Wheaton Urban District (UD) and allow for an equal reduction in the General Fund's Non-Baseline Transfer to the Wheaton UD.

The County Code requires that neither the revenue from an urban district tax nor the transfer of parking fee revenue from its associated PLD be less than 10% of the total of the two. The Executive's recommended budget for the Wheaton UD includes \$207,075 from urban district tax revenue and \$23,629 from PLD fee transfers; thus, the PLD transfer consists of 10.2% of the total of the two. The Executive recommends that the Non-Baseline Transfer to the Wheaton UD be \$1,841,650.

The revenue from parking fees in the Wheaton PLD is projected to be \$815,000. Therefore, the maximum additional revenue that theoretically could be transferred to the Wheaton UD to substitute for the Non-Baseline Transfer would be \$791,371 (i.e., \$815,000 minus \$23,629).

How much more revenue can the Silver Spring PLD afford to loan? The table below shows the ending reserve as a percent of resources in each year during FY17-22. Option #1 assumes the Executive's recommended budget, plus the \$36,000 for Lot 38 and Garage 5 wayfinding signs that the Committee recommended adding to the budget, at the request of Councilmember Leventhal. Option #4 is the same as Option #1 except there would be a loan of \$791,371, bringing the total transfer in FY17 to \$815,000. Options #3 and #4 assume lesser loans that are between Options #1 and #4.

End-of-Year Reserves as a Percentage of Resources, Silver Spring PLD

| Added loan from SSPLD in FY17 | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 | FY21 | FY22 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Option #1: no added loan (Exec rec+\$36K) | 104% | 100% | 79% | 57% | 36% | 14% |
| Option #2: Option #1+\$250,000 loan | 102% | 98% | 77% | 55% | 34% | 12% |
| Option #3: Option #1+\$500,000 loan | 100% | 96% | 75% | 53% | 32% | 10% |
| Option #4: Option #1+\$791,371 loan (max) | 97% | 94% | 73% | 50% | 29% | 7% |

Recall that the recently announced policy from the CAO is that special funds should have end-of-year reserves equal to 15-25% of resources. This suggests that the Silver Spring PLD, already

projected to drop to 14% in FY22, should not loan any additional money. However, FY22 is still five years away, and the PLD will have time to address this issue through a future fee increase, a further of expansion of charging hours¹, and/or a potential sale of more PLD property.

Council staff recommends that any FY17 loan not exceed the \$500,000 in Option #3. Any higher amount would bring the Silver Spring PLD below 10% in FY22.

The Operating Budget resolution will need to reference any such loan, but it would also need to specify the deadline for its payback. Here it is important to note the end-of-year reserves as a percent of resources for the Wheaton PLD:

End-of-Year Reserves as a Percentage of Resources, Wheaton PLD

| | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 | FY21 | FY22 |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Executive Recommendation | 38% | 10% | 3% | 14% | 11% | 8% |

If the loan is paid back to the Wheaton PLD in FY22 or earlier, its reserves-to-resources ratio will fall well below 8% by FY22, perhaps even into the negative range. On the other hand, if the payback is postponed beyond FY23, Silver Spring’s reserves-to-resources ratio will fall too low.

Council staff’s conclusion is that, even without a loan to free up General Fund money for use elsewhere in the budget, both the Silver Spring and Wheaton PLDs will need infusions of revenue to keep them solvent five years or more from now. A loan would put an even greater pressure on finding such infusions.

Bethesda Transportation Solutions (BTS) and Transportation Action Partnership (TAP). BTS is the transportation management organization (TMO) that operates the Bethesda Transportation Management District (TMD) under contract to DOT. Like other TMOs, it is funded from the Mass Transit Fund’s budget. BTS is a subsidiary of the Bethesda Urban Partnership, but it does not receive funding from the Bethesda Urban District.

The County’s contract with BTS has not included increases in salaries, benefits, rent, and health and liability insurance for several years, and so it is requesting a \$33,300 (6%) increase over the Executive’s recommendation to provide some catch-up in these areas (©1-2). The Transportation Action Partnership (TAP), the TMO that operates the North Bethesda TMD, also has not received such increases; a 6% increase over the Executive’s recommendation would bring it an additional \$31,100 in FY17. The Silver Spring, Friendship Heights, and Greater Shady Grove TMDs are all County-operated; County employees have received cost-of-living adjustments and step increases the last few years and insurance increases are also covered by the County. Should the Council wish to include this type of increase, it should do it for both BTS and TAP, adding \$64,400 to the Reconciliation List.

The funds would come from the Mass Transit Fund in FY17. However, if included in the budget, it should not be assumed that this increment would be funded necessarily from the countywide

¹ Charging hours in the Bethesda PLD’s lots and garages will expand to Saturdays in FY18, and charging hours have included Saturdays in the Wheaton PLD’s lots for many years. It is more than plausible that the Silver Spring PLD will follow suit in the next few years.

Mass Transit Tax after FY17. The Office of Legislative Oversight is in the midst of evaluating TMD strategies and goals, and an interagency working group has been examining other models for traffic mitigation agreements (TMAGs) and TMD structures. The issue of transportation management funding will be part of Committee deliberations in the latter half of 2016, and a new paradigm may be developed in time for the FY18 budget.

Complete streets guidelines. Councilmember Riemer has written to the Committee requesting that it add \$264,000 to the Reconciliation List to develop complete street guidelines (©3-4). Bill 33-13 required such guidelines to be developed by DOT by June 1, 2016, but the Executive has not requested the funding to do so. Council staff agrees that developing this set of documents is important to provide day-to-day guidance to DOT, DPS, and M-NCPPC staff as they design and review new and reconstructed streets, sidewalks, bikeways, and other street elements.

Fare Share Program. At its April 21 meeting the Committee recommended that \$500,000 be included on the Reconciliation List to reinstate the Fare Share Program that was discontinued during the recession. Noting that the Committee's other Reconciliation List items have been in smaller increments, Council staff suggests that the Committee's recommendation for Fare Share be divided into two tranches of \$250,000 each.

Homeowners Association Road Reimbursement NDA. OMB has received the official accounting of the allocation of State Highway User Revenue (HUR), and it reports that the portion of the County's allocation to this NDA should be increased by \$2,300 over the Executive's recommendation, to \$61,370. This means that the HUR available for the County's Operating Budget is reduced by \$2,300.

II. FY17-22 CIP: Executive's April 21 revisions

On April 21 the Executive transmitted several revised project description forms (PDFs) that, together, keeps his aggregate recommended expenditures within the spending affordability guidelines. Some of them have already been incorporated all or in part in the Initial CIP Reconciliation approved by the Council on April 26, others concur with changes the Council has already tentatively approved, and still others have been superseded by the Initial CIP Reconciliation. No action should be taken on them.

One new recommendation the Council has not already considered is the Executive's proposal to defer the schedule for the Seminary Road Intersection Improvement project by nearly a year. The schedule in the Approved CIP has construction completed in the summer of 2019 (early FY20), while the proposed schedule would have it deferred until the spring of 2020 (©5-6). This is not a production delay, but a deferral meant to help balance spending over the middle years of the CIP. Council staff does not recommend a deferral at this time; however, if necessary, the Council should leave open the option for a similar deferral as part of the May 19 Final CIP Reconciliation, if necessary.

On April 28 the Executive forwarded another CIP revision, for the Elmhirst Parkway Bridge project (©7-9). Its cost estimate has increased by \$286,000, which the Executive recommends covering with a \$57,000 transfer in FY16 from remaining unused appropriation in the long-completed Father Hurley Boulevard Extended project, and with \$229,000 in Federal aid in FY17. Council staff recommends approval.

III. Supplemental appropriations and amendments to the FY15-20 CIP

The Executive is recommending a total of \$9,315,000 of road reconstruction and resurfacing be accelerated from FY17 to FY16 in order to help reconcile the year-by-year expenditures in his Recommended CIP to available revenue (©10-23). The Council has already assumed exactly the same in its Initial CIP Reconciliation on April 26. The supplemental appropriations would accelerate \$1,500,000 in Resurfacing: Primary/Arterial Roads, \$2,315,000 in Residential and Rural Road Resurfacing, and \$5,500,000 in Resurfacing: Residential/Rural Roads.

Other than helping reconcile the CIP, these actions will make little noticeable difference: the work would be underway in late May and June rather than later this summer. Council staff recommends approval of all three supplemental appropriations and CIP amendments.

f:\orlin\fy16\te\fy17op\160505te.doc



May 2, 2016

Nancy Floreen
President
Montgomery County Council
100 Maryland Avenue
5th Floor
Rockville, MD 20850

Ms. Floreen:

Please find attached the FY17 budget request for Bethesda Transportation Solutions (BTS). As noted in the attachment, BTS has not received any increase in its budget for fixed costs such as salaries and benefits, rent, health insurance or liability insurance since FY10. BTS has done everything possible to be able to absorb these increases without sacrificing services to our constituents but the ability to continue to do that is no longer viable without additional funding. Our FY17 request stands at \$33,300.

We hope you and the members of your committee will look favorably upon this request.

Thank you.

Jeff Oyer
Director of Finance
Bethesda Urban Partnership

Your Route To A Better Commute!

7700 Old Georgetown Road, Lobby Level ★ Bethesda, MD 20814
(301) 656-0868 PHONE ★ (240) 223-0200 FAX
www.bethesdatransit.org

①



MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

HANS RIEMER
COUNCILMEMBER AT-LARGE

MEMORANDUM

To: T&E Committee
From: Councilmember Hans Riemer
Date: May 2, 2016
Re: Complete Streets Guidelines

Responding to greater demand for multi-modal transportation networks by our residents, the Council passed Bill 33-13 almost two years ago. These reforms are making our roads safer for bicyclists, pedestrians, and motorists alike.

But to ensure further progress and to allow for greater flexibility in implementation, the bill also required the County Executive to transmit complete street guidelines by Method 2 regulation 18 months after passage of the bill, which is June 1, 2016. The guidelines were to supersede the initial reforms of Bill 33-13 and were to be modeled on the complete street guidelines of Boston, Chicago, and Dallas.

The County Executive's recommended FY17 Budget, however, does not include funding to complete these guidelines period, much less by June 1, 2016. This is not to say that DOT hasn't made progress on multi-modal design since the legislation was adopted. The department's impressive work in White Flint and Silver Spring, among other places, demonstrates a positive shift in the department's culture.

That said, the County and its residents stand to realize great value if the work of Bill 33-13 is completed by developing complete street guidelines. First, formally approved guidelines would institutionalize the "cultural changes" at DOT and ensure that they endure. Second, the guidelines would be considerably more comprehensive than the limited number of changes made by Bill 33-13. The current roadway standards present a number of obstacles to progress rather than facilitating it:

- The roadway standards created in 2008 are more progressive than the old standards, but they were the result of compromise with the former leadership of MCDOT and therefore not as progressive as can be achieved with the current leadership.
- The goal was to supersede the existing roadway standards when the new standards were created in 2008, but MCDOT has retained most of the old standards, tripling the number of standards but still not covering all our roadway types. These standards have not been revised to reflect the changes required by Bill 33-13.
- Specifying roadway standards in our master plans was intended to provide better direction on what the intended roadway typical section should be, but if there is any change – such as including a shared use path that is not covered in any of the new roadway standards – that change cannot be specified.
- A set of Complete Streets guidelines that used a kit-of-parts approach that allowed the assemblage of the desired roadway elements would better reflect what DOT is actually doing and would be truly more context-sensitive.

Accordingly, I respectfully request that the T&E Committee consider adding \$264,000 (\$240,000 for the consultant and \$24,000 for additional DOT staff time) to the reconciliation list to fund the development of these guidelines. This proposal envisions using the well-regarded guidelines from Boston, Dallas, and Chicago as a framework and applying them to our County's unique circumstances. As such, this proposal represents a significant savings from previous estimates. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Seminary Road Intersection Improvement (P501307)

| | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Category | Transportation | Date Last Modified | 4/19/16 |
| Sub Category | Roads | Required Adequate Public Facility | No |
| Administering Agency | Transportation (AAGE30) | Relocation Impact | None |
| Planning Area | Silver Spring | Status | Preliminary Design Stage |

| | Total | Thru FY15 | Est FY16 | Total 6 Years | FY 17 | FY 18 | FY 19 | FY 20 | FY 21 | FY 22 | Beyond 6 Yrs |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|-----------|------------|---------------|-----------|------------|--------------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|
| EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (\$000s) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Planning, Design and Supervision | 1,533 | 0 | 408 | 1,125 | 13 | 31 | 200 | 881 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Land | 605 | 0 | 58 | 547 | 12 | 227 | 200 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site Improvements and Utilities | 570 | 0 | 0 | 570 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 570 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Construction | 4,550 | 0 | 0 | 4,550 | 0 | 200 | 1,179 | 3,171 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 7,258 | 0 | 466 | 6,792 | 25 | 458 | 1,579 | 4,730 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| FUNDING SCHEDULE (\$000s) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------|----------|------------|--------------|-----------|------------|--------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|
| G.O. Bonds | 7,233 | 0 | 466 | 6,767 | 25 | 458 | 1,579 | 4,705 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Intergovernmental | 25 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 7,258 | 0 | 466 | 6,792 | 25 | 458 | 1,579 | 4,730 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (\$000s) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|
| Energy | | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | |
| Net Impact | | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | |

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Appropriation Request | FY 17 | 961 |
| Appropriation Request Est. | FY 18 | 5,831 |
| Supplemental Appropriation Request | | 0 |
| Transfer | | 0 |
| Cumulative Appropriation | | 466 |
| Expenditure / Encumbrances | | 0 |
| Unencumbered Balance | | 466 |

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| Date First Appropriation | FY 15 |
| First Cost Estimate | |
| Current Scope | FY 15 7,258 |
| Last FY's Cost Estimate | 7,258 |

Description

This project provides for the design, land acquisition, and construction of an approximate 400-foot segment of Seminary Road between the Brookville Road/Seminary Place and Linden Lane/Second Avenue intersections on a new alignment; reconstruction of 650 feet of Seminary Place from Seminary Road to 450 feet east of Riley Place with a vertical alignment revision at Riley Place; increasing the Linden Lane curb lane widths along the 250 foot section between Brookville Road and Second Avenue to provide two 15-foot shared-use lanes to accommodate bicyclists; and reconstruction of the 250 foot segment of Brookville Road between Linden Lane and Seminary Road. Seminary Road will be a closed-section roadway with two 15-foot shared-use lanes, sidewalks, and will have auxiliary turn lanes at the Brookville Road/Seminary Place and Linden Lane/Second Avenue intersections. Seminary Place will be a closed section roadway with two 15-foot shared-use lanes and a sidewalk along the northern side. Brookville Road will be a closed-section roadway with one southbound 16-foot shared-use lane, sidewalks, and a parking lane on the western side. The project amenities include street lights, landscaping, and stormwater management.

Capacity

The Seminary Road Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volume for year 2007 was 11,300.

Estimated Schedule

Final design began in Summer 2015. Construction will start in FY18 and will complete in FY20.

Justification

This project will simplify vehicle movements and improve traffic congestion by eliminating the Seminary Road "sweep" between Brookville Road and Second Avenue. In addition, pedestrian and bicyclist safety will be improved. The proposed Seminary Place vertical alignment revision at Riley Place will increase intersection sight distance. Reconstruction of the segment of Seminary Road intersections between Brookville Road and Second Avenue is recommended in the North and West Silver Spring Master Plan. Facility Planning - Phase I study completed in FY09 and Phase II in FY11.

Fiscal Note

Intergovernmental revenues represent the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission's (WSSC) share of the water and sewer relocation costs. The project schedule is adjusted due to fiscal capacity.

Disclosures

A pedestrian impact analysis has been completed for this project.

Coordination

(5)

Seminary Road Intersection Improvement (P501307)

Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, Department of Permitting Services, Pepco, Verizon, Washington Gas, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

MEMORANDUM

April 28, 2016

TO: Nancy Floreen, President, County Council

FROM: Isiah Leggett, County Executive 

SUBJECT: Budget Amendment: FY17-22 Recommended Capital Improvements Program

Attached is a CIP amendment for the Elmhirst Parkway Bridge project. The bids for the project have come in higher than anticipated due to the need to maintain adequate stream flow and the need for complex excavation procedures to install bridge foundation elements. A transfer from the Father Hurley Boulevard project will cover \$57,000 of the cost increase, but an amendment is needed to fund the remaining \$229,000 in cost increases with federal funds.

I recommend that the County Council consider this project adjustment in its remaining budget worksessions. As always Executive Branch staff are available to assist you in your review.

IL:jah

Attachment

c: Stephen B. Farber, County Council Administrator
Al Roshdieh, Director, Department of Transportation

7

Elmhirst Parkway Bridge (Bridge No. M-0353) (P501420)

| | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Category | Transportation | Date Last Modified | 4/27/16 |
| Sub Category | Bridges | Required Adequate Public Facility | No |
| Administering Agency | Transportation (AAGE30) | Relocation Impact | None |
| Planning Area | Bethesda-Chevy Chase | Status | Preliminary Design Stage |

| | Total | Thru FY15 | Est FY16 | Total 6 Years | FY 17 | FY 18 | FY 19 | FY 20 | FY 21 | FY 22 | Beyond 6 Yrs |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|---------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|
| EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (\$000s) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Planning, Design and Supervision | 191 | 1 | 70 | 120 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Land | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site Improvements and Utilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Construction | 2,047 | 0 | 1,938 | 109 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 2,251 | 14 | 2,008 | 229 | 229 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| FUNDING SCHEDULE (\$000s) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Federal Aid | 1,277 | 0 | 1,048 | 229 | 229 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| G.O. Bonds | 974 | 14 | 960 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 2,251 | 14 | 2,008 | 229 | 229 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------|-----------|
| Appropriation Request | FY 17 | 229 |
| Appropriation Request Est. | FY 18 | 0 |
| Supplemental Appropriation Request | | 0 |
| Transfer | | 0 |
| Cumulative Appropriation | | 2,028,100 |
| Expenditure / Encumbrances | | 14 |
| Unencumbered Balance | | 1,951 |

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| Date First Appropriation | FY 15 |
| First Cost Estimate | |
| Current Scope | FY 17 2,251 |
| Last FY's Cost Estimate | 1,965 |

Description

This project provides for the replacement of the existing Elmhirst Parkway Bridge over Tributary to Rock Creek. The existing bridge, built in 1940, is a single span structural plate arch under fill carrying a 19'-0" roadway and 10'-0" grass shoulders on each side. The proposed replacement bridge includes a single span precast concrete arch structure under fill with a 22'-0" roadway and 8'-6" grass shoulders on each side. The project includes approach roadway work at each end of the bridge as necessary to tie-in to the existing roadway. The bridge and road will be closed to vehicular and pedestrian traffic during construction. The existing Elmhirst Bike path will remain open during the construction.

Location

The project site is located approximately 400 feet north of the intersection of Elmhirst Parkway with Cedar Lane in Bethesda

Capacity

The roadway Average Daily Traffic (ADT) is 600 and the roadway capacity will not change as a result of this project.

Estimated Schedule

The design of the project is expected to finish in Summer 2014. The construction is scheduled to start in Spring 2016 and be completed in Winter 2017.

Cost Change

\$286,000 additional cost due to the need to maintain adequate stream flow and the need for complex excavation procedures to install bridge foundation elements.

Justification

The proposed replacement work is necessary to provide a safe roadway condition for the traveling public. The 2011 bridge inspection revealed that there is severe steel corrosion with areas of 100 percent section loss along the arch springlines. The steel structural plate arch is rated in poor condition and the bridge is considered structurally deficient. The bridge is weight restricted and school buses are denied a waiver to cross the bridge due to safety concerns. Based on experiences with similar type structures in this condition the structure needs to be replaced as soon as possible or the roadway may be closed. Elmhirst Parkway is located in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Master Plan area. Elmhirst Parkway is the main entrance that extends north from Cedar Lane at the Locust Hill Estates neighborhood. Elmhirst Parkway Bridge is not considered historic but is located on the boundary of Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties Survey No. M:35-120. A review of impacts to pedestrians, bicyclists and the requirements of the ADA (American with Disabilities Act of 1991) has been performed and addressed by this project. Streetlights, crosswalks, sidewalk ramps, bikeways and other pertinent issues are being considered in the design of the project to ensure pedestrian safety.

Other

The design costs for this project are covered in the "Bridge Design" project (C.I.P. No. 509132).

Fiscal Note

(8)

Elmhirst Parkway Bridge (Bridge No. M-0353) (P501420)

The costs of bridge construction and construction management for this project are eligible for up to 80 percent Federal Aid; \$57,000 transferred from Father Hurley Blvd. Extended (#500516) in FY16.

Disclosures

A pedestrian impact analysis has been completed for this project.

Coordination

Federal Highway Administration - Federal Aid Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Program Maryland State Highway Administration
Maryland Department of Environment Maryland Historical Trust Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission Montgomery
County Department of Permitting Services Utilities Bridge Design PDF (CIP 509132)



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

MEMORANDUM

April 21, 2016

TO: Nancy Floreen, President, County Council

FROM: Isiah Leggett, County Executive 

SUBJECT: Amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program and Supplemental Appropriation #22-S16-CMCG-8 to the FY16 Capital Budget
Montgomery County Government
Department of Transportation
Resurfacing: Primary/Arterial (No. 508527), \$1,500,000

I am recommending a supplemental appropriation to the FY15 Capital Budget and an amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program in the amount of \$1,500,000 for Resurfacing: Primary/Arterial (No. 508527). Appropriation for this project will fund road resurfacing improvements on the County's primary and arterial roadways.

This supplemental is needed because of fiscal capacity reasons. The recommended amendment is consistent with the criteria for amending the CIP because the project resources have been shifted between fiscal years to provide fiscal capacity. The supplemental and amendment will also help avoid the need to fund significantly costlier road rehabilitation work on County roads by adding these funds to FY16.

I recommend that the County Council approve this supplemental appropriation and amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program in the amount of \$1,500,000 and specify the source of funds as GO Bonds.

I appreciate your prompt consideration of this action.

IL:nm

Attachment: Amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program and Supplemental Appropriation # 22-S16-CMCG-8

cc: Al R. Roshdieh, Director, Department of Transportation
Jennifer A. Hughes, Director, Office of Management and Budget

Resolution: _____

Introduced: _____

Adopted: _____

COUNTY COUNCIL
FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

By: Council President at the Request of the County Executive

SUBJECT: Amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program and
Supplemental Appropriation #22-S16-CMCG-8 to the FY16 Capital Budget
Montgomery County Government
Department of Transportation
Resurfacing: Primary/Arterial (No. 508527), \$1,500,000

Background

1. Section 307 of the Montgomery County Charter provides that any supplemental appropriation shall be recommended by the County Executive who shall specify the source of funds to finance it. The Council shall hold a public hearing on each proposed supplemental appropriation after at least one week's notice. A supplemental appropriation that would comply with, avail the County of, or put into effect a grant or a Federal, State or County law or regulation, or one that is approved after January 1 of any fiscal year, requires an affirmative vote of five Councilmembers. A supplemental appropriation for any other purpose that is approved before January 1 of any fiscal year requires an affirmative vote of six Councilmembers. The Council may, in a single action, approve more than one supplemental appropriation. The Executive may disapprove or reduce a supplemental appropriation, and the Council may reapprove the appropriation, as if it were an item in the annual budget.
2. Section 302 of the Montgomery County Charter provides that the Council may amend an approved capital improvements program at any time by an affirmative vote of no fewer than six members of the Council.
3. The County Executive recommends the following capital project appropriation increases:

| <u>Project Name</u> | <u>Project Number</u> | <u>Cost Element</u> | <u>Amount</u> | <u>Source of Funds</u> |
|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Resurfacing: | 508527 | PDS | \$225,000 | GO Bonds |
| Primary/Arterial | | Construction | \$1,275,000 | GO Bonds |
| | | TOTAL | \$1,500,000 | |

Amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program and Supplemental Appropriation
#22-S16-CMCG-8

Page Two

4. This supplemental is needed because of fiscal capacity reasons. The recommended amendment is consistent with the criteria for amending the CIP because the project resources have been shifted between fiscal years to provide fiscal capacity. The supplemental and amendment will also help avoid the need to fund significantly costlier road rehabilitation work on County roads by adding these funds to FY16.
5. The County Executive recommends an amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program and a supplemental appropriation in the amount of \$1,500,000 for Resurfacing: Primary/Arterial (No. 508527), and specifies that the source of funds will be GO Bonds.
6. Notice of public hearing was given and a public hearing was held.

Action

The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland, approves the following action:

The FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program of the Montgomery County Government is amended as reflected on the attached project description form and a supplemental appropriation is approved as follows:

| <u>Project Name</u> | <u>Project Number</u> | <u>Cost Element</u> | <u>Amount</u> | <u>Source of Funds</u> |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Resurfacing: Primary/Arterial | 508527 | PDS | \$225,000 | GO Bonds |
| | | Construction | \$1,275,000 | GO Bonds |
| | | TOTAL | \$1,500,000 | |

This is a correct copy of Council action.

Linda M. Lauer, Clerk of the Council

Resurfacing: Primary/Arterial (P508527)

Category Transportation
 Sub Category Highway Maintenance
 Administering Agency Transportation (AAGE30)
 Planning Area Countywide

Date Last Modified 4/21/16
 Required Adequate Public Facility No
 Relocation Impact None
 Status Ongoing

| Total | Thru FY14 | Rem FY14 | Total 6 Years | FY 15 | FY 16 | FY 17 | FY 18 | FY 19 | FY 20 | Beyond 6 Yrs |
|-------|-----------|----------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
|-------|-----------|----------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|

EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (\$000s)

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------|
| Planning, Design and Supervision | 10,016 | 4 | 4,298 | 5,714 | 1,414 | 1,496 | 465 | 712 | 712 | 915 | 0 |
| Land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site Improvements and Utilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Construction | 42,330 | 9,524 | 420 | 32,386 | 8,012 | 8,478 | 2,635 | 4,038 | 4,038 | 5,185 | 0 |
| Other | 22 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 52,368 | 9,528 | 4,740 | 38,100 | 9,426 | 9,974 | 3,100 | 4,750 | 4,750 | 6,100 | 0 |

FUNDING SCHEDULE (\$000s)

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------|
| G.O. Bonds | 32,129 | 9,528 | 4,740 | 17,861 | 9,396 | 7,629 | 0 | 322 | 14 | 500 | 0 |
| Recordation Tax Premium | 20,239 | 0 | 0 | 20,239 | 30 | 2,345 | 3,100 | 4,428 | 4,736 | 5,600 | 0 |
| Total | 52,368 | 9,528 | 4,740 | 38,100 | 9,426 | 9,974 | 3,100 | 4,750 | 4,750 | 6,100 | 0 |

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------|--------|
| Appropriation Request | FY 16 | 8,474 |
| Supplemental Appropriation Request | | 1,500 |
| Transfer | | 0 |
| Cumulative Appropriation | | 23,694 |
| Expenditure / Encumbrances | | 10,165 |
| Unencumbered Balance | | 15,029 |

| | | |
|--------------------------|-------|---------|
| Date First Appropriation | | FY 85 |
| First Cost Estimate | | |
| Current Scope | FY 16 | 50,868 |
| Last FY's Cost Estimate | | 59,917 |
| Partial Closeout Thru | FY 15 | 96,515 |
| New Partial Closeout | FY 16 | 9,528 |
| Total Partial Closeout | | 106,043 |

Description

The County maintains approximately 966 lane miles of primary and arterial roadways. This project provides for the systematic milling, repair, and bituminous concrete resurfacing of selected primary and arterial roads and revitalization of others. This project includes the Main Street Montgomery Program and provides for a systematic, full-service, and coordinated revitalization of the primary and arterial road infrastructure to ensure viability of the primary transportation network, and enhance safety and ease of use for all users. Mileage of primary/arterial roads has been adjusted to conform with the inventory maintained by the State Highway Administration. This inventory is updated annually.

Justification

Primary and arterial roadways provide transport support for tens of thousands of trips each day. Primary and arterial roads connect diverse origins and destinations that include commercial, retail, industrial, residential, places of worship, recreation, and community facilities. The repair of the County's primary and arterial roadway infrastructure is critical to mobility throughout the County. In addition, the state of disrepair of the primary and arterial roadway system causes travel delays, increased traffic congestion, and compromises the safety and ease of travel along all primary and arterial roads which includes pedestrians and bicyclists. Well maintained road surfaces increase safety and assist in the relief of traffic congestion. In FY09, the Department of Transportation instituted a contemporary pavement management system. This system provides for systematic physical condition surveys and subsequent ratings of all primary/arterial pavements as well as calculating the rating health of the primary roadway network as a whole. Physical condition inspections of the pavements will occur on a 2-3 year cycle. The physical condition surveys note the type, level, and extent of primary/arterial pavement deterioration combined with average daily traffic and other usage characteristics. This information is used to calculate specific pavement ratings, types of repair strategies needed, and associated repair costs, as well as the overall Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of the entire primary/arterial network. The system also provides for budget optimization and recommends annual budgets for a systematic approach to maintaining a healthy primary/arterial pavement inventory.

Other

One aspect of this project will focus on improving pedestrian mobility by creating a safer walking environment, utilizing selected engineering technologies, and ensuring Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance. Several existing CIP and operating funding sources will be focused in support of the Main Street Montgomery campaign. The design and planning stages, as well as final completion of the project will comply with the Department of Transportation (DOT), Maryland State Highway Administration (MSHA), Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), American Association of State Highway Officials (AASHTO), and ADA standards.

Fiscal Note

\$8 million is the annual requirement to maintain Countywide Pavement Condition Index of 71 for Primary/Arterial roads. In FY15 Council approved a \$3.326 GO Bond supplemental. In FY16 Council approved a \$1.5M GO Bond supplemental.

Disclosures

A pedestrian impact analysis has been completed for this project.

Resurfacing: Primary/Arterial (P508527)

Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

Coordination

Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, Other Utilities, Department of Housing and Community Affairs, Montgomery County Public Schools, Maryland - National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Department of Economic Development, Department of Permitting Services, Regional Services Centers, Community Associations, Montgomery County Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee, Commission on People with Disabilities



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

MEMORANDUM

April 21, 2016

TO: Nancy Floreen, President, County Council

FROM: Isiah Leggett, County Executive 

SUBJECT: Amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program and Supplemental Appropriation #21-S16-CMCG-7 to the FY16 Capital Budget
Montgomery County Government
Department of Transportation
Residential and Rural Road Rehabilitation (No. 500914), \$2,315,000

I am recommending a supplemental appropriation to the FY16 Capital Budget and an amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program in the amount of \$2,315,000 for Residential and Rural Road Rehabilitation (No. 500914). Appropriation for this project will fund major rehabilitation of the County's residential and rural roadways to prevent costlier maintenance or reconstruction.

This supplemental is needed because of fiscal capacity reasons. The recommended amendment is consistent with the criteria for amending the CIP because the project resources have been shifted between fiscal years to provide fiscal capacity. The supplemental and amendment will also help avoid the need to fund significantly costlier road maintenance work on County roads by adding these funds to FY16.

I recommend that the County Council approve this supplemental appropriation and amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program in the amount of \$2,315,000 and specify the source of funds as GO Bonds.

I appreciate your prompt consideration of this action.

IL:nm

Attachment: Amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program and Supplemental Appropriation #21-S16-CMCG-7

cc: Al R. Roshdieh, Director, Department of Transportation
Jennifer A. Hughes, Director, Office of Management and Budget

Resolution: _____

Introduced: _____

Adopted: _____

COUNTY COUNCIL
FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

By: Council President at the Request of the County Executive

SUBJECT: Amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program and
Supplemental Appropriation #21-S16-CMCG-7 to the FY16 Capital Budget
Montgomery County Government
Department of Transportation
Residential and Rural Road Rehabilitation (No. 500914), \$2,315,000

Background

1. Section 307 of the Montgomery County Charter provides that any supplemental appropriation shall be recommended by the County Executive who shall specify the source of funds to finance it. The Council shall hold a public hearing on each proposed supplemental appropriation after at least one week's notice. A supplemental appropriation that would comply with, avail the County of, or put into effect a grant or a Federal, State or County law or regulation, or one that is approved after January 1 of any fiscal year, requires an affirmative vote of five Councilmembers. A supplemental appropriation for any other purpose that is approved before January 1 of any fiscal year requires an affirmative vote of six Councilmembers. The Council may, in a single action, approve more than one supplemental appropriation. The Executive may disapprove or reduce a supplemental appropriation, and the Council may reapprove the appropriation, as if it were an item in the annual budget.
2. Section 302 of the Montgomery County Charter provides that the Council may amend an approved capital improvements program at any time by an affirmative vote of no fewer than six members of the Council.
3. The County Executive recommends the following capital project appropriation increases:

| <u>Project Name</u> | <u>Project Number</u> | <u>Cost Element</u> | <u>Amount</u> | <u>Source of Funds</u> |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Residential and Rural Roads Rehabilitation | 500914 | PDS | \$347,000 | GO Bonds |
| | | Construction | \$1,968,000 | GO Bonds |
| | | TOTAL | \$2,315,000 | |

Amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program and Supplemental Appropriation
21-S16-CMCG-7

Page Two

4. This supplemental is needed because of fiscal capacity reasons. The recommended amendment is consistent with the criteria for amending the CIP because the project resources have been shifted between fiscal years to provide fiscal capacity. The supplemental and amendment will also help avoid the need to fund significantly costlier road rehabilitation work on County roads by adding these funds to FY16.
5. The County Executive recommends an amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program and a supplemental appropriation in the amount of \$2,315,000 for Residential and Rural Road Rehabilitation (No. 500914), and specifies that the source of funds will be GO Bonds.
6. Notice of public hearing was given and a public hearing was held.

Action

The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland, approves the following action:

The FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program of the Montgomery County Government is amended as reflected on the attached project description form and a supplemental appropriation is approved as follows:

| <u>Project Name</u> | <u>Project Number</u> | <u>Cost Element</u> | <u>Amount</u> | <u>Source of Funds</u> |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| Residential and Rural Roads Rehabilitation | 500914 | PDS | \$347,000 | GO Bonds |
| | | <u>Construction</u> | <u>\$1,968,000</u> | <u>GO Bonds</u> |
| | | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>\$2,315,000</u> | |

This is a correct copy of Council action.

Linda M. Lauer, Clerk of the Council

(17)

Residential and Rural Road Rehabilitation (P500914)

Category
Sub Category
Administering Agency
Planning Area

Transportation
Highway Maintenance
Transportation (AAGE30)
Countywide

Date Last Modified
Required Adequate Public Facility
Relocation Impact
Status

4/21/16
No
None
Ongoing

| Total | Thru FY14 | Rem FY14 | Total 6 Years | FY 15 | FY 16 | FY 17 | FY 18 | FY 19 | FY 20 | Beyond 6 Yrs |
|-------|-----------|----------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
|-------|-----------|----------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|

EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (\$000s)

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------|
| Planning, Design and Supervision | 9,470 | 9 | 3,174 | 6,287 | 990 | 1,637 | 690 | 990 | 990 | 990 | 0 |
| Land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site Improvements and Utilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Construction | 61,583 | 25,091 | 414 | 36,078 | 5,610 | 9,728 | 3,910 | 5,610 | 5,610 | 5,610 | 0 |
| Other | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 71,062 | 25,109 | 3,588 | 42,365 | 6,600 | 11,365 | 4,600 | 6,600 | 6,600 | 6,600 | 0 |

FUNDING SCHEDULE (\$000s)

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------|
| G.O. Bonds | 55,283 | 17,803 | 3,363 | 34,117 | 6,600 | 10,915 | 1,066 | 3,702 | 6,600 | 5,234 | 0 |
| Recordation Tax Premium | 15,329 | 7,306 | 225 | 7,798 | 0 | 0 | 3,534 | 2,898 | 0 | 1,366 | 0 |
| Total | 70,612 | 25,109 | 3,588 | 41,915 | 6,600 | 10,915 | 4,600 | 6,600 | 6,600 | 6,600 | 0 |

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------|---------------|
| Appropriation Request | FY 16 | 8,600 |
| Supplemental Appropriation Request | | 2,315 |
| Transfer | | 0 |
| Cumulative Appropriation | | 35,297 |
| Expenditure / Encumbrances | | 26,067 |
| Unencumbered Balance | | 11,545 |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|----------|
| Date First Appropriation | FY 09 | |
| First Cost Estimate | | |
| Current Scope | FY 16 | 68,297 |
| Last FY's Cost Estimate | | 68,297 |
| Partial Closeout Thru | FY 15 | 0 |
| New Partial Closeout | FY 16 | 0 |
| Total Partial Closeout | | 0 |

Description

This project provides for the major rehabilitation of rural and residential roadways in older communities to include extensive pavement rehabilitation and reconstruction including the associated rehabilitation of ancillary elements such as under drains, sub-grade drains, and installation and replacement of curbs and gutters. This project will not make major changes to the location or size of existing drainage structures, if any. Pavement rehabilitation includes the replacement of existing failed pavement sections by the placement of an equivalent or increased pavement section. The rehabilitation usually requires the total removal and replacement of failed pavement exhibiting widespread areas of fatigue related distress, base failures and sub-grade failures.

Justification

In FY09, the Department of Transportation instituted a contemporary pavement management system. This system provides for systematic physical condition surveys. The physical condition surveys note the type, level, and extent of residential pavement deterioration combined with average daily traffic and other usage characteristics. This information is used to calculate specific pavement ratings, types of repair strategies needed, and associated repair costs, as well as the overall Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of the entire residential network. The system also provides for budget optimization for a systematic approach to maintaining a healthy residential pavement inventory. The updated 2013 pavement condition survey indicated that 180 lane miles (4 percent) of residential pavement have fallen into the lowest possible category and are in need of structural reconstruction. Typically, pavements rated in this category require between 15-20 percent permanent patching per lane mile. Physical condition inspections of residential pavements will occur on a 2-3 year cycle.

Other

Hot mix asphalt pavements have a finite life of approximately 20 years based upon a number of factors including but not limited to: original construction materials, means and methods, underlying soil conditions, drainage, daily traffic volume, other loading such as construction traffic and heavy truck traffic, age, and maintenance history. A well maintained residential road carrying low to moderate traffic levels is likely to provide a service life of 20 years or more. Conversely, lack of programmed maintenance will shorten the service life of residential roads considerably, in many cases to less than 15 years before rehabilitation is needed.

Fiscal Note

\$36 million is the annual cost required to maintain the current Countywide Pavement Condition Index of 68 on residential/rural roads. Related CIP projects include Permanent/Patching: Residential/Rural Roads (#501106) and Resurfacing: Residential/Rural Roads (#500511). In FY16 Council approved a \$2.315 GO Bond supplemental.

Disclosures

A pedestrian impact analysis has been completed for this project.
Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

Coordination

18

Residential and Rural Road Rehabilitation (P500914)

Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, Washington Gas Light Company, Department of Permitting Services, PEPCO, Cable TV, Verizon, Montgomery County Public Schools, Regional Services Centers, Community Associations, Commission on People with Disabilities



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

MEMORANDUM

April 21, 2016

TO: Nancy Floreen, President, County Council

FROM: Isiah Leggett, County Executive 

SUBJECT: Amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program and Supplemental Appropriation #23-S16-CMCG-9 to the FY16 Capital Budget
Montgomery County Government
Department of Transportation
Resurfacing: Residential/Rural Roads (No. 500511), \$5,500,000

I am recommending a supplemental appropriation to the FY16 Capital Budget and an amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program in the amount of \$5,500,000 for Resurfacing: Residential/Rural Roads (No. 500511). Appropriation for this project will fund road resurfacing improvements to support County roads in residential and rural areas.

This supplemental is needed because of fiscal capacity reasons. The recommended amendment is consistent with the criteria for amending the CIP because the project resources have been shifted between fiscal years to provide fiscal capacity. The supplemental and amendment will also help avoid the need to fund significantly costlier road rehabilitation work on County roads by adding these funds to FY16.

I recommend that the County Council approve this supplemental appropriation and amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program in the amount of \$5,500,000 and specify the source of funds as GO Bonds.

I appreciate your prompt consideration of this action.

IL:nm

Attachment: Amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program and Supplemental Appropriation #23-S16-CMCG-9

cc: Al R. Roshdih, Director, Department of Transportation
Jennifer A. Hughes, Director, Office of Management and Budget

Resolution: _____
 Introduced: _____
 Adopted: _____

COUNTY COUNCIL
 FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

By: Council President at the Request of the County Executive

SUBJECT: Amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program and
 Supplemental Appropriation #23-S16-CMCG-9 to the FY16 Capital Budget
 Montgomery County Government
 Department of Transportation
 Resurfacing: Residential/Rural Roads (No. 500511), \$5,500,000

Background

- Section 307 of the Montgomery County Charter provides that any supplemental appropriation shall be recommended by the County Executive who shall specify the source of funds to finance it. The Council shall hold a public hearing on each proposed supplemental appropriation after at least one week's notice. A supplemental appropriation that would comply with, avail the County of, or put into effect a grant or a Federal, State or County law or regulation, or one that is approved after January 1 of any fiscal year, requires an affirmative vote of five Councilmembers. A supplemental appropriation for any other purpose that is approved before January 1 of any fiscal year requires an affirmative vote of six Councilmembers. The Council may, in a single action, approve more than one supplemental appropriation. The Executive may disapprove or reduce a supplemental appropriation, and the Council may reapprove the appropriation, as if it were an item in the annual budget.
- Section 302 of the Montgomery County Charter provides that the Council may amend an approved capital improvements program at any time by an affirmative vote of no fewer than six members of the Council.
- The County Executive recommends the following capital project appropriation increases:

| <u>Project Name</u> | <u>Project Number</u> | <u>Cost Element</u> | <u>Amount</u> | <u>Source of Funds</u> |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| Resurfacing: Residential/ Rural Roads | 500511 | | PDS | \$825,000 |
| GO Bonds | | | | |
| | | <u>Construction</u> | <u>\$4,675,000</u> | <u>GO Bonds</u> |
| | | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>\$5,500,000</u> | |

Amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program and Supplemental Appropriation
#23-S16-CMCG-9

Page Two

4. This supplemental is needed because of fiscal capacity reasons. The recommended amendment is consistent with the criteria for amending the CIP because the project resources have been shifted between fiscal years to provide fiscal capacity. The supplemental and amendment will also help avoid the need to fund significantly costlier road rehabilitation work on County roads by adding these funds to FY16.
5. The County Executive recommends an amendment to the FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program and a supplemental appropriation in the amount of \$5,500,000 for Resurfacing: Residential/Rural Roads (No. 500511), and specifies that the source of funds will be GO Bonds.
6. Notice of public hearing was given and a public hearing was held.

Action

The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland, approves the following action:

The FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program of the Montgomery County Government is amended as reflected on the attached project description form and a supplemental appropriation is approved as follows:

| <u>Project Name</u> | <u>Project Number</u> | <u>Cost Element</u> | <u>Amount</u> | <u>Source of Funds</u> |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| Resurfacing: Residential/ Rural Roads GO Bonds | 500511 | | PDS | \$825,000 |
| | | <u>Construction</u> | <u>\$4,675,000</u> | <u>GO Bonds</u> |
| | | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>\$5,500,000</u> | |

This is a correct copy of Council action.

Linda M. Lauer, Clerk of the Council

Resurfacing: Residential/Rural Roads (P500511)

Category Transportation
Sub Category Highway Maintenance
Administering Agency Transportation (AAGE30)
Planning Area Countywide

Date Last Modified 4/21/16
Required Adequate Public Facility No
Relocation Impact None
Status Ongoing

| | Total | Thru FY14 | Rem FY14 | Total 6 Years | FY 15 | FY 16 | FY 17 | FY 18 | FY 19 | FY 20 | Beyond 6 Yrs |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (\$000s) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Planning, Design and Supervision | 10,782 | 74 | 1,407 | 9,301 | 3,000 | 2,325 | 938 | 938 | 975 | 1,125 | 0 |
| Land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site Improvements and Utilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Construction | 110,337 | 56,722 | 916 | 52,699 | 17,000 | 13,175 | 5,312 | 5,312 | 5,525 | 6,375 | 0 |
| Other | 45 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 121,164 | 56,841 | 2,323 | 62,000 | 20,000 | 15,500 | 6,250 | 6,250 | 6,500 | 7,500 | 0 |

| | Total | Thru FY14 | Rem FY14 | Total 6 Years | FY 15 | FY 16 | FY 17 | FY 18 | FY 19 | FY 20 | Beyond 6 Yrs |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| FUNDING SCHEDULE (\$000s) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Current Revenue: General | 309 | 309 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| G.O. Bonds | 119,238 | 54,915 | 2,323 | 62,000 | 20,000 | 15,500 | 6,250 | 6,250 | 6,500 | 7,500 | 0 |
| PAYGO | 1,617 | 1,617 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 121,164 | 56,841 | 2,323 | 62,000 | 20,000 | 15,500 | 6,250 | 6,250 | 6,500 | 7,500 | 0 |

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------|--------|
| Appropriation Request | FY 16 | 10,000 |
| Supplemental Appropriation Request | | 5,500 |
| Transfer | | 0 |
| Cumulative Appropriation | | 79,164 |
| Expenditure / Encumbrances | | 57,147 |
| Unencumbered Balance | | 27,517 |

| | | |
|--------------------------|-------|---------|
| Date First Appropriation | FY 05 | |
| First Cost Estimate | | |
| Current Scope | FY 16 | 115,664 |
| Last FY's Cost Estimate | | 115,664 |
| Partial Closeout Thru | FY 15 | 0 |
| New Partial Closeout | FY 16 | 0 |
| Total Partial Closeout | | 0 |

Description

This project provides for the permanent patching and resurfacing of rural and residential roadways using durable hot mix asphalt to restore long-term structural integrity to the aging rural and residential roadway infrastructure. The County maintains a combined total of 4,210 lane miles of rural and residential roads. Preventative maintenance includes full-depth patching of distressed areas of pavement in combination with a new hot mix asphalt wearing surface of 1-inch to 2-inches depending on the levels of observed distress. A portion of this work will be performed by the county in-house paving crew.

Justification

In FY09, the Department of Transportation instituted a contemporary pavement management system. This system provides for systematic physical condition surveys. The surveys note the type, level, and extent of residential pavement deterioration combined with average daily traffic and other usage characteristics. This information is used to calculate specific pavement ratings, types of repair strategies needed, and associated repair cost, as well as the overall Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of the entire residential network. The system also provides for budget optimization and a systematic approach to maintaining a healthy residential pavement inventory. The latest 2013 survey indicated that the current cost of the countywide backlog on road repairs is \$211.1 million. This represents 58 percent of total residential infrastructure pavement repair needs. Physical condition inspections of residential pavements will occur on a 2-3 year cycle.

Other

The design and planning stages, as well as project construction, will comply with the Department of Transportation (DOT), Maryland State Highway Administration (MSHA), Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), and American with Disabilities Act (ADA). Rural/residential road mileage has been adjusted to conform with the State inventory of road mileage maintained by the State Highway Administration (SHA). This inventory is updated annually.

Fiscal Note

\$36 million is the annual cost required to maintain the current Countywide Pavement Condition Index of 68 on residential and rural roads. Related CIP projects include Permanent Patching: Residential/Rural Roads (#501106) and Residential and Rural Road Rehabilitation (#500914). In FY15, Council approved a \$1 million GO Bond supplemental. In FY16, Council approved a \$5.5M GO Bond supplemental.

Disclosures

Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

Coordination

Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, Washington Gas Light Company, PEPCO, Cable TV, Verizon, United States Post Office