

Collin County 2007 Bond Program

Discretionary Funding Allocation Options



Engineering Department

Tracy R. Homfeld; PE, CFM

June 10, 2013

Available Discretionary Funding

To date, all new bond projects have been funded using savings from past county managed bond projects or city reallocated funds. No 2007 Discretionary dollars have been expended.

\$15,000,000 Allocated by the voters in the 2007 Bond Package

\$9,996,281 available now

\$1,968,865 available July 2013

\$3,034,854 programmed in 2014

Allocation Option #1

1) Case by Case – *Project is evaluated based on merit and criteria by the entire court.*

Criteria:

- Does the city have their 50% match?
- Is the project on the County Mobility Plan?
- Is the county road or bridge submitted in need of an upgrade for safety reasons?
- Does the project bring a benefit to the county through congestion mitigation/air quality benefits/economic benefits?
- Savings on city discretionary projects would go back to the discretionary account for future allocation.
- Did the city submit the project as a priority project during the county call for projects in 2012?

Historically, this is how Discretionary Bond Projects have been approved. The reason being that the court will receive requests sporadically either from a city or from the County Engineering department.

Allocation Option #1

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- Each project is looked at individually and is not automatically eliminated.
- The county Engineering Department maintains the ability to ask for funding for county road/bridge projects or other on system beneficial projects as the need arises.
- The court acts as whole when reviewing projects.
- Possibly review each cities top priority projects as submitted last year and revisit these projects with the city. (A call for projects)
- The bulk of the funding allocations could end up in one or more precincts.
- Does not allow for programming of funds; however reviewing the funding per city can be one of the criteria each time a project is submitted.

Allocation Option #2a

Equal Allocation Per Precinct –

Funding is divided 4 or 5 ways at \$3.75M or \$3M.

If project meets criteria below, the court would only vote to approve ILA to encumber the funds. The respective commissioner has control over funds in his/her precinct.

Criteria:

- Does the city have their 50% match?
- Is the project on the County Mobility Plan?
- Is the county road or bridge submitted in need of an upgrade for safety reasons?
- Does the project bring a benefit to the county through congestion mitigation/air quality benefits/economic benefits?
- Savings on city projects would go back to the discretionary account for future allocation.
- Did the city submit the project as a priority project during the county call for projects in 2012?

Allocation Option #2a

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- Funding is equally distributed throughout the county.
- Gives each court member the ability to program funds per precinct.
- Could limit county managed projects such as road/bridge projects or other On System beneficial projects.
- Possibly review each cities top priority projects as submitted last year and revisit these projects with the city. (A call for projects)
- The entire court does not decide on the merit of the project.
- Worthwhile projects may go unfunded if the precinct is “out of funds”.
- Available funding may be insufficient for construction projects.

Allocation Option #2b

*Allocation by Precinct based on % taxable Income per city–
Funding is divided among the commissioner precinct based on cities %
taxable income they provide to the county (Spreadsheet on next slide. Provided by
CCAD and shows 2012 values)*

Criteria:

- Does the city have their 50% match?
- Is the project on the County Mobility Plan?
- Is the county road or bridge submitted in need of an upgrade for safety reasons?
- Does the project bring a benefit to the county through congestion mitigation/air quality benefits/economic benefits?
- Savings on city projects would go back to the discretionary account for future allocation.
- Did the city submit the project as a priority project during the county call for projects in 2012?

Entity Name	Market Value	Percentage	Discretionary amount based on %
COLLIN COUNTY TOTAL 2012	\$ 89,809,267,053		\$ 15,000,000.00
ALLEN CITY	\$ 8,930,436,309	9.943780%	\$ 1,491,567.06
ANNA CITY	\$ 474,188,621	0.527995%	\$ 79,199.28
BLUE RIDGE CITY	\$ 27,810,644	0.030966%	\$ 4,644.95
CARROLLTON CITY	\$ 61,121,132	0.068057%	\$ 10,208.49
CELINA CITY	\$ 777,916,295	0.866187%	\$ 129,928.07
DALLAS CITY	\$ 4,461,919,328	4.968217%	\$ 745,232.56
FAIRVIEW TOWN	\$ 1,390,025,827	1.547753%	\$ 232,162.98
FARMERSVILLE CITY	\$ 175,091,261	0.194959%	\$ 29,243.85
FRISCO CITY	\$ 10,920,165,566	12.159286%	\$ 1,823,892.89
GARLAND CITY	\$ 24,620,653	0.027414%	\$ 4,112.16
JOSEPHINE CITY	\$ 38,841,983	0.043249%	\$ 6,487.41
LAVON CITY	\$ 194,403,055	0.216462%	\$ 32,469.32
LOWRY CROSSING CITY	\$ 102,137,346	0.113727%	\$ 17,059.04
LUCAS CITY	\$ 753,567,317	0.839075%	\$ 125,861.28
MCKINNEY CITY	\$ 12,898,669,629	14.362293%	\$ 2,154,343.88
MELISSA CITY	\$ 463,856,664	0.516491%	\$ 77,473.63
MURPHY CITY	\$ 1,610,554,534	1.793306%	\$ 268,995.83
NEVADA CITY	\$ 54,019,189	0.060149%	\$ 9,022.32
NEW HOPE TOWN	\$ 43,817,668	0.048790%	\$ 7,318.45
PARKER CITY	\$ 605,320,139	0.674006%	\$ 101,100.95
PLANO CITY	\$ 30,652,984,143	34.131204%	\$ 5,119,680.60
PRINCETON CITY	\$ 340,861,293	0.379539%	\$ 56,930.87
PROSPER TOWN	\$ 1,747,828,540	1.946156%	\$ 291,923.42
RICHARDSON CITY	\$ 4,739,756,210	5.277580%	\$ 791,637.05
ROYSE CITY	\$ 91,217,482	0.101568%	\$ 15,235.20
SACHSE CITY	\$ 473,920,943	0.527697%	\$ 79,154.57
ST. PAUL TOWN	\$ 82,733,900	0.092122%	\$ 13,818.27
VAN ALSTYNE CITY	\$ 84,999	0.000095%	\$ 14.20
WESTON CITY	\$ 48,378,574	0.053868%	\$ 8,080.22
WYLIE CITY	\$ 2,598,773,685	2.893659%	\$ 434,048.81
UNINCORPORATED CC	\$ 5,024,244,123	5.594349%	\$ 839,152.40
TOTAL	\$ 89,809,267,053	100.000000%	\$ 15,000,000.00

Allocation Option #3

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- Possibly review each cities top priority projects as submitted last year and revisit these projects with the city. (A call for projects)
- Majority of funding could end up in one or more precinct.
- Could limit county managed projects such as road/bridge projects or other On System beneficial projects.
- Could be used as an evaluation criteria instead of an option.

Allocation Option #4

Allocation based on three funding categories– Amount to be determined by the court

Funding for City Managed projects to be allocated by one of the options previously mentioned.

Funding for County Managed projects to be allocated by option 1.

Funding for City Managed projects for cities that do not have their match. Match to be paid back. (typically used by smaller cities)
Terms of loan to be approved by court

Criteria:

- Does the city have their 50% match? (unless they will pay back match)
- Is the project on the County Mobility Plan?
- Is the county road or bridge submitted in need of an upgrade for safety reasons?
- Does the project bring a benefit to the county through congestion mitigation/air quality benefits/economic benefits?
- Any savings from past/future county managed bond projects will be left for county managed projects and not allocated for city discretionary projects.
- Savings on city discretionary projects will go back to the discretionary account for future allocation.
- Did the city submit the project as a priority project during the county call for projects in 2012?

Allocation Option #4

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- County managed projects are not competing with city projects.
- Possibly review each cities top priority projects as submitted last year and revisit these projects with the city. (A call for projects)
- Funding, made available for smaller cities looking to advance projects, could economically benefit the city.
- Smaller amount of funds overall for cities to apply for.