Infrastructure as a
Component of
Economic Development



- Challenges
May 4, 2009
CIP Purpose and Background


DOT Capital Improvement Program Annual
Updating Process:
 April - Approve CIP

- Updated costs and schedules
- Updated revenue from approved
revenue estimate
• Establishes priorities for delivery
• Determines workload for annual
budget needs
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Proposed Silva Valley Interchange Projects ${ }^{1}$

Proposed Silver Springs Parkway and Bass Lake Rd Interchange Projects

Proposed Cameron Park Interchange Projects:

## 



Proposed Ponderosa Interchange Projects:
*PROPOSED COMPLETION YEAR

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| II PROJECTS |  |
|  |  |
| III KE | KEY ECONOMIC |
| 18 DEVELOPMENT |  |
|  |  |
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| Source of Forecas | 07108 | 08109 | 09110 | 1011 | 11112 | 121/3 | 13118 | Iotal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 ClP | 950 | 1200 | 1300 | 1300 |  |  |  |  |
| $2008 \mathrm{ClP}(2 / 11108)$ | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 |  |  |  |
| 2088 ClP (9/1/5/08) |  | 300 | 400 | 450 | 500 | 600 |  |  |
| 1113109 Board Meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13,000 |
| TFWG Direction on 1/1/1/9 |  | 200 | 200 | 300 | 740 | 1180 | 10.380 | 13.000 |

[^1]

- However, most of the revenue for projects supporting key economic
- TIM Fees are already relatively high and increasing them to raise more
revenue is not an attractive option. Examples:

In order to support economic development areas more quickly,
DOT would need to find ways to increase revenues and/or
decrease project costs. Revenues could be increased through several possible options:
- Sales tax
- Parcel tax
- Mello-Roos tax
- Assessments in special districts (e.g., MC\&FP - Master Circulation \&
Funding Plan)
- Additional State/Federal grants
- Decreasing project costs would free up funds to spend on other projects
- DOT is planning to return to the Board to begin discussions on
alternatives for several projects that currently have large price tags -
e.g., U.S. $50 /$ Cameron Park Drive Interchange, U.S. $50 /$ Silva Valley
Interchange
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[^1]:    FY 09/10 and 10/11 are based on FY 08/09 "Actuals" and TFWG projections of what developers will be building in the next few years.

    Compared to the last forecast in September, 2008, current projections are now for $1 / 3$ fewer permits for FY 08/09, 1/2 fewer for FY 09/10, and $1 / 3$ fewer permits for 10/11.

    Compared to forecasts for the 2007 CIP, the current projections are about $1 / 5$ the
    number of permits.

