Date: July 13, 2022

To: Thomas B. Modica, City Manager

From: Eric Lopez, Director of Public Works

For: Mayor and Members of the City Council

Subject: Infrastructure Investment Plan Study Session Follow-Up

On September 7, 2021, City staff presented to the City Council during a study session on citywide infrastructure needs and funding strategies. The study session highlighted strategic plans such as the Pavement Management Plan (PMP), Updated Transition Plan (UTP) for pedestrian facilities, and Facilities Condition Assessments (FCA), emphasizing that reliable data leads to better-informed recommendations and decisions. Staff also provided an update on the Federal Infrastructure Bill negotiations and Bipartisan Act and presented proposed prioritization criteria that will be used to help select capital projects as funding opportunities become available from federal, State, or local sources, including potential bonds. A copy of the infrastructure study session presentation is included (Attachment A). As additional details are released by federal and State funding agencies pursuant to the signed Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill, and the City Council decides whether to proceed with eventually issuing bonds to pay for critical infrastructure needs, City of Long Beach (City) staff will be able to draft and present to the City Council the next base five year Infrastructure Investment Plan (IIP). This memorandum will provide subject matter updates, address questions raised by the City Council during the September 7, 2021 study session, and outline next steps.

On March 8, 2022, City staff provided a budget performance update to the City Council, highlighting the City’s fiscal condition and state of the budget, development of the infrastructure investment plan, recent Fiscal Year 2021-2022 (FY 21-22) accomplishments, and community engagement efforts. The update also detailed General Fund trends and forecasts, a strategy to balance the budget, Measure A plan, opportunities for investment in infrastructure, and continued implementation of Long Beach Recovery Act programs. Potential bond fund options focused on infrastructure were highlighted as part of the Measure A plan, specifically $150 million of bond issues beginning in FY 23. Additional details, including a high-level recommended spending outline, are discussed herein.

Federal Infrastructure Investments Update

The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), enacted on November 15, 2021, provides $1.2 trillion in federal funding for infrastructure over the next five years (FY 22-26). As described in a November 22, 2021 memorandum, the legislation reauthorizes existing surface transportation and water infrastructure programs and also allocates $550 billion in new spending for roads and highways, bridges, public transit, rail, water, traffic safety, broadband, energy resiliency, and other infrastructure categories of interest to the City.
The IIJA legislation outlines the overall funding categories, amounts, and allocation methodologies for infrastructure investments over the five-year period. Unlike with recent legislation to address the public health and economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, the IIJA is not a stimulus or relief bill and does not include direct City allocations. Rather, the legislation authorizes both 1) discretionary funding programs that will require competitive applications and 2) State apportionments and block grants to specified recipients. While the City is eligible to apply directly to some of the new federal competitive grant programs that will be developed, most of the funds will be distributed directly to States through formula-based allocations and will be sub-granted to local jurisdictions through competitive grant solicitations.

Following Congressional appropriation, federal agencies are currently in the process of developing new grant programs and distributing formula funding authorized by the IIJA. The legislation specifies which federal agencies will receive allocations and provides the authority to develop new grant programs and distribute funds to eligible entities. For new programs, agencies will engage in a rulemaking process over the coming months to finetune grant timelines, eligibility requirements, administrative policies, reporting and auditing requirements, and application processes that are not detailed in the legislation. Many formula-funded programs, on the other hand, already exist and will likely move faster than new grants. Once States receive allocations for these programs, they will develop sub-grantee requirements and processes for local jurisdictions to compete for funds. This process of distribution and sub-granting through the States will occur annually over the five-year allocation period (through December 2026).

Even though many programmatic details are still in development, the IIJA does provide information regarding the types of infrastructure categories that are most likely to be funded. The legislation, as well as Congress and the Biden Administration’s narratives surrounding the bill, prioritizes infrastructure projects that have a regional impact, advance equity, support long-term environmental sustainability and climate resilience, and provide good-paying job opportunities and workforce development for infrastructure-related sectors.

Attachment C highlights the City’s approach to identifying priority projects that best align with the different programs funded by the IIJA. City projects that address a regional infrastructure need, such as a bridge replacement, corridor improvements, and supply chain congestion, or align directly with IIJA funding categories like broadband and clean drinking water infrastructure are most likely to be competitive for grants through the federal infrastructure bill. On the other hand, the legislation does not clearly fund projects that are more localized, such as community facility improvements, local streets and alleys, and park projects. Infrastructure categories that are not included in the legislation may be better suited for other grant or potential bond opportunities.

**Prioritization Criteria**

Although there are many sources of funds in the City’s budget and various grant opportunities, the citywide infrastructure needs greatly exceed available funding. Therefore, prioritizing the most relevant projects is key to maximize the benefits of public dollars. Public Works, in
conjunction with other Departments, reviews the City's capital needs and intends to prioritize projects using the following criteria, which isn't listed in any particular order:

- **Public Health & Safety** – The extent to which the project impacts maintaining and improving public health and safety

- **Number of Long Beach residents impacted** – number of users of the project/facility and/or Long Beach residents impacted; higher use rates for certain projects by greater California residents will lead to additional consideration

- **Urgency** – urgency of the project; the extent of adverse ramifications if a project is not done in the near term or meets legal concerns and mandates

- **Poor condition/high need** – extent to which an existing facility is in poor repair or condition, or alternatively for a non-existing facility, the degree of an unmet identified need (i.e., project recommended by a Strategic or Master Plan)

- **Jobs** – degree to which a project creates a significant number of jobs and local hiring opportunities

- **Equity Investment Area** – regional distribution of projects, while also ensuring investment in disadvantaged, low income, justice-impacted, and vulnerable communities of color

- **Ability to Attract Additional Funding and/or Leverage Internal Funds** – extent to which funding a project will result in additional funding or allow the City to better leverage internal funds

- **Operational Cost Savings and Revenue Generation** – extent to which the project will produce annual cost savings over the lifetime of the project or program and/or generate revenue

- **Collective Impact** – mutually reinforces other programs/services/sites (including those funded by federal recovery funds)

- **Environment** - ability to address environmental concerns

- **Risk** – minimizes or mitigates risks to the public and City

- **Shovel Ready** – projects planned and/or entitled will be prioritized over projects that have not, and projects with minimal planning/entitlement requirements will receive additional consideration over those with lengthy or complex planning requirements

As previously noted, along with prioritizing projects to maximize funding, the City's process will align projects with eligibility requirements for funding sources created by the IIJA.

To successfully compete for grants issued through the IIJA, the City has established a structure of Departments and staff who are organized to support grant writing, project delivery, and grant management of federal, State and county infrastructure recovery funding (Attachment D). A Steering Committee made up of staff from the Long Beach Recovery and City Manager’s Government Affairs Offices, and the Public Works Department is responsible for tracking all IIJA funded grants and working with Departments to prepare and submit grant applications. At
such time grants are awarded, these will be submitted to the City Council to accept and appropriate, as is the City’s process. Project delivery, project administration, and financial reporting and auditing will be managed under the City’s standard protocol for capital improvements. Depending on the level of grants and funding awarded to the City and potential bonding amounts, additional staffing will likely be needed to support project delivery, project administration, and financial reporting and auditing requirements. City staff anticipates a need for both in-house and consultant support to meet all funding and project requirements.

To establish a resource to assist City staff with grant writing, the City has released a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) seeking grant writing consultants and firms to provide grant writing services. The RFQ seeks to create a list of qualified on-call grant writing consultants/firms who possess specific grant writing expertise across various areas, including infrastructure, economic development, health, libraries, and parks, to serve various City Departments by providing tailored grant writing services and support for county, State, federal and philanthropic/foundation grant applications where needed.

2021 PMP Update

The selection of streets and alleys recommended for funding in each year’s paving program are guided by the PMP and the last approved Infrastructure Investment Plan (IIP). The most recent update to the PMP was completed in December 2021 and includes recommendations and strategies used in the development of future pavement programs. However, major redistricting changes were not anticipated and Staff will be revising specific parts of the PMP to reflect the recent changes to council district boundaries. The PMP’s recommendations are meant to maximize long-term benefits and reduce the long-term costs of maintaining the City’s substantial roadway system. It also discusses 100 percent need-based programming that was approved by the full City Council on the FY 18 Adopted Budget. Following are some of the 2021 PMP statistical highlights:

- The pavement condition assessments and analysis cover approximately 1,012 centerline miles of city-maintained asphalt and concrete roadways and alleys
- The Long Beach street network average Pavement Condition Index (PCI) equals 58
- The overall backlog of poor and very poor streets (PCI 0-40) equals 26 percent (279 centerline miles)
- Backlog is highest in the Minor Street Network at 33 percent, whereas only 13 percent in the Major Street Network
- Backlog of 10 to 15 percent is considered more appropriate and manageable from a funding perspective
- Backlog at 20 percent or more become unmanageable and backlog tends to increase faster than an agency’s ability to repair its streets

As a new feature, an online, interactive Geographic Information System (GIS) website tool is also now available to the public on the City’s Public Works website. This user-friendly program provides increased public access to pertinent data from the PMP. The new tool increases
transparency and helps educate the public on road maintenance needs citywide. Users can navigate the street network to find details on each street segment including its condition, pavement type, and last paving date going back to 2013. In addition to the interactive maps, the website link also features an introductory summary, the PCI ranges and repair treatments, example photos of pavement condition in different ranges, and rehabilitation types.

Attachment E is the latest FY 22 Map Update to the City’s IIP for Streets and Roadways to illustrate the progress the City has made in delivering the street improvement commitments associated with Measure A. The PMP also contains a plan which includes finishing the remaining streets to be done under the current IIP. It is also important to note that Council District boundaries changed in December 2021, which will alter the need-based budgeting and other district-based statistics. City staff is working with the consultant team to update maps and formulas so the website noted above can be revised within the next 1-2 months.

Pavement Management Strategy

A regular and routine pavement maintenance program is key to protecting and extending the life of City assets and optimizing the use of available funds. The most effective strategy is to prevent streets from deteriorating and failing, as the cost to repair failed streets is significantly higher than it is to maintain streets in good condition. As illustrated in the figures below, pavements tend to deteriorate rapidly once they reach a certain point in their lifespan.
A nominal investment in more-affordable surface treatments earlier in the street lifespan is more effective than deferring maintenance until heavier overlays or reconstruction is required. Pavements rehabilitated and preserved while in good or fair condition will have an extended lifetime and cost far less than those left to deteriorate to a poor condition or failed state. Full reconstruction is very expensive compared to all other forms of repair (especially in areas with inadequate curbs and gutters that impact water drainage), at least two to three times the cost and as high as 15 times the cost of preservation methods. Meanwhile, the cost to reconstruct a street in poor/failed condition, while very high, does not increase much over time. Therefore, an effective strategy is to focus on cost-effective pavement preservation methods and commit most annual maintenance funding to streets in good or fair condition, especially when funds are limited. This includes a routine crack seal program, slurry seal program, and pavement overlays. Even though crack and slurry seals do not improve pavement integrity, employing such programs consistently as key preservation measures will maintain the most square-footage of streets, help improve the City’s average PCI, and prevent further increase in backlog. Reconstructing very poor streets with available, limited funding is not as effective from a cost-benefit analysis because it addresses the least amount of roadway pavement. However, this strategy can be implemented occasionally when serviceability has been lost or safety is compromised.

However, if additional funds outside of the annual routine maintenance budgets become available from either federal, State, or new local sources, City staff can develop a strategy to address the City’s worst streets and reduce its backlog. City staff understands that the majority of resident complaints are targeted at streets in the worst condition. But as we discuss later in this memo, maintaining a healthy balance between maintaining our roadway network and
addressing our backlog of streets in poor or very poor condition is important. It is not, however, recommended that worst streets are funded with regular maintenance dollars as that is likely to have a negative impact on the City's long-term pavement condition rating. With this approach, the problem will only get worse. A two-pronged approach to maintaining streets is critical, where good streets are crack and slurry sealed and streets in the worst condition are reconstructed and then also maintained in good condition in the long-term. But to achieve this balance, additional street funding is necessary.

It is important to note that PCI is analyzed based on pavement surface distress (cracks, potholes, raveling), roughness (bumps over distance), and structural integrity. A Falling Weight Deflectometer device applies a load to the pavement simulating that of truck traffic and measures the response via surface deflections. To assess the structural integrity of a road, the field data is then compared to traffic loads the road is expected to carry. In addition, heavy trucks can cause wheel path rutting (surface depression) in a pavement surface which in turn affects the PCI rating. Traffic volume (i.e. average daily traffic) is not one of the metrics used to determine PCI, but is a real-world factor affecting pavement condition, lifespan, and distress. This type of traffic data can be used to strategically identify highly-traveled street segments with more stakeholders that should have shorter maintenance cycles, more frequent maintenance inspection, and be designed to support heavier loads. Other main factors affecting pavement condition include water intrusion (through cracks in pavement surface) and exposure to the sun.

Utility excavations also have adverse impacts – they increase the roughness of a pavement structure in the areas of a cut. These cuts lead to accelerated deterioration, potholes, and reduce the pavement's life span. This explains why agencies must place moratoriums on newly paved streets and require excavation fees as part of permitting in order to recoup costs to offset the impact. The Public Works inspection team is essential to ensure quality control (e.g., proper compaction and joint sealing) during repaving of trenches and does a remarkable job identifying and rectifying substandard work which goes a long way in maintaining PCI. Public Works standards were updated several years ago to require utilities to pave much larger sections to prevent deterioration and requiring trench resurfacing limits to be at least one foot wider than the trench width on each side, and all the way to the concrete gutter only if the trench edge is within five feet to avoid narrow floating pieces.

In alignment with the preservation strategies prescribed in the PMP, the Public Works Public Services Bureau (PSB) has been working to develop pilot in-house crews to perform crack sealing, slurry sealing, and minor concrete repairs that accompany street repaving. These City crews are being designed augment construction contractors hired by the City to increase speed and productivity. The PSB team is also exploring alternative repair methods to traditional pavement overlay and slurry seal, such as fog seal, chip seal, scrub seal, cape seal, and micro-surfacing to address certain situations or conditions and potentially reduce costs.

**Pavement Management Costs**

The table below shows maintenance costs based on the pavement condition index (PCI). The chart also shows the percent of city streets in each PCI category.
A practical determination of paving costs depends on the width and type of street. Approximately $12 million in major arterial street repairs totaling 5 miles were completed in FY 21, resulting in a rough average cost of $2.8 million per mile, accounting for inflation. Approximately $14 million in minor residential street repairs totaling 10 miles were completed, resulting in an anticipated cost of $1.8 million per mile with inflation. Average costs can increase or decrease dramatically based on whether the work is a full reconstruction or slurry seal and/or if the project includes concrete and sidewalk repairs, which can reach up to 50-percent of the total rehabilitation cost. Additionally, much higher costs can be expected from hereon due to unusually high-cost escalation rates. Just recently, materials suppliers are indicating an unusually high increase in material costs compared to the historic approximate average of 3 percent per year. Current trends are showing at least double that inflation rate, and it could be even higher in coming years. Some vendors are reporting material cost increases approaching 20 to 30 percent. As such, higher levels of investment will be needed just to keep pace.

### Pavement Management Budget

The City must optimize and plan for spending of the pavement management budget to ensure funds allocated to pavement maintenance and rehabilitation are used as effectively as possible. The City, on average, has budgeted around $32 million annually for street and alley improvements, well below the minimum required to maintain the overall current condition of the City's streets. However, the major investment in crack and slurry seal that was made possible by Measure A in 2017 made a major positive impact on the City's PMI score in the recent PMP update. Per the latest 2021 PMP, the current annual budget would allow continued degradation of City streets and a decrease in the overall PCI (from 58 to 56) and potentially raise the backlog to 28 percent. The annual cost over the next five years to maintain PCI at 58 is approximately $44 million. This amount includes repairing streets in the marginal, fair, and good condition range and a limited number of streets in poor or worse condition. The PMP also states the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCI Range</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Relative Avg. Cost per Sq. Foot</th>
<th>Repair Approach</th>
<th>Streets in This Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85-100</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>$0.2 per sq. foot</td>
<td>Like new condition. Little to no maintenance required. Routine maintenance as-needed.</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-85</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>$2.3 per sq. foot</td>
<td>Routine maintenance such as patching and crack sealing with surface treatments such as seal coats or slurries.</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>$3.10 per sq. foot</td>
<td>Heavier surface treatments and thin overlays. Localized panel replacements.</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Fair to Marginal</td>
<td>$10.17 per sq. foot</td>
<td>Optimum timing for thin to moderate overlay. Early lower costs to repair with greater returns.</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>$17.25 per sq. foot</td>
<td>Partial structural failure. Sections will require very thick overlays, surface replacement, base reconstruction, and possible subgrade stabilization.</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>$25-30 per sq. foot</td>
<td>Structural failure. Requires reconstruction which is the most expensive and impactful repair method.</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) The recommended annual budget over the next five years to reach the national average PCI of 60 and reduce backlog to 21 percent is approximately $81 million.

2) The annual cost over the next five years to achieve an average PCI of 65 and “control” the backlog by reducing it to a preferable 15 percent is approximately $114 million.

3) The estimated cost to repave all the very poor streets and alleys citywide is roughly $460 million. This amount would reduce the backlog to 17 percent but would ignore any good or fair streets. Attachment F details varied spending plans and corresponding PCI and Backlog anticipated per street network class.

Ultimately, any significant improvement in overall PCI and Backlog will require a blend of investment towards good, fair, marginal, and worst streets/alleys, but will require significantly more funding than has been available in recent annual budgets. Considering the limited funding, the focus has been on cost/benefit - maximizing service life for each rehabilitation dollar spent. However, the higher the annual budget, the more the percent allocation of the total budget can shift towards worst streets/alleys as evidenced in the tables below. The Steady State Budget columns below illustrate the vast difference in cost benefit between preservation measures like crack and slurry seal versus deferred maintenance and street reconstruction. Crack and slurry seal would only require 4 percent of the proposed annual budget but maintain almost twice the area that reconstruction would after using 22 percent of the budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rehab Type</th>
<th>Fix All Budget</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
<th>Steady State Budget (Maintain PCI)</th>
<th>Current Avg. City Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Budget</td>
<td>$327,000,000</td>
<td>$81,000,000</td>
<td>$44,000,000</td>
<td>$32,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crack &amp; Slurry Seal</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Resurfacing (Overlay)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Reconstruction</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Street Rehab</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rehab Type</th>
<th>Fix All Budget</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
<th>Steady State Budget (Maintain PCI)</th>
<th>Current City Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crack &amp; Slurry Seal</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Resurfacing (Overlay)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Reconstruction</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Street Rehab</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below shows the budgeted funds for the different street networks each of the last six years. The appropriations vary based on the types and amounts of revenue coming in each year and decisions made with those revenues across various capital needs. For example, fluctuations in gas tax received affected budgets for residential streets one year to the next.
Measure M and Measure R were less available for residential streets recently than years past as they were redirected towards arterial corridor (safety and mobility) enhancements. The FY 22 budget is lower than prior years because Measure A was committed to other critical needs like police facilities and the ADA Settlement obligation. Also, there was a $13 million budget dedicated to slurry seal in FY 17 to effectively cover and preserve a large amount of roadway area inexpensively. Then priorities and expectations shifted to Measure A streets and facilities where the streets selected as part of the investment plan were in worse shape and not slurry seal candidates.

### 6-Year Street Investment History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arterial Street Rehab</td>
<td>$15.74</td>
<td>$18.53</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$12.70</td>
<td>$14.15</td>
<td>$89.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential St. Rehab</td>
<td>$4.90</td>
<td>$12.11</td>
<td>$17.07</td>
<td>$18.95</td>
<td>$10.90</td>
<td>$13.10</td>
<td>$77.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleys</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$1.20</td>
<td>$0.40</td>
<td>$6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slurry Seal</td>
<td>$13.08</td>
<td>$2.67</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$15.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worst Streets &amp; Alleys</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$5.60</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>$5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$34.02</td>
<td>$35.10</td>
<td>$30.87</td>
<td>$36.05</td>
<td>$30.43</td>
<td>$27.65</td>
<td>$194.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers in Millions

*Funds still available to support worst streets/alleys from FY21 appropriation*

The next table shows street and alley improvement funding sources and amounts by year. In most fiscal years, funding for street paving includes Measure A, County funds, State Gas Tax funds (including SB 1), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funds, and general capital.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td>$2.40</td>
<td>$0.93</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2.74</td>
<td>$7.97</td>
<td>$7.87</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$11.50</td>
<td>$38.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A</td>
<td>$18.22</td>
<td>$11.37</td>
<td>$4.30</td>
<td>$7.10</td>
<td>$8.70</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$51.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5.90</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$5.18</td>
<td>$3.90</td>
<td>$4.14</td>
<td>$25.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure R</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$4.90</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$5.93</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$23.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop A</td>
<td>$0.90</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
<td>$0.49</td>
<td>$4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop C</td>
<td>$6.20</td>
<td>$6.20</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$6.87</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4.67</td>
<td>$27.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Capital</td>
<td>$0.40</td>
<td>$0.57</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$6.23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$34.02</td>
<td>$35.11</td>
<td>$30.87</td>
<td>$36.05</td>
<td>$30.43</td>
<td>$27.65</td>
<td>$194.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers in Millions

### Facilities Conditions Assessment Update

On April 2, 2018, Public Works formally launched the Facility Condition Assessment (FCA) Project. The City selected Faithful+Gould, Inc. (F+G) to perform facility assessments for all City-owned buildings. The project's scope includes performing comprehensive visual building evaluations for City-owned facilities, identifying corrective work needed, and developing budget estimates and projected schedules for the completion of all recommended and preventative maintenance work.
The FCA report includes:

- Visual inspection of the condition of the building on the assessment date
- Building details (year built, gross building area, property type, equipment inventory, photographs)
- Facility condition needs index (FCNI) to quantitatively assess building conditions
- Architectural, mechanical, and electrical site findings
- Deficiency reports forecasting maintenance expenditures over the next ten years, prioritizing, and categorizing the work

Each facility’s maintenance expenditures are prioritized into three priority classifications, four work categories, and given an FCNI as follows:

**Priority**

1) **Currently Critical** - Systems requiring immediate action that have failed, compromises City staff or public safety or requires to be upgraded to comply with current codes and accessibility.

2) **Potentially Critical** - System or component is nearing end of useful life and if not addressed will cause additional deterioration and added repair costs.

3) **Necessary/Not Critical** - Lifecycle replacements are necessary but not critical or mid-term future replacements to maintain the integrity of the facility or component.

**Category**

- **Deferred Maintenance** - Maintenance that was not performed when it was scheduled or assets that are past useful life resulting in immediate repair or replacement.
- **Routine Maintenance** - Maintenance that is planned and performed on a routine basis to maintain and preserve the condition.
- **Capital Renewal** - Planned future replacement of building systems that have or will reach the end of their useful life during the study period.
- **Energy & Sustainability** - When the repair or replacement of equipment or systems are recommended to improve energy and sustainability performance.

**Facility Condition Needs Index (FCNI)**

- **Good** - Facility is in a new or well-maintained condition with no visual evidence of wear, soiling, or other deficiencies.
- **Fair** - Subject to wear and soiling but is still in a serviceable and functioning condition.
- **Poor** - Subjected to hard or long-term wear. Nearing the end of its useful or serviceable life.
• **Very Poor** - Subjected to hard or long-term wear. Has reached the end of its useful or serviceable life. Renewal now necessary.

Of the 263 structures evaluated, 167 reports have been drafted. Each report is provided to the applicable City department to review and help finalize. In addition to the scope, the Planning Department is reviewing the FCA to communicate major climate issues that may affect each facility. Departments are also engaged in identifying future capital projects in the report as an appendix. Fifty percent of the reports are still in review, and departments are working together to finalize.

The draft reports have identified the following:

- There is an immediate capital need of over $304 million to bring all facilities into a fair to good condition (based on local, regional market rates and the RS Means Cost Database benchmarking, including an uplift of 45 percent to allow for potential project costs).
- The capital need will grow to over $437 million over the next ten years.
- FCNI: 38 facilities rated in Good condition, 31 rated in Fair condition, 93 rated in Poor condition, and 5 rated in Very Poor condition.
- Over the next ten years, if there is no capital investment: 8 facilities will be rated in Very Poor condition, 125 in Poor condition, 22 in Fair condition, and 12 in Good condition.

Estimated costs in the reports are based on like-for-like replacements and report generation dates. They do not consider construction escalations and fluctuations, code changes, additional work that could be deemed necessary, or the total project budget required for implementing the improvement(s).

Public Works is in the process of creating a webpage to disseminate FCA information, including a link to all finalized reports.

**Bond Funding in Other Jurisdictions**

The utilization of bond funding to improve infrastructure is not uncommon and is often done in conjunction with utilizing a new revenue source to pay debt service (principal and interest) on the bonds. The benefit of using a new revenue source for debt service is that one-time major road improvements can be accomplished while maintaining the annual investment in ongoing street maintenance. As an example of a significant bonding measure, in 2018, voters in the City of San Jose, California, authorized the issuance of $650 million in general obligation bonds to invest in city infrastructure, with at least $300 million to rehabilitate streets in the poorest conditions. The debt is repaid through annual property tax assessments and does not draw from regular maintenance budgets. In 2020, voters in Omaha, Nebraska approved a new tax to allow for upfront street repairs while maintaining existing, ongoing funding for repairs. In 2021, the City of San Diego also approved commercial paper issuance to fund short-term capital needs related to paving and storm drain infrastructure projects.
Bonding as a Funding Strategy for Infrastructure Assets

One hundred twenty-five years of public finance theory and practice in the United States supports using long-term debt, instead of scarce cash, to finance long-lived infrastructure assets such as streets, roads, bridges, and municipal buildings. There are two reasons to debt-finance infrastructure assets, one relating to equity and fairness between different generations of taxpayers, and the other relating to financial and budgetary flexibility for City Council. For long-lived assets, the best way to ensure that each generation of taxpayers pays for their beneficial use of the asset is to debt-finance the acquisition or rehabilitation of the asset up front, and then every year thereafter pay the principal and interest on the debt financing from current tax revenue collected in those years. As a result, the taxpayers of each generation who benefit from the asset also pay for that asset, through annual debt service on the bonds.

Another way to evaluate the appropriateness of this concept, which economists call “intergenerational equity,” is to consider what happens if the City instead pays cash up front for a long-lived asset. In that case, today’s taxpayers will be subsidizing future taxpayers, many of whom have not yet even moved into Long Beach. Future taxpayers will be benefiting from the major investment borne by today's taxpayers who paid in full for the upfront acquisition or rehabilitation.

The second reason for debt-financing the acquisition or rehabilitation of long-lived infrastructure assets is that it provides City Councils with more fiscal flexibility in the short- and medium-term. Available cash not spent on infrastructure asset acquisition and rehabilitation can be redirected either to the acquisition and rehabilitation of shorter-lived assets, or even to current services.

Of course, in the long term, a City Council’s fiscal flexibility is reduced by the issuance of debt because debt service payments to bondholders are mandatory, not discretionary. In a traditional, conservative “pay-as-you-go” financing approach to capital improvements, in which no debt is ever issued and all capital assets are acquired with cash, a City Council can always postpone capital expenditures if the underlying revenue source declines or dries up. That option is unavailable with respect to principal and interest payments to bondholders. It is critical that if a bond is pursued, that a dedicated funding source that can support the debt service be identified and prioritized. If utilized, bond funding can help meet the City’s critical infrastructure needs. A memorandum issued on May 17, 2021, regarding Funding Street Improvements Through Bond Issuance can be referenced for additional information.

The City should also consider bond funding to support maintenance of other critical assets like public facilities, storm drains for flood prevention, and parks, in addition to streets and pavements. To address more infrastructure needs as requested by the City Council, City staff is reviewing a $50 million bond issuance scenario every two years backed by Measure A as the revenue source. After the first issuance, City staff can recommend another bond in two or more years, pending the spend down of the first bond proceeds. The debt service, estimated at approximately $1 million annually for each $10 million bond, can be repaid with $1.5 million Measure A redirected from street/alley maintenance and $3.5 million Measure A diverted from other historical, normal infrastructure/one-time funding. Actual costs for debt service will be in large part dependent on interest rates at the time of bond issuance. The bond proceeds would also be spent on additional resources needed for design, construction management, and other
related administrative costs. Below is a potential spending plan scenario that’s subject to change. This Measure A allocation plan includes $20 million of anticipated one-time non-bond Measure A dollars included for infrastructure funding, bringing the total Measure A infrastructure investment plan to $170 million dollars over five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Category</th>
<th>Recommended Bond Proceeds &amp; Available Measure A Capital Allocation</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streets, Sidewalks &amp; Alleys</td>
<td>$100 million</td>
<td>Funds some maintenance, but focus is on worst streets &amp; alleys to reduce backlog (especially in residential streets), but will also serve to provide match requirements for federally funded grant projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities</td>
<td>$28 million</td>
<td>Funds immediate high priority needs like critical roof, flooring, electrical, plumbing, structural and HVAC repairs that will reduce future maintenance costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way, Water Quality, CAAP Improvements</td>
<td>$20 million</td>
<td>Funds right-of-way improvements that will increase safety and visibility for residents; will also fund Climate Action and Adaptation Plan projects and serve to meet granting matching requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Improvements</td>
<td>$22 million</td>
<td>Funds priority projects and leverage grant funds to rehabilitate park facilities and amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$170 million</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This level of infrastructure spending would help keep the City operating in functional condition and enhance public safety and quality of life daily, as well as in times of emergency. Addressing repairs now can avoid costlier repairs in the future and more detrimental failures. Additional funding opportunities for parks and open space through county Measure A for parks projects should also be evaluated in relation to bond funding, however the County rollout on this funding source has taken longer than anticipated and will require more coordination with the County. Given how important repairing streets is to the City Council, we will continue to explore possibilities to increase the level of investment, and bring any feasible solutions to the City Council.

**Next Steps**

The next steps include the following actions:

1) Seek any additional input from the City Council on top infrastructure criteria and priorities
2) Obtain further details on the Federal Infrastructure package
3) Finalize shovel-ready projects using the input on priorities and criteria
4) Return to the City Council with new 5-year local infrastructure investment plan as part of the FY 23 Proposed Budget that will be augmented through competitive federal grant funding

5) Evaluate additional required staff and project management resources as part of the City’s budget development process

6) Continue to inform the public about the City’s PMP and infrastructure investment plan and explore funding sources

7) Include a Measure A bond financing proposal as part of the FY 23 budget development process with specific recommended projects for City Council consideration

If you have any questions, please contact Eric Lopez, Director of Public Works, at (562) 570-5690 or Eric.Lopez@longbeach.gov.
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Study Session: Citywide Infrastructure Needs and Funding Strategies

City Council Study Session - September 7, 2021
Citywide Infrastructure Needs

- Streets and Alleys
- Sidewalks and Curb Ramps
- Stormwater Infrastructure and Treatment
- Bridges
- Traffic Signals and Signage
- Street Lighting
- Bicycle Master Plan
- Urban Forest

- Public Safety Facilities
- Parks
- Community Facilities
- Parking Facilities
- Libraries
- Other City Assets
Recently Updated Plans Outlining Infrastructure Needs

- Pavement Management Plan (PMP) for streets and alleys
- Self Evaluation and Transition Plan for pedestrian facilities
- Facilities Condition Assessments (FCAs) for public safety, park, library, parking, and community center facilities

- **Measure A** - historic investment enabled the City to conduct valuable, detailed studies relying on data
- Data leads to better-informed decisions
Continuous Need to Update Plans and Develop New Ones

- Storm Drain Master Plan
- Storm Water Master Plan
- Bridge Master Plan
- Bicycle Master Plan
- Urban Forest Plan
The PMP plans for the maintenance and repair of the City’s street and alley network to optimize pavement conditions with limited funds.

The PMP is guided by recurring evaluations of the pavement network based on surveyed pavement structural integrity, cracks, roughness, and surface distress.

Each surveyed roadway is assigned a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) score ranging from 0-100 for each street segment.

Maintaining streets in the “Good to Very Good” and “Fair to Marginal” categories provides the greatest value and extends pavement life at the lowest cost... however, our backlog of roadways in “Poor” or “Very Poor” condition is too high.
Focus on Pavement Management Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCI Range</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Relative Avg. Cost per Sq. Foot</th>
<th>Repair Approach</th>
<th>Streets in This Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85-100</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>$0-2 per sq. foot</td>
<td>Like new condition. Little to no maintenance required. Routine maintenance as-needed.</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-85</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>$2-3 per sq. foot</td>
<td>Routine maintenance such as patching and crack sealing with surface treatments such as seal coats or slurries.</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>$3-10 per sq. foot</td>
<td>Heavier surface treatments and thin overlays. Localized panel replacements.</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Fair to Marginal</td>
<td>$10-17 per sq. foot</td>
<td>Optimum timing for thin to moderate overlay. Early lower costs to repair with greater returns.</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>$17-25 per sq. foot</td>
<td>Partial structural failure. Sections will require very thick overlays, surface replacement, base reconstruction, and possible subgrade stabilization.</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>$25-30 per sq. foot</td>
<td>Structural failure. Requires reconstruction which is the most expensive and impactful repair method.</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Avg. cost is provided as references for asphalt concrete roadway only, actual costs vary greatly depending on actual field conditions and associated concrete improvements required to be improved.

Citywide Infrastructure Needs and Funding Strategies
Focus on Pavement Management Plan

- Backlog is expressed as the percentage of poor and very poor streets/alleys requiring reconstruction (PCI 0-40) as compared to network totals.

- Backlog above 20% becomes very difficult to sustain without significantly more investment.

- $58M per year to maintain PCI still does not address Backlog of poor and very poor streets/alleys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021 PMP *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady State (Maintain PCI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data based on preliminary 2021 analysis.
**Focus on Pavement Management Plan**

**Required Investment to achieve PCI of 85 in 5 years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>$559M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>$1,083M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alley</td>
<td>$128M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fix All Cost</td>
<td><strong>$1.77B</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Costs based on preliminary 2021 analysis

**% Need per District (Minor Roads)**

Breakdown of the required budget to fix all Minor roads per district.

- **9 11%**
- **1 6%**
- **2 5%**
- **3 13%**
- **8 11%**
- **7 14%**
- **6 7%**
- **5 22%**
- **4 11%**
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Existing 5-Year Infrastructure Investment Plan

- Commitments shown on current Infrastructure Investment Plan (IIP) Map located on the City’s Measure A website

- Our progress with the Measure A Map (as of July 2021):
  - Major = 66% complete
  - Residential = 74% complete
  - Alleys = 83% complete

- 230 Lane Miles Remaining on Measure A Map
  - Estimate to Complete = $145M at current value
  - Complex Federal/State Funding Sources Supports Majors

Citywide Infrastructure Needs and Funding Strategies
## 5-Year Street Investment History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22 *</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arterial Street Rehab</strong></td>
<td>$15,740,000</td>
<td>$18,527,624</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>$15,996,033</td>
<td>$12,700,000</td>
<td>$14,149,599</td>
<td>$89,113,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Street Rehab</strong></td>
<td>$4,900,000</td>
<td>$12,107,058</td>
<td>$17,073,000</td>
<td>$18,949,093</td>
<td>$10,899,000</td>
<td>$13,099,000</td>
<td>$77,027,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alleys</strong></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$6,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slurry Sealing</strong></td>
<td>$13,080,000</td>
<td>$2,670,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$15,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worst Streets &amp; Alleys Program</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$5,600,000</td>
<td>n/a **</td>
<td>$5,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$34,020,000</td>
<td>$35,105,682</td>
<td>$30,873,000</td>
<td>$36,045,126</td>
<td>$30,399,000</td>
<td>$27,648,599</td>
<td>$194,090,407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed**

**Funds still available to support worst streets/alleys from FY21 appropriation**
FY21 PMP Update Next Steps

• Creating a public-facing GIS tool which will show details of each street segment, its condition, last paving date, and when it is programmed for paving if applicable

• Plan and GIS tool will be released before Fall 2021 on City’s website

• Public Works staff will review PMP street improvement recommendations with each City Council district
Focus on ADA Self Evaluation & Transition Plan

• ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan
  o Identifies pedestrian facility non-compliance
  o Rates deficiencies
  o Communicates an action plan for improving accessibility.

• Long Beach conducted a citywide Self-Evaluation of sidewalks (1,215 miles), curb ramps (12,091) and other pedestrian paths of travel from 2017 through 2019

• Long Beach Transition Plan was completed in 2019; updates are as-needed only, not regularly scheduled
A severity score was established based on the level of non-compliance with respect to sidewalk displacements and slopes.

An activity score was established based on public use and proximity to schools, government buildings, medical/senior centers, hospitals, transit, etc.

Severity and activity rankings were combined to develop a final ranking score that was used to identify locations of high, medium and low priority.

Public outreach was conducted.

With this data, the City can plan better and address areas with the most egregious problems balanced with areas of highest use and importance.
Focus on ADA Self Evaluation & Transition Plan

Missing curb ramps (left) followed by non-compliant curb ramps (right)
Settlement Agreement Terms

• Self-Evaluation (completed)
• Create Applicable Accessibility Standards (completed)
• Updated Transition Plan (UTP) (completed)
• Conduct two public meetings with ADA stakeholders (completed)
• Access Request Program, through FY 27 (in-progress, on-track)
• Install 1,000 new plaintiff-selected curb ramps, completion by Oct 2019 (99% complete)
• Install 3,500 additional new ramps (total 4,500) by Oct 2022 (in-progress; prioritized over sidewalk repairs)
• $50m plus inflation for non-compliant curb ramps between FY 23 and FY 37 (not due yet)
• $125m plus inflation for sidewalks and crosswalks, between FY 18 and FY 47 (not due yet)
## Focus on ADA Investment Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All dollar amounts reflected in Millions</th>
<th>Spent FY18-FY21</th>
<th>Proposed Budget FY22</th>
<th>Settlement Requirement</th>
<th>Total Estimated Cost w/Inflation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing Ramps</td>
<td>$24.4</td>
<td>$15.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$50.0 (FY18-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrofit Ramps</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$50.0</td>
<td>$69.2 (FY23-37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>$10.3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$125.0</td>
<td>$189.5 (FY18-47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Request Program</td>
<td>$2.5</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>$5.3</td>
<td>$5.3 (FY18-27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$314.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **$261M** additional investment needed to meet Settlement Agreement requirements
- Missing 4,500 curb ramps do not have a cost limit
- No sidewalk funding next couple years, reprioritized for curb ramps to meet Settlement Agreement requirements

**Recommendation:** Use Measure A to annually fund curb and sidewalk infrastructure improvements reduced by other allowable sidewalk funding and one-time or structural sources if and when they are available
Focus on Facility Condition Assessments

Questions the FCA Helps Address

• What assets do we have? What condition are they in?
• Are those assets being used to their full potential?
• Are they compliant with applicable legislation and/or standards?
• How much funding do we need in order to maintain or improve the current conditions?
• When do we need to complete recommended projects?
• Where can we achieve cost savings?
• How do we prioritize the reduced funding allocation?
• How can we reduce the growing deferred maintenance list?
Focus on Facility Condition Assessments

Summary of Findings

Facility Condition Needs Index (FCI)

Value of Current Need **$292,801,681**

Need will grow to **$429,617,865** over 10-years
Conclusions

- The City of Long Beach portfolio consists of 156 primary structures located across the city.
- There is a total of $429,617,865 in anticipated expenditures over the study period.
- There is an immediate capital need of $292,801,681 (like for like repairs)
  - 31 Buildings are rated in good condition
  - 30 Buildings are rated in fair condition
  - 91 Buildings are rated in poor condition (Parks facilities, Fire Stations and public restrooms)
  - 4 Buildings are rated in very poor condition (all Parks facilities)
- Over the next 10 years the facilities will deteriorate further if there is no capital investment
  - 7 Buildings will be rated in very poor condition
  - 119 Buildings will be rated in poor condition
  - 22 Buildings will be rated in fair condition
  - 8 Buildings will be rated in good condition
Example: Drake Park FCA Summary

Address: 951 Maine Ave.
Year Built: 1949
Gross Building Area: 6,450 gsf
Onsite Date: 5/3/18
FCNI: 23.98%
Facility Condition: Poor
Immediate Capital Needs: $951,121
Future Capital Needs: $310,854
Council District: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Sys</th>
<th>Est Cost</th>
<th>% of Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Equip</td>
<td>$172,231</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Finishes (Interior)</td>
<td>$159,338</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooring</td>
<td>$117,046</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Casework</td>
<td>$88,959</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citywide Infrastructure Needs and Funding Strategies
Vast need across the City likely $3B-$4B in total cost

**How do we fund our needed infrastructure improvements?**

- Federal Funding
- State Funding
- Local City Funding
- Measure A
- Federal Infrastructure Plan Funding
- Potential Bond Funding
- Other grant opportunities

- Internal funding sources versus external

- Funding strategy for current Infrastructure Investment Plan (IIP)
  - Measure A and direct State funding are major part of funding infrastructure improvements including street rehabilitation, public facilities, parks, and mobility improvements
Competing interests for various funding sources

Funding strategy for next IIP will be different
  - Prioritization will be key using improved data and selective criteria
  - Federal infrastructure plan is still materializing
  - Potential bond funding
  - Measure A extension
  - Decreased Measure A in short-term
  - Changing Operations and Maintenance costs and impact on operating budgets
**Focus on Measure A Investments**

### Measure A Funding to Date (FY 17 - FY 22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Original Estimated Budget*¹</th>
<th>FY 17- FY 22 Budget*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>60.95</td>
<td>78.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Recreation</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>33.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>43.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities- Stormwater Protection</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaches and Marinas</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$100.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>$159.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All dollar amounts reflected in Millions

- Measure A Infrastructure funding for FY 23 – FY 27 projected to decrease.
- Decrease required to not exceed State cap on local tax rates (LA County Measure H)
- FY28 – Measure A should increase towards FY17-FY22 levels, pending Council approval
Climate
- $5.1 billion over four years for water resilience and drought preparedness
- $3.7 billion over three years for climate resilience in disadvantaged communities
- $3.5 billion over four years for zero-emission vehicle and charging infrastructure

Transportation
- $4.2 billion in bond funds for high-speed rail
- $3.5 billion for transit projects, active transportation, and climate adaptation investments
- $2.3 billion to repair state highways, local roads, bridges, and rail
State FY 22 Adopted Budget: Infrastructure Spending

Digital Inclusion
- $6 billion multi-year investment in broadband infrastructure and access

Housing
- $10 billion over two years for Project Homekey and other programs to build permanent housing for people experiencing homelessness
- $534 million for critical infrastructure for affordable housing

Library
- $439 million for an equity-focused matching grant program to support library projects and maintenance
State FY 22 Adopted Budget: Long Beach Projects

Parks and Open Space
- $8.5 million: MacArthur Park rehabilitation
- $4.3 million: Walking trail along San Gabriel River
- $3.3 million: Open space around the LA River
- $1.2 million: El Dorado Regional Park softball and baseball fields
- $850,000: Bixby Park improvements

Community Partnerships
- $5 million: Center for Inclusive Business and Workforce Development
- $1 million: The Children’s Clinic Family Health and Wellness site

Education
- $20.6 million: Music and theatre complex at LBCC Liberal Arts Campus
- $14.8 million: Construction at LBCC Pacific Coast Campus
Federal Earmarks Requests: Long Beach Projects

Community Projects

- Located in FY 22 appropriations bills
- $1.5 million: Silverado Park Signature Playground
- $1.2 million: Public Safety Training
- $250,000: Michelle Obama Library services and equipment

Highways and Transit Projects

- Located in the House-passed INVEST in America Act to reauthorize transportation infrastructure for the next five years
- $12 million: Anaheim Street Corridor
- $8 million: Artesia Great Boulevard Project
- $1.45 million: ADA Curb Ramps and Sidewalks
Overview: Federal Infrastructure Negotiations

Biden Plans—proposals released Spring 2021
• American Jobs Plan: $2.25 trillion over 8 years for physical infrastructure investments
• American Families Plan: $1.8 trillion for human infrastructure and social supports

5-Year Reauthorization Bill—House passed on July 1
• INVEST in America Act: $715 billion for transportation and water over five years
• Includes the City’s highways and transit earmarks requests

Senate Bipartisan Act—Senate passed on August 10
• $550 billion in new spending for infrastructure
• Nearly $400 billion for 5-year reauthorization
• Does not include the City’s highways and transit earmarks requests

Budget Reconciliation—deal announced July 13; legislation expected in September
• $3.5 trillion budget resolution unlocking reconciliation process
What’s in the Bipartisan Act?

Citywide Infrastructure Needs and Funding Strategies

- Transportation Infrastructure: $110 billion
- Power Grid: $73 billion
- Rail: $66 billion
- Broadband: $65 billion
- Drinking Water and Wastewater: $55 billion
- Resilience and Cybersecurity: $43 billion
- Transit: $39 billion
- Airports: $25 billion
- Ports/Waterways: $17 billion
- EV Infrastructure and Alternative Vehicles: $13.5 billion
- Safety and Research: $10.5 billion

*In billions*
What’s Not in the Bipartisan Act?

Direct City Allocations

• The City’s highways and transit earmarks in the House-passed INVEST in America Act are not included in the Bipartisan Act

• Unlike recent COVID-19 relief legislation, the Bipartisan Act does not include direct City allocations for infrastructure

• Rather, the bill outlines various State apportionments, block grants, and competitive grant programs for which the City can apply
Bicameral Alignment

• The House and Senate versions of transportation reauthorization differ in overall amount (from $715 billion to $400 billion) and certain policy proposals
• Some want a conference committee to address differences
• House Speaker Pelosi and other Democrats have said they won’t move forward with the Bipartisan Act until they have a larger infrastructure package

Reconciliation

• Democrats unveiled a budget resolution framework outlining what will be included in a $3.5 trillion reconciliation package (i.e., broader categories of human infrastructure proposed in the Biden Administration’s plans)
• Only requires 50 votes in the Senate, instead of 60 like most legislation
• Legislation expected mid- to late-September
Proposed Staff Prioritization Criteria

- **Public Health and Safety** – The extent to which the project impacts maintaining and improving public health and safety.

- **Number of Long Beach Residents Impacted** – The number of users of the project/facility and/or Long Beach residents impacted; higher use rates for certain projects by greater California residents will lead to additional consideration.

- **Urgency** – The urgency of the project; the extent to which there are adverse ramifications if the project is not done in the near term.

- **Poor Condition/High Need** – The extent to which an existing facility is in poor repair or condition, or alternatively for a non-existing facility, the degree of an unmet identified need (i.e., Project Recommended by Strategic or Master Plan).

- **Jobs** – Degree to which a project creates a significant number of jobs and local hiring opportunities.
Selection and Prioritization of Specific Projects

- **Investment Area** – Regional distribution of projects, while also ensuring investment in disadvantaged and/or low-income community.

- **Ability to Attract Additional Funding and/or Leverage Internal Funds** – extent to which funding this project will result in additional funding or allow the City to better leverage internal funds.

- **Operational Cost Savings and Revenue Generation** – The extent to which the project will reduce annual cost savings over the lifetime of project or program, and/or generate revenue.

- **Shovel Ready** – Projects that have been planned and/or entitled will be prioritized over projects that have not, and projects with minimal planning/entitlement requirements will receive additional consideration over those with lengthy or complex planning requirements.
“Shovel Ready” is based on 6, 12 and 18-month buckets:

• **Six-Month Shovel Ready:**
  o Design complete, or minimal. Permitting process minimal or not required

• **Twelve-Month Shovel Ready:**
  o Design needed. Permitting process minimal or not required. For large projects, permitting in process

• **Eighteen-Month Shovel Ready:**
  o Significant design needed, permitting (Environmental, Building and Safety), required
• **Much higher investments in recent years**
  - Due in large part to Measure A - higher pavement condition index

• **Investment is not enough to maintain street condition** -
  - Average spending is about $33 m annually (and Measure A revenue is decreasing in FY 23)
  - Need to likely spend over $58 million a year to maintain PCI at/near current levels. $58M still does not include a major investment in poor streets/alleys

• **More streets are in poor condition**
  - Difficult to address and still prevent good/fair streets from failing and going to poor condition

• **Poor condition streets are dramatically more expensive to repair**
  - Unlike good/fair streets, poor condition streets don’t get much more expensive over time

• **A cost-effective street program requires most attention to good/fair streets**
  - Repairing poor streets soaks up large resources and potentially diverts funding from preventing good/fair streets from becoming poor condition streets

• **November 2020 – City Council requested analysis on a bond issuance**
• A bond can provide immediate funds for street repairs and maintenance
  • Bonds add interest costs, but save on construction inflation and street deterioration

• A bond will require est. annual debt service of $0.95 m for each $10 m
  • About $3 million in interest for each $10 m over the assumed 15-year bond term
  • Not all proceeds available for actual construction
  • Some of the proceeds will be needed for issuance costs, design costs, construction management, and administrative costs

• Funding street bonds can be budgetarily problematic
  • May reassign funds away from other priority needs (including annual street maintenance); as a result, a street bond needs to be weighed against other priorities in accordance with City Council policies
Three Ways to Pay Debt Service (Annual Cost of Borrowing)

- **New tax or assessment**
  - Most common approach - requires a vote with voters indicating streets are a high priority

- **Existing revenue source that becomes available**
  - Example – an old bond gets paid off leaving funding available for new debt service
  - Measure A could be used as it is not fully planned/allocated beyond FY 22. Measure A is not as certain a long-term revenue source as many other revenues

- **Reductions in lower priority service/infrastructure**
  - Use of Measure A for debt service will require even more reductions in historical infrastructure/one-time spending
    - Due to the tax rate reduction, Measure A revenue will be significantly lower for five years beginning in FY 23
    - Due to expected significant budget shortfalls, it may also be appropriate to consider using more Measure A to help maintain police and fire services
  - General Fund monies could also be reallocated to street bond debt service, if other, lower-priority spending is identified and cut from the budget
Impact on Other Priorities

- Many infrastructure issues/priorities
  - Streets, legal requirement for sidewalk work, Fire Station 9 and other stations, HVAC systems that have shut down facilities, police crime lab and property storage, park restrooms, community centers, failing roofs, etc.

- Would debt issuance for streets impact other requirements and what is the appropriate mix of projects?

- What effect does bonding today have on the availability of future Council’s to also fund important street and infrastructure projects?

- A broader analysis and discussion of future Measure A funds is important to determine how much for capital vs. other priorities
  - Other priorities may include: Funding Fire Station 9, Police Neighborhood Safe Streets Funding, Playgrounds and parks, Sidewalk ADA work, maintaining operations for public safety, normal annual street repair, matching funds for federal dollars, etc.
Selected Streets will Impact Long-Term Pavement Condition

- **Emphasizing repairing the worst streets** - most positive short-term impact for street condition
- **Emphasizing repairing the good-fair streets** - most positive long-term impact for street condition
- Mix of worst/good-fair streets funded by a bond issue is likely a key to whether long-term impact on street condition is positive or negative
  - Is an issue only if street maintenance funds are diverted and used for debt service
  - Would need a special PCI study to determine the impact of the mix of streets
  - Complex analysis: cost inflation, interest on debt, less money for annual maintenance, and costly poor streets versus good/fair streets impact on PCI
Bonding to Fund Street Repairs - Actions

Action to be Taken Depending on Comments from City Council

• Staff to develop an example street bond using $5 million annually (about $50 million in street funding) from Measure A
  - Will assume $1.5 m in Measure A will be diverted from street/alley maintenance (amount in the FY 22 budget) and $3.5 m in Measure A diverted from other historical normal infrastructure/one-time funding
  - Will incorporate more poor condition streets than will maximize the PCI
  - At this time, will not do a PCI study to see if such a bond will help or hurt the long-term pavement condition, but would be desirable if City Council wishes more information.

• Review the results with City Council early next year to proceed, pause, or modify
  - Would be reviewed after the FY 23 budget status update
  - Review will include an update on other critical capital funding needs and potential sources.
  - Review will also include updates on federal/state funding that may become available
Next Steps for Citywide Infrastructure Plan

• Wish list to short list
• Seek input from City Council on top infrastructure criteria and priorities
• Link strategic plans with fiscal capacity
• Obtain more details on Federal Infrastructure package
• Staff will compile a list of shovel-ready projects using the input on priorities and criteria
• Return to City Council with new infrastructure investment plan
• Inform the public about the infrastructure investment plan
• Explore bond financing, pending federal funding disbursements
Thank you

Eric Lopez
Director of Public Works
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Opportunity</th>
<th>5-Year Total</th>
<th>Allocation Type</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Funding Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport Improvement Program</td>
<td>$15 billion</td>
<td>Formula</td>
<td>Airports</td>
<td>LGB expects $6.3 million for first two years and then could change based on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>enplanements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery Processing</td>
<td>$3 billion</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>Demonstration projects for advanced battery component manufacturing and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Investment Program (New)</td>
<td>$40 billion</td>
<td>Formula/Competitive</td>
<td>States and</td>
<td>States will receive formula funds but will have a 15% set-aside to address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($27.5 billion formula, $12.51 billion competitive)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>off-system bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadband Deployment</td>
<td>$42.45 billion</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>Broadband Equity, Access and Deployment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfields Restoration Projects</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>Cleanup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) Program</td>
<td>$1 billion</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>States and Localities</td>
<td>Strengthen the resilience of critical infrastructure such as transportation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>energy, water supply and comms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Reduction Formula Program</td>
<td>$6.42 billion</td>
<td>State Apportionment</td>
<td>States and</td>
<td>States will sub-allocate 65% of funds on a per-capita basis to counties and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>local governments for eligible projects (e.g., public transit, trails,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>energy-efficient street lights, ZE equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Utilization Grant Program (New)</td>
<td>$310.14 million</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>States and</td>
<td>Authorizes $310.14 million for carbon utilization through 2026 and establishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>a new grant program for states, local governments, and utilities to procure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>products made using captured carbon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charging and Fueling Infrastructure Grants</td>
<td>$2.5 billion</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Counties and</td>
<td>50% of total program funds will be distributed annually through community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>grants for the installation of EV and alternative fueling infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements (CRISI) Grant Program</td>
<td>$5 billion</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>Development of innovative rail projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culvert Removal Grant Program (New)</td>
<td>$1 billion</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>Projects to replace, remove or repair culverts that would improve or restore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fish and marine life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cybersecurity Grant Program (New)</td>
<td>$1.3 billion</td>
<td>State Apportionment</td>
<td>States and</td>
<td>Localities are eligible as subgrantees of states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Grid Resilience</td>
<td>$5 billion</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Electric grid</td>
<td>Reduce impacts of extreme weather and disaster on electric grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>operators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate At-Grade Rail-Highway Crossings</td>
<td>$2.5 billion</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>Eliminate blocked at-grade crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant</td>
<td>$550 million</td>
<td>Block Grant</td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>Programs for energy efficiency, renewables, ZE transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Opportunity</td>
<td>5-Year Total</td>
<td>Allocation Type</td>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>Funding Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Streets Program</td>
<td>$500 million</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>Census blocks with total percentage of residents who identify as non-white is more than 50% are eligible—projects to reduce urban heat centers and improve air quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Mile Broadband</td>
<td>$1 billion</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>Construction of middle-mile broadband infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernizing Energy Infrastructure (New)</td>
<td>$3 billion</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>Demonstration projects focused on advancing smart community technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects</td>
<td>$3 billion</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Infrastructure Development Program</td>
<td>$2.25 billion</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Ports</td>
<td>Port infrastructure (e.g., electrification, new equipment, EV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTECT (Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-saving Transportation) Grant Program (New)</td>
<td>$8.7 billion</td>
<td>Formula/Competitive</td>
<td>States and Localities</td>
<td>Locals can apply to enhance resiliency of coastal infrastructure and evacuation routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAISE Grant Program (formerly BUILD/TIGER)</td>
<td>$7.5 billion</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>Surface transportation projects with significant local or regional impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconnecting Communities Pilot Program (New)</td>
<td>$1 billion</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>USDOT will award eligible facilities acting as a barrier to restore connectivity ($350 million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of Truck Emissions at Port Facilities</td>
<td>$250 million</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Ports</td>
<td>Advancement of Port electrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Streets and Roads for All Grant (New)</td>
<td>$5 billion</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>Implement safety initiatives to prevent death and serious injury (Vision Zero)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Mobility and Revolutionizing Transportation (SMART) Grant (New)</td>
<td>$500 million</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>Smart city or community technologies and systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Transportation Block Grant</td>
<td>$72 billion</td>
<td>Block Grant</td>
<td>State and Localities</td>
<td>Creates new eligibilities: EV charging, cyber protections for transportation facilities, tourism, resiliency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Contaminants</td>
<td>$20 billion</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>Capitalization grants to address lead in drinking water infrastructure, emerging contaminants, and PFAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherization Assistance Program</td>
<td>$3.5 billion</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>Projects that reduce energy costs for low-income households by improving energy efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Funding Program</td>
<td>Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) Program</td>
<td>Carbon Reduction Formula Program</td>
<td>Cybersecurity Grant Program (New)</td>
<td>Middle Mile Broadband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Department</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>Economic Development / Technology and Innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Criteria Evaluation Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LB Residents Impacted:**
- Number of users of the project/infrastructure and/or Long Beach residents impacted: Higher use rates for certain projects by greater California residents will lead to additional consideration.
- Extent of adverse ramifications if a project is not done in the near term or meets legal concerns and mandates.
- Poor Condition/High Need: Extent to which an existing facility is in poor repair or condition, or alternatively for a non-existing facility, the degree of an unmet identified need (i.e. project recommended by a Strategic or Master Plan).
- Equity Investment Area: In disadvantaged, low-income, justice-impacted, vulnerable communities of color (DAC).
- Ability to Attract Additional Funding and/or Leverage Internal Funds: Extent to which funding a project will result in additional funding or allow the City to better leverage internal funds.
- Operational Cost Savings and Revenue Generation: Extent to which a project will produce annual cost savings over the lifetime of the project or program and/or generate revenue.
- shovel Ready: Projects planned and/or entitled will be prioritized over projects that have not, and projects with minimal planning/entitlement requirements will receive additional consideration over those with lengthy or complex planning requirements.
- Environment: Extent to which a project addresses environmental concerns.
- Risk: Minimizes or mitigates risks to the public and City.
- Master Plan Approved: Listed in a Council-approved Vision Plan or Master Plan.
- Collective Impact: Mutually reinforces other programs/services/sites (including those funded by federal recovery funds).
This chart shows the City structure of Departments and staff who are organized to support grant writing, project delivery, and grant management of federal, state and county infrastructure recovery funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Annual Budget / PCI / Backlog</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Alley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Conditions</td>
<td>Current PCI</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Backlog</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Nothing</td>
<td>Post PCI</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Backlog</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix All Budget</td>
<td>Ave. Annual Budget</td>
<td>$327M</td>
<td>$98M</td>
<td>$202M</td>
<td>$27M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post PCI</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Backlog</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Budget (Including all available funding sources)</td>
<td>Ave. Annual Budget</td>
<td>$81M</td>
<td>$19M</td>
<td>$52M</td>
<td>$9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post PCI</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Backlog</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Budget (With S1 for Minors)</td>
<td>Ave. Annual Budget</td>
<td>$32M</td>
<td>$14.8M</td>
<td>$10M</td>
<td>$880K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post PCI</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Backlog</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>