

# City of Alexandria, Virginia

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** APRIL 3, 2015  
**TO:** THE HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL  
**THROUGH:** MARK B. JINKS, ACTING CITY MANAGER *MJ*  
**FROM:** NELSIE L. BIRCH, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET *NR for NLB*  
**SUBJECT:** BUDGET MEMO #11: RESPONSE TO COUNCIL QUESTIONS

---

Every Friday, the Office of Management & Budget issues a Budget Memo to answer questions posed by members of City Council that can be addressed in a question and answer format. Below are answers to some of the questions posed thus far.

### EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION (J. Wilson)

**Question:** **What would be the fiscal impact and policy implications of fully funding all remaining obligations of the closed "Pension Plan for Fire Fighters and Police Officers," and satisfying remaining commitments through purchase of annuities or lump sum distributions?**

**Answer:** In order to provide a thorough response to Council's request, the pension division has requested a cost estimate from the City's pension fund administrator to purchase the annuities. Once the data analysis is received and reviewed, approximately two weeks from 3/27/2015, OMB will immediately send the response to the Council.

### OFFICE OF PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY (J. Wilson)

**Question:** **Do we have other, more useful and extensive, performance measures that we apply to OPA?**

**Answer:** OPA was established in and began operating in FY 2013. In OPA's first year, it conducted eight AlexStat meetings and provided 72 recommendations for improvement. The AlexStat meetings and recommendations range from department specific issues (i.e. Department of Emergency Communications operations) to Citywide issues (i.e. employee turnover). In FY 2014, OPA's responsibilities were expanded to include developing departmental strategic documents including goals and indicators with the City Manager and departments. In FY 2014, OPA also began work on service analyses which are requests from

the City Manager’s Office or departments to study an issue which does not necessitate the formal AlexStat process. During FY 2015, OPA has continued to lead AlexStats and service analyses. Additionally, OPA has assisted City departments with developing and tracking their performance goals and indicators.

Please find below a complete list of indicators for the Office of Performance and Accountability (OPA). FY 2015 estimated data is based on data through February 2015.

Indicator	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Estimate	FY 2016 Target
Percent of City Long Term Outcomes that improved or maintained performance year-to-year (favorable trend: ▲)	66%	61%	-	-
Percent of City Long Term Outcomes that are meeting or exceeding their targets (favorable trend: ▲)	41%	41%	-	-
Percent of department headline indicators that improved or maintained performance year-to-year (favorable trend: ▲)	-	73%	-	-
Percent of city elected officials and employees reporting they understand and focused on achieving the City's Long Term Outcomes (LTOs) and department goals, strategies (favorable trend: ▲)	-	-	-	60%
Number of indicators in department goals and strategies (favorable trend: ▲)	-	1,247	▲ 1,550	-
Percent of indicators with at least one year of data (favorable trend: ▲)	-	42%	▲ 65%	▲ 70%
Percent of indicators with at least three years of data (favorable trend: ▲)	-	25%	▲ 35%	▲ 45%
Percent of implemented recommendations that positively impact achieving our City LTOs, goals, and strategies (favorable trend: ▲)	-	-	-	55%
Percent of all recommendations approved at AlexStat meetings or presented in service analyses that were implemented successfully by the department responsible (favorable trend: ▲)	31%	▲ 55%	▲ 60%	▲ 65%
Number of all recommendations approved by the City Manager from AlexStat meetings and service analysis, rolling total (favorable trend: ▲)	72	▲ 104	▲ 130	-
Number of AlexStat meetings held (favorable trend: ▲)	8	▼ 4	▲ 15	▲ 20
Number of service analyses completed (favorable trend: ▲)	0	▲ 1	▲ 5	▲ 6

**Key:**

Favorable trend in year-to-year performance ▲	Unfavorable trend in year-to-year performance ▼	No change in year-to-year performance ▬	Informational indicator ▬
---	---	---	---------------------------

**Note:** Targets for FY 2016 were provided before the FY 2016 budget development process. Changes in resource allocation may impact a department’s ability to achieve stated targets.

**TRANSIT SUBSIDIES (J. Wilson)**

**Question:** Operating Budget (14.72): Federal law allows paratransit fares to be set at twice the applicable fixed route service fares. With DASH fares proposed to increase, what additional revenue can be realized by setting the DOT paratransit fares at twice the proposed DASH fare?

**Answer:** On March 11, 2015, the Alexandria Transit Company Board, which governs DASH, proposed to defer a fare increase in FY 2016. Instead of an increase,

DASH is proposing budget reductions to meet the City's subsidy in the City Manager's FY 2016 Proposed Budget.

The current DASH fare is \$1.60, while the current DOT paratransit fare (in City limits) is \$3.00. If the current DOT paratransit fare was increased to \$3.20, double the DASH fare rate, the City would realize an additional \$6,500 in revenue.

TAXES/REVENUE (J. Wilson)

**Question: Operating Budget (14.83): The proposed budget indicates that increased utility fees will partially offset the increased Utility Site Inspection staffing. Budget Memo 2 does not show utility fee increases. What fees are being increased? How much revenue do they generate? Why are they not being increased in a manner to fully cover the cost to provision these services?**

**Answer:** The City of Alexandria grants utilities and telecommunication companies reasonable access to the public right-of-way to provide services to the community. However, in order for utilities to maintain or upgrade their infrastructure, they often need to access roads or sidewalks by excavation. This, in turn, affects pavement performance. Because the City invests millions of dollars annually on transportation maintenance and infrastructure, the impact of utility company activity on pavement performance is an increasing concern.

In the City's recent citywide pavement management effort, the presence of utility cuts lowered the pavement condition index (PCI) on some roads compared to pavement of the same age with no utility cuts. Additionally, City staff frequently identifies links between the presence of utility cuts and accelerated pavement deterioration. Adjacent to excavated areas, staff has observed the presence of fatigue (alligator) cracking occurring around the edges of a cut. The introduction of utility cuts is much like the introduction of cracks on pavement. If improperly sealed, water intrusion may occur which further weakens the strength of the pavement. In short, as more cuts occur on City streets, there is a higher possibility of water intrusion and eventual weakening of pavement strength.

Authority for assessing a utility inspection fee for excavation permits exists in City Code Section 5-2-147. The City did not previously charge utility companies for this inspection; however, beginning in FY 2016 staff proposes to assess a \$75 inspection fee per utility cut. Staff proposes this change because utilities are significantly increasing both capital and maintenance efforts which has increased impacts to the City's street infrastructure. This projected annual revenue increase is estimated to be approximately \$67,500, which equals \$75 per permit multiplied by 900 permits per year. This is a conservative estimate based on projected utility schedules for FY 2016.

The City Code notes that inspection fees must be used to recover the actual cost of inspections. Therefore, the fee proposal in FY 2016 assumes a conservative cost recovery model which may be adjusted in the future as staff continues to

work with utilities and telecommunication companies to improve utility cut forecasting estimates.

#### CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (J. Wilson)

**Question:** **Capital Improvement Program (Page 109): Can I get a refresh of Budget Memo 7 from FY 2008? Specifically, I would like some detailing of how the proposed Citywide Street Lighting capital project could be utilized or expanded to include the funding of new pedestrian scale lighting as detailed in approved Small Area Plans that did not include designated funding sources (Mount Vernon Business, Arlandria, etc). Please ensure that the memo addresses potential public/private partnership opportunities to accomplish these initiatives.**

**Answer:** The current lighting program provides funding for installation of new street lighting Citywide, on a case-by-case basis and is currently funded at \$25,000 annually. The street lights installed are owned and maintained by Dominion Virginia Power. As Budget Memo #7 from FY 2008 outlines, there is a significant capital and operating cost to install and maintain new pedestrian-scale lighting. The installation (capital) cost is approximately \$100,000 per block based on previous estimates. The City would be responsible for the operating costs of the street lights, which would be metered and are approximately \$2,400 per block annually. Neither Dominion nor the City has an approved standard for pedestrian lighting at this time. An alternative strategy could be to install mounted light fixtures on buildings in poorly lit areas. Currently there is insufficient funding for the cost of pedestrian scale lighting as detailed in Small Area Plans. For instance, given the current CIP funding, it would take approximately four (4) years to complete one City block, based on the annually funding of \$25,000 per year and the \$100,000 cost estimate to complete one City block.

The program could be expanded to include public/private partnership opportunities by implementing a 50/50 cost-share program with interested homeowner associations, civic associations, businesses and residents for the capital costs to install building-mounted light fixtures along dimly lit corridors. Long-term maintenance and operating costs would be the responsibility of the homeowner.

#### POLICE DEPARTMENT (J. Wilson)

**Question:** **How does the change to police compensation impact cumulative earnings model?**

**Answer:** Since 2013 the Human Resources Department, working with the three Public Safety Work Groups (PSWGs), has used the cumulative earnings model as the primary tool to compare the pay of the City's sworn/uniform public safety jobs to similar jobs in the comparator market. The model compares how the City's pay structures and pay systems deliver pay relative to our comparators over the course of an employee's career. By mapping an employee's career progression, we are

better able to identify when our pay falls behind the market average and why. This approach differs from the “snap shot in time” approach that focuses exclusively on the value of pay ranges (i.e., minimum and maximum salaries).

The data contained in the model reflects FY 2015 compensation data and assumes the fastest rate of accession, or that an officer promotes at the earliest eligible point once they fulfilled the minimum years of service required for their current rank.

The tables below compare the cumulative earnings for each police officer rank in year 25 of service which is the first year an employee is eligible to retire. The proposed cumulative earnings assume the market alignment recommendations that were included in the City Manager’s Proposed Budget, which include:

- Increasing entry police officers by one pay grade (a 5% adjustment)
- Increasing lieutenants by one pay grade (a 5% adjustment)
- Increasing the police pay scale by 4.5%

Rank	Current Cumulative Earnings - Year 25	Proposed Cumulative Earnings - Year 25
Police Officer I to Police Officer IV (Entry to Full Performance)	(\$73,698)	\$47,728

**Comment:** *Non-supervisory police officers are eligible to career ladder from entry P.O. I to full performance P.O. IV.*

*The Proposed Budget recommends reallocating P.O. I and P.O. II ranks from PS-9 to PS-10 (a 5% increase) and increasing the Police Pay Scale by 4.5%.*

Rank	Current Cumulative Earnings - Year 25	Proposed Cumulative Earnings - Year 25
Sergeant	(\$174,901)	(\$31,416)

**Comment:** *Assumes the officer reaches the full performance P.O. IV. rank then promotes to Sergeant.*

*The Proposed Budget recommends increasing the Police Pay Scale by 4.5%.*

Rank	Current Cumulative Earnings - Year 25	Proposed Cumulative Earnings - Year 25
Lieutenant	(\$291,875)	(\$47,674)

**Comment:** *Assumes the officer reaches the full performance P.O. IV. rank and remains in the rank of Sergeant for the minimum number of years necessary to qualify for a promotion to Lieutenant.*

*The Proposed Budget recommends reallocating the Lieutenant rank from PS-16 to PS-17 (a 5% increase) and increasing the Police Pay Scale by 4.5%.*

Rank	Current Cumulative Earnings - Year 25	Proposed Cumulative Earnings - Year 25
Captain	(\$365,492)	(\$131,738)

**Comment:** *Assumes the officer reaches the full performance P.O. IV. rank and remains in the ranks of Sergeant and Lieutenant for the minimum number of years necessary to qualify for a promotion to Captain.*

*The Proposed Budget recommends reallocating the Lieutenant rank from PS-16 to PS-17 (a 5% increase) and increasing the Police Pay Scale by 4.5%.*

The recommended market alignment adjustments significantly improve an employee's cumulative earnings by year 25. For non-supervisory ranks, the cumulative earnings shift from a deficit of negative \$73,698 to positive \$47,728. The model also shows that the City is at or above the market average all but one year from entry to year 25.

Substantial improvements are also seen across the three supervisory ranks, however all three remain behind the market average in cumulative earnings. This is likely due to a variety of factors including but not limited to: amount of time between promotions, higher percentage step increase amounts and the use of longevity steps. To close the gap in cumulative earnings for supervisory positions, the City would need to consider amending the pay structure of the City's pay scales or pay delivery systems. Such considerations have been noted by the Police PSWG and will likely be studied in the future.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (J. Wilson)

**Question:** Given the future plans for the City Marina (in particular the settlement agreement with the Old Dominion Boat Club (ODBC) what is the necessity for City funding of the \$1.25 million of FY 2016 and FY 2017 funding for the City Marina Utility Upgrades? If this project is still considered a necessity even in light of the pending changes, what opportunities are available to recoup the costs of this investment from the tenants of the marina?

**Answer:** As part of the 2013 Waterfront Dock & Marina Maintenance & Repair Assessment, the electrical system in the City Marina was identified as inadequate and recommended as a high priority action item per the Assessment. Funding in the amount of \$1.25M was planned in last year's City Council Approved CIP for FY 2016-2017 and is also included for the same fiscal years as part of the City Manager's Proposed FY 2016-2025 CIP.

The City Marina's power supply is not sufficient for modern day vessels, including the City Fire Boat, and safety risks are present as indicated in the 2013 Waterfront Dock & Marina Maintenance & Repair Assessment. Upgrades planned include the consolidation of transformers, appropriate power supply, and multiple safety enhancements. The upgrade of the system will include individually metered slips providing the City the opportunity to recover direct power use by boaters and the potential of increased docking fees commensurate with better services.

The settlement agreement with ODBC provides for interim use of the A/B pier beginning in the FY 2022-2024 time frame if the Waterfront Plan implementation construction proceeds as anticipated. The agreement also provides for the return of the A/B pier to the City if ODBC builds private piers at their new location. Due to the time frame in which ODBC could potentially utilize the piers on an interim basis, City staff recommends completion of the utility upgrades in FY 2016-2017 to improve utility service in the City Marina.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (J. Wilson)

**Question:** (Page 241): In light of Arlington's cancellation of the Streetcar effort, why does the "Transit Corridor "A" – Crystal City/Potomac Yard Streetcars" project remain funded for planning/feasibility?

**Answer:** The Proposed FY 2016-2025 CIP includes \$3.0M in NVTA 70% funds in FY 2021 for streetcar project planning and design funding. This is the same funding and timing that was included in the City’s previously Adopted CIP for FY 2015-2024. When the new FY 2016-2025 Proposed CIP was prepared, keeping this funding and timing for the streetcar project was not an explicit decision. Rather, given the funding source for this streetcar design project phase was NVTA 70% money (which is restricted to projects of regional significance that increase transportation capacity), and given the six-years out date of FY 2021 of this project’s previously contemplated planning and design start, no action was taken in changing the use of these NVTA 70% funds in the Proposed CIP. In addition, although Arlington has cancelled both of their streetcar projects (Columbia Pike and Crystal City streetcar lines) and likely intends to keep to their current BRT plans in the Crystal City corridor, there has been no City Council or Transportation Commission discussion of dropping the Alexandria element of what was once contemplated to be a regional streetcar project.

If Council wishes to amend the Proposed FY 2016-2025 CIP and drop the streetcar project from the City’s CIP, it is suggested that the NVTA funds be designated for a FY 2021 interim transportation contingent in the CIP and that a use for these funds be developed as part of the FY 2017-2026 CIP process.

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (J. Wilson)**

**Question:** (Page 370): **The proposed CIP indicates that the new CAD system was deployed in January 2015. Why is there an additional \$2.3m programmed for FY 2017-FY 2020 for this project? What scope of work does that funding provide for?**

**Answer:** Implementation of the CAD Project is expected to be fully completed by the end of calendar year 2015. The \$2.3m included in FY 2017-2020 of the City Manager’s Proposed FY 2016-2025 CIP is for required capital infrastructure upgrades to keep the system running optimally. The table below reflects the estimated ongoing capital infrastructure costs in order to maintain the system. Examples of such infrastructure include: replacement workstations, servers, networking hardware, data storage systems, and other IT related equipment. These figures do not account for operating costs such as equipment technical support or maintenance which are budgeted by departmental users. As is the case with all IT investments, these estimated funding needs will be re-evaluated annually to determine when these replacements will actually need to occur.

Fiscal Year	Description	Cost
FY 2017	Records Management System server replacement, hardware replacement contingency funds	\$0.6m
FY 2018	Data storage hardware replacement, hardware replacement contingency funds	\$0.3m
FY 2019	Storage Area Network replacement, Police mobile operational replacement hardware, networking	\$1.1m

	hardware replacement, hardware replacement contingency funds	
FY 2020	Hardware replacement contingency funds	\$0.3m
Total FY 2017-2020		\$2.3m

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (J. Wilson)**

**Question: Can you detail the sources and uses of all funds related to the King Street Metrorail Station Area Improvements Project, as well as possible alternative uses for the funds currently programmed for it (including the new \$3.7M in the proposed CIP), specifically these funds' applicability for transportation projects that were cancelled or delayed in this year's proposed Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)?**

**Answer: The King Street Metrorail station is a gateway to the City of Alexandria, with the highest ridership and most transfers of all the transit stations in the City. The station was constructed over 30 years ago, and the design no longer meets the needs of the increased number of rail and bus riders that utilize the station. The King Street Metrorail Station Area Improvements were ranked in staff's internal budget development as a high-priority project since it improves safety and efficiency at the Metrorail Station, serves as a gateway for visitors and residents, and promotes economic vitality for Old Town.**

The sources of all funds related to the King Street Metrorail Station Area Improvement Project are as follows:

- The total project budget is \$11.7M, of which \$8.0M was budgeted in prior year CIPs and \$3.7M was added in FY 2016 to reflect updated project cost estimates (including WMATA's proposed new overhead charge rate)
- This project has the following funding sources:
  - Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), and State Urban Funds total \$7.9M, of which \$2.3M is budgeted in FY 2016. While the King Street Metrorail Station Area Improvements project is currently approved for these State and Federal funds, the funds could not be reallocated to another project without prior approval from the appropriate State and Federal agencies. Eligible projects may include multi-use trails and intersection improvement projects, but would be subject to appropriate agency review.
  - Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) funds budgeted for this project total \$3.8M, of which \$1.4M is budgeted in FY 2016. TIP funds are flexible and could be used for any transportation capital or operating project with City Council approval.

**OTHER PUBLIC SAFETY (J. Wilson)**

**Question: What is the formula used and what has been the City's utilization for the Northern Virginia Juvenile Detention Center (NVJDC)?**

**Answer:** The current agreement states that the City’s share of the cost is determined by taking the total estimated operating expenses for the facility and first subtracting out the State’s share of the expenses. Next, the NVJDC applies revenues from other sources from the fiscal year ending 1 year prior to the year the budget is being developed (e.g. FY 2013 revenues applied towards FY 2015 budget). This reduces the amount that the local jurisdictions would otherwise need to pay. The remaining projected expenditure amount is called the “Local Share.”

This Local Share is then distributed to the participating jurisdictions of Alexandria, Arlington County and the City of Falls Church. The jurisdictions’ contributions are based upon the average use of the facility, in client days, of each jurisdiction’s clients. Each jurisdiction’s average use factor is calculated on an annual basis, based on the actual utilization for the previous three calendar years. Non-participating jurisdiction’s client days and vacancies are not factored into this calculation.

Utilization of the facility in client days since FY 2006 is below. The City’s contribution to NVJDC has ranged from \$1.2 million in FY 2006 to a high of \$1.6 million in FY 2008-2010 and \$1.4 million in FY 2011-2014. There is no direct correlation between childcare days in a given year and that year’s contribution due to fact that each jurisdiction’s utilization is measured as a percent of total utilization and is calculated as a three-year trailing average. Revenues from other sources also impact the amount of the overall jurisdiction’s share and vary year-to-year.

Childcare days utilized	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
Alexandria	8,615	6,180	5,599	5,438	5,628	5,569	4,429	3,663	4,638
Arlington	10,979	10,435	9,110	10,482	10,435	8,244	6,067	6,101	5,425
Falls Church	498	783	481	418	397	172	240	265	41
<b>Total</b>	<b>20,092</b>	<b>17,398</b>	<b>15,190</b>	<b>16,338</b>	<b>16,460</b>	<b>13,985</b>	<b>10,736</b>	<b>10,029</b>	<b>10,104</b>

Discussions on the new agreement largely keep this method intact. The primary proposed change to this methodology is to require revenues to be budgeted and applied in the same year as they are received instead of the current 2 year delay. In terms of capital funding, the NVJDC has recently completed a 20-year forecast and analysis of future expected capital needs. As part of the agreement negotiations, some of the accrued fund balance that is not being returned to the local jurisdictions in FY 2016 will be used to start a Capital Infrastructure fund, which will allow the NVJDC to save for anticipated future capital needs according to this plan. Part of the NVJDC annual budget request will be a specific amount for capital resources required to ensure the solvency of the fund and complete scheduled projects according to the 20-year plan, or other needs that may be identified. The jurisdictions will review the anticipated capital needs and requested funding amounts annually as part of the budget development process.

## CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (J. Wilson)

**Question:** **Operating Budget (14.99)** There were fairly dramatic changes as to how the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) dollars were utilized, including a near-depletion of new capital investment due to inclusion of WMATA Operating costs as a TIP funding beneficiary. Can Staff provide a detailing of the transportation improvements that were removed as TIP funding beneficiaries as a result of this decision?

**Answer:** The proposed TIP is a balanced, 10-year plan that projects \$11.5M in expenditures in FY 2016. This includes projected revenues of \$7.9M from the 2.2-cent set-aside and \$3.6M of reprogrammed funds from prior years. The TIP also absorbed a \$2.9M projected increase in FY 2016 WMATA operating costs; over the entire 10-year plan, this added expenditure totals \$28.1M. This absorption of WMATA increase by the TIP was driven by the need to close the City's \$31M budget gap. In this case, continuing existing transportation operations was a higher priority than undertaking new operating programs or certain capital projects. Additionally, the TIP supports \$6.5M of WMATA capital costs over the ten-year plan. While the TIP proposes maintenance of existing programs and services, all expansion efforts and future capital projects were reduced, deferred or eliminated. The following transportation improvements were removed as TIP funding beneficiaries:

- **Capital Bikeshare (operating):** The TIP eliminates operating support for Phase III (expansion to 32 stations from the current 16), and future expansion plans from FY 2017-2025. The operating impact in FY 2016 is a reduction of \$129K; the total 10-year proposed reduction to Bikeshare operating costs is \$3.4M.
- **DASH Fleet Expansion (capital & operating):** The proposed TIP eliminates planned DASH fleet expansion in the ten-year plan. A total of \$3.3M in capital costs and \$14.1M in operating expenditures were eliminated. It is also noted that \$7.2M in capital expenditures for DASH expansion funded with NVT A 30% funds were also eliminated from the ten-year plan.
- **Mount Vernon Avenue/Russell Road Intersection (capital):** The proposed TIP eliminates this planned intersection improvement (\$1.3M).
- **Old Cameron Run Trail (capital):** The proposed TIP eliminates this planned shared-use path improvement (\$1.4M). A total of \$2.1M in CMAQ/RSTP funding still remains for this project. Without additional funding, the project scope will have to be scaled back or this project will no longer be feasible to complete.
- **Backlick Run Trail (capital):** The proposed TIP eliminates this planned shared-use path improvement (\$1.1M). A total of \$2.1M in CMAQ/RSTP funding still remains for this project. Without additional funding, the project scope will have to be scaled back or this project will no longer be feasible to complete.
- **Laborer III (operating):** A Laborer III to support Metroway operations was removed from the TIP (\$0.7M over the ten-year plan). These functions will be

absorbed by existing T&ES staff. The position was added in FY 2015 but was not filled.

- As the TIP capital projects went largely prioritized on a standalone basis within the TIP program funding stream, for next year's CIP development, the capital projects that fell out of the TIP will be more fully prioritized within the context of all City CIP capital requests.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (J. Wilson)

**Question: The reservation of 2.2 cents of real estate tax was designed to fund new and enhanced transportation service in the City. With over a third of these costs now being utilized to maintain existing service with WMATA, does Staff now recommend structural changes to the TIP to reflect the re-purposing of these funds?**

**Answer:** At this time, staff does not propose restructuring the TIP. While the TIP now provides more support to the maintenance of current transportation and transit services, the entire 2.2 cents is still being utilized for transportation and transit purposes. This aids in calculating the NVTA required "maintenance of effort" amount. Staff can look at this TIP funding structure as part of the FY 2017 budget.