

## **9.0 FINANCIAL IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**

The recommendations described in this report are considered the most important for enhancing pedestrian safety and personal mobility. Resources to fund these important improvements are available on the local, state and federal levels. Identifying the appropriate funding mechanisms begin with understanding the available options.

### **9.1 LOCAL FUNDING RESOURCES**

The City of Longview may fund a portion of these projects with its local funding tools. Several options exist at this level of funding. One option involves the City allocating a portion of the revenues it receives annually to the building of sidewalks and crossing enhancements. Other cities have experienced success with this approach by designating a certain baseline of their general funds for strategic implementation of a program, such as the completion of an ADA transition plan. Another possible funding method involves the City selling revenue bonds to finance targeted improvements. The City of Longview has successfully executed this method with its Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Projects identified by this report could be incorporated in the next CIP call for projects. A final local funding option involves the procurement of private funds. Partnerships with local businesses and/or advocacy groups can help fund segments of facilities or needed amenities. Longview Transit has successfully implemented a bus shelter maintenance program, allowing private advertising in exchange for maintaining bus shelter infrastructure. Exploring ways to expand these public-private partnerships could lead to funding dollars for the needed sidewalk and ADA enhancements.

### **9.2 NON-LOCAL FUNDING RESOURCES**

The City of Longview could leverage local funds to obtain additional funding through grants available from state and federal programs. Two primary sources of funding for implementing the pedestrian access to transit improvements are the Community Development Block Grant Program and the Federal Transportation Alternatives Program.

There are a number of different funding sources that can be considered for financing the proposed improvements. However, the availability of these other funds is difficult to predict. Many times these programs have limited dollars available for award and a high number of applicants seeking them. Careful consideration of the time required to pursue a program versus the likelihood of award, should be given to available programs with limited resources.

### 9.2.1 Prime Funding Mechanisms

The **Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program** is one of the longest continuously run programs at the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and is a flexible program that provides communities with resources to address a wide range of unique community development needs. The CDBG program works to ensure decent affordable housing, to provide services to the most vulnerable in our communities, and to create jobs through the expansion and retention of businesses. At least 70 percent of CDBG funds must be used for activities that benefit low and moderate income persons. In addition, each activity must meet one of the following national objectives for the program: (1) benefit low- and moderate-income persons, prevention or elimination of slums or blight, or (2) address community development needs having a particular urgency due to existing conditions posing a serious and immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community for which other funding is not available.

The City of Longview currently uses this program to fund some of its other projects, such as low-income housing and utility improvements. Staff members are very familiar with the requirements and could use CDBG dollars to fund several of the proposed projects, particularly along Mobberly Avenue. However, a finite amount of funds are available for CDBG activities each year. By allocating a portion to construct the pedestrian improvements identified by this study, the City will limit its use of CDBG funds on other projects.

Another viable source of funding for the City of Longview is the **Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)**, which was authorized under MAP-21: Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (the current two-year national transportation funding and authorization bill passed in 2012). The TAP provides funding for programs and projects that are defined as transportation alternatives, and incorporates the project categories of the former Transportation Enhancement (TE) and Safe Routes to School (SRTS) programs of the national funding predecessors into one flexible program. General types of projects eligible under this program include:

- On- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities
- Infrastructure projects for improving non-driver access to public transportation
- Enhanced mobility and improved safety and access to schools
- Pedestrian facilities and amenities along boulevards and similar multi-modal roadways

The TAP funding available to communities in the East Texas area is overseen by the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT). Using the general federal guidelines for types of projects eligible under the program, TxDOT will establish their own guidelines for administering the funds. To date the Department has not finalized their rules and guidelines, which are prerequisites for allocating the two years of funding authorization. The TAP

projects are expected to require at least 20 percent local match to qualify for funding, with more local participation garnering greater evaluation scoring.

By the time TxDOT issues their call for TAP projects sometime in 2014, the City of Longview and Longview Transit should be in concurrence regarding the top priorities for projects to submit for potential funding. The City of Longview should prepare a memoranda of understanding with potential funding partners, and gather support letters from partner agencies and advocates.

### 9.2.2 Other Available Programs with Limited Resources

The **Livability Communities Initiative (LCI)** is a program of the Interagency Partnership for Sustainable Communities – which is a collaboration of the Department of Transportation (DOT), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). These groups are working together like never before to provide citizens with access to affordable housing, a wider range of transportation options, and lower transportation costs, while protecting the environment in communities nationwide.

The streetscape infrastructure (including sidewalks, crossings and amenities) for transit access within one-half mile walking distance of a fixed bus route or transit station is eligible for federal funding under the Federal Transit Administration’s LCI. This funding source was the intended target for preparation of this Pedestrian Transit Access Plan. All improvements identified here are in line with the expected evaluation criteria for the program. However, the time frame for which the program will issue a Call for Projects is unknown.

Another potential funding mechanism is available through the **Texas Main Street Program (TMSP)**. It is one of the oldest and largest in the nation, with more than 80 fully designated communities. The TMSP is part of the Community Heritage Development Division of the Texas Historical Commission and operates in affiliation with the National Main Street Center, a subsidiary of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. The City of Longview is a current member of the Texas Main Street Program. Every year the TMSP Improvements Program provides eligible Texas Main Street communities with matching grants to expand or enhance public infrastructure in historic main street areas. Applications are due each October, with available funding of \$50,000 to \$150,000.

Texas Parks & Wildlife Department administers the **National Recreational Trails Fund (NRTF)** in Texas under the approval of Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). This federally funded program receives its funding from a portion of federal gas taxes paid on fuel used in non-highway recreational vehicles. The grants can be up to 80% of project cost with a maximum of \$200,000 for non-motorized trail grants. Funds can be spent on both motorized and non-motorized recreational trail projects such as the construction of new recreational trails, improvement to existing trails, development of trailheads or trailside facilities, and acquisition of trail corridors. The application deadline is February 1st of each year.

Although none of the recommended projects are exclusively trails, several improvements are near future trailheads. The proposed crossing enhancements at Fourth Street and Clinic Drive are located very close to a future trailhead for Cargill Long Trail. The City plans to construct a parking area and trail entrance on the east side of Fourth Street near the intersection. By incorporating these two projects into one, a win-win scenario is created, where pedestrians have additional access via the trail and trail users have a safer crossing at Fourth Street. This combined project could take advantage of funding provided through the NRTF. The NRTF funding may also apply to the Marshall Avenue and Fagan Street project. The Maude Cobb Convention Center and P.G. Boorman Trail are located just west of the proposed improvements. The City plans to connect the Convention Center to the trail. The connection details are not defined at this time; however, depending on its placement, portions of the access-to-transit improvements could qualify from NRTF funding.

### 9.3 MATRIX OF POTENTIAL FUNDING RESOURCES

Not every funding source is appropriate for every project. Depending on the recommended improvement, a project may or may not qualify for a particular source. This is especially true for the non-local funds. The proposed improvements were cross referenced with the available funding mechanisms. **Table 6** outlines which programs should be pursued for each project.

**Table 6 • Matrix of Potential Funding Resources**

Project	Key Features	Estimated Cost	Target Timeline	Potential Funding Resources
HIGH ST @ KILGORE COLLEGE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Completing sidewalk gaps</li> <li>– Installation of street crossings</li> <li>– Installation of pedestrian signal heads</li> </ul>	\$ 14,970	Short Range	Local Funds LCI Funds TMSP Funds
HIGH ST @ COLLEGE ST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Completing sidewalk gaps</li> <li>– Installation of street crossings</li> <li>– Installation of pedestrian signal heads</li> </ul>	\$ 52,010	Short Range	Local Funds LCI Funds
LAKE LAMOND @ TEMPLE ST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Installation of sidewalk ramps</li> <li>– Installation of street crossings</li> </ul>	\$ 10,770	Short Range	Local Funds CDBG Funds LCI Funds
MARSHALL ST@ FAGAN ST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Installation of 1,800 LF of sidewalk</li> <li>– Installation of street crossings</li> <li>– Installation of pedestrian signal heads</li> </ul>	\$ 83,860	Short Range	Local Funds LCI Funds TMSP Funds NRTF
<b>Total Estimated Construction Costs for Short Range Timeline</b>		<b>\$ 161,610</b>		
FOURTH ST @ WHATABURGER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Installation of 4,600 LF of sidewalk</li> <li>– Installation of street crossings</li> </ul>	\$ 131,420	Mid-Range	Local Funds TAP Funds LCI Funds
FOURTH ST @ EMILY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Installation of 2,300 LF of sidewalk</li> <li>– Installation of street crossings</li> </ul>	\$ 71,880	Mid-Range	Local Funds LCI Funds
MOBBERLY AVE @ LEVEL ST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Installation of 3,000 LF of sidewalk</li> <li>– Installation of street crossings</li> </ul>	\$ 112,950	Mid-Range	Local Funds CDBG, TAP Funds LCI Funds
MOBBERLY AVE @ N. OF BIRDSONG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Installation of 5,000 LF of sidewalk</li> <li>– Installation of street crossings</li> </ul>	\$ 150,740	Mid-Range	Local Funds CDBG, TAP Funds LCI Funds
MOBBERLY AVE @ PACIFIC AVE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Installation of 3,000 LF of sidewalk</li> <li>– Installation of street crossings</li> <li>– Installation of pedestrian signal heads</li> </ul>	\$ 123,300	Mid-Range	Local Funds CDBG Funds LCI Funds
<b>Total Estimated Construction Costs for Mid-Range Timeline</b>		<b>\$ 590,290</b>		
FOURTH ST @ HOLLYBROOK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Installation of 6,500 LF of sidewalk</li> <li>– Installation of street crossings</li> </ul>	\$ 198,510	Long Range	Local Funds TAP Funds LCI Funds
GREEN ST @ AVALON AVE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Installation of sidewalk</li> <li>– Installation of street crossings</li> <li>– Installation of traditional traffic signal</li> </ul>	\$ 248,520	Long Range	Local Funds TAP Funds LCI Funds
MOBBERLY AVE @ MAIN POST OFFICE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Installation of sidewalk</li> <li>– Installation of street crossings</li> <li>– Installation of pedestrian HAWK signals</li> </ul>	\$ 408,990	Long Range	Local Funds TAP Funds LCI Funds
MARSHALL ST @ GOOD SHEPHERD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Installation of 3,000 LF of sidewalk</li> <li>– Installation of street crossings</li> </ul>	\$ 123,220	Long Range	Local Funds LCI Funds TMSP Funds
FOURTH ST @ CLINIC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Installation of sidewalk</li> <li>– Installation of street crossings</li> <li>– Installation of traditional traffic signal</li> </ul>	\$ 308,060	Long Range	Local Funds TAP Funds LCI Funds NRTF
<b>Total Estimated Construction Costs for Long Range Timeline</b>		<b>\$ 1,287,300</b>		
<b>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS</b>		<b>\$ 2,039,200</b>		

9.3.1 Combination of Projects to Seek Funding

The projects shown in **Table 6** are grouped so that the construction costs associated with each are manageable and reasonably priced for local funding options. However, to competitively pursue some of the funding resources described in Section 8.2, the projects may need to be combined to form larger scopes of work. Many of these funding options require a notable amount of effort to secure funds. Without bundling projects, it would likely not be worth the City’s effort to apply for these very competitive funding dollars. **Table 7** presents a possible combination to create more competitive super projects and seek non-local funding. These projects were bundled based on their relative location to one another.

**Table 7 • Potential Project Combinations to Seek Non-Local Funding**

Super Projects	Individual Projects	Total Construction Cost
Improvements @ Mobberly Ave and Avalon Ave	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Mobberly Ave @ Level St</li> <li>– Green St @ Avalon Ave</li> </ul>	\$ 361,470
Improvements @ LeTourneau University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Mobberly Ave @ N. Birdsong St</li> <li>– Mobberly Ave @ Main Post Office</li> </ul>	\$ 559,730
Improvements @ Fourth St and Loop 281	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Fourth St @ Whataburger</li> <li>– Fourth St @ Clinic Dr</li> <li>– Fourth St @ Hollybrook Dr</li> </ul>	\$ 637,990
<b>TOTAL COMBINED CONSTRUCTION COSTS</b>		<b>\$ 1,559,190</b>