

Response to Questions on the FY 2008 Advertised Budget Plan

Request By: Chairman Connolly

Question: What has been the bond funding history for the Neighborhood Improvement Program and the Commercial and Redevelopment Improvement Program? Have any bond referendums for these programs failed?

Response:

The Neighborhood Improvement Program was developed to provide improvements to older County neighborhoods. Specifically bond funding was approved by voters to finance the cost of neighborhood improvement programs providing for the construction and reconstruction of streets and sidewalks, including necessary curbs, gutters, culverts, drains, and street lights, and the acquisition of necessary land. The chart below shows the year of the bond referendum, the amount of the bond referendum and a brief listing of the project purpose and amount. Since the first referendum was approved in 1980 for neighborhood improvements, a total of \$76.21 million was approved for neighborhoods only (excluding an amount of \$6.12 million for community development in conservation areas and bond issuance costs). This funding has resulted in the completion of 45 project phases in 29 neighborhoods.

Neighborhood Improvement Program:

Bond Referendum	Amount	Purpose
1989	\$30 million	<p style="text-align: center;">Community Improvement - \$23.88 million: Brookland-Bush Hill(Lee District) Phase I & II - \$5.73 million Engleside (Lee District) Phase I & II - \$5.755 million Lincolnia Heights (Mason District) Phase I & II - \$4.53 million Courtland Park (Mason District) Phase I & II - \$5.665 million Planning and design - \$2.20 million</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Community Development Program - \$6 million: Bailey’s Conservation Area (Mason District) - \$1.31 million Fairhaven Conservation Area (Mount Vernon District) - \$1.23 million Gum Springs Conservation Area (Mount Vernon District) - \$2.48 million James Lee Conservation Area (Providence District) - \$0.98 million</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Bond Issuance Costs - \$0.12 million</p>
1986	\$ 20 million	<p style="text-align: center;">Greenway Downs, Groveton, Bel Air, Broadview, Hillwood and New Alexandria- \$15.6 million Begin projects in other applicant areas - \$4.4 million</p>
1984	\$20 million	<p style="text-align: center;">Specific Projects: \$14.018 million: Hybla Valley Farms - \$2.158 million Memorial Heights - \$11.860 million (Tremont Gardens, Beverly Forest and Wynfield) Undesignated: \$5.982 million</p>
1980	\$12.33 million	<p style="text-align: center;">Specific Projects: \$7.5 million Annandale, Dranesville, Lee, Mount Vernon and Providence Districts Undesignated: \$4.83 million</p>
Total	\$82.33 million	

The Commercial and Redevelopment Improvement Program focused on public improvements in commercial and redevelopment area. Specifically bonds were sold in 1988 to finance the construction and reconstruction of utilities, roadways and sidewalks, including necessary curbs, gutters, culverts, drains, street lights, signage and landscaping, and the acquisition of necessary land. The chart below shows the year of the bond referendum, the amount of the bond referendum and a brief listing of the project purpose and amount.

Commercial and Redevelopment Area Improvement Bonds

Bond Referendum	Amount	Purpose
1988	\$32 million	<p align="center">Commercial Areas: Central Annandale - \$7.6 million Central Springfield - \$3.3 million Bailey's Crossroads - \$6.2 million Vienna - \$1.2 million Route 1 - \$2.0 million McLean - \$2.0 million</p> <p align="center">Redevelopment Area: Woodley-Nightingale mobile home park - \$9.7 million</p>
Total	\$32 million	

Have any bond referendums for these programs failed?

No, all proposed bond referendums for the Neighborhood Improvement Program and the Commercial and Redevelopment Improvement Program were approved by the voters at referendum and are shown on the above charts. Available records indicate that 1980 was the first time this type of question was put to the voters.

It should be noted that in last year's Capital Improvement Program (CIP), it was recommended that bond financing might not be the most appropriate financing mechanism for these types of projects. Staff is reviewing options for financing these types of projects.