## RADNOR TOWNSHIP

CAPITAL PLAN DISCUSSION | NOVEMBER 6, 20I7

## AGENDA

I. Capital Plan Overview - As Presented in Township Manager Recommended Budget

- How the Capital Plan fits within the overall budget

2. Review of Current Funding Situation
3. Review of Funding Gap
4. Introduction of a Funding Proposal
5. Timing and Next Steps

## FIVEYEAR CAPITAL PLAN LAYOUT

The Plan is included in the Budget (v2)
beginning on page 158


FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PLAN
2018-2023
Nunx venomimeom

For each Year, a summary of Plan
Sources and Uses is provided


The Plan has the following categories of projects:

- Department Vehicles and Equipment
- Fire Company Capital Contributions
- Information Technology / PEG
- Capital Projects:
- Road \& Bridge Construction Group
- Facilities
- Traffic Signals
- Park Improvement Plan
- Sanitary Sewer
- Stormwater


## FIVEYEAR CAPITAL PLAN LAYOUT (CONT'D)

Then, for each category, a summary table identifies the specific projects


Then, for each item in the Plan, there is a one page project summary page
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Different formats for Park Plan and Stormwater Plan since they have separate resident committees providing input


## FIVEYEAR CAPITAL PLAN LAYOUT (CONT'D)

- Incorporating the Capital Plan to the overall Budget
- The Sources and Uses bottom line
- Calculates the amount needed to fund the projects identified
- The calculated amount flows to the General Fund as a "capital transfer" which pulls general resources from the General Fund and deposits them into the Capital Fund
- In order to proceed with the projects identified in the Capital Plan, sufficient General Fund transfers are required.



## REVIEW OF CURRENT FUNDING SITUATION

## Pay as you Go Portion of the Capital Plan

- Includes short-term assets, moving fleet, departmental capital and IT
- Since 201I, the Township has benefited from business tax and permitting revenue growth
- A portion of those increased revenues have been allocated to fund departmental capital (Pay as you go)
- Prior to 2010, the Township utilized proceeds from large borrowing transactions to fund all capital, including shortterm.
- GFOA Best Practice, CBFAC, CARFAC and Administration all recommend to utilize current resources to fund shortterm capital purchases, or match financing length with useful life of asset. That has been accomplished.

| Sources: | 2018 Budget |
| :--- | ---: |
| Verizon PEG Contributions | $\$ 170,000$ |
| Sale of Property and Equipment | 20,000 |
| Interest Income | 6,000 |
| General Fund Transfers \| Included in TMRCB | $1,573,917$ |
| Total Sources | $\mathbf{1 , 7 6 9 , 9 1 7}$ |
|  |  |
| Ilses: | 391,900 |
| Folice | $2 b 9,901$ |
| Fublıc Works \| Solıd Waste Dıvisıon | 301,018 |
| Fublic Works \| Infrastructure / Highway Division | 245,312 |
| Fublic Works \| Park Maintenance Division | 95,050 |
| Information Terhnol̊gy | 193,700 |
| FEG (amount includes \$136,000 of contributions to FS21) | $283,03 G$ |
| Cire Service Lquipment Contributions | $\mathbf{1 , 7 6 9 , 9 1 7}$ |

## REVIEW OF CURRENT FUNDING SITUATION (CONT’D)

## Pay as you Use Portion of the Capital Plan

- Includes longer-term assets, such as infrastructure, facilities and grounds, signals, and certain park improvements.
- As noted, the Township funded these capital needs with long-term bonds, usually issued every couple of years (going back to the early 1990's). The practice stopped after 2007 for a multitude of reasons
- Given the size of these improvements, current resources are not forecasted to be sufficient to fund these projects for the foreseeable future.
- As a result, some funding plan will need to be determined.

| Recommended Funding I Possible sources for funding: | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ Amount |
| :--- | ---: |
| 2017 Excess General Fund Balance and/or Planned General |  |
| Fund Transfers |  |
| Road Resurfacing Supplement to Liquid Fuels | $\$ 225,918$ |
| Gıanl Applied Prujecls (Corminilmenls made) | 225,189 |
| Parking Lots (Funded through parking revenue) | 38,000 |
| Facilities (Necessary to keep facilities functioning) | 266,500 |
| Subtotal of Recommended Funding | $\mathbf{7 5 3 , 6 0 7}$ |
|  |  |
| Additional Projects in Plan that would require additional | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ Amount |
| funding |  |
| Park Improvements (nen-bond funds) | $\mathbf{1 8 3 , 0 0 0}$ |
| Board of Commissioner Requested Projects | 495,000 |
| Non-Grant Signal Improvement Projects | $\mathbf{3 4 0 , 0 0 0}$ |
| Non-Grant Capital Project / Infrastructure Projects | 60,000 |
| Non-Bond Park Improvement Projects | $\mathbf{1 , 0 7 8 , 0 0 0}$ |
| Subtotal of Additional 2018 Project Needing Funding |  |

## REVIEW OF CURRENT FUNDING GAP

## Pay as you Use Portion of the Capital Plan

- The updated five year plan includes the following totals needing funding
- Specific Projects are identified in the Capital Plan

| Pay-As-You-Use: | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Road \& Bridge | 285,918 | 269,091 | 196,718 | 200,281 | 126,188 | 154,000 |
| BOC Projects | 495,000 | 430,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| Traffic Control | 563,189 | 385,078 | 799,000 | 729,000 | 655,000 | 225,000 |
| Building \& Grounds | 266,500 | 266,000 | 260,000 | 150,000 | 275,000 | 60,000 |
| Parking Lots | 38,000 | 300,000 | 20,000 | - | 26,000 | - |
| Park Improvements | 183,000 | - | $1,293,000$ | - | - | - |
| Total PAYU Plan | $\mathbf{1 , 8 3 1 , 6 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 6 5 0 , 1 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 1 8 , 7 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 2 2 9 , 2 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 2 3 2 , 1 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 9 , 0 0 0}$ |

## INTRODUCTION OF A FUNDING PROPOSAL

- Borrow roughly $\$ 3.5$ million every three years
- 20 Year bonds;
- Fixed Interest Rates;
- Generate roughly $\$ 3.35$ million to fund the Pay as you Use Capital Program for three years
- Results in annual capital of \$I.I million
- Forecasted through 2050, the capital plan funding might look like this:


## INTRODUCTION OF A FUNDING PROPOSAL (CONT'D)

- The $\$ 3.5$ Million was chosen for a reason:
- The annual debt service expense fits within the current debt service expense totals
- The program: We borrow small increments, pay those down, and then refill the bucket
- The result: The added capital funds will not add to current township expenses; therefore, current tax rates should be sufficient to fund the program for the foreseeable future.


## INTRODUCTION OF A FUNDING PROPOSAL (CONT'D)

- Here's how the program looks graphically:
- We forecasted out twelve different borrowing transactions
- Outstanding principal would grow until roughly the sixth borrowing, then level out
- The same holds true with the annual debt service expense (principal + interest)




## INTRODUCTION OFA FUNDING PROPOSAL (CONT'D)

- Here's how the program fits within the Township's current Debt Service program:
- These expense graphs include all of the current outstanding bonds that are funded by the General Fund
- Excludes open space bonds and prior sanitary sewer bonds
- Over the forecasted period, the total General Fund debt service stays similar to today's levels (with some growth out in 2030 - 2035 that can be planned for accordingly)

```
Net General Fund Debt Service Total Current and Proposed (w/Capital Funding Plan) Full Maturity Outlook
Current General Fund Total
```



Net General Fund Debt Service Total
Current and Proposed (w/Capital Funding Plan)
Full Maturity Outlook
Current General Fund Total With Capital Borrowing Added
$\$ 6,000,000$
$\$ 4,000,000$
$\$ 2,000,000$


## INTRODUCTION OF A FUNDING PROPOSAL (CONT'D)

- Funding Proposal Issue with 2018 Budget:
- If the Board elects to proceed with the borrowing plan, or some version of it, the capital plan will need either (a) additional non-borrowed funding or (b) projects will need to be prioritized to fit within funding approved
- As noted in the table below, the funds generated through the small borrowing will not cover projects, as included today.

|  | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  | 2021 |  | 2022 |  | 2023 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beginning Balance: | \$ | 588,259 | \$ | 2,838,259 | \$ | 1,738,259 | \$ | 638,259 | \$ | 2,888,259 | \$ | 1,788,259 |
| Sources: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GF Transfers |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Bond Proceeds |  | 3,500,000 |  | - |  | - |  | 3,500,000 |  | - |  | - |
| Less: COI |  | $(150,000)$ |  | - |  | - |  | $(150,000)$ |  | - |  |  |
| Net Proceeds |  | 3,350,000 |  | - |  | - |  | 3,350,000 |  | - |  | - |
| Uses: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital Expenses |  | 1,100,000 |  | 1,100,000 |  | 1,100,000 |  | 1,100,000 |  | 1,100,000 |  | 1,100,000 |
| Ending Balance | \$ | 2,838,259 | \$ | 1,738,259 | \$ | 638,259 | \$ | 2,888,259 | \$ | 1,788,259 | \$ | 688,259 |
| Capital Plan Proposal |  | 1,831,607 |  | 1,650,169 |  | 2,718,718 |  | 1,229,281 |  | 1,232,188 |  | 589,000 |
| Difference |  | $(731,607)$ |  | $(550,169)$ |  | $(1,618,718)$ |  | $(129,281)$ |  | $(132,188)$ |  | 511,000 |
| Aggregate Difference |  | $(731,607)$ |  | $(1,281,776)$ |  | $(2,900,494)$ |  | $(3,029,775)$ |  | $(3,161,963)$ |  | $(2,650,963)$ |

## INTRODUCTION OF A FUNDING PROPOSAL (CONT'D)

## Strengths

- Generate roughly \$1.I million per year for the foreseeable future to fund capital without raising taxes
- Take advantage of today's low interest rate environment
- Provides an opportunity to re-visit the program at least every three years
- Matches the benefit / asset life with the obligation / payment
- Being that no additional taxes would be needed to fund the plan; this discussion can continue beyond the budget decision cycle


## Weaknesses

- Borrowed funds are fixed for the determined period (in this case, we're assuming 20 year repayments). Once borrowed, we should assume that we'll have those expenses for 20 years.
- Expensive Cost of Issuance each time funds are borrowed
- More expensive than cash due to interest costs


## Opportunities

- Forces prioritization of projects and limits "added" capital projects outside of the plan
- Provides flexibility in future years if the funding need increases or decreases, or if funds are needed for projects funded outside the General Fund (i.e. Sanitary Sewer and/or Stormwater)
- Capitalizes on the Township's strong credit rating (Aal - steady by Moody's effective in October 2017)


## Threats

- Interest Rate Risk | If interest rates rise over time, the cost of the program will become more expensive (for new issues only)
- Inflation Risk |With fixed annual spending limits, as projects become more expensive, less funds are available for each project
- Could limit opportunity to borrow for larger capital outside of the this plan for large one-time projects


## TIMING AND NEXT STEPS

- Timing
- As noted, if the Board is resolute on not adjusting millage rates for 2018 , then the capital discussion can continue beyond the budget approval season [noting that the Capital Plan will have to be modified to reflect what is included in the 2018 Board Adopted Budget]
- The Budget Ordinance will be on the November 27 agenda for introduction and can still be amended before;
- The Budget Ordinance will be on the December II agenda for adoption (to meet the Charter requirement)
- Next Steps
I. Board review of projects: Determine if they agree on project and it's priority

2. Board review of funding: Determine how to fund projects agreed upon in Next Step \#I

## AGENDA RECAP

I. Capital Plan Overview - As Presented in Township Manager Recommended Budget

- How the Capital Plan fits within the overall budget

2. Review of Current Funding Situation
3. Review of Funding Gap
4. Introduction of a Funding Proposal
5. Timing and Next Steps

## THANK YOU



