

City Council Regular Meeting

Tuesday, October 1, 2024 at 6:30 PM

By: Gary Lehrer

Please attach this document as an addendum to the meeting.

Item M - General Public Comments

Road Repairs and I-24

Street Maintenance Facts from the city website, Item 2 (attached)

*"18% of the city's streets have **FAILED**"* FAILED!!!

"27% of the city's streets are Poor"

That's 45% of our city's streets !!!

This was a couple years ago. None of the failed roads have been repaired, so they are worse and there are more of them.

Argument Against I-24 which will be on the ballot (attached)

We're not against continuing the 1/2c sales tax for road repairs.

We're against

- 1) using ONLY the 1/2c sales tax for road repairs
- 2) borrowing \$56M from the future, putting us further in debt and **NOT living within our means**
- 3) making the tax permanent, which it IS if we borrow against the future 25 years.

It's not enough. It says right here in the "Street Maintenance Facts" Item 3 that using only the supplemental sales tax is not enough:

"The 2012 passage of the Supplemental Sales Tax provides a revenue of approximately \$5.5 million per year, and at this rate of revenue, the average PCI (Pavement Condition Index) would go down from 54 to 41."

Again, this was a couple years ago, but the city knew THEN it wasn't enough and the PCI would go down. And it has.

Fred Strong says that the worst roads were never maintained for the 40 years before the E-12 measure, and they have not been repaired in the 12 years of E-12 so they have been neglected for over 50 years. Most of them on the west side.

I-24 is not enough and we don't agree to go into debt or pay extra taxes to have basic services like roads and police and fire. It's your job to provide them.

Thank you

Lehrer, Gary

Public Comment, Item M



CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES

"The Pass of the Oaks"

Street Maintenance Facts

- 1) The City maintains about 160 centerline miles of road, representing 33M Square Feet of pavement:
 - 18.5% are arterial streets (i.e. Spring Street, Niblick, Union, Creston)
 - 8.17% are collector streets (i.e. Rolling Hills, Scott)
 - 71.45% are residential streets
 - 1.88% are alleyways

(Note: the City has (4) full time employees on the streets maintenance crew)

- 2) With 100 being a brand new road, the average Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of the City's street system is 54:
 - 3.6% of the city's streets are Excellent (91-100 PCI)
 - 21.4% of the city's streets are Good (71-90 PCI)
 - 30% of the city's streets are Fair (51-70 PCI)
 - 27% of the city's streets are Poor (31-50 PCI)
 - 18% of the city's streets have Failed (0-30 PCI)

See the Pavement Condition Index Map.

- 3) In order to bring the average PCI from 54 to 80, the City will need to spend \$25 million per year for the next 10 years. Increasing the PCI from 54 to 59 would require a revenue of \$12 million per year for the next 10 years. The 2012 passage of the Supplemental Sales Tax provides a revenue of approximately \$5.5 million per year, and at this rate of revenue, the average PCI would go down from 54 to 41.
- 4) Improving the City's streets with a budget of \$5.5 million per year, when the need is \$25 million per year, is a balancing act to meet the community's expectations. Pavement deteriorates slowly during the first 10 years of its life and the PCI rating decreases from 100 to 60 slowly. Once a street is beyond 10 years old, the PCI rating decreases rapidly; a street with a PCI of 60 can decrease to 30 within 4-6 years. Furthermore, the cost to bring a street with a PCI of 60 or more will cost less than performing maintenance on a road with less than 60 PCI. This is because streets with a PCI of 60 or more will only require surface application to extend its life, while streets that are below 60 PCI will require repairing the area beneath the surface (i.e. road base).

Another balancing act is to consider which streets need to be repaired first. Arterial streets, such as Spring Street, Creston Road, and Sherwood Road have large volumes of daily traffic and a majority of residents who use these streets would benefit from the improved road. Furthermore, streets within the city limits benefit actual residents of the city. On the other hand, residential streets have lower volumes of traffic and only those who live within these neighborhoods benefit from the improved road.

Lehrer, Gary

Public Comment, Item M

To: Melissa Boyer, City Clerk

Date: July 19, 2024

Argument Against Ballot Measure I-24

Here is what the current City Council and City Staff ("they") are not telling you.

The E-12 measure generates about \$7M/year until March, 2025 to cover maintenance of our roads until Mar, 2025. We all know, and they publicly acknowledge, that many roads have not been properly maintained by this money.

They call it a half cent supplemental tax to make it sound small and helpful. It's actually a half of a percent in additional sales tax, on top of the 20% inflation we're all paying now.

They claim that the majority of the tax will be paid by visitors, but I can find no evidence of that here or anywhere. The vast majority will be paid by us. A minor portion will be paid by visitors, for the things they buy while they are here.

If this measure passes, they intend to borrow \$56M in a bond, against 25 years of future sales tax. This bond would only pay for ¼ of the entire \$200+ million project. The bond is a loan, repaid from the majority of the next 25 years of additional sales tax. Therefore, necessary road maintenance and further improvements would have to come from somewhere else.

The tax and borrowed bond money is not specifically for road maintenance, but will go into the general fund for anything on the budget.

They say "if you think the roads are bad now, imagine how they'll be if we don't pass this". They have budgeted pickleball courts and other discretionary items assuming this measure will pass. Regardless if it fails, they are obligated to maintain the roads. I feel strongly that we need to stop discretionary spending and focus on necessary road maintenance first.

I hope this helps you to carefully consider your vote,

David Nelson

Proponent of the Referendum Against Paid Parking