

March 13, 2014

VIRGINIA: At a Regular Meeting for the Capital Improvements Program of the Hanover County Planning Commission in the Board Auditorium of the Hanover County Government Building, Hanover County, Virginia, on Thursday, March 13, 2014 at 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT: Ms. Claiborne R. Winborne, Chairman
Mr. Jerry W. Bailey
Mrs. Edmonia P. Iverson
Mr. C. Harold Padgett, Jr.
Mrs. Ashley H. Peace
Mr. Randy A. Whittaker
Mr. David P. Maloney
Mr. Dennis A. Walter
Mrs. Betty S. Gray

ABSENT: Mr. Larry A. Leadbetter, Vice-Chairman

ALSO

PRESENT: Mrs. Shelly Wright, Budget Division Director
Mr. John A. Budesky, Deputy County Administrator
Mr. Michael Flagg Public Works Director
Mr. Randy Hardman, Public Works Deputy Director
Mr. Steve Herzog, Public Utilities Director
Mr. Gary Craft, Public Utilities Deputy Director
Deputy Terry Sullivan, Sheriff's Department
Mr. Greg Sager, Parks & Recreation Director
Mr. Marvin Fletcher, Jr., General Services Director
Mr. Kevin Nelson, Information Technology Director
Mr. Eddie Buchanan, Fire/EMS Division Chief
Mr. Curtis Shaffer, Emergency Communications Director
Mr. Steve Chidsey, Public Works Operations Director
Mr. Ed Buzzelli, Director of Operations
Mrs. Lynn Bragga, Budget Development Director

There were no citizens present.

Meeting Called to Order

The Chairman, Ms. Winborne called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. All members were present except Mr. Leadbetter.

March 13, 2014

Mr. Maloney stated that this is the Planning Commission's annual review of the proposed FY15-FY19 Capital Improvements Program. He introduced Mrs. Shelly Wright for that presentation, and following her presentation Public Utilities will present the proposed utility projects.

Presentation of Proposed CIP

Mrs. Shelly Wright, Budget Division Director provided an overview of the proposed FY15-FY19 CIP. Looking at the County's Funding Sources Chart: The chart takes into account projects from all funds, including the County, Airport, Utilities and schools over the five-year period of the program. The total for all five years is \$122.6M. The utilities funding comes from user and capacity fees; local General Fund funding accounts for 26%; Long Term Debt includes both utilities and schools; State and Federal Aid at 14% is comprised of \$12.1M for Airport grants, and \$5.2M in County Projects, which is primarily road improvements. Other Sources are at 6% include \$190,000 of asset forfeiture money collected in a prior year; use of fund balance assignments of \$5.7M, and reserve for revenue \$1M in appropriation; Road proffers make up for 2% or \$2.5M of the total five year CIP. She said in looking at the expense side for the five year period, the largest portion is in the Utility Fund, followed by County Improvements at 32%, the schools account for 20%, and the Airport at 10%.

Mrs. Wright stated that the overview with County projects as represented in the table details proposed investment, Capital and Technology for the County improvements five year program totaling \$38.7M. The General Fund on-going revenue sources support 24M or 62% of that total investment. Other funding sources include the Fund Balance Assignment which is savings from prior years, as well as the State share of road improvement projects, grants and asset forfeiture funds from prior years as described earlier.

In looking at the first year of those County projects the proposed \$7.3M is primarily in the categories of technology, roads, Public Works, and vehicles. Those account for just over 70% of the

March 13, 2014

total. These projects are broken down into the areas of General Government Administration, Public Works, Public Safety, and Reserves. The Airport is another half million dollars of which only \$5,000 comes from the General Fund.

The projects that fall under General Government Administration function are all technology related. Year one is proposed to be budgeted at \$2.8M and includes funding for new software systems in the departments of Finance and Management Services, Assessment and Human Resources funded through prior year savings. The remaining projects are on-going technology maintenance and replacement expenses to support the technology infrastructure. The increase in this category from our current CIP of \$1.7M is due to the increase in those defined software systems.

Under the Public Safety function year one is proposed to be \$1.8M, this includes funding for one fire truck, two ambulances, and patient diagnostic equipment for the ambulances, Sheriff's Office Building Renovations and radio system upgrades and equipment replacement. Over the five-year program, funding in this area increased \$3.1M. The largest change is due to the addition of mandated fire equipment replacement at \$1.3M and moving toward a sustainable fire engine fleet replacement program.

The Public Works function is proposed at \$2.1M in year one, with a majority of that funding allocated for reserve for future roadway improvements. This proposed five-year CIP is down \$1.3M from the current Plan. The significant changes are in roads which increased \$2.2M over the life of the program. Watershed improvements and regional stormwater which decreased by \$3.4M.

Presenting another table, Mrs. Wright stated that this table details the Funding Sources that support those County projects in the five-year Plan. The General Fund accounts for 50% of the funding in the first year. The proposed Airport Capital Funding is for additional Ramp Apron and Taxiway connectors on the east side to meet the demand for additional hangers and corporate hanger

March 13, 2014

development. The largest General Fund Contribution is \$40,000 per year in the out years of the Plan used to match Federal and State Grants.

The Schools investments are in facility improvements at 68%, Technology 20% and equipment replacement at 12%. The schools \$6.3M Capital Budget in the first year includes \$4.7M of facility renovations, \$1M for technology enhancements and \$600K for replacement of school buses.

The \$6.3M Capital Budget is funded with \$1.6M of General Fund funding and \$4.7M of Debt funding. The \$8.7M Public Utility CIP Budget includes both renewal and replacement projects and system expansion projects. Included in the renewal and replacement projects is an anticipated \$3.3M Joint Capital cost payment to the City of Richmond.

The slide on Life Cycle costs for County Projects shows that we have anticipated increases in maintenance costs of up to \$600K annually by year five if all projects go forward as planned. By taking older software off-line as a result of the replacements the net change in maintenance may be lower. Life Cycle costs for the Utilities Projects do not pick up until the fourth year of the Plan by bringing large water and sewer improvements on-line.

Mrs. Wright said that concluded the overview of the CIP packet.

Ms. Winborne advised that Mr. Leadbetter was not present but had left her a list of questions he wanted answers to. The format of the financial budget sheets have been modified from last year's. Specifically categories have been reworded, added or eliminated. He asked for an explanation of the change.

Mrs. Wright advised that she was unsure of which categories Mr. Leadbetter was referring to. The formatting of the sheets the only difference is the tables look different but they are the same columns with the same presentation of data. She asked what specific categories he was speaking of.

Ms. Winborne answered she did not know but she would ask him to get in touch with her.

March 13, 2014

Mrs. Wright agreed.

Ms. Winborne said Mr. Leadbetter had a follow-up question which was can we have a format that is consistent from year to year. She asked if Mrs. Wright envisioned next year's formatting to change.

Mrs. Wright answered no and explained that the format they have gone to now is actually more updated. The previous format up to this past year was a very intensive manual product and since it was manual entry there was obviously more opportunities for error. The system they use now is "pivot tables" in Excel.

Ms. Winborne said Mr. Leadbetter's last question was at last year's CIP meeting Mrs. Peace asked if the Commission could obtain an evaluation metric showing where the projects were. She said the Commission had received information at their desk tonight and asked if that was this metric she just asked about.

Mrs. Wright replied yes. It was her understanding this is what was decided to go forward to list what the status is of each of the projects with the target completion.

Mr. Padgett said they have long term debt as one of the sources of funding. He questioned how this is done and if there were bond issues or a combination, and what is done with it.

Mrs. Wright said it depends on what they are actually borrowing for as to what type of schedule it is. If it is a very large debt issuance it may be broken down into separate draw downs and the type of source that is available depends on what the project is eligible for at the best rate.

Ms. Winborne asked what asset forfeiture is.

Mrs. Wright explained it is when there is property that is ceased as it relates to particularly drug cases, and when it comes in it is split between the Sheriff's Office and the Commonwealth Attorney. There are Federal and State strict guidelines that determine what is eligible for use of that funding.

March 13, 2014

Ms. Winborne said on page 218 the words “cash proffers” are used as well as in the pie chart. She asked if everywhere in this document the words “cash proffers” are used if “road proffers” is what is being referred to.

Mrs. Wright answered yes. As the Commission is aware there are only road proffers. In terms of a broader funding category the financial category is cash proffers.

Ms. Winborne asked if there are any cash proffers left that are not road proffers and if so, how that is delineated.

Mrs. Wright replied they do have road proffer funding left and they are using those for the appropriate projects. There are no other proffers available but she has to look at those balances. She said she could get back to Ms. Winborne on that if she wanted her to.

Mr. Bailey asked regarding proffers, he said on the first slide Mrs. Wright showed there was a little over 2% in proffers of the \$122M. He asked if that is where the \$2,306 road proffer contributions were kept.

Mrs. Wright said yes.

Mr. Bailey asked what else is in that funding category there other than that.

Mr. Maloney asked Ms. Winborne if he could clarify.

Ms. Winborne replied certainly.

Mr. Maloney stated that number at least assumes a portion of the \$2,306 road proffers. He said to keep in mind that for certain developments lots greater than 50 there may be a different proffer amount negotiated. Therefore, it would be any expected collection on any road proffer that was negotiated and collected for the fiscal year. He added it is probably not many but he believed there are still some lots which there have not been an amendment processed for the entire cash proffer based on the value of that cash proffer. He was not prepared to give an actual accounting of how many proffer

March 13, 2014

dollars are left, but it is likely during the current year and next few years there will not be a significant amount but they may still continue to collect cash proffers for schools and other public facilities because those property owners have never come in to request an amendment to the zoning.

Mr. Bailey commented if it was \$400K per year they probably would not expect it to be more than 200 houses a year to be built.

Mr. Maloney said it will probably be more than that.

Ms. Winborne said she believed in the past there was a line item at one time that had something like \$468K and that was the school portion of the proffers that they have not been able to spend because they are not in capacity building. She asked if that money is accounted for in the County budget or if it is in a line item somewhere for the schools.

Mrs. Wright stated the schools still have some proffer money in the Capital fund.

Ms. Winborne said it does not show up on the County's Budget but it is in the schools budget.

Mrs. Wright said correct because it is not being appropriated to spend on a project.

Mr. Whittaker asked Mr. Maloney if a time limit was set on when someone could amend their proffers.

Mr. Maloney replied no, the Board set a time limit to expedite proffer amendment cases and those cases had to be submitted last December in order to reach an expedited agenda. Any cases submitted subsequent to that will just follow in the normal rotation for a routine case which typically is 3 to 4 months.

Mrs. Peace asked for a general orientation on a document the Commission received this evening showing projects complete and in progress.

Mrs. Wright answered that basically they asked departments to give them a listing of the current projects that they have in the CIP. This gives an idea of whether or not a project will continue

March 13, 2014

to be in progress and a target date for completion is intended to give a general idea as to whether or not the nature of the project is such that it would be completed within this year or continue on multi-year. If any of these projects will continue on to another year they would not be in the budget document because it is not new money.

Mrs. Peace said she recalled asking last year for some type of summary document of exactly what was spent in the previous fiscal year in the general categories.

Mrs. Wright explained a summary document is available to look at on-line.

There was general discussion on how the budget is developed through Excel stating it is a very manual process. Mrs. Wright stated that they are in the process of looking at new budgeting systems that can do a five-year budget. She said the CIP multi-year tracking is a priority for them.

Ms. Winborne advised that this question was from Mr. Leadbetter. There are several proposed technology upgrades on many of the information systems that are presently in use, so will there be either an increase or decrease on personnel after upgrading the IT capabilities.

Mr. Kevin Nelson, Information Technology Director, came forward and said it is unknown at this point; however, to implement the systems they do not expect to have a need for more people. With the new systems they will be able to be so much more efficient. He said "in the short term we are good."

Ms. Winborne said she noticed that there is an IT request from the schools and a significant outlay for the County. She asked if there is an articulation between whatever the schools are using and the County.

Mr. Nelson replied before he was the Director the internal auditor did a review of the County IT and schools IT and noted some areas of collaboration that they should be talking about and they have started that process. There is nobody in the state that has schools and County IT together because

March 13, 2014

it does not work for lots of reasons, he said however, collaboration is a key and they identified approximately five areas that they should be looking at and they have started those discussions.

Ms. Winborne said that is excellent. She asked about the GIS-Based Asset Management System on page 230.

Mr. Nelson said they put that under IT because that is where the Geographic Information System is located. Right now they do not have a good way to track a lot of the work orders that they do. Public Utilities has tons of infrastructure. Public Works their infrastructure is growing under all the new stormwater regulations and this will be a way to tie work orders on a given line or drainage easement, so they can start to track that over time and see where they are having problems. Right now they do have some systems in access and excel but they are not very efficient; however, there is a system that a predominant of localities use. It creates a more efficient way for them to track maintenance on infrastructure and assets.

Ms. Winborne said she noticed in the report it states using this new system will allow the public to log in requests for staff to check on physical locations.

Mr. Nelson said with Public Utilities but more so with Public Works where there are trees in easements and various things like that. They hope there will be an interface through the internet where someone can go in and pin point where their need is, and it will be easier for them to report those kinds of things.

Ms. Winborne asked if anyone was there from the Sheriff's Department.

Deputy Terry Sullivan came forward.

Ms. Winborne asked him to share a little more about the request for renovations to the former emergency communications center.

March 13, 2014

Deputy Sullivan explained that the renovations are based on use of asset forfeiture fund. The renovation design is just to make better use of the emergency communications room right now as it is in a state of disrepair from use over the years.

Ms. Winborne said on page 242 it talks about purchasing encrypted portable radios. She asked if this is a gradual purchase to come into compliance.

Mr. Curtis Shaffer, Emergency Communications Director came forward. He said the radio replacement project that he was referring to Hanover County purchased in 2010 a new radio system, Fire/EMS, Sheriff's Office, and the rest of the County users were provided with new radios. This equipment will be reaching the end of its useful life approximately 2017-2019. He advised that our County Administrator, Mr. Harris challenged that we come up with a gradual phased in approach to replace and refresh those radios, and this is the initial wave of that. We have received an end of life letter from the manufacture for the existing radios.

Ms. Winborne asked if all the new radios will have this encryption standard.

Mr. Shaffer said yes. He explained that what is driving this is their concern with interoperability amongst our public safety partners, Henrico, Chesterfield, and Richmond have a very old radio system that they are currently in the process of upgrading. So, we want to be able to maintain the interoperability that they have with the Capital Region Partners, and encryption is one of those discussion items that are currently being planned for.

Ms. Winborne said according to page 241 the elevator cylinder is going to cost \$75K for the Vaughan-Bradley Building and on page 261 the elevator cylinder for the Wickham Building is going to cost \$51K. She questioned why there is such a cost difference between the two elevators.

Mr. Marvin Fletcher, Jr., Director of General Services, answered the elevator in the Wickham Building is a smaller capacity elevator than the one in the Vaughan-Bradley Building. So, that is part

March 13, 2014

of the difference in the replacement cost. Also, the elevator in the Vaughan-Bradley building would be considerable younger and so the technology in the elevator may be a little more expensive.

Mr. Whittaker said there was some talk last year about replacing some computers in the Sheriff's cars. He asked if they will be doing any of that.

Deputy Sullivan replied that many of their mobile data terminals are in excess of seven years old which has been a challenge with technology and upgrades. There is some planning regarding replacement but he was not sure where they are with that.

Mrs. Wright advised that there is a replacement schedule for the mobile data terminals because their unit cost is under the threshold for the CIP. They are in the Sheriff's operating budget and so there is a replacement every year so that they can continue to cycle them out in batches.

Ms. Winborne asked if someone was present from the Fire Department.

Eddie Buchanan, Fire Department Division Chief came forward.

Ms. Winborne stated that Mrs. Peace was making a point earlier that last year there was a request for a much smaller number of vehicles. She asked him if they bought an ambulance and a ladder truck.

Mrs. Wright asked if she was talking about the end of June 30th FY13.

Ms. Winborne said yes.

Mrs. Wright said she has that information but she will have to get it to her. The interesting thing about fire trucks is that from the time that we appropriate the money for a fire truck via at the lower cost pumper or the most expensive ladder truck, it is about a two year process from the time that money is appropriated until they actually get the truck. What she believed Ms. Winborne wanted to know is what they ordered with that money.

March 13, 2014

Ms. Winborne stated that last year there was \$250K for a Fire Engine and heavy squad replacement and \$376K for an ambulance replacement and Chief Piland gave a very interesting explanation last year about how you refurbished vehicles and recycle them into something else. Mr. Leadbetter wanted to know if the money that is in for this year is for new engines or refurbished engines.

Mr. Buchanan replied that going forward they are looking for new engines. The refurbished engines are more common in ambulances and they have investigated that with some of the tankers. But it is really more cost effective in those cases just to go ahead and buy new because the systems that are onboard are complex. Ambulances are a little different because they can take the box off of the vehicle and put it on a new chassis.

Ms. Winborne said that is what Chief Piland explained to them last year. She said Mr. Leadbetter has a question about the proposed budget for the watershed improvement program being significantly less than the proposed budget from last year's CIP.

Mr. Mike Flagg, Director of Public Works, stated there is a significant change between last year's CIP and this year is primarily due to new information and also cost estimates on implementing what is referred to as Chesapeake Bay TMDL special condition. He explained that there was a significant lowering of the net unit cost to implement than was originally expected as well as some State Grant dollars and so forth has caused them to lower their overall expectations for revenue and that is reflected in the new CIP.

Ms. Winborne said as noted on page 256 she asked if their vehicles when replaced go to County surplus or are they passed to another department for use.

Mr. Fletcher said the answer is all of the above. For those vehicles that still have some useful life they are moved to another department. If they have reached the end of their useful life they are

March 13, 2014

sold through an auction process and those funds go back into the General Fund for the County when it is collected.

Mr. Whittaker stated that he and Mr. Bailey met with Mr. Flagg and because they are talking about vehicles he wished to ask Mr. Flagg to explain what he does with his trucks.

Mr. Flagg said Mr. Steve Chidsey and his staff in the interest of trying to save the County money keep a 20-year Capital Replacement Plan which is not unlike what other departments do. The trash trucks will easily run 500,000 miles but they only run the hook lift trucks about 10 years and then they send them off to have the chassis cut down and shortened and make a road tractor out of it because those road tractors then spend another 10 years in service pulling long trailers from our convenience centers. So, instead of buying a \$130K rig it costs approximately \$15K to have the chassis cut down. That is some of the things their staff is doing to try to extend the service life.

Ms. Winborne said she had one more question from Mr. Leadbetter. At last year's CIP meeting he stated that there was a quarterly roads report. Since this is a topic of discussion in many of our zoning cases he would like to know if the Commission can be put on your distribution list.

Mr. Flagg answered certainly. He said also for the ease of access, each quarter they hold that update for the Board of Supervisors and therefore it is a slide presentation as well as access to that status report on-line. He stated that he would be happy to send them the link or the physical documents. He said he had a copy of the last report if anybody wanted it.

Ms. Winborne asked him to give it to Mrs. Gray and she will make copies and give them to the Commission at their meeting next week.

Mrs. Peace said he mentioned a reduction in the Budget Line Item of about \$20M. She asked how those funds would have gotten appropriated in the CIP Budget overall.

March 13, 2014

Mr. Flagg said for clarification the \$20M was over a 15 year horizon as opposed to just the 5-year horizon. But it was actually anticipated revenues from some sort of revenue enhancement, i.e. a tax increase, which did not occur, so they never landed as real dollars. During the same period they were considering revenue alternatives, special taxing districts, stormwater, utilities things of that nature, so essentially they never had to worry about collecting those dollars.

Mr. Whittaker thanked Mr. Flagg and his department for doing such a wonderful job and have worked hard to get to this point of extending the life of the trucks and saving the County money.

Ms. Winborne thanked Mr. Flagg.

Mr. Padgett said he had a question for Fire/EMS. In the past the ambulance service was free and few years back we changed that to charge people who had insurance to cover it. He asked what happens if someone does not have insurance.

Mr. Buchanan replied if someone does not have insurance they will receive a bill. If someone cannot pay the bill they have a hardship program as an option for them. They also have a subscription program where if someone feels they have a person that will go to the hospital repetitively they can subscribe to that and it is a one-time fee and covers all their trips to the hospital for the year.

Mr. Padgett asked if they track people to see if they have insurance or not.

Mr. Buchanan replied they have a vender that handles all of the actual billing and they also collect insurance information as part of their reporting and submit it to the vender and they do all the work.

Mr. Padgett asked if the revenues from that are just to off-set their expenses.

Mr. Buchanan answered yes sir, and that just goes back to the budget.

Ms. Winborne asked about the \$300K for a top coat application on the garage floor. She asked how many bays are there.

March 13, 2014

Mr. Fletcher answered there are approximately 22. The total building is 41,000 square feet. Approximately 25,000 square feet is service bay shop concrete floors. They were treated with a coating when they were new and they renewed it again to protect them because they are heavily used.

Mr. Whittaker asked if they have looked at the use of compressed natural gas for the new school buses.

Mr. Fletcher answered they have done some basic research into that. Based on the size of their fleet right now, with the dollars and the cost of natural gas verses what their conventional diesel fuel would be it does not seem the payback would be there at this point. But it is something that they are continuing to look at. He said next month there is a national gas conference at the convention center in Richmond that he will be attending.

Ms. Winborne asked Mr. Sager about the skate board park he talked about last year.

Mr. Greg Sager, Director of Parks and Recreation, replied that the \$50K in this current year's FY14 budget FY14 they had used all but approximately \$2,000. He said at Pole Green they have added some very brightly colored skate ramps, some fencing, and replaced portions that needed to be moved out of there. He said they just have some signage left to put in and that will complete the FY14 project.

Ms. Winborne asked if the budget contains lighting for athletic field number 1.

Mr. Sager replied they do not have any projects in the FY15 – FY19 proposed CIP right now. He said what he thought she saw was the reflection of a potential enhanced lighting at Courthouse Park and the effects that it might have on our budget if they have to pay for additional electrical for utilities. There are no projects right now in the 5-year plan.

Mrs. Peace asked if he has a desire to do some projects.

March 13, 2014

Mr. Sager replied he knew there are limited resources out there and they have tried to prioritize the projects that they need to have done. So, the budget before them is something his department is on-board with as well everybody else.

Mrs. Peace asked if there are savings in other categories if there is an opportunity in the current Fiscal year to reallocate some funds to Parks and Recreation.

Mrs. Wright replied that if there are savings in those other projects they will probably come back and that would be part of the year end return, which then can be used in the next year's budget. They generally do not reallocate it to a project that was otherwise not vetted through the complete process as they would not create a project mid-year without Board approval. She clarified that there is a Courthouse lighting project that does have funding in FY18 and FY19 that is in the proposed CIP.

Mr. Whittaker said so there is no money being spent on Parks and Rec for the next couple of years.

Mrs. Wright confirmed none other than this \$140K in athletic field lighting.

Ms. Winborne said Mr. Buzzelli, Facilities Director and Ms. Lynn Bragga, Director of Budget Development and Financial Reporting for the schools were present. She explained that she and Mr. Leadbetter had met with Mr. Myers and a couple of school board members and then again with staff before this meeting. She thanked all of them for being so cooperative in getting information and being prepared for tonight. She asked if either of them wished to make any general comments.

Mr. Ed Buzzelli, Director of Operations introduced Ms. Lynn Bragga, Budget Director and said they both started their jobs at the same time. He did not have any general comments to make but advised he was present to answer any questions about any of the projects in the Capital Plan and Ms. Bragga can answer questions related to the funding sources for those projects.

Ms. Winborne asked what they do with the old buses.

March 13, 2014

Mr. Buzzelli replied he believed the useful age of a bus in Hanover County is 15 years and after that it either goes into a lighter duty or goes into surplus to another county that may not have the funding sources for buses or it gets sold.

Ms. Winborne said the renovations that are in here and the CIP program looks a little different from last year and she understood from Mr. Myers they changed their accounting system.

Mr. Buzzelli stated that the CIP is a lot different than it was last year. There are no major school renovations in the 5-year plan. And for clarification a major renovation is when you take a school and basically do all of the upgrades necessary to take a 50 or 60 year old building and add 30 to 50 years of useful life to it. Most of that work is infrastructure related such as electrical, plumbing, sewage and also part of the renovation is to bring old classrooms up to current standards for size and technology. Those are very expensive. Those renovations have been deferred to years 6-10 of the Plan and right now the CIP is mainly for facility improvements on a smaller scale to continue to operate the schools as is and maintenance. It is a prudent idea for the next 5-years based on the overall general condition of the schools in Hanover County.

Ms. Winborne asked if they have a facilities assessment between last year and this year.

Mr. Buzzelli answered they did. He explained the way they did that is they always get input from Principals regarding their needs for their school and then he and members of his staff go to each of the facilities and look at all of the major components such as roofs, heating & AC systems, kitchens, every piece incorporated in a school and sort of give it a rating and assess each of those as to whether it needs to be replaced in the next 1-5 years or if it can go 6-10 years, or if it can go further into the future. He said they do that for every category at every school and that is how they came up with this year's CIP with a general idea of how much money might be available and then prioritize the most critical needs first at each school.

March 13, 2014

Mrs. Peace questioned whether there are any schools that are near the end of their age life or might need to be replaced.

Mr. Buzzelli believes that some of the most prestigious schools in Hanover County are also some of the oldest. Washington Henry, Battlefield Park and Henry Clay, there are challenges with those schools and then we have to make the decision on which ones would be better to renovate or build new because they are going to be costly either way. Right now the schools are still in functioning condition but are reaching a critical point to make that decision.

Mrs. Peace asked if those discussion on which schools to renovate or rebuild were happening now.

Mr. Buzzelli replied there is no funding to consider doing anything now. The planning for that has taken place previously because it was in the Plan before, so there has been some work done on what it could potentially look like and what the renovation would take place. The first step would be to hire an architect to get a real idea of cost. And that would not probably take place any time in the next 5-years and he did not believe it is a need for the next 5-years.

There was general discussion regarding renovating and rebuilding schools on the same sites.

There being no further questions from the Planning Commission, the Chairman thanked everyone for coming to the meeting. At that time most of the department representatives left.

Public Utilities

Mr. Gary Craft, Deputy Director of Public Utilities, presented the FY2015-FY2019 Capital Improvements Plan.

The FY15 budget year there are 18 entries; approximately \$9M total.

March 13, 2014

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN FY15

	NO. PROJECTS	CAPACITY ENHANCEMENTS	REHABILITATION & RENEWAL
WATER	3	\$1,672,000	
WASTEWATER	1	\$1,750,000	
WATER	5		\$3,888,991
WASTEWATER	8		\$1,095,000
OTHER	1		\$311,000
TOTAL	18	\$3,422,000	\$5,294,991

This is a list of some of the projects; 6 = pipe line projects; 5 = facility projects; 1 = is our annual joint Capital Cost Payment made to the City of Richmond. We are obligated by contract to pay a pro-rated share of the Capital Improvements that the City undertakes for facilities that help treat the water and pump the water and store the water from the City to Hanover County.

Ms. Winborne said he had explained that to them last year. She thought it is very intriguing.

Mr. Craft said yes he did talk about this last year. There is a little bit of a spike there around FY17 but they feel like once they get through this 5-year CIP those numbers will come down and they will be able to spend more of our Capital Improvement money on infrastructure within the County.

WATER

	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19
Air Park WST & WPS - Upgrade				\$34,000	\$290,000
Ashcake Road/Long Road WL					\$282,000
Brandy Creek Drive WL	\$129,000				
Cedar Lane WL - Phase 1		\$208,000		\$826,000	
Cedar Lane WL - Phase 2				\$359,000	
Chamberlayne Road WL	\$975,000				
Courthouse System - Improvements			\$168,000		
Dianne Ridge - Treatment			\$39,000	\$102,000	
Elmont WST & Pump Station	\$697,000		\$2,955,000		
Georgetown - Wellhouse Rehab		\$85,000			
Hanover-Richmond Contract-Joint Capital Cost	\$3,264,991	\$6,422,948	\$6,881,717	\$5,020,644	\$1,262,086

March 13, 2014

1-95 Crossing at Long Road WL				\$141,000	
-------------------------------	--	--	--	-----------	--

Water projects in these slide shows 5 water line projects and 5 facility improvement projects and these are rehab renewal projects for the 5 years.

WATER

	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19
Lockwood WPS – Improvements					\$391,000
Meadowbridge Road WL					\$172,000
New Ashcake Road WL		\$322,000		\$1,334,000	
Doswell WTP – Powder Activated Carbon Feed System			\$354,000		
Quarles Road Facility - Rehabilitation	\$162,000				
Rt. 360 at Bell Creek Road WL (VDOT)	\$183,000				
Sliding Hill Road & Ashcake Road WL					\$310,000
Waterline Replacement		\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000
Water Tank Rehabilitation	\$150,000	\$350,000	\$117,000	\$295,000	\$500,000
Water Treatment Plant Rehab.		\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000

For the wastewater projects, for 5 years there are 2 pipeline projects and 9 facility projects shown. A lot of pump station improvements, enhancements, rehab and renewal at the pump stations as well as some of our treatment plants.

WASTEWATER

	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19
Air Park WWPS – Generator Replacement			\$73,000		
Ashland Sewerline Rehab. Area 2				\$850,000	
Ashland Sewerline Rehab. Area 3		\$202,000			
Ashland WWTP – Sludge Press Rehabilitation	\$75,000				
Ashland WWTP – Two Generator & Fuel Tank					\$700,000

March 13, 2014

Replacement					
Ashland WWTP – Nutrient Improvements Phase 2					\$165,000
Ashland WWTP – Polymer Control Panel				\$160,000	
Ashland WWTP – Ultraviolet Disinfection System Replacement	\$54,000	\$458,000			
Beaverdam Creek WWTP - Divider Gate Replacement		\$93,000			
Beaverdam Creek WWPS - Grinder Replacement					\$221,000
Beaverdam Creek, WWPS Pump Control Panel Replacement				\$200,000	

There is one pipeline project on this slide, and 12 facility projects.

WASTEWATER

	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19
Best Products WWPS					\$161,000
Courthouse WWTP Aeration Tank Rehab	\$160,000				
Courthouse WWTP Ultraviolet Disinfection System Replacement					\$120,000
Doswell WWTP Aeration Blowers Replacement					\$210,000
Doswell WWTP Clarifier Weir & Baffle Replacement		\$20,000	\$189,000		
Doswell WWTP Digester Blowers & Enclosures Replacement				\$126,000	
Doswell WWTP – Equalization Tank Rehab			\$510,000		
Doswell WWTP – Magnesium Hydroxide Tank Replacement					\$175,000
Doswell WWTP – Ultraviolet Disinfection System Replacement	\$340,000				
Hanover Courthouse WWPS – Pump Replacement			\$119,000		
Hardees WWPS – Pumps Replacement	\$59,000				

March 13, 2014

LeReve Manor WWPS – Rehab	\$85,000				
Mechanicsville Sewer Rehab – Area 1					\$100,000

This is the final wastewater slide, one pipeline project on this slide and 9 facility projects.

Facility upgrades, modifications, rehabilitation and replacement.

WASTEWATER

	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19
Mechumps Creek WWPS Replacement					\$150,000
Pamunkey Reg. Jail WWPS Pumps & Screen Replacement				\$282,000	
Pump Station #5 WWPS - Rehab					\$763,000
Quarles Road WWPS – Pumps Replacement	\$180,000				
Shelton Pointe WWPS - Upgrade				\$85,000	\$348,000
Sneed Street WWPS – Pumps Replacement		\$77,000			
Stoney Run Creek Sanitary Sewer Interceptor – Phase 6	\$1,750,000				
Totopotomoy WWTP - Influent Step Screen #2 Addition			\$250,000		
Totopotomoy WWTP – Ultraviolet Disinfection Control Panel Replacement	\$142,000				
Wastewater WWPS – Upgrade Control Panels to 27 Stations		\$540,000			

Mr. Craft said for miscellaneous projects they are buying 3 pieces of equipment and there is some money in the out years for vehicle replacement, and in FY19 they have customer information and asset management system upgrades and replacements. Think that may be part of what was discussed earlier with Mr. Nelson as far as Asset Management Systems. The total for the 5 years is \$47.1M.

March 13, 2014

MISCELLANEOUS

	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19
Customer Information & Asset Management Systems Upgrades and Replacements					\$500,000
New Vacuum Excavator	\$81,000				
New Backhoe	\$90,000				
Diesel Powered Potable Pump	\$140,000				
Vehicle Replacement		\$65,000		\$290,000	\$322,000
TOTAL:	\$8,716,991	\$8,992,948	\$11,805,717	\$10,254,644	\$7,292,086

Mr. Craft said here is a slide showing capacity enhancement projects over the next 5 years. He reviewed those areas.

Ms. Winborne said there are several projects that concern the Town of Ashland, she asked twenty plus years ago when the Town sold the County the system if the Town contributes anything currently toward the maintenance and upkeep of these facilities in the Town.

Mr. Craft answered no ma'am. They are the County's to operate and maintain.

Ms. Winborne asked in comparing last year to this year if they have a similar number of projects.

Mr. Craft replied they are heavier on the rehab renewal than they are on capacity and enhancement. Due to the economic downturn they have delayed a lot of what would have been waterline extensions and sanitary sewer extensions, and are focusing on the infrastructure in place.

Ms. Winborne stated that the schools are doing their facility assessments and asked if they are doing something similar.

Mr. Craft answered yes ma'am, and these projects are the result of on-going facility assessments.

Mrs. Peace asked if they look at zoning cases that have been approved by the Board when they are thinking about their Master Facilities Plan.

March 13, 2014

Mr. Craft answered no usually the zoning cases come after they have already put utilities in an area. So, the land that is under rezoning might be extending infrastructure particularly within the property itself. But the “backbone” is already laid to serve those properties that might come in for rezoning.

Mr. Maloney advised under previous Comprehensive Plans one of the growth management strategies the County employed was to phase growth within the Suburban Service Area (SSA). And they had defined phases where they expected utility extensions to occur in 5-year increments. The Board’s Policy while they had that phased plan was to not pre-zone property out of phase. So, if there was an area identified in the 2012 – 2017 phase the Utilities Master Plan in the CIP would recognize either an existing phase or a phase about to come in and there would typically be a project or projects to “put the straw” into that area. Then the development community would extend to the project. In the most recent plan, because of a lot of different factors, the decision was made to eliminate that planned phasing. So, as of right now the entire SSA is in phase. So, assuming it increases over the next several years there will be continued coordination with planning and utilities to begin to identify those growth corridors and areas to make sure that the infrastructure is in place to serve those but it is not going to be tied to a very distinct phased area that was present in the previous plans.

Mrs. Peace said he reminded her of the language change in the Comprehensive Plan about utility connection on the other side of the street.

Mr. Maloney stated under the current Plan there was a policy change. If for instance, using Rural Point Road because portions of the southern half of that road is within the SSA, under previous plans any extension of a water line to serve any property to the north which would be outside the SSA was precluded. Under the current Plan they have modified those policies to allow individual connections for individual properties.

March 13, 2014

Mr. Steve Herzog, Director of Public Utilities, advised they had a situation a few years ago when there was a severe drought and wells were going dry, they were running a water line in the street in front of a house that had a dry well and when they asked to connect we had to tell them they could not connect and that seemed like the most bureaucratic unfriendly thing we could do to our citizens. So, again the idea behind this was not to expand the SSA but if we have a water line in front of someone's house and they want to connect they would be allowed to do it. Years ago we used to allow that to occur but that was changed in the late 1990s or early 2000s so he said thank you for supporting that change because he did not want to be looking at that person with the dry well and telling them no they cannot connect because they are on the wrong side of the street.

Mrs. Peace thought this CIP budget seems not to anticipate a lot of additional connections or anything like that.

Mr. Herzog stated that is not a revenue source for them. They do not have a lot of connections like that. Again, he believed the way it was adopted is it takes both the concurrence of the Director of Planning to make sure they are in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, and the Director of Public Utilities to make sure that they are not creating a problem for the utility system. However, this is not a regular occurrence because most people who have a well want to stay on the well if when their well goes dry often times they would like to connect.

Ms. Winborne opened the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak. Seeing no one come forward, she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Winborne asked if any of the Commission members had any questions regarding the draft Resolution.

Mr. Padgett pointed out that regarding the draft resolution in the 4th "whereas" in the last line the word *advise* he believed should be *advice*.

March 13, 2014

Mr. Walter agreed.

Mr. Padgett asked Mr. Walter's opinion on exactly what is the Planning Commission's due diligence on the CIP is. The State says the Commission prepares this but he "thanked God" they really do not actually prepare it; however, it is up to the Commission as to whether or not to have a public hearing.

Mr. Walter advised that the State Code provides that every locality have a Capital Improvement Program. State Code does not require that every locality's Planning Commission be the reviewing agency. State Code basically recognizes that the Planning Commission has some inherent expertise in the fact that it reviews and makes recommendations on the Comprehensive Plan as well as individual zoning cases that comes before it. State Code only provides that our Planning Commission may prepare and revise annually the CIP. He said it is a little unrealistic to think that the Commission in whatever locality is going to be the creator of the CIP because just listening to the in depth presentations tonight the amount of knowledge that needs to go into it is probably beyond the ability of anybody without intensive staff support. What is before the Commission is a proposal that the County Administrator made to the Board of Supervisors and everyone understood when it was made that the Commission would be reviewing it. That's the historic nature that has worked here in Hanover County. The fact that State Code does not outline a specific procedure, but states that the Commission may have the direction of the governing body repair and prepare the CIP, in essence what the Board of Supervisors here in Hanover has said is they would like the Commission to do that and the Board asks that the County Administrator looks first at what is going to be presented for the Commission for its consideration.

Mr. Walter stated that he has been working with the Commission for approximately 12+ years and in the past there have been recommendations from the Commission to the Board of Supervisors

March 13, 2014

specifically on an issue that was discussed tonight and that is Parks and Recreation. There was a previous member of the Commission who every year would request that something be put in the resolution because that Commissioner was concerned that there were no funds for Parks and Recreation. And he felt that is an appropriate part of a Commission's recommendation. He said he was using that as example but that it could be any item that is in the CIP.

Mr. Maloney said with regard to due diligence as asked by Mr. Padgett from his perspective as Planning Director, he believed a valuable role and probably the most valuable role is to look at projects as they pertain to land use, growth, development, and infrastructure matters. He said the map on the screen before them is an excellent example. He pointed out the location of individual projects, which are confined within the SSA. He said there is a nexus between their charge to advise the Board on matters related to land use, and those facilities necessary to support that Plan. In looking at the Comprehensive Plan there are expensive items, which are really related to County operations and not to growth and development. Whether there is a half percent growth rate or 3% growth rate our aging technology systems are going to need replacement, those are expensive items and they are not dependent upon how or where the County is growing. There will not be any language in the Comprehensive Plan that talks about the need for future information technology system upgrades. There is language in terms of park needs, library needs, road needs and so forth.

Mr. Maloney advised as he discussed with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman earlier this week in reviewing the agenda, the Commission may want to consider revising this process to focus specifically on those capital projects that are related to land use, growth, development, whether they be system upgrades and renovations or whether they be new facilities or new sewer/water line connections but those are the components of the CIP that influence and are influenced by growth within the County. He thought in high levels similar to some of the questions that were raised that

March 13, 2014

there appears to be reasonableness between the cost and scope of the project. That sort of question certainly is within the purview of the Commission. He said he would be hesitant to say the Commission should say the estimates they are given should be lower because what the Commission thinks the cost should be is irrelevant because the costs are the costs and none of us have the technical expertise to really second guess that. At the same time he believes it would be hard for the Commission to say they want to add \$1M for a future regional park in the eastern part of the County because we do not know how that \$1M relates to the cost of that park. The appropriate recommendation from the Commission would be the Commission believes the Board should add a new regional park into the CIP for the succeeding 5-years. And let the budget and finance folks figure out what the funding source could be for that and how that could be incorporated into the budget. So, there is a fine line between reviewing the CIP in terms of hard cost, and in just reasonableness and relating those projects back to the Comprehensive Plan and making sure they are commensurate with planned growth and growth trends in our land use policy.

Mr. Maloney reiterated if the Commission is looking at ways of improving this process and refining the process he believed that identifying those projects related back to the Comprehensive Plan would be a good place to start.

Mr. Padgett said for an example they asked some questions tonight about actual verses last year and that to him was not within the purview of the Commission even though it might be of interest because that is an operational matter for the County and under the control of the Board and the Administrator. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Whittaker left at 8:52 p.m.

Mr. Whittaker returned at 8:54 p.m.

March 13, 2014

Mr. Maloney advised he did not want to comment on whether it is under the purview of the Commission or not but his response would be is if Hanover County has a number of financial controls in place but they do have as Mrs. Wright suggested a re-appropriation process at the end of the year. So, if it is a Comprehensive Plan update and consultant services have been utilized, if that project is carried from one fiscal year to another, as a department head he has to submit a request to re-appropriate those funds at the end of the fiscal year. He gave the following example. If \$50K is appropriated for a consultant study and by the end of fiscal year, \$25K has been spent and it is expected that sometime by the middle of FY15 the remaining \$25K will be spent there is a process for the money to be re-appropriated into the following year. But it is not going to appear in his operational budget, if it is a capital project it is not going to appear in the subsequent CIP because those funds were already appropriated. For new funds there is a process the finance folks use to reconcile the records to make sure expenditures and revenues balance with what was budgeted. The annual audit makes sure that the funds were used according to their intended purpose. So, there are many financial controls to make sure funds are not being misused.

There was general conversation regarding the new Courthouse not being in this year's CIP.

Mr. Padgett said it sounded like to him that the 4 schools that were in the CIP last year could probably use some money in this next 5-years "but yet it's not there." He thought the Commission should request that money be appropriated to these schools.

Ms. Winborne advised that she had at least 3 meeting with the schools and Mr. Leadbetter was there for 2 of them, and she is perfectly comfortable with their explanation of how they are approaching the maintenance of those older buildings. And regarding the \$15M that was allotted for each school she understood it was more of "place saver" for money just to let everyone know something is coming in the future. It was not based on facility's assessment other than they are old and

March 13, 2014

they are going to need something. So, the reason they are not in the CIP as Mr. Buzzelli said is in 5-7 years they will have a big committee and will be looking at whether to renovate or rebuild. That was the question we raised last year with Mr. Carper. What they gave us they consider appropriated dollars and those projects will be done. And that is why it looks different than it did last year.

Mrs. Peace stated that she liked Mr. Padgett's idea and she certainly believes the schools conversation is extremely complex. She questioned whether there was an opportunity to make a recommendation particularly for Washington Henry and some of the other schools that have some serious capital needs of pre-development funds or some opportunity to let the Board know with declining school enrollment how can we make that a priority to renovate the oldest facilities without stepping on anyone's toes.

Ms. Winborne said the school representatives would say if they were still here tonight that they have just done a facilities extensive assessment and this CIP reflects that. She encouraged the Commission not to get in the middle of the schools business without the benefit of the school folks being present because she talked directly with them and she does believe they have it under control. They have done a thorough assessment and have a plan for how they are going to get to the decision of either total renovation or rebuilding. She did like the idea of suggesting something for Mr. Sager.

Mr. Padgett asked Mr. Maloney and Mr. Walter if it was their opinion that the Commission has done their "due diligence" regarding the CIP.

Mr. Maloney advised from his perspective he absolutely believes they have done their due diligence. And with that he said he was not trying to interfere with the Commission decision regarding a park facility, but as of right now the budget is balanced and if the Commission does recommend allocating funds for a park project, it would mean either a change in the revenue structure or money

March 13, 2014

being pulled from another project. And he cautioned the Commission not to add a project to the CIP unless they have identified a project that they do not think deserves the same priority.

There was general discussion regarding debt issuance, lines of credit and cash reserves.

Mrs. Peace asked if it would be appropriate just to express their support for Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Walter stated that the Commission could potentially add as part of the resolution to indicate that the Planning Commission believes that additional funds for future years should be considered for Parks and Recreation and request that the Board direct staff for next year to include that. Because every year the staff goes through the process and as Mrs. Wright indicated earlier money would have to be moved from another project. But if the Board after receiving the Commission's recommendation considers it and agree that it may be appropriate to put some money in for Parks than some other project maybe moving another project for another year or something like that, that would be a useful way for the Commission to communicate their desire to the Board. However, not to suggest a specific amount, or date but basically documenting the Commission's concerns and ask that in the future the Board consider that the CIP include projects for Parks and Recreation.

Ms. Winborne asked Mrs. Iverson if she had any thoughts on requesting funds for Parks and Recreation.

Mrs. Iverson replied that she felt the draft resolution should be left as it is.

Mr. Bailey thought if Parks and Recreation wanted money he should have asked for it.

Mrs. Iverson agreed.

Ms. Winborne asked if he knew that Mr. Sager did not ask for any funds.

Mr. Bailey answered no but they have to work with what is being presented to them.

Mrs. Wright has already talked about how hard it would be to go back if we want to allocate money to

March 13, 2014

redo the budget, and “I fully understand what she is saying.” And he did not think it was their position after the fact to be going back and trying to put money into the Plan.

Mr. Whittaker said he fully understood the huge task for the Finance Department and putting the budget together; however, he would like to make a recommendation to the Board that Parks and Recreation get some funds in the future.

Mr. Bailey stated he did not believe any of the Commission members would object to that.

Mr. Whittaker said there are a lot of kids in the County and the parks themselves along with the amenities in the parks get worn out. He believed Parks and Recreation should have some funds available.

Mr. Maloney advised that in looking at the Community Facilities Plan starting in 2012 based on population service levels, excess capacity for what is classified as district or Regional Park, Hanover is slightly deficient in Community Parks and has a greater need in Neighborhood Parks. But our Plan says the County does not administer Neighborhood Parks, and so that is left up to individual developments. By the end of 2017, the Plan suggests that the County will be deficient by 61 acres for a Community Park. So, if the Commission were to make a recommendation with regard to parks, the recommendation may be simply that you recommend the Board in the next succeeding years consider providing Parks and Recreation Capital Funds to increase the number of Community Parks within the County in accordance with the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Winborne asked if everybody agreed with that language.

The Commission was in agreement.

Mr. Maloney added that is where the Capital Project is balanced against the Facilities Plan.

Mrs. Wright said she wished to clarify something. There are two ways they look at future years. Of course, there is adoption in the current CIP in the out years, and then there is to be a part of

March 13, 2014

the next year's development of the CIP, the FY16-FY20, and that is what they need to be referencing specifically because the other piece of this is the Board cannot approve a budget that is higher than what they have advertised.

Ms. Winborne stated they were talking about the next cycle.

Mrs. Wright said okay so they need to make sure that date is mentioned. She said regarding Mr. Whittaker's comments about Parks and Recreation needing funds because things get worn out she said to keep in mind that the CIP is only one component of the Budget and it has a very specific threshold. One of which is that the unit cost for something has to be \$50,000 or more with the exception of something like a construction project. Obviously, every individual component of a building is not going to be \$50K but if it is a construction project that is different. Therefore, Parks and Rec. does have many other repair maintenance components to their budget, and other things. It is called Service Level Plan (SLP) so what you see is not all the money they have to work with other than postage and copiers.

Ms. Winborne said they understood. She said what Mr. Maloney has highlighted for them is in their Comprehensive Plan using the formula there will be deficiencies in the future and through our resolution in the out years this is "space saver" money to remind the Board that our CIP has a formula that says there will be deficiencies.

Mr. Maloney said yes. But when he said in the future years, he should have said any future budget cycle, which would also reflect future years. Then ultimately this goes back to the service level, and the Board can accept the Commission's recommendation or not but that goes back to that political decision on service level. What is that service level and is the deficiency as projected in the Comprehensive plan, and is the benefit worth the cost to correct that deficiency.

March 13, 2014

Ms. Winborne said the Board will make that decision. But the Commission can certainly remind them that that's out there in the CIP. She asked Mr. Walter where the recommendation would be inserted in the resolution.

Mr. Walter noted that obviously someone would need to make a motion and assuming the motion would be to adopt the resolution with the aforementioned amendment he suggested adding it between the first and second "resolved" paragraphs reading as: "Be it further resolved that the Planning Commission recommends that the Board of Supervisors directs staff in the preparation of the FY2016 – FY2020 Capital Improvement Program to consider projects that would result in the creation of a Community Park as outlined in the Community Facilities Plan or something substantially similar to that. He believed that will address the concerns that Mrs. Wright raised as well as well as provide the time that Mr. Maloney raised.

Ms. Winborne added and to change the typo in the 4th paragraph the word *advise* to *advice*.

Mr. Padgett made the **MOTION** that they adopt the Resolution with the addition of the section that was just discussed and the change of the word *advise* to *advice* and leave the actual wording to Mr. Walter.

Mr. Whittaker **SECONDED**.

Ms. Winborne asked Mrs. Iverson if she was comfortable with the motion.

Mrs. Iverson replied yes.

The Planning Commission voted **UNANIMOUSLY TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION FOR THE FIVE YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM FY 2015 THROUGH FY 2019, SUBJECT TO THE MODIFICATION FOR THE INCLUSION OF FUNDING FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMMUNITY PARK.**

March 13, 2014

**RESOLUTION
FIVE YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM
FY 2015 THROUGH FY 2019**

WHEREAS, the Hanover County Planning Commission is charged by State Law and County Ordinance with responsibility for advising the Board of Supervisors on matters dealing with growth and development of the County; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors adopted a Comprehensive Plan Update on September 11, 2013, guiding the role of development in the County and the provision of public utilities; and

WHEREAS, on April 10, 2013, the Board of Supervisors adopted a Five Year Capital Improvements Program for FY 2014 through 2018, to provide a guide for implementing County development policies; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with State Law, a Capital Improvements Program document for FY 2015 through FY 2019, has been drafted by the County Administration and has been presented to the Planning Commission for its consideration and advice; and

WHEREAS, the Hanover County Planning Commission has considered the recommended Capital Improvements Program, at a public hearing held on March 13, 2014;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Commission of Hanover County that the FY 2015 through FY 2019, Capital Improvements Program, as proposed by the County Administrator, is recommended to the Hanover County Board of Supervisors.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Planning Commission recommends that the Board of Supervisors direct staff to consider inclusion of funding for the construction of a community park, as classified in the Utilities and Community Facilities section of the Comprehensive Plan, as part of the preparation of the Five Year Capital Improvements Program for FY 2016 through FY 2020.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Secretary shall transmit this resolution to the Board of Supervisors and the County Administrator along with a copy of the minutes the Commission meeting.

The vote was as follows:

Mr. Bailey	Aye
Mrs. Iverson	Aye
Mr. Leadbetter	Absent
Mr. Padgett	Aye
Mrs. Peace	Aye
Mr. Whittaker	Aye
Ms. Winborne	Aye

March 13, 2014

The motion carried.

ADJOURNED

There being no further business Madam Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:23 p.m.

The next meeting is Thursday, March 20, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.