

POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

July 9, 2008

7:00 p.m.

County Complex, Building A Large Conference Room

A. Roll Call

PRESENT:

Mr. Reese Peck, Chair
Mr. Jack Fraley
Mr. Chris Henderson
Mr. Rich Krapf

ABSENT:

Mr. George Billups

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ms. Kate Sipes, Senior Planner
Ms. Leanne Reidenbach, Senior Planner
Mr. John McDonald, Manager of FMS
Mr. David Allen, Senior Budget Analyst
Mr. Brian Elmore, DMA

B. Minutes

Mr. Peck opened the meeting at 7:00pm.

Mr. Henderson motioned for approval of the minutes.

Mr. Krapf seconded the approval of the minutes.

The minutes were adopted unanimously.

C. Old Business

Ms. Sipes handed out a packet on transportation funding as requested at a previous Committee meeting. She stated the packet dealt with the funding process more than actual numbers.

Mr. Henderson handed out a second draft of the CIP proposal for the Board for review and discussion. The proposal is to more closely align the CIP with the Comp Plan. Mr. Henderson added 'increased transparency' to the proposal's benefits.

The Policy Committee discussed the language, wording and layout of the proposal's second draft.

Mr. Peck stated Mr. Billups had discussed with him establishing guidelines and triggers in the Comprehensive Plan for existing projects before taking on new projects.

Mr. Fraley repeatedly emphasized the need for word specificity and positive phrasing in the CIP proposal.

Mr. McDonald stated some departments enter the CIP process without a financing plan or sense of priority. He asked if the Policy Committee would like departments to present specific projects, already rated by the department against other projects. He also stated that staff could present a project list that had already been vetted by County Administration. Finally, he clarified that when the Board looks at the 5 year budget, including the CIP, a funding plan is also provided. Mr. Peck stated the Policy Committee needed big picture information for the CIP, such as new projects, new priorities, and funding. He said priorities can be packaged to the Board in order for them to make more informed decisions. He said the CIP could be used to manage public expectations and gain public input.

Ms. Sipes asked about the \$50,000 cut off for CIP projects and Mr. McDonald noted that it was an arbitrary number that could be changed.

Mr. Fraley stated the Policy Committee could tell the various departments not to present CIP wish lists. He said in the private sector, sometimes capital funds are distributed to various departments for them to spend as they choose.

Ms. Reidenbach asked if departments would be gathering their CIP projects a year before the rest of the County budget is determined. Ms. Reidenbach suggested the CIP process be bi-annual and the Committee concurred.

Mr. Henderson stated the CIP should include both the source and use of funds.

Mr. Fraley and Mr. McDonald discussed the status of JCSA funding and noted that the State delegated different powers and authority to the utilities. He said County money could be used to support JCSA but not the reverse.

Mr. McDonald asked how much detail the Comp Plan would give on public facilities standards.

Mr. Henderson stated the Comp Plan must be more specific to align with the CIP. He said if a proposed CIP project was not in the Comp Plan, it could need a Comp Plan amendment. He said the Comp Plan must have as much detail as possible.

Ms. Sipes stated it could take several years to increase the Comp Plan's level of specificity. She asked if capital maintenance projects, such as a \$3 million school roof, would be included in the proposal for the Board.

Mr. Henderson stated capital maintenance would be included but not necessarily ranked by the Policy Committee.

Mr. McDonald stated some departments have regular replacement schedules for their capital equipment.

Mr. Peck stated that one strength of the new proposed CIP would be eliminating the peaks and valleys from yearly budgets.

Mr. Fraley discussed the presentation of the CIP proposal at the joint Planning Commission/Board work session. He said the proposal was not currently on the work session agenda and that no date for the work session had been set. He said that once the final draft is done, he will contact Chairman Goodson to discuss the best way to move forward. He said the final draft will be discussed before the entire Planning Commission, probably in August.

Ms. Reidenbach asked if the Policy Committee would meet in August, noting the second Wednesday had a conflict with the scheduled Community Conversation. Mr. Peck indicated the Community Conversation was important and there would be no Policy Committee in August.

Mr. Peck stated he wanted to address the Ordinance relating to the CCRC and density issues.

D. New Business

Mr. Peck mentioned that he would like additional information about the CCRC case, amendments to the R-4 ordinance, and clarification for the calculation of densities for future projects.

Mr. Fraley said that based on his talks with the Assistant County Attorney, the County cannot have a moratorium on new construction on News Road. He said development can be paused if tied to the Comp Plan or can have voluntary pauses/deferrals if linked to the completion of an area study.

Mr. Krapf mentioned a Virginia Supreme Court case that stated counties can have development moratoriums based on specific population triggers.

Mr. Henderson and Mr. Fraley discussed the challenges involved with developing the rest of the News Road corridor including that it's almost at two-lane road capacity.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Peck moved to adjourn.

Mr. Fraley seconded.

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.



Reese Peck, Chairman