

POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

June 10, 2009

6:00 p.m.

County Complex, Building A

A. Roll Call

Present

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

Others Present

Ms. Tammy Rosario, Principal Planner
Ms. Leanne Reidenbach, Senior Planner
Mr. Brian Elmore, Development Management Assistant

Mr. Chris Henderson called the meeting to order at 6:05pm.

B. Minutes – May 11, 2009

Ms. Kratter submitted a written list of corrections to the minutes.

Mr. Krapf moved for adoption of the minutes as amended, with a second from Mr. Fraley.

The minutes were approved as amended (4-0; Yes: Fraley, Henderson, Kratter, Krapf; Absent: Peck).

C. Old Business

1. Capital Improvements Program (CIP)

The Policy Committee discussed the language and wording of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) ranking criteria.

Ms. Deborah Kratter stated that the Committee wants to review projects with a total \$50,000 project cost.

Ms. Leanne Reidenbach noted that this was a different procedure than past years and clarified that the Committee would then review projects whose request in a given year may only be \$10,000, but the total project over all years funding was requested was in excess of \$50,000. She then stated that Financial Management Services had reviewed the document and suggested that the Committee include language on why they wanted to omit capital maintenance projects.

Mr. Chris Henderson stated the criteria should be written as an instruction manual for future Planning Commission members. He said the rationale for excluding maintenance should be included.

Ms. Reidenbach stated the Committee will still receive CIP maintenance requests, but will not be ranking those projects. She said the Committee's non-maintenance rationale extended from departments knowing when their equipment and facilities need replacement.

Mr. Jack Fraley stated he hoped maintenance would switch to a predictive system, supported by new software. He said the Committee does not add value to maintenance decisions. The Committee opted to omit any language on rationale for excluding ranking of maintenance projects.

Ms. Reidenbach stated new CIP projects would only be ranked biannually. She said in the off years, only exception projects would be ranked. If projects are submitted during exception years, they can be ranked and inserted into the existing list of priorities. Year-one projects would not be re-ranked during the off-years. Oftentimes during rankings, the Committee will not have a funding cap figure.

The Committee discussed the language of the individual ranking criteria.

Mr. Fraley stated negative examples should not be included in the weightings, such as projects that would not apply to each factor.

In a voice vote, the Committee approved including single project examples in the rankings text (3-2; Yes: Henderson, Kratter, Peck; No: Krapf, Fraley).

Mr. Peck stated he was wary of including surveys where the respondents are unaware of budget considerations, consist of a particular user group, or are not scientific.

Ms. Kratter stated the Committee could determine the relevance of each survey.

Mr. Peck stated even if new jobs were not local, the County will still benefit from the additional tax-base. He said over time, commuting professionals would relocate to the County.

Mr. Peck stated County decisions to locate schools and parks outside of the Primary Service Area (PSA) undermine Committee policies. He said that once utilities for public facilities are installed, other development will follow the water lines. CIP proposals that would expand the PSA should include costs of alternative water systems.

Ms. Reidenbach stated that Financial Management Services asked the Policy Committee to give additional consideration to both projects which have more positive impacts on the operating budget. For example, a new facility will certainly add to operating expenses, but consideration should be given to those projects that attempt to limit those impacts. This would be visible in life-cycle costs.

Mr. Peck stated lower County facility life-cycle costs ultimately affect the tax rate.

Mr. Fraley stated several of the weightings seemed too small. He said the "Time and Location" criteria could be consolidated into other categories.

Ms. Reidenbach stated the Committee had an additional 10% in weightings to allocate as the final criteria provided for an override rather than any weighting.

Mr. Peck stated "Time and Location" should be included for time-sensitive major infrastructure.

Mr. Henderson stated Ironbound Square was a County development with public benefits and a very specific time horizon.

Mr. Fraley stated the "Special Consideration" should not have a percentage, although the Committee would use some subjectivity.

Mr. Henderson stated the "Special Consideration" criteria should elevate projects to the top of the list. He said he would favor allocating the additional 10% to "Economic Development."

Ms. Kratter stated that not all mandates would qualify under "Special Consideration." She supported allocating the additional 10% to "Economic Development."

Mr. Rich Krapf proposed allocating an additional 5% to both "Economic Development" and "Health and Safety."

Mr. Peck stated he favored allocating the additional 10% to "Economic Development," but could also support adding the 10% to increase the "Operating Budget" criteria or splitting it and giving 5% to each.

Ms. Kratter changed her recommendations to 15% each for "Economic Development" and "Health and Safety." She stated the much heavier weightings for "Quality of Life" and "Health and Safety" allow the Committee to better differentiate projects.

Mr. Fraley changed his recommendations to 15% each for "Economic Development" and "Health and Safety."

Ms. Reidenbach noted that she would make the requested changes and send the document to the Committee.

Ms. Kratter offered to contact Mr. Joe Poole and Mr. George Billups to discuss the criteria in advance of the next Planning Commission meeting.

2. Capital Improvements Program Timeline

Ms. Reidenbach presented the proposed timeline for the FY11 CIP process.

The Committee agreed that the full Planning Commission should vote on the revised ranking criteria at the July 1 meeting and forward the timeline and criteria to the Board of Supervisors as a reading file item for the July 14 meeting.

Mr. Fraley stated the memorandum to the Board should be for their information as a follow-up to the joint work session earlier this year. It should include information on reviewing other localities' methods and an indication of how much work went into developing the criteria.

3. Adjournment

Mr. Henderson moved to adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

7. C. Henderson
Chris Henderson, Chair of the Policy Committee