

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD A WORK SESSION ON THE 8th DAY OF OCTOBER, IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND TWO OF OUR LORD IN THE COURTROOM OF THE OLD COURTHOUSE IN NEW KENT, VIRGINIA, AT 3:00 P.M.

IN RE: ROLL CALL

Julian T. Lipscomb	Present
Rebecca M. Ringley	Present
James H. Burrell	Absent (arrived at 3:40 p.m.)
Dean E. Raynes	Absent (arrived at 3:05 p.m.)
W. R. "Ray" Davis, Jr.	Present

Chairman Davis opened the meeting.

IN RE: SIX YEAR PLAN

R. E. Prezioso, Resident Engineer from VDOT, presented the proposed six-year plan and revenue projections. He reviewed the priorities from FY 2001/2002 (eleven projects, two of which have been completed), and the four priorities for FY 2002/2003, which consists of projects on Terminal Road, Stage Road and Mt. Pleasant Road, as well as monies for an undesignated project. For the first priority project, Terminal Road, funding of \$438,246, should be complete in two years, and advertising is expected in 2006. Priority two consists paving a portion of the unpaved section of Stage Road at a projected cost of \$1,652,000. The third project on the priority list is to pave another mile of the unpaved part of Mt. Pleasant Road at a projected cost of \$1,370,000. He reported additional Regular Road Funds of \$1,173,000 and Unpaved Road Funds of \$190,750 which will be available in the last two years of the plan. Regular Road Funds may be used on unpaved roads, but Unpaved Road Funds may not be used on paved roads. The Board can decide to use these funds to fund development of some projects.

Mr. Prezioso proposed that the projects to be dropped from the priority list were Old Telegraph Road, Watkins Road, Henpeck Road (2 sections), Higgins Road, and a different section of Stage Road. Traffic counts were reviewed on some of the roads that had been removed. There was concern that Henpeck Road, which has a large traffic count (1100 vehicles), was dropped from the priority list. Mr. Prezioso explained that there were not sufficient funds to pay for either part of the Henpeck Road projects, and that it would take 4 - 5 years just to fund that project. There was a recommendation that the County look at doing some spot improvements. There is also a possibility of re-initiating the South Henpeck Road project for development only with the extra paved road funds, although none would be available until 2007. \$70,000 has been spent so far on survey and design work.

There was also some dispute about the traffic counts reported for Egypt Road and Stage Road. Mr. Prezioso reported some environmental issues in the Terminal Road project, which are attempting to be mitigated so permits can be issued. He reported that they have been advised that highway maintenance and construction funds will not be cut.

Mr. Prezioso suggested that the extra unpaved road funds could be spent on a "pave in place" on Higgins Road.

After discussion, Mrs. Ringley moved that Mr. Prezioso provide the Board with estimates and other information necessary and add South Henpeck Road to the six-year plan as priority #4 and Higgins Road as Priority #5. The members were polled:

Julian T. Lipscomb	Aye
Rebecca M. Ringley	Aye
James H. Burrell	Absent
Dean E. Raynes	Aye
W. R. "Ray" Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

Mr. Prezioso will develop some rough estimates for the Board and plan to present the final plan for approval at Public Hearing at the December meeting.

IN RE: RESIDENT ENGINEERS REPORT

Mr. Prezioso reported that the upcoming meeting on October 11, 2002, at the Sandston office, was a opportunity to meet with the area's new Commonwealth Transportation Board member, Mr. McCarthy. The Administrator and Board Chairman from Charles City County has been invited to that meeting as well.

At a meeting in November, all elected officials from all localities have been invited to meet and share their concerns with the Commissioner, Secretary, and General Assembly members.

Mr. Prezioso reported that their maintenance crews have been involved in mowing, litter pick up, tree trimming on Route 249, and shoulder stone work. Construction at Bottoms Bridge is underway. The project at Routes 249/155 has been just about completed, and the project at Routes 249/665 is also nearing completion.

He explained the process of the shoulder stone project. Mr. Raynes reported what he considered to be a dangerous section east of Stage Road and Mr. Prezioso will follow up.

VDOT is close to filling the area superintendent position vacated by Hal Godfrey. Mr. Lipscomb commended the gentleman who has been temporarily filling the position.

Mr. Burrell mentioned that the mowers were knocking down crossover reflectors. Mr. Prezioso indicated that they were having problems with excess speeds by the mowers and they were working on that.

Mr. Davis asked that VDOT consider reducing the speed limit in Barhamsville to 45 mph, in consideration of the safety of the school buses as well as the increase in truck traffic.

There was some discussion as to what kind of promotional material would be permitted in the Welcome Center being constructed at the eastbound I-64 rest area. Mr. Prezioso reported that because Virginia used federal funds to construct I-64, there are limitations regarding advertising. Historical and cultural materials are permitted, and there may be some creative ways in which to include advertising for some of the local businesses.

Regarding Interstate 64, there are development funds only to widen from Airport Drive to I-295, as well as from I-295 to Route 249, but no construction money for either project. To the east of New Kent, he understands there is development money only as well. Any proceeds from the transportation bond referendum pending in Hampton Roads will be designated for use on very specific projects.

IN RE: WATER & SEWER STUDY

Charles Redlinger, from Resource International, presented his draft report on the water and sewer study performed in Bottoms Bridge, Talleyville, Woodhaven Shores, and Providence Forge. For each location, he reviewed water and sewer demands, water storage tank siting, water supply, sewer options, as well as project phasing.

Projected cost of construction of a wastewater treatment plant to service Bottoms Bridge and Talleyville was estimated to be \$16,880.00. Phase I of water and sewer projects in Bottoms Bridge were estimated to cost \$17,673.500. The estimated cost of Phase I to provide water (constructing 2 tanks and a new deep well) and sewer to Talleyville totaled \$28,432,500. Regarding Providence Forge, projected costs to provide water and sewer was \$1,721,000. For Woodhaven Shores, costs to provide water and sewer services were estimated to be \$1,794,000. The costs of the sewer collection system or water distribution systems were not included in any of the estimates. These costs translate to approximately \$8,000 per acre.

Mr. Redlinger suggested using the Pamunkey River for discharge as opposed to the Chickahominy River because it has less stringent discharge standards. There was also discussion concerning the sewer agreement with Henrico County to accept up to 600,000 gallons a day, and he reported that, in the long run, there would be little, if any, cost savings to the County as compared to constructing its own wastewater treatment plan.

There was also discussion on how to pay for these projects. Few localities raise taxes to fund water and sewer. In some areas, developers fund this work. Some localities are using Community Development Authorities to finance infrastructure, which will be covered later in his presentation.

Mr. Davis inquired about special tax districts. There was discussion on how Mr. Redlinger obtained his figures for water and sewage flow in Bottoms Bridge and Talleyville. He reported that he had been given some figures by the Bottoms Bridge group, and also looked at the comprehensive plan. Mrs. Ringley also asked about figures for existing business usage in the Bottoms Bridge area. She inquired whether the area between Bottoms Bridge and Talleyville was included in the study, to which Mr. Redlinger reported that it was not. She indicated that existing businesses and properties that are zoned for business should be included in order for the study to be valid. As far as time frames, Mr. Redlinger reported that it would take between 1½ to two years to construct after getting commitments from property owners.

Mrs. Ringley indicated that she thought that the cost of extending the Eltham plant to I-64 was going to be a part of this study. Mr. Redlinger reported that was not part of the original request.

Mr. Lipscomb reported that the septic system for the proposed new high school was estimated to cost \$612,000, and he would like the Board to consider having that area included into the study as well.

Mr. Redlinger reported that his figures for usage in mixed development areas was based on an average “rule of thumb” figure, based on acreage.

After discussion, it was decided that Mr. Redlinger would obtain and provide the current usage figures from Bottoms Bridge, and include the new high school and the Eltham/Barhamsville area in his study.

Next to speak was Keenan Rice, President of Municipal Capital (MuniCap), a public financial consulting firm. One of his firm’s specialties is special taxing districts for providing public infrastructure. He

reviewed some of their projects in Richmond, Henrico, Hanover and Prince William County, as well as in Maryland. He explained that the idea behind a Community Development Authority (CDA) is that a limited geographic area will benefit from the improvements that are provided and as a result, it is not appropriate for the entire county to pay for the improvements. CDA is a version of a special taxing district. Under Virginia law, CDAs have a different legal authority from a special taxing district.

A CDA is created by the County and is an independent board, typically five to seven members appointed by the County. The primary mechanisms the CDA typically uses to repay bonds are special assessments levied by the County. He reported that property taxes are more effective than user fees, like water and sewer fees. The Board does operate independently of the County. Bonds are issued by the CDA itself, and the County has no responsibility or liability for them.

Mr. Rice reported that when issuing bonds by a CDA, there are four distinct phases, the first of which is the planning phase. The planning phase takes into account the land use and how projects will be funded, and whether there are any other funding sources available. Financial discipline can shape the plans during this phase. Phase two is governmental action, in which the County creates the CDA and appoints its board, levies the assessments, and enters a memorandum of understanding between the County and the CDA. Phase three involves the issuance of the bonds, which involves hiring an underwriter and some substantial legal work. Phase four is the actual operation of the CDA, that can come to the County each year with requests. In addition to issuing bonds, CDAs can also do other things, like operating parking garages or sewer or water treatment plants. Phase one often includes the operational uses of the CDA. He recommends that a workshop be planned in the future in order to provide some more specific information. He reported that CDAs can encourage economic development and also insure a high quality of development.

His company's fees are normally paid by developers, but in some localities, they work for the county or the property owners. Their fees are based on time and material.

The County Attorney provided a handout with information on creation of CDAs for review by the Board members.

RE: ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the work session was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.
