

COUNTY OF HENRICO, VIRGINIA
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SPECIAL MEETING
September 23, 2008

The Henrico County Board of Supervisors convened a Special Meeting on Tuesday, September 23, 2008 at 4:45 p.m. in the County Manager's Conference Room, Administration Building, Henrico County Government Center, Parham and Hungary Spring Roads, Henrico County, Virginia. The Chairman of the Board of Supervisors called the meeting to order at 4:49 p.m.

PRESENT

The Honorable David A. Kaechele, Chairman
The Honorable Patricia S. O'Bannon, Vice-Chairman
The Honorable James B. Donati, Jr., Varina District Supervisor
The Honorable Richard W. Glover, Brookland District Supervisor
The Honorable Frank J. Thornton, Fairfield District Supervisor
Mr. Virgil R. Hazelett, P.E., County Manager
Ms. Angela N. Harper, FAICP, Deputy County Manager for Special Services
Mr. Leon T. Johnson, Deputy County Manager for Administration
Mr. Robert K. Pinkerton, P.E., Deputy County Manager for Community Operations
Mr. Randall R. Silber, Deputy County Manager for Community Development
Mr. Barry R. Lawrence, Assistant to the County Manager/Clerk to the Board
Mrs. Tanya B. Harding, Deputy Clerk to the Board
Mr. C. Michael Schnurman, Legislative Liaison
Mr. Joseph P. Rapisarda, Jr., County Attorney
Mrs. Tamra R. McKinney, Director of Public Relations & Media Services
Mr. Fred C. James, Media Specialist, Public Relations & Media Services
Mr. John A. Vithoukas, Director of Finance
Mr. Eugene H. Walter, Management and Budget Division Director
Mr. Paul N. Proto, Director of General Services
Mr. George H. Cauble, Jr., Director of Human Resources
Mrs. Paula Reid, Assistant Director of Human Resources
Mr. Ralph J. Emerson, Jr., Director of Planning
Mr. David D. O'Kelly, Jr., Assistant Director of Planning
Ms. Leslie A. News, Principal Planner
Mr. Michael Kennedy, Planner IV
Mr. Edward L. Priestas, Director of Public Works
Mr. Timothy A. Foster, Assistant Director of Public Works
Mrs. Karen K. Mier, Director of Recreation and Parks
Mr. Neil C. Luther IV, Assistant Director of Recreation and Parks
Mr. Albert Azzarone, Parks Planning Supervisor
Mr. Mark J. Coakley, General Registrar
Mrs. Anne Marie Middlesworth, Deputy General Registrar
Ms. Meredith R. Beadles, Office Supervisor, General Registrar's Office

Mrs. Bebe W. West, Chairperson, Electoral Board
Mrs. Alice F. Creighton, Vice Chairperson, Electoral Board
Mr. Ronald B. Chaney, Sr., Secretary, Electoral Board
Mr. Nathan A. Emm, Senior Associate, EDAW, Inc.
William A. Gray, Esquire, Sands Anderson Marks & Miller
Ms. Elizabeth Hancock Greenfield, Director of Government Affairs, Richmond Association of Realtors
Ms. Melodie N. Martin, Staff Writer, *Richmond Times-Dispatch*
Mr. Tom Lappas, Publisher/Editor, *Henrico Citizen*

Election Officials' Compensation

Mr. Hazelett recognized Mr. Coakley, who introduced the members of the Electoral Board. Mr. Coakley narrated a Power Point presentation (see enclosed copy), which included statistics on the number of registered voters, precincts, and election officials in Henrico County; a regional comparison of compensation for three levels of election officials; reasons for requesting an increase in the rate of pay for Henrico election officials; and the proposed increase submitted by the Electoral Board as well as the cost of this proposal. Mr. Donati commented that he thought the proposed pay increase was long overdue and well deserved.

Following the presentation, Mr. Coakley and Mr. Hazelett responded to questions from members of the Board of Supervisors regarding the status of preparations by the Registrar's Office for election day in November, the number of voting machines in the County, whether there have been any citizens complaints about the manner in which voter registration has been handled by the Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles, and the number of Henrico citizens eligible to vote. After determining that it was the consensus of the Board to move forward with the Electoral Board's proposal, Mr. Hazelett advised that a Board paper would be placed on the October 14, 2008 agenda to increase the rates of pay for officers of election.

Master Plan of Development for Tuckahoe Park

Mr. Hazelett recognized Mr. O'Kelly, who showed slides depicting the zoning, aerial view, and manmade features of the Tuckahoe Park site (see enclosed copies). Mr. O'Kelly provided background information on the park's master plan

and also identified plan goals. He then introduced Mr. Emm, who narrated a Power Point presentation (see enclosed copy) covering existing site issues, key concerns raised by Tuckahoe Little League and the public, design principles, master plan components, a comparison of the conditions of the existing park with the preferred alternative, and project phasing and costs.

During the presentation, Mr. Emm was joined by Mrs. Mier and Mr. Hazelett in responding to a number of questions from Board members pertaining to the impact of the plan on existing fields and restrooms, field lighting technology, anticipated uses for the proposed multi-purpose field, the number of youth currently served by Tuckahoe Little League, the facilities that would be included in the first phase of the plan, the location of a new entrance proposed for the site, whether there would be sufficient spectator seating and concession areas to accommodate future little league activities, how the plan would address tree coverage, the total cost of the four phases of the project and whether this cost is reflected in the County's Capital Improvements Plan, the proximity of the first phase of the project to the surrounding neighborhood, the project's timeline, how drainage issues are addressed in the plan, the amount of site clearing that would be required by the first phase of the project, and whether the proposed site improvements could be funded as a bond referendum project. Mr. Hazelett advised that the plan of development for Tuckahoe Park would be considered by the Board at its October 14, 2008 meeting.

Proposed Central Virginia Regional
Transportation Authority

Mr. Hazelett noted that he and Mr. Kaechele were serving on a work group of the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission (RRPDC) that was formed in reaction to legislation introduced by Senator John Watkins and Delegate Frank Hall during the 2008 Session of the Virginia General Assembly. The work group had developed a proposal for a regional transportation authority. Although County staff did not have a recommendation on this controversial proposal, it

was bringing forward information so that the Board could decide whether to include the proposal in the County's 2009 Legislative Program.

Mr. Hazelett recognized Mr. Pinkerton, who narrated a Power Point presentation addressing proposed legislation that would establish the Central Virginia Regional Transportation Authority (see enclosed copy of presentation). Mr. Pinkerton reviewed the legislative and judicial history of existing transportation authorities in Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads. He also reviewed pending legislation sponsored by Delegate Hall and Senator Watkins, HB 1573 and SB 767, which would either create a new Central Virginia Regional Transportation Authority (HB 1573) or grant taxing powers to and allow expansion of the existing Richmond Metropolitan Authority (SB 767). Mr. Pinkerton explained that RRPDC established the Transportation Funding Strategies Work Group in April 2008 to study the need for a regional transportation funding solution. This work group included representatives from the nine member jurisdictions of RRPDC as well as state legislators and representatives of both the business community and transit services. The group met several times to discuss the formation of a Central Virginia Regional Transportation Authority and methods of generating revenue for this entity. Its efforts resulted in draft legislation that would authorize the Central Virginia Regional Transportation Authority. Mr. Pinkerton discussed the following components of the proposed legislation: core localities, composition of the authority, powers of the authority, continuing responsibilities of the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), revenue sources under consideration, and the use of revenue by the authority.

Mr. Pinkerton, Mr. Hazelett, and Mr. Rapisarda responded to questions from Board members during the presentation relating to whether GRTC was participating in the work group; eminent domain powers of special authorities; how the proposed authority would prioritize projects; the

role of VDOT in the authority; whether the authority would have its own legal staff, taxing powers, and revenue sources; and the County's *share of revenue generated by the authority*. Mr. Pinkerton advised that the authority would collect \$31 million annually from Henrico, \$18 million of which would be returned to the County. The authority's total annual revenues would be \$100 million, \$60 million of which would be returned to the localities. He concluded his presentation by noting that the four major local jurisdictions in the Richmond region would need to reach a consensus on how to proceed and whether to support the transportation authority proposal in their individual *legislative programs and in the RRPDC Legislative Program*.

Following the presentation, Mr. Pinkerton and Mr. Hazelett responded to a lengthy series of questions and comments from Board members regarding how the authority's share of revenues would be used, whether the authority would have the ability to bid projects, how authority projects constructed within Henrico would be handled, whether the County's current allocations from VDOT would impact funding for the authority, whether the County would be pursuing legislation once again during the upcoming session to seek parity with Arlington County in the State funding formula for road maintenance allocations, the additional fees and taxes citizens would have to pay to support the authority, whether the authority or localities would be protected from future State funding reductions, how the authority would interact with the Metropolitan Planning Organization, the need for including an "opt out" clause in any legislation establishing a regional transportation authority, whether the revenues collected by the authority from Henrico citizens could be used more efficiently by the County, whether the authority would issue its own bonds and have its own bond rating, the current status of HB 599 funding, the current status of the other transportation authorities within the Commonwealth, how the authority would affect the existing operations and responsibilities of VDOT within the Richmond

region, and the cost of running the authority.

Mr. Kaechele commented that the authority would generate additional transportation revenues for the Richmond region that the region would not otherwise receive under the existing transportation funding structure through VDOT. Mr. Glover expressed concern that the Commonwealth would be taking money from Henrico citizens to run the authority. Mr. Thornton stated that the Board needs to be good stewards of the taxpayers' money but also needs to be careful not to be obstructionists. He further stated that the County needs to be visionary but not taken advantage of. Mr. Thornton pointed out that this was a complex situation that would put the onus on localities so the Board should be careful. Mr. Kaechele noted that the proposal would not go forward unless all of the localities participate.

At Mr. Kaechele's request, Mr. Hazelett commented on RRPDC's perspective on this issue and how other localities are looking at it. Mr. Kaechele suggested that the Board have discussion on the issue with State legislators. Mr. Glover voiced concerns about the County's limited representation on the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) and CTB's ability to redirect transportation funds from central Virginia to other areas of the Commonwealth.

The Board recessed for dinner at 6:22 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m.

Proposed Central Virginia Regional
Transportation Authority (continued)

There was further discussion on this matter. Mr. Hazelett responded to additional questions from Board members concerning whether central Virginia was a donor region for purposes of transportation funding, the amount of transportation enhancement funds received by the County, the future role of the CTB should the authority be established, the rationale for the 60/40 allocation formula proposed for the authority, the risks to the County of not participating in the authority versus the risks of participation, and how revenues generated by the authority would be monitored. Mr. Glover stated that he had received

a few e-mails from constituents suggesting that the County should not go along with the authority. Mrs. O'Bannon noted that automotive repair businesses had voiced concerns pertaining to the proposed auto repair tax. Mr. Hazelett pointed out that transportation authorities are probably the wave of the future given the realities of limited State funding for transportation. Mr. Kaechele and Mr. Thornton indicated that the Board should hold off on making a decision until it meets with the County's legislative delegation in early November. Mr. Kaechele stated that the General Assembly would not push for a transportation authority in this region without the region's support.

Mr. Hazelett alerted the Board to a resolution on the evening's agenda to authorize the issuance of general obligation improvement bonds and advised that he, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Vithoulkas would be leaving at 6:00 a.m. the following morning to meet with bond rating agency representatives in New York City. He commented on the current bond market and noted he had written the School Board and School Superintendent that a general obligation bond referendum could not go forward until 2010. Mr. Hazelett spoke to local budgetary challenges given that fixed costs are going up but revenues are not increasing. He, Mr. Vithoulkas, and Mr. Walter responded to a question from Mr. Glover relating to the status of the County's sinking fund. Mr. Hazelett expounded on the current state of the economy and the lack of consumer spending. Mr. Vithoulkas commented that homes in Henrico County are still experiencing positive appreciation but that other economic indicators are not so positive. He and Mr. Walter responded at length to questions from Board members regarding the County's revenue trends and projections for the current and upcoming fiscal years, revenue shortfalls at the State level, and local trends in commercial construction. Mr. Glover commented that the County was fortunate in being able to meet its budget when the State and many other localities were complaining about shortfalls. Mr. Hazelett stated that the County's biggest challenge was dealing with the unanticipated sharp rise in fuel costs.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:57 p.m.


Chairman, Henrico County Board of Supervisors