

February 12, 2008

At the reconvened meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Prince Edward County, held in the Third Floor Conference Room of the Court House, on Tuesday the 12<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2008; at 5:00 p.m., there were present:

William G. Fore, Jr.

Sally W. Gilfillan

Robert M. Jones

Charles W. McKay

James C. Moore

Howard F. Simpson

Lacy B. Ward

Mattie P. Wiley

Also present: Wade Bartlett, County Administrator; Sarah Puckett, Assistant County Administrator; Jonathan L. Pickett, Director of Planning and Community Development; Mr. Alan Leatherwood, Resident Highway Engineer, VDOT; Keith Halbohn, Transportation Contract Administrator; and Mark McKissick, Assistant Resident Engineer.

Chairman Fore called the meeting to order.

In Re: Changes to the Six-Year Highway Improvement Plan

Mr. Alan Leatherwood, Resident Highway Engineer, reviewed the estimated allocations and advised the amounts will decrease. He said the secondary unpaved roads and the TeleFee are the state funds which can be used for unpaved roads or any state incidental construction items. He said the others allocations were types of federal funds which would have to be used on federally eligible roads, such as Route 626 and Route 643, which were classified as “major collectors”, as they require a different standard. Those specifications include 22 feet of pavement with a six or seven foot shoulder and a four foot deep ditch. He added the costs increase dramatically for those changes.

Mr. Leatherwood said that \$250,000 could be spent on unpaved roads; all others would have to be federally eligible roads. He said the state funds had to be used to match the federal funds. He also stated nothing had been included for rural additions.

Mr. Leatherwood said Route 638 remained as first priority, because VDOT policy requires that if the County drops that project, the County would have to reimburse VDOT for the funds already expended on that project. He said a meeting was scheduled for March 19, 2008, from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. at which time the 527 impacts would be explained. He said Route 638 was surveyed but it was not a collector; Route 643 was a major collector. He said it had not been surveyed at that time, and the costs more than doubled since last year.

Mr. Leatherwood continued saying the picture was bleak, and inflation rates increase of 13% per year are built into the plan. He said surveys would begin on roads when they could.

Mr. Keith Halbohn, Transportation Contract Administrator, said VDOT's hands were tied. He said the funds could only be spent on federally eligible roads. He said state funds were used to match the federal obligation. He said the Route 643 cost was estimated to go up \$4 million; and he was asked if the residency would be able to cover it. He then said for the small amount of funding that Prince Edward County receives, it could not be funded in the Six-Year Plan. He said that the only thing they were allowed to do was to put it on roads that were eligible for federal funds.

Mr. Halbohn said Route 626 is also a major collector, and plans were to widen and overlay it. This can no longer be done on a federally eligible road. A new project would need to be created to do so. He said the state was attempting to maximize the Federal funding.

Mr. McKay suggested revenue sharing and said the County needs to budget funds each year for roads, and get matching funds from state grants.

Mr. Leatherwood said revenue sharing would be available if the County could provide at least \$1 million. He added if the County was willing to administer the project, the County could provide less funding, but the County was not staffed to administer the projects. He said the General Assembly was changing the tiers but was unsure of the status. He said the standards and requirements essentially stopped work on Route 643 and Route 626. He said realistically, it may take 12 to 13 years to complete Route 643

if funds were not spent on any other projects, and only includes 1.2 miles of the road from the town limits to the bypass.

Mr. Halbohn said he contacted the central office regarding Route 626 for a cost of \$360,000; if it goes to project, it would cost \$3.5 million. He was told that unless the project was federally funded, the project would not go forward. Mr. McKissick said a lot of the cost is administrative overhead, such as environmental permits and forms.

Chairman Fore said Mr. McKay's recommendation would probably be the best thing to do, but the cost and escalation of things, it would still make projects difficult.

Mr. Leatherwood said every rural county was in bad shape. He said the county could accumulate \$500,000 of local funds for two years, and then apply for revenue sharing to advance the project; that would put the County at a higher tier to get more matching funds.

Further discussion regarding possible solutions followed.

Mrs. Puckett said the Chapter 527 regulations would need to be taken seriously because when developers approach the County wanting to build a project, the County would have to know the transportation impact of the development. Mr. Bartlett said Senate Bill 738 could change that; Mr. Leatherwood said Senator Watkins' bill was trying to limit or eliminate impact fees and proffers.

Mrs. Gilfillan questioned tax rates rising when a new subdivision was built. She said she felt the development must help pay for itself, and was in favor of impact fees and proffers.

Chairman Fore asked if the impact fees could be specified for road-only projects. Mr. Bartlett said the fees could be specified for roads, education, etc. Mr. Pickett, Director of Planning and Community Development, said there must be a relationship between the funds and the project. Mr. Bartlett added impact fees are mainly transportation but they could be used for libraries and other things also.

Mr. Pickett said Prince Edward County did not meet the threshold for growth rate and development necessary so were not able to consider impact fees. He said there was a \$5,000 cap per lot in Senate Bill 738, and some localities charge \$15,000, and in northern Virginia they're charging as much as \$47,000 per lot.

Chairman Fore then asked about the relationship in the reduction of funds due to the other road maintenance or taking in a road under the rural addition program.

Mr. Leatherwood said maintenance was a separate issue and had been level-funded since 1990. He said the rural addition funds had not been set in the past two years, and once Slaydon Forest was complete, there may have been a balance \$100,000.

Chairman Fore said he had an inquiry about the Timberlake Drive project, off Back-Hampden Sydney Road. Mr. Leatherwood said because that was subdivided after 1990, it may not qualify. Anything subdivided prior to 1949 was covered; anything subdivided between 1949-1992 was up to local government, and anything after 1992 was 100% developer or residents. He added there was good news about the unpaved road projects; Miller Lake Road was to be advertised on February 26, 2008. He said the Route 613 project was out of their office. Route 751 was the next project that still had an issue to resolve in order to move the project forward. Further discussion followed.

Discussion turned to the Aspen Hill Road project. Mrs. Puckett said Recreational Access has not yet been requested because there is no trail, and the master plan has been from "Aspen Hill to the bridge", to "the bridge to Farmville." She said the trail has not been built, and VDOT and the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) will not accept the County's argument that it is an eligible recreational access project until the State Park is being built. She added the project should remain in the list with the intent of pursuing Recreational Access in the future.

Mr. Leatherwood said if the bond package goes through, there would be \$7.5 million for DCR for parks. He said the High Bridge Trail to Town of Farmville project was ready to begin, and VDOT would be doing the work. He added that the County could receive \$400,000 of recreational access monies per facility because it would be going to a state facility. He added that the County may receive another \$150,000 but it would require a \$150,000 match, and that a lot of the enhancement funds were being rolled into the trails and state parks.

Sally Gilfillan left the meeting at this time.

After some discussion, the Board reached a consensus to leave the Six Year Plan as it stood and consider budgeting money for a transportation fund for the County. Chairman Fore added that Mr. McKay's suggestion was good and that the Board should include a road fund in the County budget. He

said a public hearing would need to be held during the March 11<sup>th</sup> Board meeting, even though nothing had been changed.

Mr. McKay made a motion to advertise a public hearing during the March 11, 2008 Board meeting; the motion carried:

Aye:	William G. Fore, Jr. Robert M. Jones Charles W. McKay James C. Moore Howard F. Simpson Lacy B. Ward Mattie P. Wiley	Nay: None
------	---	-----------

Absent: Sally W. Gilfillan

On motion of Mr. Moore and adopted by the following vote:

Aye:	William G. Fore, Jr. Robert M. Jones Charles W. McKay James C. Moore Howard F. Simpson Lacy B. Ward Mattie P. Wiley	Nay: None
------	---	-----------

Absent: Sally W. Gilfillan

the meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.