



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Loudoun County Board of Supervisors, Finance/Government Operations and Economic Development Committee Capital Improvement Program Work Session, Wednesday, March 8, 2023

Date Wednesday, March 8, 2023
Place Board Room, First Floor, Government Center, 1 Harrison Street SE, Leesburg, Virginia
Length 1h 37m (video)

- Official meeting video (county, Granicus): <https://loudoun.granicus.com/player/clip/7211>
- Agenda (Granicus): https://loudoun.granicus.com/AgendaViewer.php?view_id=73&clip_id=7211

Machine transcript (speech-to-text) produced by Coraggio Consulting. Not an official county record. Names and numbers may be misspelled; check the video at the timestamp before quoting.

Speech-to-text: whisper.cpp, model large-v3-turbo. Produced 2026-10-22. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:06:21] Hey, Michelle, testing your audio and visual, please.

[00:07:43] Hey, Michelle, try again.

[00:08:25] Michelle, can you try again? This is Ernie. I don't think Michelle actually needs to be a panelist, so you may not need to worry about doing your testing.

[00:08:45] Can you copy on that? Hi, Michelle, can you speak again?

[00:09:06] One more time, Michelle. I think it's something more.

[00:09:27] It's on her end. Okay.

[00:12:38] All right.

[00:17:19] Okay. I would like to call to order the March 8th, 2023, Loudoun County Board of Supervisors Finance Government Operations and Economic Development Committee CIP work session This room has a hearing loop. If you need hearing assistance, switch your hearing aids to telecoil mode If you need a

headset, we have those available as well and please see the clerk to request one Pursuant to Virginia code section 2.2 - 37.0-8.2 and the board's rules of order

[00:17:54] Supervisor Briskman requested to participate in this meeting by electronic communication and is participating remotely from Sterling, Virginia. A physical quorum of the Board of Supervisors is present in the boardroom and the board has made arrangements for the voice of Supervisor Briskman to be heard by all persons in the boardroom. Supervisor Briskman has made this request within the required time frame and the county attorney has determined that Supervisor Briskman meets the qualifications to participate remotely.

[00:18:27] The committee will record that Supervisor Briskman participated remotely from a private location in Sterling, Virginia. The focus of tonight's meeting will be a work session on the FY 2023 to FY 2028 amended capital improvement program.

[00:18:44] Each committee member will have three minutes for questions each round with as many rounds as we need. We may, outside of the motions, we may loosen that rule because we've got a lot more going on tonight than we anticipated.

[00:19:00] I'll turn this over to staff to provide a presentation with any updates before we take up project questions and discussion. And we've got Nikki and we've got Nancy and Scott and Truman. All right. Thank you for being here. Good evening, Madam Chair, members of the committee.

[00:19:20] Thank you. Before I go into summarizing the item, I would just like to remind the committee of some of the motions that the committee made at the last work session. So the committee did recommend to direct staff to include the Loudoun County Public Schools Capital Facility Planning Guidelines in the FY24 appropriations resolution for approval.

[00:19:44] The committee also voted to send funding consideration for weight rooms, press boxes, tennis court lighting at Dominion High School, and press boxes and tennis court lighting at Potomac Falls High School, and the amount of \$4.39 million to the FY23 fund balance discussion.

[00:20:03] The committee also recommended that the board terminate the Waterford traffic calming project and reallocate the \$500,000 to a new village of Waterford preserving the landmark project. And there were two motions for projects on the future identified list.

[00:20:24] One was to add a community arts center, and the other was to add a shared use path to the scope of the Ashburn Road Parallel Pedestrian Bridge over Beaver Dam project. And to add the Southern Service Center.

[00:20:41] And, excuse me, yes, and to add the Southern Service Center as a project to the CIP. So we'll go to the presentation and just summarize the funding scenario. The committee detailed one funding scenario for staff to run.

[00:21:04] The scenario included, oh, I'm sorry, we're trying to get the presentation up.

[00:21:29] Okay, there we go.

[00:21:47] So the funding scenario that the committee directed staff to run included evaluating delaying the Prentice Drive, Loudoun County Parkway to Lockridge Road project as an offset and accelerate Shellhorn Road, the Inwa property to Morin Road, Route 7 eastbound widening from Loudoun County

Parkway to Route 28, West Wind Drive, Braddock Road widening from Paul VI to Loudoun County Parkway or the North Star Boulevard widening Tall Cedars Parkway to Braddock Road and the Bus Shelters Project.

[00:22:24] Staff evaluated each project, beginning with the ability to delay Prentice Drive. A couple of points that are highlighted in the item for the Prentice Drive Project, the first being that there is an active segment of Prentice Drive, which is the Waxpool Road to Loudoun County Parkway segment.

[00:22:45] This project would continue to be developed on its current timeline. Additionally, the county was awarded \$76 million in NVTa funding for the entire Prentice Drive project. So staff inquired with NVTa about any implications on that funding if we were to delay the other segment.

[00:23:04] So per that discussion, NVTa would require a MOU, a Memorandum of Understanding, stating that the second segment will still be completed without any additional funds from NVTa within a county estimated time frame, and any failure on the county's part to complete that project would require a return of funds to NVTa in proportion to the construction funding on the two segments. Staff believe construction on the Loudoun County Parkway to Lockridge segment could

[00:23:37] begin in FY29 with completion in FY31. If this scenario is approved, then DTCI would begin work on the MOU after the budget is adopted. The second issue worked out on Prentice is that the Loudoun County Parkway to Lockridge segment is currently in design, and it's at 90%, so staff does recommend that the design work be completed and approved by the Department of Building and Development and VDOT, and also that any remaining land acquisition be completed, as well as the Dominion transmission

[00:24:15] line work. All of this work should be brought to completion before any work is suspended on the rest of that segment. Of the projects evaluated for acceleration, only Shellhorn Road and Route 7 widening projects were recommended to accelerate. So yes, on this slide we show that the funding for the Prentiss Drive, Loudoun County Parkway to Lockridge Road can be delayed, so it's moved out to a future fiscal year, which is currently FY29 where that construction funding would

[00:24:49] be allocated. The Shellhorn Road project is almost to 100% design and is expected to be complete in early FY24. Additional land acquisition funding is needed for this project, and that is accommodated in this scenario in FY24. Utility relocation and construction are both accelerated by one year, so construction would now start in FY26. For the Route 7 widening project, this is not an active

[00:25:24] project, and staff does believe the project could begin in FY24, and all phases are accelerated by one year in this scenario, and that would put construction in FY29. For the other projects that were not recommended for acceleration, which are West Wind, Braddock Road, and North Star, these projects, based on their current status and the next steps that are required to advance them, there is some extensive or complicated work that has to be done, which does not allow for acceleration in the production schedules of those projects. So staff does not recommend that the

[00:26:03] project schedules change and they remain on the current timeline as proposed in the budget. And finally, for the bus shelters project, this was also not recommended for acceleration. This project is a recurring funding, and the intent is to construct approximately 20 bus shelters per year for a total of 120 shelters. With this being a new project, right now it's not known whether any acceleration in completing additional shelters is possible at this point, but that can be

[00:26:36] reevaluated as the program ramps up. So the result of that survey, or excuse me, of that scenario is the delay of Prentice Drive to FY29 and the acceleration of Shellhorn Road and the Route 7 eastbound widening. We additionally note in the item that as a result of this scenario, there is a remaining debt capacity of \$25.8 million. Staff is recommending that no action is taken to fill that debt capacity. The FY25 budget process will introduce two new years to the CIP in which

[00:27:15] projects will come into the six-year period and that capacity can be used to accommodate new projects. And then the alternative to that scenario that staff would offer is to advance the land acquisition on the Route 50 Loudoun County Parkway interchange project into FY28.

[00:27:34] We can take any questions from the committee. Nikki, thank you very much. I've got Supervisor Letourneau. Thanks. Okay, let me dive in a little bit. So how much money is the other segment of Prentice Drive. And while you're looking at that, it sounds like what happened was we got a \$76 million reward for all of Prentice Drive. We split the projects and we put

[00:28:12] all \$76 million on the first segment, which is leaving me wondering what other money is there. I wouldn't have thought that segment was that expensive. Well, we're getting the exact number. Yes, the whole \$76 million was placed on that first segment of the project. And that award is contingent on us actually building the entire road. Correct. When the application was done, it was for the entirety of Prentice Drive.

[00:28:45] It sounds like we have to build it. Your estimate is somewhere between 29 and 31. So NVTa specified that the MOU just needs to state a county estimated timeline. But as staff, it was determined that likely construction on that segment could begin in FY29.

[00:29:02] but what if we didn't want to if we don't complete the project at all or if we just wanted to wait even further even longer so the time frame that was discussed with the mvta staff was roughly the 2031 time frame so i think we could you know push it a couple of years um if it's longer than that i think we need to have further discussion with their with their staff and that's why i was asking how much that other segment even is in case we had to pay that money back i mean the issue is I mean, as we discussed, I'm not sure we ever were going to need that road because, as you point out in this item, the lane just changed so dramatically.

[00:29:42] So as much as I would never want to jeopardize MBTA funding on something, I also don't want to spend another \$140 million of county money just to get \$76 million that we've already allocated to a different project. The total is \$83 million on the max pool.

[00:30:01] So we owe almost all, okay, so there's very little county money there. Correct. So I guess then the question is, if we have to build it, should we delay it? I mean, it sounds like we have to build this road.

[00:30:17] That's kind of what I'm hearing. Or we have to give back \$76 million. Correct. Yes. Or do we have to give back all the \$76 million? Yes. Well, you said it proportioned. Yeah, in proportion to the construction. So what is that proportion? I think that's what warrants discussion with NVTa, more discussion.

[00:30:37] If our intent is to fully construct the other segment, then we would need to, the existing segment, the wax pool, then we would need to discuss with them exactly what level of funding would need to be returned to them if we did not do the other piece.

[00:30:55] Yeah. Okay. So how much money in geobonds is freed up exactly if we did delay Prentice? Because I was having trouble sort of following the math of just even the recommended scenario.

[00:31:13] Right. So the difference will be the funding that we have on Shellhorn. So, sorry, I haven't done all the math here. So the Shellhorn project is a total of 47.5, and then the Route 7 widening is a total of 5.2.

[00:31:41] So there is a very large portion of Prentice Drive that is just moving out. But see, if we accelerate Shellhorn, wouldn't that then free up the money that's allocated in Shellhorn? I come up with, in FY26, there should be now money that's opened by moving these things around.

[00:32:01] So we move up the appropriations on the two projects that are accelerated, which is Shellhorn and Route 7, and then the remaining appropriation on Prentice would just move out. So from an appropriation standpoint, there's no additional appropriation that's just free.

[00:32:20] It's the Shellhorn Project moves in, Route 7 moves up as well, and then any funding that would have been allocated here. So there's \$109 million that is available in 26, right? Yes. So the two recommendations that you gave us, I think, are about 50, and then you said there's a remainder of 25.

[00:32:42] So where's the rest? so the appropriation is just gone the remaining balance of the appropriation is gone so what we're dealing with then is just debt capacity that's created so nothing nothing else is appropriated to fill what's left on but it still should be more debt capacity right if there's 109 million in construction that we're budgeting in 26 we're dealing with a cash flow of how that construction funding is going to be financed so some of that remaining cash flow falls outside

[00:33:15] of the six-year period so it's not going to be the whole 109 million that is sitting in fy26 that debt issuance gets spread out over the life of the construction okay let me see if anyone else yeah go ahead for now all right uh chair randall um i'm not sure if you don't have to give all the money back I know you guys are going to talk to the MBTA staff again and let me know but we've done this I've done this quite a few times of other counties and I am not convinced that the entire amount is that I will call miss Backman

[00:33:55] in the morning and you all call staff but but I I believe it might be might need to be the entire amount they did use the phrase proportional amount we just don't know what that amount is all up with them okay all right seeing no more on committee members madam chair oh i'm sorry julie yes hi good evening and i apologize for the complications um this evening thank you for letting me attend remotely um i guess the one

[00:34:31] question i have i i'm i'm not sure i guess i can understand the benefit of the route 7 the shell horn accelerating those projects but i just want to clarify what staff thinks we could do with the extra, that's not a great word to use for, but what we could do with the, all it is extra capacity in our lend and what we could borrow, I guess, or use bonds for, or has staff just not figured that out yet?

[00:35:05] I guess that's the \$25 million in debt capacity. What's the benefit of, what could be the benefit of having that or being able to use that for something else? And how quickly can we do it? So the recommendation in the item is to not try to fill that capacity right now.

[00:35:21] There are no other active capital projects that are ready to advance to construction or otherwise in a place that would necessitate that level of debt issuance in FY28. So staff's recommendation is to just leave that capacity open so that when we do the next iteration of the CIP, which will introduce the two new years, then that capacity is just available for as projects move into the six-year plan.

[00:35:49] So as we discussed with the finance committee, prioritizing projects to get into the CIP, that capacity would be available as well for that purpose. I see. So it would be something that would probably be decided this time next year. As part of the CIP development process.

[00:36:07] Yeah. Gotcha. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Supervisor Briskman. Supervisor Glass, did you have any thoughts or comments on this? Not at this time, thank you. Not at this time. All right.

[00:36:23] All right. Supervisor Letourneau, did you have? I did. So let me get into that question that Supervisor Brisbane just asked about the other debt capacity. So the other option here is the 50 Loudoun County Parkway interchange project. Do we know what the status is of land acquisition on the northwest corner?

[00:36:45] And have we done any more analysis of the cemetery that exists on the northwest corner that at one time I think we were concerned could impact our ability over there?

[00:37:05] Ask Jim to give an update on that. So, can I share that one, Chair?

[00:37:26] The Chair just noted that no one in the cemetery will object. So there is a family plot located roughly in the middle of the parcel.

[00:37:45] Depending on the final configuration of any interchange that would be planned at that location, it is not necessarily a foregone conclusion that that plot would be physically impacted by the future interchange.

[00:38:05] We'd have to get into a fair amount of design before we could confirm that. But other than identifying that parcel as a good part of it will be needed for the...

[00:38:26] We know we need at least some of this parcel now, right? To protect the corridor. Well, yeah, I mean, I don't mean we need it this second, but we already know we need some of the parcel. Yes, sir. So why wouldn't we try to acquire it as soon as we can since we know we need it and we know that land values are only coming up?

[00:38:46] That's the idea. But that's not staff's recommendation. It's one of the additional options for consideration. It's staff's, I mean, you want to address the staff?

[00:39:02] So, yeah, the recommendation is that right now the land acquisition funding is planned for a future fiscal year on that project. So because there is the excess capacity, debt capacity in FY28, that land acquisition appropriation could move into FY28 to assist, as they've discussed, in acquiring the parcels that we would need in order to continue the work on that Route 50 Loudoun County Parkway interchange project.

[00:39:29] I guess maybe my question for, it might even be Mr. Hempstreet is, should we even look at trying to acquire the parcel earlier with the land acquisition funds if we know we need it? Just reacting to, I mean, to me, this isn't even land banking because this is an identified project where we already know we need a plot.

[00:39:53] So, I just need to understand, are you using existing funds for the project and, or? I mean, we use land acquisition funds for a lot of projects that don't have allocations in the CIP. The projects are allocated, but we're not using money out of that project for land acquisition.

[00:40:12] Yeah, so my question for staff on that one is, have we done enough work on that interchange design to know how much of a parcel we need to purchase in that quadrant? No, sir. I mean, there are some very conceptual configurations of interchanges, but we haven't advanced that far in the interchange alternatives report to see, like, a preferred alternative starting to come up to the top for consideration.

[00:40:48] So we would want to wait until we knew exactly what we needed in that process? Yes, because we – so one of the questions, for example, is what side of the existing at-grade intersection would the bridge go?

[00:41:05] Do we try to route around it and then build the bridge and the existing footprint of the existing intersection? We just don't know that yet. What's the timing on when we would have that, Jim or Mr. Zeller? So we're just starting the process of hiring a consultant for design services.

[00:41:25] so it'll be a couple years out. Okay, so would it be helpful to have money allocated in the CIP for land acquisition then? I mean, again, it would be desired.

[00:41:47] I mean, if we did it for the southeast and southwest corners, I'd have to think that it would be a good idea for the northwest corner. Okay, so that may lead to what I would prefer to do then with the remainder.

[00:42:05] So, Supervisor Letourneau, were you going to need help putting together a different motion for tonight, an additional motion for tonight? Well, I think all I would do is take, does the motion in the packet include the Prentice scenario?

[00:42:27] So the motion in the packet is delaying Prentice. So it would take this scenario that the committee directed. If I simply added to that motion that I wish to allocate 25.8 and debt capacity in FY28 to land acquisition in scenario two, that would probably cover it, right?

[00:42:45] Yes, you could, yes. Okay, I don't think I need to. I could do it on the fly. All right, but yes. Okay, Supervisor Glass. Thank you, Madam Chair. So the 25 million that staff is saying that they would wanted it unallocated to put it into, is that what you're, I just want to verify.

[00:43:12] It is, partly because I don't think staff was very clear just now on what they actually preferred no offense i think they were saying it's up to us and either way is desirable is that fair i don't want to misrepresent so if you're referring to which one of these additional considerations so the staff recommendation is to not take any action on that capacity but if the committee would like to use that capacity then our other recommendation would be to move that land acquisition funding all right okay all right

[00:43:47] We have a few motions that have come up today. We have a motion by Supervisor Briskman, and I'll turn to Supervisor Briskman shortly.

[00:44:05] This will be on Les Park. We have a joint motion from Supervisors Glass and Turner that I will read and make on their behalf. And then I have a motion on Heritage High School that I'll bring in.

[00:44:24] So I'd like to ask Megan and Tim, do you want us to make these motions before we go to the draft motion that is in the packet that seems to be the omnibus motion? Yes. All right. Let's go to Supervisor Briskman first.

[00:44:43] Julie, do you want to read? Thank you, Madam Chair. And if you'd like to finance. Thank you. Go ahead. sorry i have a little bit of an echo um are you do you guys hear an echo we we're okay we can

hear you okay i will power through then um i move that the finance government operations and economic development committee recommend the board of supervisors add to the projects identified for future development section of the fy 2023 fy 2028 amended capital improvement program to

[00:45:22] incorporate all currently unfunded blessed park improvements or phase two for blessed park all right did you want to read the additional i further move to direct staff to return to the fgo edc for a discussion on the scope and cost estimate for these improvements are you comfortable with that yes that sorry i i didn't see that second part of the motion but if that is what staff wants then that's fine with me yes yes if that's fine with you that's great

[00:46:00] and second from supervisor sayings um julie julie do you want to make opening comments yes um i i am doing this because i have a um i have something coming forward uh to public hearing next week and probably um for about the full border project a development close by on the gw area a university center area it is my intention to see if the applicant would be amenable to

[00:46:38] sending some of their cap facilities funds to the bless park improvements phase two however i can't do that unless it's listed in the projects for future funding in our CIP. I apologize for the lateness on this. When the CIP first came out, I was pretty surprised there wasn't anything, there wasn't a separate page for Bless Park. And it was my understanding that Bless Park had been fully funded. I later found out that just the phase one of Bless Park had been fully funded and we still have a phase two that needs to be funded. And so

[00:47:16] this is why I would like phase two to be in the future fiscal years list thank you madam chair very very good thank you any comments supervisor sayings and then chair Randall yes I think thank you madam chair this is the staff can you clarify because I remember was it last year when we voted on Bliss Park I guess phase one you want to call it I thought part of that motion are there understanding was was to move phase two we're gonna do some studying analysis and then we were still going to, you know, move forward with that project.

[00:47:49] So is this motion needed or necessary to achieve what Supervisor Brissman laid out about possibly seeing if she can get proffers, money from another project to this project?

[00:48:05] So typically when we accept proffers for a specific proffered facility, that's either a triggered facility that's featured in the CNA or this capital improvement program. This won't hurt having it called out in that section of the capital improvement program.

[00:48:23] But you're correct that also this is a project that staff intends to continue working through once the phase one is constructed. So, again, so can you clarify, so is the motion even actually needed then, or is it? I believe Supervisor Bristman's intent is to have it so that she can engage in proffer negotiations.

[00:48:47] cannot say specifically if this facility is called out in the capital needs assessment but knowing that product is over a decade old yeah we haven't been able to work or research this motion at all so but I don't think there's harm in it passing would that be that was what you're gonna say but I'm sure through mr. mystery is that what you're gonna I was just gonna say we just received the motion about 4:00 p.m. today so we have not looked at it we don't have any background information so I we just haven't had a chance to process it so

[00:49:23] And that's why we added the last phrase, which is just to say that we need to look at it, figure out the scope, understand what the project is so that we can advise the finance committee on it. So the

motion as it's written right now, if it passes, your intent is to go back, do some homework studying, bring it back, and give us your analysis, and then we'll make a final vote.

[00:49:49] Correct. So when you send it to a future, whatever, the future fiscal years, I guess we call this now, the products identified for future development section, we have more projects in that section in terms of value than we have funding by probably something like 100 to 1.

[00:50:09] So what we do with these motions is we accept those as, because that's going to the board, so the board has to agree, but assuming the board agrees, we take all these projects and we have to then scope them, we have to then price them, and then we will come back to the finance committee next year with a process to say, okay, we're adding two additional years to the capital plan.

[00:50:35] How do you want to prioritize projects coming into the capital plan? How do you want to, you know, are you going to prioritize road projects? Do you want to prioritize facility projects? We'll have to have that conversation with the finance committee.

[00:50:51] And then so a project like this would need to be scoped. We would need to price it. And then we would fit it into the criteria that you give us. And we would propose that, you know, that would fit into the year where we add it. That's how we would take that direction.

[00:51:08] All right. Thank you for that clarification. Thank you so much. Thank you. Chair Randall. Thank you, Madam Chair. Madam Chair, can I ask Ms. Brixman a question? Absolutely. Ms. Brixman, I'm a little, I'm a bit confused about what you're trying to do here. You're saying you want to go back to the applicant and talk about proper money.

[00:51:24] I'm confused about that. And then my question is, if in out years, in the out years, if there are more projects sitting in the out years than money, it would seem that there's possibly a project that would get bumped.

[00:51:46] Are you trying to move this up? Because if you are, something gets bumped out, because something gets bumped. Help me understand what you're trying to do here, Ms. Bricksman, if you don't mind. Sure thing, Madam Chair. Thank you for the question. So it's not the Blessed Park applicant I'm talking about.

[00:52:04] It's the Lakeview development that's coming through, coming to us next week. And so what I'm trying to do is see if I could direct dollars to facilities that would actually benefit that specific community rather than those dollars going into sort of the general county pot.

[00:52:27] So the closest thing I could figure out that would directly benefit that community would be Bless Park because it's just right down the road. And the projects that are in Phase 2 include Don't Laugh, Pickleball, Skate Spots, Off-Leash Dog Park, and that does have to be studied.

[00:52:51] But anyway, the idea is to put it in the future years so I can... If I don't have it in there, I can't send money. Ms. Bixman, hold on. Where is the money coming from? That's my disconnect. Next week, we will be seeing an application for Lakeview.

[00:53:11] It's a housing development, Peterson Company housing development right there at University Center. Okay. And it's coming to public hearing next week. So that's the one. They've got about \$10 million in facilities.

[00:53:26] Are you saying that unless we do this, the money from, then that applicant can't proffer any money? Before you answer, Supervisor Briskman, Megan very much wants to say something, so I'm going to let her jump in.

[00:53:44] Thank you. Thanks for allowing me to clarify. Just first of all, if the public hearing is next week, this project won't be added to the CIP by that time. So I just want to clarify that. The second thing I just want to say is that the way that the county is allowed to accept proffers, either cash or facilities, is based on the county's adopted capital facility standards.

[00:54:11] We have existing capital facility standards that call for different types of parks throughout the county. Blast Park specifically, at this time, I don't believe needs to be a called-out facility in that section of the CIP because we can already expect applicants to mitigate their impacts on park facilities by board policy that's already established.

[00:54:43] So then, is this needed? It's maybe not a needed motion. So the question is whether or not the district supervisor and the finance committee and then ultimately the board want to add this to the capital program as a funded project.

[00:55:04] So if there are remaining improvements that the board would like to see done at this facility, then yes, it should be added to the CIP. If it's not a project the board wants to entertain at this point, then I would say, no, don't ask us to add it to the capital plan.

[00:55:25] Madam Chair, anything else? Thank you, Madam Chair. Okay, I understand that, and thank you. Ms. Brixman, so this will come to public hearing next week, is that correct? Yes.

[00:55:42] And you haven't had this discussion with the applicant yet, correct? No, we've already talked to the applicant about potentially doing, helping with projects in Bless Park. And you believe this has to be done first before you can get an answer from the applicant?

[00:56:02] No, I mean, I think the applicant's perfectly willing to do it. The problem is I can't, we can't, there's no place to send it because there's no, it's not even on the list in the CIP. So I can't direct the proffers directly to Bless Park because Bless Park has no page in the CIP.

[00:56:21] Staff told me that Bless Park was not in the CIP at all because it was fully funded. That turns out to mean that Bless Park Phase 1 is fully funded. There's another phase, Phase 2, that includes some of the projects I just mentioned that's in the out years.

[00:56:38] And what I would like to do is put it on the list for future funded projects. It doesn't mean that we don't have a chance to prioritize other projects before that or after that it just means it's on the list it's on the radar and then and it's got a little bit of money in there because of the development that you know came through that was able that I was able to direct proffers to it okay all right uh thank you Mr. Tam Street yes I thank you uh thank you Chair, I'm sorry. I concur with what Ms. Burke said, which is there does not need to be a project

[00:57:16] in the CIP for a proffer to be made to an existing facility. So that can be done. If the proffer is set aside, then we will figure out how to program it. To an existing facility. Excellent. Alright, then I withdraw my motion.

[00:57:34] I apologize. We are grateful to you, Supervisor Briskman. Sorry. Anything? Supervisor. Yeah, let me, I was just going to say, even if this had passed, I think this doesn't take effect until July, so it wouldn't

have made any difference because the land use application would have been dispensed of.

[00:57:53] But also, general comment, I think it's challenging when we have brand new projects introduced the day of the meeting that there's been no discussion about because nobody's prepared to discuss them. And I understand there's no money associated with future fiscal year projects, but I still would like to have some idea about what i'm voting to put in the cip very good thank you all right i'm going to bring up um supervisor glass and supervisor turner's motion um and i'll i'll make the motion i move the finance government operations and economic development committee recommend the

[00:58:33] board of supervisors add to the projects identified for future development section of the FY 2023 to FY 2028 amended capital improvement program to incorporate, one, a pedestrian bridge over Route 7 along Lansdowne Boulevard, Claiborne Parkway, two, a pedestrian bridge, bridge expansion over the Dulles Greenway along Sicklin Road, three, a pedestrian bridge over the Dulles Greenway along Belmont Ridge Road, and four, the Pacific Boulevard extension

[00:59:08] from Old Ox Road to the Route 28 Sully Road Innovation Avenue Interchange. I further move to direct staff to return to the FGOEDC for a discussion on the scope and cost estimate for these improvements.

[00:59:27] Second for discussion from Vice Chair Sains, I am going to defer an opening to, it looks like, Supervisor Turner. Thank you, Madam Chair. The purpose for this motion really is to take projects that I know the first three projects are in the sidewalks and trails priority program.

[00:59:52] When the developer came to us for the Hyde Park application, we asked for a pedestrian bridge across the Greenway on Belmont Ridge Road. And staff had to recommend against that because there was nothing in the CIP for that project.

[01:00:08] What this motion does is it moves three existing projects that are already identified in the sidewalks and trails program into the future fiscal years with no funding, with no intent to move it down or move it forward in the CIP, but this allows us to place all these projects in the future fiscal years if we have applications, land applications, that could proffer these projects and pay for them.

[01:00:32] So, for example, the pedestrian bridge over Route 7 along Lansdowne Boulevard, Claiborne Parkway, we have Lansdowne Boulevard, which is right at the terminus of where this pedestrian bridge would be. That could be a potential proffer. Same thing with the Sicklin Road. We have Goose Creek Village West, which is coming up.

[01:00:48] That could be a proffer for that application and so on. So this is intended to be a placeholder in future fiscal years for these land applications that are coming up within the next year or two to potentially enter into the discussions about proffers as part of those applications.

[01:01:04] If the committee is amenable to doing this, I would propose a friendly amendment, which would be I further move, comma, in the event any of these projects are identified for acceleration out of future fiscal years comma staff return to the finance committee for discussion of the scope and estimate i'd rather not have staff spinning wheels to figure cost estimates on projects that may sit in future fiscal years indefinitely so let's wait until they're ready to move out of future fiscal years and come in for consideration before we task staff to actually do their homework

[01:01:39] thank you all right thank you supervisor turner um supervisor saints would you accept that as a friendly amendment um i would have to hear from staff first all right um mr hemstreet any thoughts on this yeah thank you uh chair i'm sad i you know so again we we received these about 4 p.m i saw them about 6 15 after we had started the meeting so we did add staff's recommendation is to add that language because we really don't know what these projects are we need to understand exactly

[01:02:17] what is being proposed to be added we need to understand how VDOT will look at them and whether or not VDOT will permit them much less maintain them and so if if the board really wants to add these projects to the capital program I really believe that we need to take a look at them and understand enough about them to be able to say and price them to be able to say to to the to the board that we recommend these projects move forward and in in in what future fiscal year they should come into the capital plan so i do we do recommend that we take a look at these and we just

[01:02:55] we're at a little bit of a disadvantage because we're reacting kind of at the last minute to something that we were not aware of coming into the meeting very good um supervisor sayings that's a part of your request so do you have any other comments i would say let's just keep the motion as is because that's the language at the bottom of my understanding that's staff's add-in and that's what they wanted to have in so I would say let's just keep it the way it is that they vetted it once they received it and if we vote for it for them to go do their homework and come back then we'll come back and we can have further discussion um can I have questions no yeah okay

[01:03:33] yes so Mr. Turner said that what is it three of these all three of these are well three of them So number one, two, and three, I'm assuming Mr. Turner, are identified. And can somebody explain number four? Because I'm trying to figure out where would this actually connect?

[01:03:50] Because Pacific Boulevard runs parallel to 28, but then that ends to the parking facility for the Dulles Greenway. So how would we connect Pacific Boulevard to Old Oaks Road and then by way to the Innovation Avenue interchange?

[01:04:10] I'm trying to understand that. Supervisor Turner. Or Supervisor Glass, if either of you has an answer to that. Well, I know that Pacific Boulevard was part of a discussion from a large study from VDOT, and it's also in the CTP.

[01:04:30] So I do remember it was discussed on the need for that area, especially when innovation comes in to have connectivity for the development that's coming in.

[01:04:47] Okay, I still need more information because the immunization is in the existence now, right, and operational. Ms. Glass, is this project, I'm sorry, I'll hear from my other colleagues with their questions, but I'm kind of hesitant, I'll be honest with you, I'm a little hesitant on these.

[01:05:18] And with all due respect to my colleagues, I understand you're fighting for some projects that you feel are needed already get into the to the program but we have a process that was sent out to all of us for to prevent this type of situation and I wish we would would add here to that you know in the future please because it is very difficult to try to take this all in at the last hour so let's leave it at that for right now thank you I'll go to chair Randall and then to supervisor Letourneau thank you

[01:05:55] Madam Chair. As Chair at large, I am a little more removed, a little more distant from CIP discussions, and I honestly don't want to put my finger on the scale for one district or the other because everyone's my constituents and everyone has valid points. However, I do want to know what's going on,

and I do want to be able to ask coaching questions and understand things, and some of these things being thrust on me right now I can't even I I need one to go ask questions too I'm a I'm I and you all know this I'm a field trip maker I'm going to go look at it and see how it looks and so

[01:06:35] I would make a motion to table this right now to table this question until the next meeting and so the staff has a little more time I have a little more time and we know what's kind of going on I feel I feel too at a loss to ask reasonable questions and certainly couldn't vote on it right now.

[01:06:55] So I'm going to make a motion to table. All right. Motion to table has been made by Chair Randall. Is there a second? I'm going where she is, but I wanted to ask a few questions right now. And most of the table is not debatable. So would you mind withdrawing for a moment?

[01:07:15] I withdraw my motion to table until questions are asked and then I'll remake my motion to table. yes okay um yeah this is a little frustrating because this is our second cip meeting i could understand a little bit if it was our first but aren't some of these programs already in the cip in the sense that they're part of the sidewalk and trails program i mean weren't they evaluated nancy you're nodding your head yes so yes yes so i don't really understand then i mean if if the

[01:07:52] question is whether somebody could proffer money to them they could right because they've already been evaluated you have that's correct yes okay can i go back to supervisor turner yes chair go ahead i don't know if a pedestrian bridge across uh the greenway on belmont ridge road is in the sidewalks and trails program do we know that i don't yeah and i don't know that's literally because if it is we've been through this chair yes i agree with supervisor turner we do not know

[01:08:29] if these are a part of that program we we need to go back and have the opportunity to talk with the board members understand exactly what's being proposed and then have our conversations can i make another observation this is not the only time that we can add future fiscal year projects to the cip right that's correct so it doesn't have to happen right now i think these all of these motions are we should be doing the cost estimate scope analysis part first before we do the even for future fiscal year so we have some idea what we're adding so i'm perfectly fine with looking at these i don't want to sound like it being negative or difficult i just i you know

[01:09:08] this process wise this has gotten me all bollocksed up and i would like to understand some of these i do remember the discussion of one of these because it came up i think it was hyde park right and i thought we didn't really want it so it went away because of other reasons okay but what i'm trying to avoid and and obviously there may be procedural challenges here and i'm totally fine with that it's just before staff couldn't recommend the pedestrian bridge because it wasn't the cip so we're going okay we got projects that are valid projects that are in the sidewalks and trails okay let's end the cip if that's not the way to do it i'm done i'm at a loss that's all i would i think

[01:09:47] we should just have the analysis have the questions be submitted on this by the supervisors and then And I guess we are going to take this up with the full board, but I don't know if they're going to have much for us. But we can do this outside of this cycle if it's future fiscal year because it doesn't affect the budget anyway.

[01:10:04] Let me just go to Supervisor Brisman and see. Supervisor Brisman, any questions, comments within this motion? Thank you, Madam Chair. I think my colleagues asked the questions that I might have asked.

[01:10:19] It is a little bit confusing. I think four projects kind of right in one big bundle is a little bit hard to digest. I'm happy to consider it at a later meeting or maybe our wrap-up or maybe like Supervisor Letourneau said, we can do it outside the budget process.

[01:10:37] And then I'd be happy to consider as well. All right. Chair Randall. We'll make a motion to table to the next meeting. I will second that. Motion all in favor of tabling to the next meeting, I assume, of the Finance Committee?

[01:10:55] Yes, ma'am. All right, please say aye. I know I'm not debatable, but next meeting? How much time? Would that be enough time? Not next meeting. Tim or staff? So I agree with what Supervisor Letourneau said, which is what I would recommend is that the staff and I have the opportunity to meet with Supervisor Turner and Supervisor Glass, understand exactly what they're proposing, and be able to make a recommendation to add this to a future fiscal year.

[01:11:33] The future fiscal year component of the CIP is not a part of your current discussion. You do not need to make a decision on that today as part of this process. So that can be done, say, in the April Finance Committee meeting or the May Finance Committee meeting, and then proceed to the board independently to have that conversation.

[01:11:53] That would be my recommendation to the committee. Chair Randall? So I would make the motion to table this to the, just, I think we should table it to a date certain. Do you want a date certain in the Finance Committee meeting? I would say the May Finance Committee meeting.

[01:12:09] All right. That would be the motion I would make. I'll second that. Okay. All right. All in favor of tabling this motion until the May Finance Committee meeting, please say aye. Aye. And I'll vote aye, so that's 5-0.

[01:12:25] Thank you, both supervisors, for bringing this forward, and we'll see you in May. And I am going to profusely apologize for doing something I did not want to do, which is to bring another motion at this late date, because I really wanted to stick to the promises we had made to staff and each other, not to raise new issues.

[01:12:54] However, when Heritage High School found out that Dominion and Parkview were able to send to fund balance in September press boxes, and I think weight rooms and tennis court lighting, I think, Heritage asked us to do the same for them.

[01:13:20] So with great apologies to my colleagues and staff, I'm going to move the Finance, Government Operations, and Economic Development Committee, recommend that the Board of Supervisors send consideration of funding for the weight room expansion, press boxes, and tennis court lighting at Heritage High School in the amount of \$3.55 million to the FY 2023 fund balance discussion.

[01:13:46] Is there a second from Superfus? I'd really like to second that one. Supervisor Briskman, you can have the second. Supervisor Letourneau is being very gracious. I appreciate both of you. I would simply say that based on my discussions just this afternoon right before the meeting with a member of the Heritage community,

[01:14:15] The Heritage is an older school of the newer model, but is behind the more recent schools in a lot of their facilities. And the students there are feeling that they are sort of the second choice.

[01:14:39] And so this is primarily the community is trying to support the students. So that's all I have to say on it. I would ask for my colleague's support. This would go to fund balance. I have informed the Heritage community that this is not a guarantee, that unless we have enough fund balance to cover everything that's going to fund balance, there may well be competition for these funds.

[01:15:05] But I would like to give Heritage a shot at them. Anyone else? Supervisor Letourneau? Yeah, I just was going to say the last part. I just want to make sure there's clarity in the community that us sending it to the fund balance discussion does not mean we're going to use fund balance for this, but that it will be on the list of projects that the board will make a note to consider when we get to fund balance, but that it will depend entirely on what we have for fund balance and what other projects or needs, sometimes it's mid-year staffing because of something that emerges or whatever, arise.

[01:15:39] so at this point i think we have previous was like five or six million i think it was so this is another three and a half so it could be a little bit challenging but i'm perfectly happy to consider it i don't think it's a new issue because we've discussed it previously it at this point is do you know is it in the school cip and if so i can just look what the full list of no i know it's in but what what the full list of their press box slash weight room slash improvements are they typically do not include that level of detail in their actual cip document my only other

[01:16:17] observation would be okay it maybe you could just send it to us every school will now that hasn't had a renovation recently will now want to be on the list so it would be helpful maybe for the rest of us to find out whether we're going to have similar requests coming our way because i honestly don't know exactly what the status is of all those. Supervisor Letourneau, if you'd like to formalize that question, we can send that to LCPS for our response. Yes, I would like to ask for the full list of, is it press boxes, weight rooms, tennis courts, lighting, those sort of projects

[01:16:57] that are scheduled to occur. In fact, we received a constituent question today asking about lighting at Freedom High School tennis courts. No kidding. So it does come up. These questions that are coming up are because LCPS delayed these improvements?

[01:17:15] Are you looking for the projects that were delayed? I'm looking for, no. Or the schedule as they exist? Both the delayed projects, but also just the whole list of projects and what the schedule is. Okay. So that we know that. Thank you. Good. Chair Randall? I would associate myself with Mr. LeTerno's comments.

[01:17:31] I would also maybe add to that, that I guess motion that Megan just made that um I wouldn't mind knowing when when they were last renovated because because I want to know the the order and who you know which school got what most recently or didn't get something most recently I mean Freedom High School how was Freedom High School it's like a fairly new school um well it's same area as Heritage um 05 05 what year was heritage to okay okay I would like to I would like just to just to find out when

[01:18:08] things were renovated most recently I also want to have a discussion with our colleagues on the school board to find out are they getting these questions are they getting these these emails had to be honest more information about their cap program and what what are they what are they what are they doing with this money to be quite honest I mean I hate to say it like that but it there is there There should be a fund of money in the school board for just the continued renovation of our schools and things like this.

[01:18:43] And if every school is now saying that they need a new weight room or something, this is a discussion I want to have with our colleagues on the school board, perhaps when they come on the 16th, of how are they prioritizing these improvements and those discussions.

[01:19:00] Because, you know, how many high schools do we have now? 27 high schools now 18 18 did you say 40 okay 14 18 high schools a lot of high schools to all to have this discussion all at once and so if they can bring a list of what was done was recently and how they make the decisions that would also be really helpful thank you ma'am thank you Megan and then supervisor briskman I would like to respond to the one question you asked which was are they getting the same types of emails and anecdotally yes that's what we

[01:19:34] understand. I would just, we will transmit those more formal questions to LCPS, but I would just direct the board's attention to our CIP, which includes the school CIP under LCPS facility renewals and alterations on 11-13. That is the program that the board funds annually for those types of improvements if you look at fy 24 and fy 25 and fy 26 compared to 27 and 28 you'll see

[01:20:08] that those years are far reduced those reductions in those years were taken as mr lewis shared at the last work session to address cost overruns in their other prioritized projects so this is a program that's county staff and school staff work to fund and we've ramped it up year over year but because resources are scarce LCPS did have to make some choices during budget development and did have to reduce the amount of projects that could be funded out of this program in FY 24 25 and 26

[01:20:44] yes and that helps a lot and I will go read them over that that doesn't help me know which ones were most recent and that's what i need to know because i mean this feels very much like picking winners and losers and it does not feel good to have to do it like this thank you very good supervisor briskman any comments thank you yes i i can add maybe just a little bit of clarity and you know it's it's been a little bit difficult because when i do go to the schools and i try to get sort of a priority list it's really difficult to get it um i was trying to figure out

[01:21:21] if a school was supposed to get a playground and they said oh it's on it's we don't give out the list but no that school's not getting a playground like well there's a list somewhere if you know what the answer is no but anyway um i'll forward this to everybody the press boxes are now that were supposed to get done in fy 23 to 25 at all three of the schools dominion potomac falls and heritage are now moved to fy27 the weight rooms were supposed to get done fy24 to 25 and dominion was supposed to have theirs this summer they have been moved to tbd which means who knows after the

[01:21:59] six years cip is done i don't know and then the tennis court lighting um that was supposed to get done in fy24 is also now moved to tbd so i can forward this to you guys um so you can see that And those three schools were the ones that were kind of next up in the rotation based on the age of the schools and the facilities.

[01:22:22] But I do have a question, though. You know, it's pretty clear from, and I just turned to that page that Ms. Bork said to turn to, it's pretty clear that cost overruns are the issue. And so I don't understand if it's cost overruns, why we cannot use contingency funds for some of these projects.

[01:22:41] Because contingency funds have been used for cost overruns before, and if these are cost overruns, then that's exactly what contingency funds are supposed to be used for, in my opinion. And then

also, my other question is, in some of the answers in the packet for tonight, it said that these were new projects, and they're definitely not new projects if the schools have been discussing them for a while.

[01:23:06] So those are kind of my two questions, and I'm happy to support the motion. Obviously, I seconded it. Thank you very much. all right i oh megan can do would you like me to respond absolutely um so just thanks i think i am using imprecise language so if i could um the responses in the packet reference new projects um those projects that have been the topic of discussion are currently not planned for in lcps's school board's adopted cip and adding them would add them to the adopted cip and so that's why

[01:23:42] we have been calling them new projects because they are currently not planned for in FY24. Cost overrun and how I was describing in budget development, we had a CIP that was adopted last year that included a series of new construction for LCPS schools. Those cost estimates and even bids have come in significantly over what was budgeted last year. And so in an effort to anticipate new estimates and future cost overruns. LCPS had increased their cost estimates for

[01:24:19] future projects in FY24 and beyond. There is only a certain amount of capacity that we have in our CIP, and should we had to have accommodated all of those cost increases and continue funding the alterations and renewal program for LCPS, that would have affected county projects. And so we worked with LCPS staff to identify areas of their proposal that could be reduced to accommodate appropriately their new cost estimates without overly impacting the county and transportation

[01:24:52] portions of the CIP. Thanks, Megan. All right, I'm going to call for the vote now. All in favor, please say aye. Julie? Aye. Any opposed, say nay. Any abstentions? All right, that will pass 5-0.

[01:25:11] I really do appreciate staff and my colleagues' patience on this. Are we ready? Nikki, do you have anything else you need to tell us before we go to the main motion in the packet? I do not. All right.

[01:25:27] I'm going to read the omnibus motion then. I move that the Finance, Government Operations, and Economic Development Committee forward the FY 2023 to FY 2028 amended capital improvement program, Capital Asset Preservation Program Fund, Major Equipment Replacement Fund, Metro Garages Fund, Public Facilities Fund, and Transportation District Fund, as amended by the committee on March 8, 2022, to the Board of Supervisors, March 13, 2023, Budget Work Session, for review and approval.

[01:26:03] Second by Supervisor Letourneau. Any comments from my colleagues? Julie, anything? No, Madam Chair, I'm good. thank you happy to support all right all in favor please i have an amendment oh you have an amendment all right yes all right so my amendment will be to add on to that that the um 25.8 of debt capacity and fy 28 be allocated to the uh route 50 loudon county parkway interchange land acquisition i think

[01:26:38] we should split that motion well it's an amendment to the motion so um i thought that would be a a separate motion so should we just go forward with the main motion and then happy to all right let's let's vote on the main motion just the main motion and then and then we'll go with to supervisor letourneau for his proposed motion all in favor of the main motion please say aye any opposed say nay that'll pass 5-0 supervisor letourneau okay i would then move that the 25.8

[01:27:17] million, or \$26 million, and outstanding debt capacity in FY28 be allocated in Scenario 2 to the Route 50 Latin County Parkway Interchange Project. I will second for purposes of discussion, Supervisor Letourneau.

[01:27:35] Thank you. I appreciate the second for discussion. So I understand what staff is saying, the recommendation to leave it unopened, but I think we also heard from Mr. Zeller and the transportation folks that we do need this land, and it's an identified project, so it would be helpful.

[01:27:51] I think you said it would be helpful to have it in the CIP. I want to point out, you know, I constantly advocate for this project, and one of the reasons Supervisor Turner, I think, just left, I was going to try to appeal to him, even though he can't vote tonight, which is there are no pedestrian connections to the entire extent south of Route 50.

[01:28:13] So Route 7 has four different places now with the interchanges and overpasses So all these bikes and trails and everything everybody's building, you can get to. But if you live anywhere south of 50, this project is the project that will finally give you a crossing of Route 50 so that anybody, a pedestrian or anybody on a bike, can safely cross.

[01:28:37] So I will consistently advocate for trying to move the project along. I've been advocating for it for 12 years. We've finally gotten into an interchange access report project. I think anything we can do to try to acquire land as early as we can, and I think once the interchange access report money study is done, we should have a discussion about trying to acquire the land for it.

[01:29:00] But I think having it as a placeholder, I mean, the money is not going to get allocated to FY28 regardless, but I think having it as a placeholder at least gives it something that's in there so that that money is allocated. So that is my pitch on that. All right. Let me go to Chair Randall and then Vice Chair Sains.

[01:29:21] Mr. Latourna, do you mind repeating the motion? The motion is, so on page seven where it says additional options for consideration, it is the second scenario there, which is alternatively the board consider. So I just said to allocate the now open \$25.8 million of debt capacity to that project as staff mentions here.

[01:29:45] Okay. You know what? You have been talking about this for a long time. These constituents are yours as much, mine as much as yours. And I do think that, you know, Route 50 actually needs something because it's not, I won't say it's unsafe. That's not something I want to say, but it can be more safe if we did this. And so I believe I'm going to support this motion.

[01:30:10] very good uh supervisor saints all right um two questions one to mr loturno first by way of the chair would this be in relation to our conversation last evening that was private that you and i had oh no i was kidding yeah well so this yeah this parcel is yes it's in relation it's their cousins

[01:30:47] it's the same yeah they're cousins okay yes okay all right and then to staff with this this motion with this delay any projects any other projects that are in the cip or hurt take away any money from anything else or well besides apprentices but any other projects that are that are on the table no sir and this is not going to hurt my i'm going to be selfish my my projects? No, this will not impact any other project in the CIP. Okay, all right, then I'm

[01:31:19] uncomfortable. Okay, supervisor. Thank you. I believe that was staff's recommendation that we not dedicate this extra debt capacity to any specific project right now, and I really don't feel very comfortable doing that without knowing what our other options are. I mean, this just came up tonight that we're going to have this 25 million that's a lot of money in debt capacity and all of a sudden we're sending it to one project i appreciate supervisor letourneau's

[01:31:56] advocacy and i appreciate all of the reasons why we might want to do this but honestly i i just don't think that we have enough information to say that we are going to allocate 25 million of our debt capacity which could go to a number of other projects in the county not just sterling or Algonquian or you know it could go to any number of projects and staff might have some ideas as to where they would want to send that debt capacity or use that debt capacity that we just don't know about yet so I I would I'm not going to support the motion and I would consider

[01:32:33] tabling the motion to a future finance meeting because we don't need to make this decision right now either do no we don't we it's debt capacity it's debt I mean we don't have to decide today what we want to do with that deck well staff can answer that question in my time but staff recommended we don't allocate this yet or nikki this to anything yet i believe yes so we did provide that as an alternative that if the committee would like to recommend some use for that that the route 50 interchange land acquisition is what staff would then recommend if there was

[01:33:11] something to move into that and we would need the committee to make that decision tonight in order to forward the CIP to the board's full work session. So staff thinks this is the next top priority for us with that \$25 million debt capacity.

[01:33:28] Let me turn to Tim. Tim? Yeah, thank you, Chair. So the purpose of the staff recommendation is that, as we indicated earlier, we have a lot of projects that are set to come into the next iteration of the CIP next year.

[01:33:48] The amount of money that those products represent is well above the capacity that's available in the additional two years that are added. So staff recommended leaving this last \$25 or \$26 million open because what we were anticipating was being able to use some of this debt capacity perhaps to help bring some additional, one or more additional projects into the CIP and funding it or starting to fund it as early as FI-28 if the project was ready.

[01:34:23] So that was the reason for the staff recommendation, and the reason why it was the first staff recommendation. And then the rest or balance of what Ms. Spate said is accurate with respect to the second alternative.

[01:34:39] Thank you. All right. Supervisor Letourneau closing. Yeah, I think I need to make a close. So this is an existing project on 10-73. There is already money in the CIP in 25 and 26 allocated for this project.

[01:34:55] There is also land in 28, land acquisition money, \$6.7 million allocated for the project. So what this motion does, if you go to the future fiscal year portion of this project, it is \$238.3 million on 10-7-3.

[01:35:13] So this basically, which includes \$26.1 million of future fiscal year land acquisition, again, money that we know we need. so this just moves it up into that last year of the cip obviously the board will have the opportunity to reallocate money next year as part of the cip anyway but this is not the same scenario as we were discussing this is not a new project this is an existing cip project with money already in it and the reason we have to decide this tonight is because we are allocating debt capacity in the cip within the six-year period this is a this is a motion to move it to fy 28

[01:35:50] The other thing that I will say is, not to be super parochial, but to be frank, the only reason we're having any discussion about reallocating any money from Prentice is because I brought this forward at the last meeting and suggested it, and several folks and projects have benefited from that, and that's

fine, that's how this should work, and I think staff has made good recommendations for those, but I don't think there's any harm in moving this money up so that there is more, at least, in this project, because we will be trying to get federal funds, and state funds and all that stuff, and the more that we can show that we've started the process

[01:36:26] of allocating funding for this, and I worry that this \$280 million won't even be enough, but it's a huge project. It's hugely important. This is in the top three intersections in the county for crash data every single year. There are no pedestrian crossings, so it is my number one thing to try to get done before I leave or die. One of the two. I hope not, but if I don't at this damn project, though.

[01:36:54] All right. All in favor, please say aye. Aye. You convinced me, Matt. Opposed, say nay. Abstentions? All right. That will pass 5-0.

[01:37:11] You guys need anything else from us? All right. Then we are adjourned. Thank you all very much. Good night.



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com