

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE  
"A World Class City"

**Department of Neighborhood Development Services**

City Hall Post Office Box 911  
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902  
Telephone 434-970-3182  
Fax 434-970-3359  
[www.charlottesville.org](http://www.charlottesville.org)



November 12, 2012

**TO: Charlottesville Planning Commission, Neighborhood Associations &  
News Media**

# Please Take Notice

A Work Session of the Charlottesville Planning Commission will be held on **Tuesday November 27, 2012 at 4:00 p.m. at the Water Street Center (407 E. Water Street)**

## AGENDA

1. Capital Improvement Program
2. Review Land Use Community Feedback
3. Land Use Vision and Goal Discussion
4. Public Comment – 15 minutes

cc: City Council  
Maurice Jones  
Aubrey Watts  
Jim Tolbert  
Neighborhood Planners  
Melissa Thackston, Kathy McHugh  
Mary Joy Scala  
Craig Brown, Rich Harris

**City of Charlottesville  
City Manager's Office  
MEMO**



**TO:** Planning Commission  
**FROM:** Leslie Beauregard, Director, Budget and Performance Management  
Ryan Davidson, Budget and Management Analyst  
**CC:** Maurice Jones, City Manager  
Jim Tolbert, Director, NDS  
City Council  
**DATE:** November 20, 2012  
**SUBJECT:** **FY 2014 – 2018 Proposed Capital Improvement Program**

---

Presented for the Planning Commission's consideration is the Proposed FY 2014-2018 Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

As has been the case in recent years, preparing for this five year plan was most challenging. What is being presented to the Planning Commission reflects what we know at this time regarding the City's total revenue and expenditure needs for FY 2014, and should be considered a **DRAFT**. Until staff has a complete picture for the total budget, the 5 year CIP will remain a work in progress and could see adjustments between now and when the Proposed Budget is presented to City Council in March.

There are still many unknowns, including how City revenues are projected to perform in FY 2014, and how any additional State and Federal cuts will impact the City, not only on the revenue side, but the City may be expected to pick up unfunded mandates passed along by the State. In addition, staff has been analyzing very closely the City's debt limit and what the City can afford to borrow for capital needs. This CIP as presented puts us at the top of our policy limit: debt payments at no more than 8% of General Fund budget. We are very concerned about a larger CIP without an identified source of additional revenue to pay for it. For these reasons, some of the strategies used to balance the CIP for FY 14 and future years include:

- Annual recurring projects (major maintenance, etc.) received no additional cuts, but saw the continuation of the 5% reduction that was put in place as part of the FY 13 Adopted CIP;
- No additional funding to go towards the CIP Contingency, previously budgeted at .5% of total project expenditures per year;
- Staff received total new requests of slightly over \$5.0 million for FY 14, of which only \$1.0 million were funded; and new requests in the amount

of \$31.6 million for the total 5 year CIP, of which only \$5.0 million were funded; and

- Focus on maintaining what we are currently doing, rather than adding new projects.

Staff looks forward to the upcoming discussion with the Planning Commission on this draft 5 year plan. If you have questions or need more information before the Planning Commission meeting, please don't hesitate to contact me (beauregard@charlottesville.org) or Ryan Davidson, Budget and Management Analyst (davidson@charlottesville.org).

### **Information for November 27<sup>th</sup> PC Work session**

In preparation for the November 27<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission work session, attached is information on the Proposed FY 2014-2018 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Staff will give a short Power Point presentation followed by a question/answer session. Any follow up will be included as information for the December 11<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing.

- Attachment I** – FY 2014-2018 Proposed CIP
- Attachment II** – Proposed FY 2014 CIP Revenue and Expenditure Description Summary
- Attachment III** – FY 2014-2018 Unfunded CIP Projects List
- Attachment IV** – Evaluation Criteria for Project Ranking
- Attachment V** – Final Project Criteria Scoring
- Attachment VI** – Project Request Forms
- Attachment VII** – School Facilities and City Facilities Capital Project Detail
- Attachment VIII** – Capital Improvement Program Development Timeline and Code Requirements

### **FY 2014 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program Process Changes**

After the adoption of the FY 2012 – 2013 budget, a CIP Request Process Revision Committee was formed to look into making improvements to the CIP request and review process. As a result of the one-on-one meetings with departments, staff research, and the CIP Request Process Revision Committee meetings, several recommended changes to the CIP Request process and applications were made for the FY 2014 – 2018 CIP Process. These changes were reviewed and approved by both the Planning Commission and City Council.

The changes that affect the FY 2014 – 2018 CIP submissions include:

- Removal of 3 criteria from the scoring system
- Additional of 3 new criteria and revisions to several of the existing criteria for 9 total scored criteria
- Removal of Areas of Special Consideration

- Departments no longer assign scores for each criteria, instead provide scoring justification and the Technical Review Committee will assign criteria scores.
- Changes to the request forms through the addition of areas for project phase, departmental priority, and project expenditures

The final process change deals with the Planning Commission Comprehensive Plan Priorities. After discussion with the Planning Commission, the Comprehensive Plan Priorities will not be a scored criterion in future cycles. Following the Planning Commission's June work session, staff will distribute these priorities to City departments for consideration in the development of future CIP submissions. The departments will have the option to, and be encouraged to, work with the Planning Commission to create a joint Planning Commission/departmental submission for any projects that specifically meet one of the Comprehensive Plan priorities.

The current priorities identified by the Planning Commission are:

- Improve, expand, and enhance the park system, create and maintain pockets of open space in higher density zoning districts, create alternative active use opportunities in new and existing facilities or maintain and enhance natural areas for the variety of citizens within our community.
- Reduce single occupancy vehicle trips by expanding alternative modes of mobility;
- Increase and diversify affordable housing options;
- Improve the natural quality and ecology of streams, rivers and riparian zones;
- Promote vitality in Entrance Corridors through infrastructure improvements and enhancements.

# Attachment I

## FY 2014 – 2018 Proposed CIP



**Proposed Capital Improvement Program  
FY 2014-2018**

	<u>Adopted FY13</u>	<u>Proposed FY14</u>	<u>Projected FY15</u>	<u>Projected FY16</u>	<u>Projected FY17</u>	<u>Projected FY18</u>	<u>5 Year Total</u>	<u>Notes</u>
<b>Revenues</b>								
Transfer from General Fund	4,400,000	4,444,000	4,488,440	4,533,324	4,578,657	4,624,444	22,668,865	
FY 2011 Fund Balance Surplus	1,800,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Contribution from Albemarle County (CATEC)	0	57,500	60,000	120,000	81,500	245,000	564,000	Pending Adoption in County CIP program
Contribution from Albemarle County (Central Library)	175,000	90,000	197,500	75,000	0	0	362,500	Pending Adoption in County CIP program
Contribution from Schools (Small Cap Program)	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	1,000,000	
State Transportation Funds (Belmont Bridge - Revenue Sharing Match)	1,460,904	0	0	0	0	0	0	
State Transportation Funds (Hillsdale Drive Connector - Revenue Sharing Match)	500,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	
PEG Fee Revenue	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	225,000	
CY 2013 Bond Issue	8,643,210	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CY 2014 Bond Issue	0	6,353,040	0	0	0	0	6,353,040	
CY 2015 Bond Issue	0	0	8,864,097	0	0	0	8,864,097	
CY 2016 Bond Issue	0	0	0	7,907,618	0	0	7,907,618	
CY 2017 Bond Issue	0	0	0	0	8,905,026	0	8,905,026	
CY 2018 Bond Issue	0	0	0	0	0	5,838,209	5,838,209	
<b>TOTAL AVAILABLE REVENUES</b>	<b>\$17,224,114</b>	<b>\$11,189,540</b>	<b>\$13,855,037</b>	<b>\$12,880,942</b>	<b>\$13,810,183</b>	<b>\$10,952,653</b>	<b>\$62,688,355</b>	
<b>Expenditures</b>								
<b>BONDABLE PROJECTS</b>								
<b>EDUCATION</b>	<b>Adopted FY13</b>	<b>Projected FY14</b>	<b>Projected FY15</b>	<b>Projected FY16</b>	<b>Projected FY17</b>	<b>Projected FY18</b>	<b>5 Year Total</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Project								
Lump Sum to Schools (City Contribution)	1,045,491	1,045,491	1,045,491	1,045,491	1,045,491	1,045,491	5,227,455	
City Schools HVAC Replacement	475,000	475,000	475,000	475,000	475,000	475,000	2,375,000	
Charlottesville High School - Fire Suppression System	0	600,000	541,900	0	0	0	1,141,900	New Project in FY14-18 CIP
Middle School Reconfiguration Design	0	0	0	0	0	750,000	750,000	New Project in FY14-18 CIP
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>1,520,491</b>	<b>2,120,491</b>	<b>2,062,391</b>	<b>1,520,491</b>	<b>1,520,491</b>	<b>2,270,491</b>	<b>\$9,494,355</b>	
<b>FACILITIES CAPITAL PROJECTS</b>	<b>Adopted FY13</b>	<b>Projected FY14</b>	<b>Projected FY15</b>	<b>Projected FY16</b>	<b>Projected FY17</b>	<b>Projected FY18</b>	<b>5 Year Total</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Project								
Lump Sum to Facilities Capital Projects	1,045,491	1,045,491	1,045,491	1,045,491	1,045,491	1,045,491	5,227,455	
City Facility HVAC Replacement	237,500	237,500	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	1,037,500	
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,282,991</b>	<b>\$1,282,991</b>	<b>\$1,245,491</b>	<b>\$1,245,491</b>	<b>\$1,245,491</b>	<b>\$1,245,491</b>	<b>\$6,264,955</b>	
<b>PUBLIC SAFETY AND JUSTICE</b>	<b>Adopted FY13</b>	<b>Projected FY14</b>	<b>Projected FY15</b>	<b>Projected FY16</b>	<b>Projected FY17</b>	<b>Projected FY18</b>	<b>5 Year Total</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Project								
Bypass Fire Station Renovation	0	0	0	0	0	500,000	500,000	Needs will be reevaluated upon the completion of the Fontaine Avenue Station.
Circuit Court Renovation	0	0	0	0	500,000	600,000	1,100,000	Moved funding out 1 year from original request. The initial funding in FY17 & FY18 is to be used for architecture and design work.

Regional Police Firearms Range	576,711	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Additional project funding (\$250K) to be transferred from Mobile Data Computer account.
Fire Portable Radio Replacement	0	125,000	125,000	0	0	0	250,000		
Replacement Fire Pumper Truck	850,000	0	1,768,000	0	956,135	0	2,724,135		Pushed out 2 years from original replacement schedule.
800 MHz Radio System Upgrade (ECC)	0	0	1,238,902	1,238,902	1,238,902	0	3,716,706		Represents the City's portion of the cost for the 800 MHz radio system upgrade/replacement.
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,426,711</b>	<b>\$125,000</b>	<b>\$3,131,902</b>	<b>\$1,238,902</b>	<b>\$2,695,037</b>	<b>\$1,100,000</b>	<b>\$8,290,841</b>		
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND ACCESS</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>5 Year</b>		
<u>Project</u>	<u>FY13</u>	<u>FY14</u>	<u>FY15</u>	<u>FY16</u>	<u>FY17</u>	<u>FY18</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Notes</u>
Undergrounding Utilities	400,000	0	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	380,000		
New Sidewalks	285,000	285,000	285,000	285,000	285,000	285,000	1,425,000		
West Main Streetscape	0	0	750,000	750,000	750,000	0	2,250,000		Funds increased by \$417,500 in FY15-17.
Street Milling and Paving	1,457,959	1,472,539	1,487,264	1,502,137	1,517,158	1,532,330	7,511,428		
Belmont Bridge - State Revenue Sharing Match	1,460,904	0	0	1,000,000	1,000,000	0	2,000,000		Funding in FY16 and 17 to ensure all funds on hand when construction is scheduled to begin (per state 5 year plan).
Hillsdale Drive Connector - State Revenue Sharing Match	500,000	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Martha Jefferson Neighborhood Streetscaping	0	50,000	300,000	0	0	0	350,000		Funds reduced by \$250K in FY14 - represents design only funds in FY14.
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$4,103,863</b>	<b>\$1,807,539</b>	<b>\$2,917,264</b>	<b>\$3,632,137</b>	<b>\$3,647,158</b>	<b>\$1,912,330</b>	<b>\$13,916,428</b>		
<b>PARKS AND RECREATION</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>5 Year</b>		
<u>Project</u>	<u>FY13</u>	<u>FY14</u>	<u>FY15</u>	<u>FY16</u>	<u>FY17</u>	<u>FY18</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Notes</u>
Washington Park Rec Center Expansion	0	0	0	0	100,000	0	100,000		Moved initial funding out one year to FY17.
Rives Park Renovations	750,000	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Azalea Park Renovations	375,000	375,000	0	0	0	0	375,000		
McIntire Park - Master Plan Implementation	0	0	750,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	500,000	3,250,000		Pushed request out 1 year to start funding in FY15 instead of FY14.
Lee Park Retaining Wall	0	240,000	0	0	0	0	240,000		
Tonsler Park Master Plan	0	0	250,000	750,000	0	0	1,000,000		
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,125,000</b>	<b>\$615,000</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>	<b>\$1,750,000</b>	<b>\$1,100,000</b>	<b>\$500,000</b>	<b>\$4,965,000</b>		
<b>STORMWATER INITIATIVES</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>5 Year</b>		
<u>Project</u>	<u>FY13</u>	<u>FY14</u>	<u>FY15</u>	<u>FY16</u>	<u>FY17</u>	<u>FY18</u>	<u>Total</u>		
Stormwater Initiatives	600,000	600,000	0	0	0	0	600,000		FY13-17 CIP had \$100K per year budgeted; budget removed due to anticipation of the creation of Stormwater Utility. If utility is not created by Council will need to add funding back into the CIP.
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$600,000</b>	<b>\$600,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$600,000</b>		
<b>SUBTOTAL BONDABLE PROJECTS</b>	<b>\$10,059,056</b>	<b>\$6,551,021</b>	<b>\$10,357,048</b>	<b>\$9,387,021</b>	<b>\$10,208,177</b>	<b>\$7,028,312</b>	<b>\$43,531,579</b>		
Bondable Contingency	43,545	0	0	0	0	0	0		Contingency removed due to current balance of \$2.5 million.
<b>TOTAL BONDABLE EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>\$10,102,601</b>	<b>\$6,551,021</b>	<b>\$10,357,048</b>	<b>\$9,387,021</b>	<b>\$10,208,177</b>	<b>\$7,028,312</b>	<b>\$43,531,579</b>		

<b>STATE AND FEDERAL FUNDED PROJECTS</b>								
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND ACCESS</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>5 Year</b>	
<u>Project</u>	<u>FY13</u>	<u>FY14</u>	<u>FY15</u>	<u>FY16</u>	<u>FY17</u>	<u>FY18</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Belmont Bridge Replacement	1,460,904	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Hillsdale Drive Connector	500,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>SUBTOTAL STATE AND FEDERAL PROJECTS</b>	<b>\$1,960,904</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	
<b>NONBONDABLE PROJECTS</b>								
<b>EDUCATION</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>5 Year</b>	
<u>Project</u>	<u>FY13</u>	<u>FY14</u>	<u>FY15</u>	<u>FY16</u>	<u>FY17</u>	<u>FY18</u>	<u>Total</u>	
School Small Capital Improvements Program	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	1,000,000	Funded through contribution from City Schools.
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>	
<b>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>5 Year</b>	
<u>Project</u>	<u>FY13</u>	<u>FY14</u>	<u>FY15</u>	<u>FY16</u>	<u>FY17</u>	<u>FY18</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Economic Development (Strategic) Initiatives	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	750,000	
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$150,000</b>	<b>\$150,000</b>	<b>\$150,000</b>	<b>\$150,000</b>	<b>\$150,000</b>	<b>\$150,000</b>	<b>\$750,000</b>	
<b>NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENTS</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>5 Year</b>	
<u>Project</u>	<u>FY13</u>	<u>FY14</u>	<u>FY15</u>	<u>FY16</u>	<u>FY17</u>	<u>FY18</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Neighborhood CIP Funds	47,500	47,500	47,500	47,500	47,500	47,500	237,500	
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$47,500</b>	<b>\$47,500</b>	<b>\$47,500</b>	<b>\$47,500</b>	<b>\$47,500</b>	<b>\$47,500</b>	<b>\$237,500</b>	
<b>TRANSPORTATION &amp; ACCESS</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>5 Year</b>	
<u>Project</u>	<u>FY13</u>	<u>FY14</u>	<u>FY15</u>	<u>FY16</u>	<u>FY17</u>	<u>FY18</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Sidewalk Repair	201,571	203,587	205,623	207,679	209,756	211,854	1,038,499	
State Bridge and Highway Inspections	118,750	119,938	121,137	122,348	123,571	124,807	611,801	
Minor Bridge Repairs	190,000	191,900	193,819	195,757	197,715	199,692	978,883	
JPA Bridge - City Match	200,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CAT Transit Bus Replacement Match	338,075	425,636	49,669	42,637	46,449	363,165	927,556	Budgeted amounts include funding for Hybrid buses and trolley packages.
Intelligent Transportation System	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	475,000	
City Wide Traffic Improvements	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	475,000	
Citywide ADA Improvements - Sidewalks and Curbs	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	475,000	
Bicycle Infrastructure	200,000	103,000	106,090	109,273	112,551	115,928	546,842	3% inflationary increase
Michie Drive Traffic Signal	0	300,000	0	0	0	0	300,000	Added as new project in FY14-18 CIP
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,533,396</b>	<b>\$1,629,061</b>	<b>\$961,338</b>	<b>\$962,694</b>	<b>\$975,042</b>	<b>\$1,300,446</b>	<b>\$5,828,581</b>	
<b>PARKS &amp; RECREATION</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>5 Year</b>	
<u>Project</u>	<u>FY13</u>	<u>FY14</u>	<u>FY15</u>	<u>FY16</u>	<u>FY17</u>	<u>FY18</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Parks and Schools Playground Renovations	100,786	101,794	102,812	103,840	104,878	105,927	519,251	
Trails and Greenway Development	75,590	76,346	77,109	77,880	78,659	79,446	389,440	
Urban Tree Preservation and Planting	48,925	49,414	49,908	50,407	50,911	51,420	252,060	
Parkland Acquisition	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	475,000	
Public Art Fund	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	125,000	
Cemetery Restoration	50,000	0	50,000	0	50,000	0	100,000	

Belmont Spray Ground Repairs	0	100,000	0	0	0	0	100,000	Added as new project in FY14-18 CIP - amount would cover repairs to remove safety hazards and ensure proper operation of sprav features.
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$395,301</b>	<b>\$447,554</b>	<b>\$399,829</b>	<b>\$352,127</b>	<b>\$404,448</b>	<b>\$356,793</b>	<b>\$1,960,751</b>	
<b>STORMWATER INITIATIVES</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>5 Year</b>	
Project	<b>FY13</b>	<b>FY14</b>	<b>FY15</b>	<b>FY16</b>	<b>FY17</b>	<b>FY18</b>	<b>Total</b>	
Neighborhood Drainage Projects	166,250	166,250	0	0	0	0	166,250	Funds to become part of and funded through the anticipated creation of a Stormwater Utility. If utility is not created by Council will need to add funding back into the CIP.
Stormwater CCTV Camera System	135,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$301,250</b>	<b>\$166,250</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$166,250</b>	
<b>TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>5 Year</b>	
Project	<b>FY13</b>	<b>FY14</b>	<b>FY15</b>	<b>FY16</b>	<b>FY17</b>	<b>FY18</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Communications Technology Account/Public Access	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	225,000	Funded through PEG Fees.
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$45,000</b>	<b>\$45,000</b>	<b>\$45,000</b>	<b>\$45,000</b>	<b>\$45,000</b>	<b>\$45,000</b>	<b>\$225,000</b>	
<b>OTHER GOVERNMENTAL COMMITMENTS</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>5 Year</b>	
Project	<b>FY13</b>	<b>FY14</b>	<b>FY15</b>	<b>FY16</b>	<b>FY17</b>	<b>FY18</b>	<b>Total</b>	
YMCA Pool (City Share)	625,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charlottesville Housing Fund	760,000	1,528,154	1,569,322	1,611,600	1,655,016	1,699,602	8,063,694	
Charlottesville Housing Fund - CIP Contingency Reimbursement	650,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Home Energy Conservation Grant Program	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	625,000	
Tax Billing and Assessment System	300,000	300,000	0	0	0	0	300,000	
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,460,000</b>	<b>\$1,953,154</b>	<b>\$1,694,322</b>	<b>\$1,736,600</b>	<b>\$1,780,016</b>	<b>\$1,824,602</b>	<b>\$8,988,694</b>	
<b>SUBTOTAL NONBONDABLE PROJECTS</b>	<b>\$5,132,447</b>	<b>\$4,638,519</b>	<b>\$3,497,989</b>	<b>\$3,493,921</b>	<b>\$3,602,006</b>	<b>\$3,924,341</b>	<b>\$19,156,776</b>	
Nonbondable Contingency	28,162	0	0	0	0	0	0	Contingency removed due to current balance of \$2.5 million.
<b>TOTAL NONBONDABLE EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>\$5,160,609</b>	<b>\$4,638,519</b>	<b>\$3,497,989</b>	<b>\$3,493,921</b>	<b>\$3,602,006</b>	<b>\$3,924,341</b>	<b>\$19,156,776</b>	
<b>TOTAL PROJECT EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>\$17,224,114</b>	<b>\$11,189,540</b>	<b>\$13,855,037</b>	<b>\$12,880,942</b>	<b>\$13,810,183</b>	<b>\$10,952,653</b>	<b>\$62,688,355</b>	
<b>Funding Gap</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	

## Attachment II

# Proposed FY 2014 CIP Revenue and Expenditure Description Summary



# **Proposed FY 2014 CIP Revenue and Expenditure Description Summary**

## **Revenue Summary**

Total proposed revenues for FY 2014, **\$11,189,540**, are broken down as follows:

- 1) The General Fund transfer to the Capital Fund is proposed at a total of \$4,444,000.
- 2) A contribution from Albemarle County of \$57,500 for the County's portion of expenses related to facility improvements at the CATEC.
- 3) A contribution from Albemarle County of \$90,000 for the County's portion of expenses related to facility improvements at the Central Library.
- 4) The annual \$200,000 contribution from the Charlottesville City Schools for their Small Capital Improvement Program. There is a corresponding \$200,000 project on the expenditure side for this purpose.
- 5) PEG Fee revenue of \$45,000 which is received as part of the franchise agreement with Comcast.
- 6) The \$6.35M in bond revenue part of a bond issuance that will take place during CY 2014 to pay for those projects deemed bondable.

## **Expenditure Summary**

### **Bondable Projects**

Total expenditures for the FY 2014 Bondable projects, **\$6,551,021**, are broken down as follows:

#### ***Education***

- 1) Lump Sum to Schools Proposed FY 14– \$1,045,491  
This sum is the yearly appropriation to the City Schools for their Capital Program. Some of the items covered by this appropriation include: Jackson-Via Building Envelope Restoration and Fire Sprinkler System Installation; CHS campus security lighting and paving phase III; and Interior Painting - Systemwide.  
The balance for the lump sum to schools account as of November 20, 2012 is \$1,276,564.

- 2) Schools HVAC Replacement Plan Proposed FY 14– \$475,000  
 Facilities Maintenance has developed a 20-year plan for the replacement of HVAC equipment. Each piece of equipment has a predictable life cycle, beyond which failure becomes imminent. All aging equipment will be replaced with the most energy-efficient option available on the market, resulting in direct and lasting cost savings. The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$529,786.
  
- 3) CHS Fire Suppression System Proposed FY 14– \$600,000  
 These funds are to provide for the installation of a complete automatic fire suppression (sprinkler) system throughout the existing facility (including the Performing Arts Center wing), consisting of approximately 263,300 SF. Charlottesville High School was constructed in 1974. At the time of its construction, fire sprinklers were not a code requirement. During the past 40 years since its construction, building and fire codes, and fire suppression technology, have changed. According to current Building Code requirements, if CHS were a new construction today, fire sprinklers would be mandatory.

### ***Facilities Capital Improvements***

- 1) Lump Sum to Facilities Capital Projects Proposed FY 14– \$1,045,491  
 In FY 2014, Facilities Capital Projects has been allocated a lump sum of \$1,045,491 in order to fund improvements and repairs to various City owned facilities. These include: Central Library building envelope restoration and fires protection system upgrades; CATEC Civil Rights Compliance construction; Building envelope restoration at the Preston Morris Building; EPDM roof overlay and gutters at the City Warehouse; and any other repairs deemed to be necessary in order to preserve the City’s properties. The balance for lump sum to facilities account as of November 20, 2012 is \$2,762,612.
  
- 2) City Building HVAC Replacement Plan Proposed FY 14– \$237,500  
 Facilities Maintenance has developed a plan for the replacement of HVAC equipment in City Facilities. Each piece of equipment has a predictable life cycle, beyond which failure becomes imminent. All aging equipment will be replaced with the most energy-efficient option available on the market, resulting in direct and lasting cost savings. The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$233,973.

### ***Public Safety and Justice***

- 1) Fire Portable Radio Replacement Proposed FY 14– \$125,000  
 Funds will be used to replace the Fire Department's 800 MHz portable radios. The current portable radios are approximately 10 years old and will all be out of warranty by the time of the completion of this project. The new radios will provide increased volume and clarity, improved noise cancelling, GPS tracking, higher visibility and greater ease of operation while under emergency conditions.

## ***Transportation and Access***

- 1) New Sidewalks Proposed FY 14 - \$285,000  
This funding attempts to remedy the gaps that remain throughout the sidewalk infrastructure of the City. Priority is given to completing the sidewalk network around schools, parks, business centers and community amenities such as libraries, post offices, etc. Project locations will be approved by the Planning Commission and City Council. The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$290,304.
  
- 2) Street Milling and Paving Projected FY 14 – \$1,472,539  
These funds will be used to repair street problems that occur during the year, such as potholes, and support additional street milling and paving projects that are a major part of maintaining the City’s aging infrastructure. This is also part of a dollar match for the over \$2,000,000 received from VDOT. The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$70,010.
  
- 3) Martha Jefferson Neighborhood Streetscaping Proposed FY 14 - \$50,000  
This money will be used for a planned approach to enhance the overall look as well as the usability of network connections between redeveloping Martha Jefferson Hospital site and the downtown mall area, particularly Locust Avenue, 9th Street, and High Street for all modes of travel (i.e., by private automobile, transit, foot, or bicycle). The proposed funds in FY 14 will be used for planning with construction dollars to be appropriated in future fiscal years

## ***Parks and Recreation***

- 1) Lee Park Retaining Wall Proposed FY 14– \$240,000  
This project repairs the retaining wall which is on the south and west side of the property and currently falling apart. The retaining wall work will need to be both historically accurate and engineered while saving a large sycamore tree.
  
- 2) Azalea Park Renovations Proposed FY 14– \$375,000  
Renovations to Azalea Park will be undertaken following the Park Master Planning process that was completed in the winter of 2009-10. The park currently contains playground equipment, athletic field amenities and an off-leash dog area that require replacement and/or renovation. The addition of a restroom facility in this park is also required. Renovations to the park consistent with the adopted Master Plan will take place in a phased manner two fiscal years – FY 14 is the second year of funding for this project. The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$30,629.

## ***Stormwater Initiatives***

- 1) Stormwater Initiatives Proposed FY 14– \$600,000  
The decision to establish a Stormwater Utility and corresponding fee will be made by City Council in January 2013. The Stormwater utility rate will be set to provide adequate revenue for the CIP component of the program. If the new Stormwater Utility is approved, these funds will be used to sustain the current Stormwater capital program until the revenue from the billing is collected. The funds will be used for major rehabilitation

(repair, replacement, and improvement) of the City's existing stormwater system. The City has an aging stormwater infrastructure (consisting of over 50 miles of pipes) and currently approximately 11 miles of corrugated metal and vitrified clay pipes have been identified as being in need of immediate repair or replacement based on deterioration of the pipes. If Council does not approve the creation of the Stormwater Utility future Stormwater capital funding needs will have to be reevaluated and added back into the current and future to future CIP's.

The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$200,052.

## **Non-bondable Projects**

Total expenditures for the FY 2014 Non-Bondable projects, **\$4,638,519**, are broken down as follows:

### ***Education***

- 1) Schools Small Capital Improvements Proposed FY 14– \$200,000  
This sum is to cover the some of the small capital improvement projects within the various City Schools. This expenditure item is offset by a corresponding dedicated revenue source from the Schools.  
The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$543,679.

### ***Economic Development***

- 1) Economic Development (Strategic) Initiatives Proposed FY 14– \$150,000  
The City has a history of funding a strategic investments fund so that a ready source of funds is available when unique opportunities arise. The strategic initiative funds are critical to the economic development efforts of the City. These efforts include marketing, business retention, small business support, incubator support, sponsorship of job fairs and workforce development. These funds are also used to assist in the long term strategic improvements, to grow and expand the tax base, as well as allowing the City to respond quickly to take advantage of a variety of strategic opportunities.  
The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$1,792,702.

### ***Neighborhood Improvements***

- 1) Neighborhood CIP Funds Proposed FY 14– \$47,500  
This project is lump sum CIP project money to address various neighborhood capital improvement requests. Projects are requested by residents on behalf of neighborhood betterment and completed in accordance with City Procurement Guidelines. This program allows for funds to be used for various capital projects solicited by neighborhoods or determined as needed by Council that are not otherwise covered in the traffic calming/sidewalk/drainage programs.  
The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$18,233.

## ***Transportation and Access***

- 1) Sidewalk Repair and Improvements Proposed FY 14– \$203,587  
This project funds the repair of the City’s existing sidewalks. Sidewalk repairs are necessary to keep existing infrastructure safe and hazard free and are necessary for completion of the pedestrian network which in turn is needed to balance sound transportation alternatives. When the tripping hazards, gaps, and broken sidewalks are repaired it helps to minimize the liability of the City.  
The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$53,919.
- 2) State Bridge Inspections Proposed FY 14– \$119,938  
This project is the continuation of the required State inspections of the various bridges throughout the City. VDOT requires bridge inspection reports on numerous structures be submitted annually. The current inspection schedule includes 22 bridges, box culverts, and overhead signs. Prior to FY 14 this project was combined with the Minor Bridge Repair project under the title State Bridge and Highway Priorities. The projects were separated to show the true cost of doing inspections and the cost of bridge maintenance.  
The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$55,350.
- 3) Minor Bridge Repairs Proposed FY 14– \$191,900  
This project is the continuation of the required maintenance of the various bridges throughout the City. This request is for lump sum CIP project money to rehab/maintain citywide bridge projects. Work may include repairs to substructure (generally includes parts underneath and out of sight) and superstructure (generally includes the deck, railings, and 'visible to motorists' parts) elements.  
The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$20,231.
- 4) City Match Requirement for CAT Transit Bus and Bus Related Purchases Proposed FY 14– \$425,636  
The matching funds are to leverage Federal and State capital grant funding for bus purchases. In FY 2014, CAT Bus & Bus-Related Purchases will include: 1 Trolley, 1 Hybrid Bus, and any necessary bus stop improvements. In recent years, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has ruled that it will only provide funding for base bus packages. They will not support additional costs associated with the purchase of hybrid drive buses or trolley packages, therefore, the entire cost of upgraded bus packages, must be borne by the City. For cost projections it is assumed that the federal share is 80 percent, the state share is 4 percent, and the City share is 16 percent.  
The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$1,069,434.
- 5) Intelligent Transportation System Proposed FY 14– \$95,000  
The Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) is comprised of traffic signal related hardware and software that communicates and coordinates with traffic signals citywide from the Traffic Operations Command Center. The system is also comprised of three weather stations related to street surface conditions during weather emergencies, and four (4) variable message boards located on major city entrances. Coordinated signal corridors controlled from the Control Center include Emmet St, Main St, Avon St,

Preston Ave, and Ridge/5th. The project funds maintenance and upgrades of the system, including field and command center hardware and software, as well as on-going costs for utilities such as phone lines.

The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$216,600.

- 6) City Wide Traffic Improvements Proposed FY 14– \$95,000  
This CIP project money will be used to address various traffic issues and neighborhood traffic calming issues. Projects would include re-striping pavements, reconfiguring intersections, rephrasing traffic signals, and other creative retrofitting to existing operations in lieu of building new roads. All potential projects will be discussed at Traffic Meetings to include NDS, police, fire, parks/trails planner, and public works. Traffic calming projects would be approved by residents and completed in accordance with the adopted Traffic Calming Guidelines.  
The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$137,078.

- 7) Citywide ADA Improvements - Sidewalks and Curbs Proposed FY 14– \$95,000  
This project would provide handicapped accessibility at various locations throughout the City allowing the City to meet federally required guidelines for handicapped access. Upgrades include but are not limited to curb cuts and ADA ramps, crosswalks, bulbouts, enhanced pedestrian signal equipment for signalized intersections, sidewalk obstruction removal, etc.  
The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$127,363.

- 8) Bicycle Infrastructure Proposed FY 14– \$103,000  
This project addresses various bicycle access and safety issues on City streets. Potential projects will be vetted through the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Committee as well as at Traffic Meetings to include NDS, police, fire, parks/trails planner, and public works. Projects would include re-striping pavements, reconfiguring intersections, additional bicycle detection at traffic signals, signing, and other creative retrofitting to existing streets.  
The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$270,370.

- 9) Michie Drive Traffic Signal Proposed FY 14– \$300,000  
This project provides for the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Hydraulic Road and Michie Drive, including acquisition of ROW to install signal poles. This project will improve our transportation system to address capacity, speeding, congestion, will increase traffic flow and allow residents of Michie Drive the opportunity to exit their living areas more safely.

### ***Parks and Recreation***

- 1) Parks and Schools Playground Renovations Proposed FY 14– \$101,794  
The Parks and Recreation Department maintains twenty-nine (29) playgrounds across the City. This project includes the replacement of the City Parks playground equipment and of playground equipment at Charlottesville City School Parks, to ensure user safety and

comply with current codes. This project will provide improved safety for the residents who use playgrounds daily.

The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$170,337.

- 2) Trails and Greenway Development Proposed FY 14– \$76,346  
This project is the result of reallocated capital funds at the direction of City Council in February 2006. Parks and Recreation is currently managing this program and has moved forward on a number of fronts, new construction through Safe Routes to School funds around Buford Middle School and at Venable School, in McIntire Park along the 250 bypass for a commuter trail, at Azalea Park, and the improvement of connections to existing trails through the site plan review process. Trails were the # 1 priority as defined by the citizens in a citizen survey conducted as part of the Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment in 2005.  
The unallocated balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$206,376.
- 3) Urban Tree Preservation and Planting Proposed FY 14– \$49,414  
The protection of the Urban Tree Canopy has a direct affect upon air quality, stormwater management and quality of life for City residents and is a highly held value among residents of the City. These funds are used for preventive work and the preservation of the tree canopy, leveraging the completed tree inventory in the city, assess problem trees and further define action strategies toward the protection of the tree canopy. These funds will also be used for the procurement of replacement trees and the planting of new trees in areas of where invasive species are prevalent and along riparian buffers to enhance water quality and stormwater management strategies.  
The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$344,917.
- 4) Parkland Acquisition Proposed FY 14– \$95,000  
These funds will be used to pursue land acquisition opportunities to preserve open space, protect natural resources and improve riparian buffers and provide future trail connections. Green infrastructure and open space conservation are often the cheapest way to safeguard drinking water, clean the air and achieve other environmental goals.  
The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$378,777.
- 5) Public Art Fund Proposed FY 14– \$25,000  
This funding supports the annual Art in Place lease, provide funds for the possible purchase of art works or sculptures from the Art in Place show, and support other specific art installations.  
The balance for this project, formerly called Art in Place, as of November 20, 2012 is \$49,273.
- 6) Belmont Spray Ground Repairs Proposed FY 14– \$100,000  
These funds would go toward the replacement of the filtration/feature control system that is currently secured in a 6' underground pit which floods and is dangerous to employees. The entire filtration/sanitation/control system would also be replaced, and secured in a new above ground building. This would eliminate problems with the chemical feed

system and the feature control system, which is inoperable causing the water to run all day instead of turning off after 8 minutes.

### ***Stormwater Initiatives***

- 1) Neighborhood Drainage Projects Proposed FY 14– \$166,250  
These funds are used to partner with City property owner funding to solve neighborhood drainage and flooding issues on residential properties that have never been budgeted on their own merit before. Cost participation by City residents makes the City funds go further.  
The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$176,797.

### ***Technology Infrastructure***

- 1) Communications Technology Account/  
Public Access Television Proposed FY 14– \$45,000  
This funding will allow the City to continue upgrading and improving its cable network services and programming to the citizens by providing technology equipment and maintenance of that equipment to the Public Access Offices at CATEC; providing technology and equipment to Channel 10 located in City Hall. This funding is tied to the PEG Fee Revenue.  
The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$53,000.

### ***Other Governmental Commitments***

- 1) Charlottesville Housing Fund Proposed FY 14– \$1,528,154  
The mission of this program, as adopted by City Council’s Housing Advisory Committee in November 2006, is to meet the housing challenges facing our residents by dedicating, consolidating and expanding financial support for the preservation and production of affordable housing in our community. The City is working to accomplish the goal adopted by Council in February 2010 for growing of supported affordable housing stock to 15% of overall housing stock by 2025. Charlottesville Housing Fund dollars are specifically targeted toward assisting with creation of new low income housing opportunities. Based upon these goals \$1.52 million of FY 2014 CIP funding is earmarked for the Charlottesville Housing Fund.  
The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$888,250.
- 2) Home Energy Conservation Grant Program Proposed FY 14– \$125,000  
The Home Energy Conservation Grant Program is a grant/loan program for residential owner-occupied housing that would fund energy conservation measures for the recipients by either providing a grant to low income families, or a low interest loan to non low income families, as incentive for energy conservation. The intent of the program is to provide savings on utilities; to facilitate low income families to be able to afford energy saving measures; and to reduce the usage of nonrenewable energy. The Home Energy Conservation program provides grants up to \$5,000 per qualified household to complete critical energy efficiency improvements. Participants first receive a home energy audit to

identify the biggest culprits of energy waste and to determine an appropriate scope of work. For the past three fiscal years, the City of Charlottesville has partnered with the Local Energy Alliance Program (LEAP) to carry out the Home Energy Conservation Grant program.

The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$0.

- 3) Tax Billing and Assessment System Proposed FY 14– \$300,000  
A new project in FY 13, this dollar amount is the second half of the funding that will pay for a new tax system to be used by the Treasurer and Commissioner of Revenue Offices. The current tax system is 14 years old, and has not kept up with changes and advances made at the State and local level in assessment methods, billings, collections, system integration, GIS integration, and technological advances. Accounting for a revenue stream of over \$75 million annually that would come through this system, increased efficiency of 1-2% would yield \$75,000-\$150,000 in increased revenue per year. The balance for this project as of November 20, 2012 is \$300,000.

## **Attachment III**

### **FY 2014 – 2018 Unfunded CIP Projects List**



### FY 2014-2018 Capital Improvement Program Unfunded List

Project Title	Requested FY 14	Requested FY 15	Requested FY 16	Requested FY 17	Requested FY 18	5 Year Total	Notes/Comments
<b>Facilities Management</b>							
City Building HVAC	99,528	-	-	-	-	<b>99,528</b>	Represents the difference between amount requested and amount proposed in FY14-18 CIP.
Central Library Renovation	-	-	-	991,680	14,505,368	<b>15,497,048</b>	Since this is a joint City/County project, this should be reflected in both jurisdictions CIP plans. Currently, this project is not reflected in the County's capital budget.
Circuit Court Renovation and Expansion	-	-	-	-	12,300,000	<b>12,300,000</b>	Moved funding out one year from original request. Funds for construction are projected at this time to be included in FY19.
PW Yard Relocation - Phase II	170,000	2,000,000	-	-	-	<b>2,170,000</b>	Given other funding needs and projected revenues available, this is not recommended for funding.
<b>Public Safety</b>							
Regional Firearms Range	250,000	-	-	-	-	<b>250,000</b>	Funding to come from an existing Police CIP account for Mobile Data Computers.
Crisis Negotiation Command Vehicle	100,000	-	-	-	-	<b>100,000</b>	Currently have another vehicle (trailer) used for this purpose. Given other funding needs and projected revenues available, this is not recommended for funding.
Bypass Fire Station Renovations	-	-	2,150,000	2,000,000	-	<b>4,150,000</b>	Needs will be reevaluated upon the completion of the Fontaine Avenue Station.
Self Contained Breathing Apparatus	-	-	-	450,000	-	<b>450,000</b>	To be funded through increased annual contributions to the Equipment Replacement Fund.
<b>Neighborhood Development Services</b>							
Banner Program	110,000	-	-	-	-	<b>110,000</b>	Given other funding needs and projected revenues available, this is not recommended for funding.
Belmont Bridge - Auxiliary Pedestrian Bridge	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	<b>2,500,000</b>	Project still in design phase and awaiting further direction from Council on final design before proceeding.
Bicycle Infrastructure	147,000	143,910	140,727	137,449	134,072	<b>703,158</b>	Represents the difference between amount requested and amount proposed in FY14-18 CIP.

Project Title	Requested FY 14	Requested FY 15	Requested FY 16	Requested FY 17	Requested FY 18	5 Year Total	Notes/Comments
Forest Hills Neighborhood Improvements	50,000	-	-	-	-	50,000	As improvements are sidewalk and traffic improvement related, recommendation is to fund improvements through the Citywide Traffic Improvements, ADA Improvements Sidewalks and Curbs, and New Sidewalk accounts.
Historic Street Name Signs	90,000	-	-	-	-	90,000	Given other funding needs and projected revenues available, this is not recommended for funding.
Minor Bridge Repairs	308,100	306,181	304,243	302,285	300,308	1,521,117	Represents the difference between amount requested and amount proposed in FY14-18 CIP.
Martha Jefferson Streetscaping	450,000	200,000	-	-	-	650,000	At the direction of NDS. removed all FY14 funding except design money. Funds in the projected FY 15 CIP for future construction needs.
New Sidewalks	415,000	415,000	415,000	415,000	415,000	2,075,000	Represents the difference between amount requested and amount proposed in FY14-18 CIP.
NS Bridge Repairs	500,000	500,000	-	-	-	1,000,000	Funds were to accelerate the schedule to coincide with construction of the 250 Bypass Interchange, but given other funding needs and projected revenues available, this is not recommended for funding.
Starr Hill and Meadows Safety Improvements	300,000	-	-	-	-	300,000	
Citywide Traffic Improvements	105,000	105,000	105,000	105,000	105,000	525,000	Represents the difference between amount requested and amount proposed in FY14-18 CIP.
West Main Streetscape Improvements	3,000,000	-	-	-	-	3,000,000	Funding adjusted to meet timing of projects (\$750K per year in FY15-17) so actual amount is only \$750K less than requested
Wayfinding Updates	100,000	-	100,000	-	100,000	300,000	Given other funding needs and projected revenues available, this is not recommended for funding. Further cost examination requested has been requested of the submitting department.
<b>Stormwater Initiatives</b>							
Neighborhood Drainage	-	166,250	166,250	166,250	166,250	665,000	Funds to become part of and funded through the anticipated creation of a Stormwater Utility. If utility is not created by Council will have to add funding back to CIP.
Stormwater Initiatives	775,000	1,375,000	1,270,000	2,030,000	2,850,000	8,300,000	Funds to become part of and funded through the anticipated creation of a Stormwater Utility. If utility is not created by Council will have to add funding back to CIP.

Project Title	Requested FY 14	Requested FY 15	Requested FY 16	Requested FY 17	Requested FY 18	5 Year Total	Notes/Comments
						-	
<b>Parks and Recreation</b>						-	
ADA Retrofits - Parks Facilities	-	75,000	-	75,000	-	150,000	Funding deferred until complete plan for improvements is in place.
Belmont Spray Ground Replacement	-	200,000	500,000	-	-	700,000	Funding provided in FY14 to correct safety hazards and system operations issues. Represents the difference between amount requested and amount proposed in FY14-18 CIP.
City/County Joint Parks Improvements	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	375,000	Given other funding needs and projected revenues available, this is not recommended for funding.
Downtown Mall Repair Fund	50,000	-	50,000	-	50,000	150,000	Recommended to be funded through Parks Operational budget.
Key Center ADA Elevator	-	-	100,000	-	-	100,000	Given other funding needs and projected revenues available, this is not recommended for funding.
Key Center Gym Floor Replacement	100,000	-	-	-	-	100,000	Given other funding needs and projected revenues available, this is not recommended for funding.
Lee Park Retaining Wall	-	100,000	-	-	-	100,000	Represents the difference between amount requested and amount proposed in FY14-18 CIP.
McIntire Park Softball Lighting Replacement	325,000	-	-	-	-	325,000	Funding should be included as part of the McIntire Park Master Plan implementation.
Parks Needs Assessment and Comp Plan	50,000	-	-	-	-	50,000	Not considered a capital project. Recommended to be funded through Parks and Recreational Operational budget or means other than CIP.
Parkland Acquisition	105,000	105,000	105,000	105,000	105,000	525,000	Represents the difference between amount requested and amount proposed in FY14-18 CIP.
Parks Lighting Replacement	-	200,000	200,000	-	-	400,000	Given other funding needs and projected revenues available, this is not recommended for funding.
Park Site Master Planning	50,000	-	50,000	-	50,000	150,000	Recommend that Master Planning cost be included as part of the individual project cost and not separated out.
Pen Park Shop Relocation	-	250,000	-	-	-	250,000	Given other funding needs and projected revenues available, this is not recommended for funding.
Pen Park Tennis Court Replacement	250,000	-	250,000	-	-	500,000	Given other funding needs and projected revenues available not recommended for funding.
Recreation Facility Technology Modernization	75,000	-	75,000	-	75,000	225,000	Given other funding needs and projected revenues available, this is not recommended for funding. Recommend as parks/facilities are updated that this be included in those cost.

Project Title	Requested FY 14	Requested FY 15	Requested FY 16	Requested FY 17	Requested FY 18	5 Year Total	Notes/Comments
Tonsler Park Master Plan Implementation	-	-	-	250,000	-	<b>250,000</b>	Funding push out one fiscal year from original request. Represents the difference between amount requested and amount proposed in FY14-18 CIP.
Washington Park Rec Center Expansion	-	2,000,000	-	-	-	<b>2,000,000</b>	Parks requested \$100K in planning and design funds for FY14 that was moved out to FY17.
						-	
<b>Technology Infrastructure</b>						-	
Citywide Phone System Upgrade	350,000	-	-	-	-	<b>350,000</b>	Further study to be conducted to better asses needs of the departments, and funding requirements.
J&DR Phone System Upgrade	40,000	-	-	-	-	<b>40,000</b>	To be funded as part of the larger Citywide Phone system upgrade.
						-	
<b>Public Works</b>						-	
Street Milling and Paving	497,461	532,736	569,363	616,542	665,370	<b>2,881,472</b>	Represents the difference between amount requested and amount proposed in FY14-18 CIP.
<b>Total for all Requests</b>	<b>9,437,089</b>	<b>9,249,077</b>	<b>7,125,583</b>	<b>8,219,206</b>	<b>32,396,368</b>	<b>66,427,323</b>	

## **Attachment IV**

# **Evaluation Criteria for Project Ranking**



***City of Charlottesville, Virginia***  
***FY 2014 – 2018 Capital Improvement Program***  
***Project Evaluation and Criteria Scoring***

**Criteria #1 – City Council Adopted Strategic Vision and/or Priorities**

*How does the project help meet the goals of the City Council Strategic Vision and/or the City Council Priorities?*

**Review Committee Scoring**

- 5 Project meets the goals of the City Council Strategic Vision and/or Priorities
- 0 Project does not meet the goals of the City Council Strategic Vision and/or Priorities

**Criteria #2 – Public health and safety**

*How does the project eliminate or prevent an existing health, environmental, or safety hazard?*

**Review Committee Scoring**

- 5 Project completely eliminates or prevents an existing health, environmental, or safety hazard.
- 3 Project partially eliminates or prevents an existing health, environmental, or safety hazard.
- 0 Project does not eliminate or prevent an existing health, environmental, or safety hazard.

**Criteria #3 – Infrastructure investment / protection**

*How does the project protect and preserve the City's infrastructure?*

**Review Committee Scoring**

- 5 The project improves and / or protects the City's infrastructure.
- 3 The project maintains the City's infrastructure.
- 0 The project does not protect or preserve the City's infrastructure.

**Criteria #4 – Impact on City operational finances / revenue generation**

*Explain how the project will have a positive, neutral, or negative impact on the City's operational Finances.*

**Review Committee Scoring**

- 5 The project will result in a positive net impact on City finances.
- 3 The project will result in a neutral net impact on City finances.
- 0 The project will result in a negative net impact on City finances.

**Criteria #5 – Leverages outside funding**

*How will the project leverage outside funding to facilitate completion of the project, and how much additional funding will be leveraged?*

**Review Committee Scoring**

- 5 The project will leverage outside funding for project completion.
- 0 The project will not leverage outside funding for project completion.

**Criteria #6 – Environmental sustainability/LEEDS building certification**

*How does the majority of the project support the City of Charlottesville’s environmental sustainability goals and commitments?*

**Review Committee Scoring**

- 5 Project directly meets the City’s environmental sustainability goals/commitments (e.g., the project is directly related to a sustainability initiative and/or is committed to pursuing LEED certification for new construction or major renovations, where applicable)
- 3 Project contributes to the City’s environmental substantiality efforts
- 0 Project neither fulfills a LEED requirement nor does it contribute to the City’s environmental substantiality efforts.

**Criteria #7 – Encouragement of economic development**

*How will the project help stimulate development or redevelopment of properties and/or encourage economic development in the City corridors?*

**Review Committee Scoring**

- 5 The project will encourage increased economic development in the City’s corridors.
- 0 The project will not encourage increased economic development in the City’s corridors.

**Criteria #8 – Ties in to other projects / organizations**

*Does the project tie into other existing or proposed projects, and/or will the project be done in partnership with another non-City organization?*

**Review Committee Scoring**

- 5 The project ties into another existing project(s) or the project will be done in partnership with another non-City organization
- 0 The project does not tie into another existing project and will not be done in partnership with another non-City organization.

**Criteria #9 – Improves and/or increases the level of service provided by the City**

*How does the project improve and/or increase the level of service provided by the City?*

**Review Committee Scoring**

- 5 The project improves and/or increases the level of service provided by the City.
- 0 The project does not improve and/or increase the level of service provided by the City.

# Attachment V

## Final Project Criteria Scoring



**FY 2014 - 2018 CIP Final Project Criteria Scoring**

<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>REQUESTING DEPARTMENT</b>	<b>Criteria #1 Council Adopted Strategic Vision</b>	<b>Criteria #2 Public Health and Safety</b>	<b>Criteria #3 Infrastructure Investment/Protection</b>	<b>Criteria #4 Operational Finances/ Revenue Generation</b>	<b>Criteria #5 Leveraging of Outside Funding</b>	<b>Criteria #6 Environmental Sustainability</b>	<b>Criteria #7 Encouragement of Economic Development</b>	<b>Criteria #8 Ties into Other Projects</b>	<b>Criteria #9 Improved or Increased Service Levels</b>	<b>TOTAL CRITERIA</b>
Belmont Bridge Revenue Sharing	NDS	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	0	5	38
McIntire Park Master Plan Implementation	Parks and Recreation	5	0	5	3	0	5	5	5	5	33
West Main Streetscape Improvements	NDS	5	3	5	0	0	3	5	5	5	31
Central Library Renovation	Facilities	5	0	5	3	5	5	0	0	5	28
New Sidewalks	NDS	5	3	5	0	5	5	0	0	5	28
Park Land Acquisition	Parks and Recreation	5	0	5	3	0	5	0	5	5	28
Water Resources Protection Program	Utilities	5	3	5	3	0	5	0	0	5	26
Belmont Bridge - Auxiliary Pedestrian Bridge	NDS	5	0	0	0	5	5	0	5	5	25
Martha Jefferson Streetscaping	NDS	5	5	5	0	0	0	5	0	5	25
Park Lighting Systems Replacement	Parks and Recreation	5	0	5	5	0	5	0	0	5	25
Starr Hill and Meadows Safety Improvements	NDS	5	3	3	0	0	3	0	5	5	24
Belmont Spray Ground Replacement	Parks and Recreation	5	3	5	3	0	3	0	0	5	24
Regional Police Firearms Range	Police	5	3	0	3	0	3	0	5	5	24
Street Milling and Paving	Public Works	5	3	5	3	0	3	0	0	5	24
Public Works Yard Relocation	Facilities	5	0	5	3	0	5	0	5	0	23
J&DR Phone System Upgrade	J&DR Courts	5	0	5	3	5	0	0	0	5	23
Bicycle Infrastructure	NDS	5	3	5	0	0	5	0	0	5	23
Citywide Traffic Improvements	NDS	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	23
McIntire Softball Field Lighting Replacement	Parks and Recreation	5	5	5	0	0	3	0	0	5	23
Recreation Facility Technology Modernization	Parks and Recreation	5	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	23
Tonsler Park Master Plan Implementation	Parks and Recreation	5	0	5	3	0	5	0	0	5	23
CHS Fire Suppression System	Schools	5	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	5	23
ADA Recreational Facilities Compliance	Parks and Recreation	5	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	5	21
City County Joint Park Improvements	Parks and Recreation	5	3	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	21
Downtown Mall Repair Fund	Parks and Recreation	5	3	5	3	0	0	5	0	0	21
Key Center ADA Elevator	Parks and Recreation	5	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	5	21
Parks & Rec Needs Assessment Update	Parks and Recreation	5	0	3	3	0	0	0	5	5	21
Parks Site Master Planning	Parks and Recreation	5	0	3	3	0	0	0	5	5	21
Pen Park Shop Relocation	Parks and Recreation	5	3	5	3	0	5	0	0	0	21
Lee Park Retaining Wall	Parks and Recreation	5	5	5	3	0	3	0	0	0	21
Replacement Fire Engines	Fire	5	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	5	21
Self Contained Breathing Apparatus	Fire	5	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	5	21
Telephone System Upgrade	IT	5	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	20
Washington Park Center Expansion	Parks and Recreation	5	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	5	20
Minor Bridge Repairs	NDS	5	3	5	3	0	3	0	0	0	19
Michie Drive Traffic signal	NDS	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	18
Key Center Gym Floor Replacement	Parks and Recreation	5	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	18
Crisis Negotiation/Command Vehicle	Police	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	18

**FY 2014 - 2018 CIP Final Project Criteria Scoring**

<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>REQUESTING DEPARTMENT</b>	<b>Criteria #1 Council Adopted Strategic Vision</b>	<b>Criteria #2 Public Health and Safety</b>	<b>Criteria #3 Infrastructure Investment/Protection</b>	<b>Criteria #4 Operational Finances/ Revenue Generation</b>	<b>Criteria #5 Leveraging of Outside Funding</b>	<b>Criteria #6 Environmental Sustainability</b>	<b>Criteria #7 Encouragement of Economic Development</b>	<b>Criteria #8 Ties into Other Projects</b>	<b>Criteria #9 Improved or Increased Service Levels</b>	<b>TOTAL CRITERIA</b>
Forest Hills Neighborhood Improvements	NDS	5	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	<b>16</b>
NS Bridge Structure Major Repairs	NDS	5	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	<b>16</b>
Wayfinding Updates	NDS	5	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	5	<b>16</b>
Pen Park Tennis Court Renovations	Parks and Recreation	5	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	<b>16</b>
Banner Project	NDS	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	<b>8</b>
Historic Street Name Signs	NDS	5	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	<b>8</b>

**Attachment VI**  
**Project Request Forms**



City of Charlottesville  
 FY 2014 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program  
**Existing Project Request Form**

(1) Project Title

(2) Project (WBS) Number

(3) Project Manager

(4) Requesting Department Head

(5) Estimated Project Start Date

(6) Estimated Project Completion Date

(7) Requested Project Funding

Approved FY 09 - 13	Projected FY 14	Projected FY 15	Projected FY 16	Projected FY 17	Projected FY 18	Requested 5 Year Total	Request Status
						-	Currently in 5 Year CIP

(8) Project Expenditures

Approved FY 09 - 13	Projected FY 14	Projected FY 15	Projected FY 16	Projected FY 17	Projected FY 18	Projected Beyond FY 18
-	-	-	-	-	-	-

(9) Project Phase

(10) Revenue Sources

	Approved FY 09 - 13	Projected Revenue FY14 - FY 18	Projected Revenue Beyond FY 18	KNOWN PROJECT REVENUE
<i>City</i>	-	-	-	-
<i>Federal</i>	-	-	-	-
<i>State</i>	-	-	-	-
<i>County</i>	-	-	-	-
<i>Other</i>	-	-	-	-
<b>REVENUE TOTAL</b>	-	-	-	-

(11) Project Description

Provide a detailed description and history of the project.

(12) Project Changes

List all changes to the project (timing, scope, funding, ect.) since the submission of the original project request.

City of Charlottesville  
FY 2014 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program  
**Existing Project Request Form**

**(13) Alternate Scope(s) to Project**

Is there an alternative method for completing the project, such as spreading the project over more than one fiscal year, using different materials, completing the project in different phases, or only completing a portion of the original project request?

**(14) PLEASE ATTACH A PICTURE OR MAP TO BETTER EMPHASIZE WHAT IS BEING ADDRESSED BY THE REQUESTED PROJECT.**

Paste picture(s) or map here.

*City of Charlottesville*  
*FY 2014 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program*  
*Request Form Instructions*  
**Existing Projects**

The information presented below will help guide you through the completion of the CIP Request Form for **existing projects currently included in the 5 year CIP (FY2013 – 2017) that have no changes in funding or scope.**

**CIP Project Application Explanation**

*(1) Project Title* – For all new projects list the name of the project as you want it to appear in SAP. For existing projects please give the name of the project as it appears in SAP for the current and/or prior fiscal year(s).

*(2) Project WBS Number* – For all existing projects please give the project WBS number. For all new requests leave this cell blank, and a new WBS number will be provided for you by the Budget Office.

*(3) Project Manager* – List the name of the person that will be responsible for the daily management / administration of the project.

*(4) Requesting Department Head* – List the name of the Department Head who is responsible for this project.

*(5) Estimated Project Start Date* – Provide the date on which it is estimated the project will begin either construction or incurring expenditures – whichever comes first.

*(6) Estimated Project Completion Date* – Provide the date on which it is estimated that project construction will be completed and no new expenditures incurred. If the project is a recurring yearly project you should list the completion date as “Ongoing”.

*(7) Requested Project Funding* – For all projects list the amount requested from the City for each fiscal year from FY 2014 through FY 2018. For any projects that were approved in Fiscal Years 2009 – 2013, please list the total appropriated budget for all years between FY 2009 – 2013. The column titled Requested 5 Year Total will calculate automatically so please do not insert data in this cell. In the cell titled Request Status, which is highlighted in yellow, please select the appropriate status of the requested project from the drop down menu provided.

*(8) Project Expenditures* – In the column labeled *Approved FY 09-13*, insert the total amount of project funds already expended between FY 2009 and FY 2013. In the columns labeled *Projected FY 14* through *Projected FY18*, insert the projected amount of funds that will actually be expended in each fiscal year during 5 years of the upcoming

CIP (FY 2014 – 2018). In the column labeled *Projected Beyond FY18*, please insert any known or estimated project expenditures that will be incurred after FY 2018 – for ongoing projects provide an estimate of the next five fiscal years outside of the current CIP timeframe (FY 2019 – FY 2023).

(9) Project Phase – For each fiscal year in which there are projected expenditures, please provide the phase of the project that will incur these expenses during that fiscal year. In the row of cells highlighted in yellow there is a drop down menu with three options, please select the appropriate phase for each fiscal year. If only design and/or planning is expected to occur in the fiscal year select the Design/Planning option, if both Design and Construction are anticipated to occur in that fiscal year select the Design and Construction option, and if only construction will be occurring in the fiscal year select the Construction option.

(10) Revenue Sources – In the column labeled *Approved FY 09-13*, insert the total amount of project revenues approved between FY 2009 and FY 2013 from each applicable source. In the column labeled *Projected Revenue FY 14 – 18*, insert the projected total revenue for the project during 5 years of the upcoming CIP (FY 2014 – 2018). In the column labeled *Projected Revenue Beyond FY18*, insert any known or estimated project revenue that will be collected after FY 2018 (for ongoing projects do not include estimates past FY 2023). Place the amounts of revenue from each different source in the appropriate row so that all sources of revenue are properly identified. If the project will not receive any outside revenue place the entire amount revenue required in the row labeled *City*. The row labeled *Revenue Total* and the column labeled *Known Project Revenue* will calculate automatically so do not fill in those rows. The amounts in these rows and columns should balance with the total amounts input in #8 *Project Expenditures*.

(11) Project Description – Provide a detailed description of the project that is being requested, including any history or background information on the project.

(12) Project Changes – For any project that has changed since the submission of the original request, list all changes to the project since the submission of the original request including changes to scope, timing, funding, etc.

(13) Alternate Scope(s) to Project – List any and all alternative methods for completing the project, such as, spreading the project over more than one fiscal year, using different materials, completing the project in different phases, or only completing a portion of the original project request.

(14) Picture and/or Map Attachments – Attach pictures and/or maps that illustrate or better emphasize the need for the project.

**City of Charlottesville**  
**FY 2014 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program**  
**New or Modified Project Request Form**

**(1) Project Title**

**(2) Project (WBS) Number if Existing Project**

**(3) Project Manager**

**(4) Requesting Department Head**

**(5) Estimated Project Start Date**

**(6) Estimated Project Completion Date**

**(7) Requested Project Funding**

Approved FY 09 - 13	Projected FY 14	FY	Projected FY 15	Projected FY 16	Projected FY 17	Projected FY 18	Requested 5 Year Total	Request Status
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

**(8) Project Expenditures**

Approved FY 09 - 13	Projected FY 14	FY	Projected FY 15	Projected FY 16	Projected FY 17	Projected FY 18	Projected Beyond FY 18
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**(9) Project Phase**

	Design/Planning	Design and Construction	Construction				
--	-----------------	----------------------------	--------------	--	--	--	--

**(10) Revenue Sources**

	Approved FY 09 - 13	Projected Revenue FY14 - FY 18	Projected Revenue Beyond FY 18	KNOWN PROJECT REVENUE
<i>City</i>	-	-	-	-
<i>Federal</i>	-	-	-	-
<i>State</i>	-	-	-	-
<i>County</i>	-	-	-	-
<i>Other</i>	-	-	-	-
<b>REVENUE TOTAL</b>	-	-	-	-

**(11) Departmental Priority**

If Department submitted multiple new/modified projects provide departmental priority and reasoning behind priority ranking.

**City of Charlottesville**  
**FY 2014 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program**  
**New or Modified Project Request Form**

**(12) Project Description**

Provide a detailed description and history of the project.

**(13) Project Changes**

List all changes to the project (funding, timing, scope, ect.) since the submission of the original project request.

**(14) Legal Mandate**

Yes or No - if yes provide actual law or court mandate requiring project.

**(15) Comprehensive Plan Goal/Chapter**

Yes or No - if yes provide Comprehensive Plan Goal and/or Chapter that the project falls under.

**City of Charlottesville**  
**FY 2014 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program**  
**New or Modified Project Request Form**

**(16) Criteria #1 - City Council Adopted Strategic Vision and/or Priorities**

Explain how project meets the goals of the City council Strategic Vision and/or Priorities.

**(17) Criteria #2 - Public Health and Safety**

Explain how the project prevents or eliminates an existing public health, environmental, or safety hazard.

**(18) Criteria #3 - Infrastructure Investment / Protection**

Explain how the project protects or preserves the City's Infrastructure.

**(19) Criteria #4 - Impact on City Operational Finances / Revenue Generation**

Explain how the project will have a positive, neutral, or negative impact on City finances.

**City of Charlottesville**  
**FY 2014 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program**  
**New or Modified Project Request Form**

**(20) Criteria #5 - Leverages Outside Funding**

Explain how additional outside funding will be leveraged to facilitate the completion of the project, how much, and the sources of the additional outside funding.

**(21) Criteria #6 - Environmental Sustainability/LEEDS Building Certification**

Explain how the majority of this project will lend to or support the City of Charlottesville's environmental sustainability goals and commitments?

**(22) Criteria #7 - Encouragement of Economic Development**

Explain how the project will directly help stimulate development or redevelopment of properties, and/or encourage economic development in the City's corridors?

**(23) Criteria #8 - Ties Into Other Projects/Organizations**

Provide details as to how this project ties into another existing City project(s) or if the project will be done in partnership with another non-City organization(s).

**City of Charlottesville**  
**FY 2014 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program**  
**New or Modified Project Request Form**

**(24) Criteria #9 - Improves and/or Increases the Level of Service Provided by the City**

Explain what City service this project will improve, or what increase in service this project will result in, and how.

**(25) Alternate Scope(s) to Project**

Is there an alternative method for completing the project, such as spreading the project over more than one fiscal year, using different materials, or only completing a portion of the original project request?

**FOR TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE USE ONLY**

Is the project request form complete with adequate project information and criteria justification? **YES/NO**

**City of Charlottesville**  
**FY 2014 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program**  
**New or Modified Project Request Form**

**(26) PLEASE ATTACH A PICTURE OR MAP TO BETTER EMPHASIZE WHAT IS BEING ADDRESSED BY THE REQUESTED PROJECT**

Paste picture(s) or map here.



*City of Charlottesville*  
*FY 2014 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program*  
*Request Form Instructions*

**New and Modified Projects**

The information presented below will help guide you through the completion of the CIP Request Form for **new projects or projects that are being modified from what is in the existing 5 year CIP**, as well as provide guidance to the Project Scoring Criteria portion of the FY 2014 – 2018 CIP request process.

**CIP Project Application Explanation**

*(1) Project Title* – For all new projects list the name of the project as you want it to appear in SAP. For existing projects please give the name of the project as it appears in SAP for the current and/or prior fiscal year(s).

*(2) Project WBS Number* – For all existing projects please give the project WBS number. For all new requests leave this cell blank, and a new WBS number will be provided for you by the Budget Office.

*(3) Project Manager* – List the name of the person that will be responsible for the daily management / administration of the project.

*(4) Requesting Department Head* – List the name of the Department Head who is responsible for this project.

*(5) Estimated Project Start Date* – Provide the date on which it is estimated the project will begin either construction or incurring expenditures – whichever comes first.

*(6) Estimated Project Completion Date* – Provide the date on which it is estimated that project construction will be completed and no new expenditures incurred. If the project is a recurring yearly project you should list the completion date as “Ongoing”.

*(7) Requested Project Funding* – For all projects list the amount requested from the City for each fiscal year from FY 2014 through FY 2018. For any projects that were approved in Fiscal Years 2009 – 2013, please list the total appropriated budget for all years between FY 2009 – 2013. The column titled Requested 5 Year Total will calculate automatically so please do not insert data in this cell. In the cell titled Request Status, which is highlighted in yellow, please select the appropriate status of the requested project from the drop down menu provided.

*(8) Project Expenditures* – In the column labeled *Approved FY 09-13*, insert the total amount of project funds already expended between FY 2009 and FY 2013. In the columns labeled *Projected FY 14* through *Projected FY18*, insert the projected amount of

funds that will actually be expended in each fiscal year during 5 years of the upcoming CIP (FY 2014 – 2018). In the column labeled *Projected Beyond FY18*, please insert any known or estimated project expenditures that will be incurred after FY 2018 – for ongoing projects provide an estimate of the next five fiscal years outside of the current CIP timeframe (FY 2019 – FY 2023).

(9) Project Phase – For each fiscal year in which there are projected expenditures, please provide the phase of the project that will incur these expenses during that fiscal year. In the row of cells highlighted in yellow there is a drop down menu with three options, please select the appropriate phase for each fiscal year. If only design and/or planning is expected to occur in the fiscal year select the Design/Planning option, if both Design and Construction are anticipated to occur in that fiscal year select the Design and Construction option, and if only construction will be occurring in the fiscal year select the Construction option.

(10) Revenue Sources – In the column labeled *Approved FY 09-13*, insert the total amount of project revenues approved between FY 2009 and FY 2013 from each applicable source. In the column labeled *Projected Revenue FY 14 – 18*, insert the projected total revenue for the project during 5 years of the upcoming CIP (FY 2014 – 2018). In the column labeled *Projected Revenue Beyond FY18*, insert any known or estimated project revenue that will be collected after FY 2018 (for ongoing projects do not include estimates past FY 2023). Place the amounts of revenue from each different source in the appropriate row so that all sources of revenue are properly identified. If the project will not receive any outside revenue place the entire amount revenue required in the row labeled City. The row labeled *Revenue Total* and the column labeled *Known Project Revenue* will calculate automatically so do not fill in those rows. The amounts in these rows and columns should balance with the total amounts input in #8 *Project Expenditures*.

(11) Departmental Priority – If your department submits multiple new and/or modified capital project requests, please provide a departmental priority ranking, by level of importance to your department. If applicable you should provide the justification behind the ranking - i.e. Project essential to department business operations, Council requested project, etc. Rankings should not be duplicated – i.e. if a department submits 15 new/modified projects then each project will receive a ranking of 1-15 based upon the level of importance to that department.

(12) Project Description – Provide a detailed description of the project that is being requested, including any history or background information on the project.

(13) Project Changes – For any project that has changed since the submission of the original request, list all changes to the project since the submission of the original request including changes to scope, timing, funding, etc.

(14) Legal Mandate - In this box you need to answer the question of whether or not the **entire requested project** is required under a State or Federal mandate, City Code, or Court order. If so you must cite specific laws and/or ordinance numbers, or the specific court order requiring project.

(15) Comprehensive Plan Goal/Chapter – In this text box you need to answer the question of whether or not the project is related to a Comprehensive Plan goal or chapter. If yes then identify what item in the City of Charlottesville’s Comprehensive Plan that this project addresses or is related to. If not justification must be provided as to why the request is to be included in the City’s CIP. To view the City’s current Comprehensive Plan please go to <http://www.charlottesville.org/Index.aspx?page=1745>.

(16) Criteria #1 – City Council Adopted Strategic Vision – Please identify what item on the Strategic Vision statement, or the Council Priorities list, that this project addresses or is related to. In order to receive credit for this criteria the requesting department must also provide details on how the requested project meets either the vision area or the Priority area. A complete listing of the Council Strategic Vision areas and the City Council Priority areas is provided in a separate document attached to these instructions.

(17) Criteria #2 – Public Health and Safety – Please state what the public health or safety risk is that this project will correct or help to correct. In order to receive credit for this criteria, the requesting department must also provide how the requested project will remedy the public health or safety condition.

(18) Criteria #3 – Infrastructure Investment / Protection – Please specify what part of the City’s infrastructure that the requested project will help to maintain, protect, or preserve and in order to receive credit for this criteria, the requesting department must also provide details as to how the requested project will maintain, protect, or preserve the City’s infrastructure.

(19) Criteria #4 – Impact on City Operational Finances / Revenue Generation – Please identify whether the requested project will have a positive impact on the City’s operational finances (i.e. revenue generation or cost savings), a neutral impact (i.e. no impact on the City’s operational budget), or negative impact on the City’s operational finances (i.e. costing the City money through increase personnel or maintenance costs). In order to receive credit for this criteria, the requesting department must provide details to explain the financial impact that the requested project will have on City operational finances (i.e. specific personnel costs, maintenance costs, utility costs, office space, revenue generation, etc.).

(20) Criteria #5 – Leverages Outside Funding – In order to receive credit for this criteria the requesting department needs to explain how additional outside funding will be leveraged to facilitate the completion of the project, how much additional funding is anticipated to be leveraged, and the sources of the additional outside funding.

(21) Criteria #6 – Environmental Sustainability / LEEDs Building Certification – In order to receive credit for this criteria, the requesting department must provide details as to how the majority of the project directly supports, or is directly related to, a sustainability initiative and/or is committed to pursuing LEED certification for new construction or major renovations (where applicable). Below are links to the City’s environmental policy.

**Charlottesville Environmental Administration and the 2003 Environmental Sustainability Policy –**

<http://www.charlottesville.org/Index.aspx?page=554> (see the top of the page for a link to sustainability policy document)

**The US Mayor's Climate Protection Agreement**, signed in July 2006, -

<http://www.usmayors.org/climateprotection/agreement.htm>

- You can find the related Resolution that was passed by City Council in the July 17, 2006 agenda packet (pages 30-36):

<http://www.charlottesville.org/index.aspx?page=143>

(22) Criteria #7 – Encouragement of Economic Development – In order to receive credit for this criteria, the requesting department must provide details as to how the project will directly help stimulate development or redevelopment of properties and/or directly encourage economic development in the City corridors.

(23) Criteria #8 – Ties Into Other Projects / Organizations – In order to receive credit for this criteria, the requesting department must provide details as to how this project ties into another existing City project(s) or if the project will be done in partnership with another non-City organization(s).

(24) Criteria #9 – Improves and/or Increases the Level of Service Provided by the City – In order to receive credit for this criteria, the requesting department must provide details as to what City service this project will improve, or what increase in service this project will result in, **and** how this project will either improve or increase the level of service provided by the City.

(25) Alternate Scope(s) to Project – List any and all alternative methods for completing the project, such as, spreading the project over more than one fiscal year, using different materials, or only completing a portion of the original project request.

(26) Picture and/or Map Attachments – Attach pictures and/or maps that illustrate or better emphasize the need for the project.

# Attachment VII

## School Facilities and City Facilities Detail Capital Projects





## Charlottesville City Schools 5-Year Capital Improvement Plan

Report Date: October 26, 2012



	Approved FY 2011 7/1/10 - 6/30/11	Approved FY 2012 7/1/11 - 6/30/12	Approved FY 2013 7/1/12 - 6/30/13	Projected FY 2014 7/1/13 - 6/30/14	Projected FY 2015 7/1/14 - 6/30/15	Projected FY 2016 7/1/15 - 6/30/16	Projected FY 2017 7/1/16 - 6/30/17	Projected FY 2018 7/1/16 - 6/30/17
<b>Funding:</b>								
City CIP Appropriation -- includes partial funding for Small Cap Program:	\$1,068,463	\$1,100,517	\$1,045,491	\$1,045,491	\$1,045,491	\$1,045,491	\$1,045,491	\$1,045,491
Schools Supplemental Appropriation --March 23, 2011:	\$250,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
City Line Item Approp. FY 2012 - earmarked for CHS Football Bleachers:	\$0	\$1,200,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
City Line Item Approp. FY 2012 - earmarked for CHS Artificial Turf Field:	\$0	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FY08 & FY09 Close-Out Carry Forward:	\$544,776	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Year-End Carry Forward:	\$1,107,508	\$332,689	\$332,041	\$438,682	\$213,381	\$220,039	\$250,557	\$180,825
<b>Total Available Funds:</b>	<b>\$2,970,747</b>	<b>\$2,733,206</b>	<b>\$1,377,532</b>	<b>\$1,484,173</b>	<b>\$1,258,872</b>	<b>\$1,265,530</b>	<b>\$1,296,048</b>	<b>\$1,226,316</b>

**Large Cap Projects**

	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
<b>Buford Architectural &amp; Functional Renovation</b>	\$1,600,000							
Buford Building Envelope Restoration						\$425,000		
Buford Electrical (11 panel replacements)								\$73,000
B-M Building Envelope Restoration		\$405,000						
B-M VCT Replacement (west wing lower & upper halls, and cafeteria)					\$97,000			
Central Office 1 ADA Improvements						\$100,000		
CHS / MLK-PAC Electrical (70 panel & 3 switchboard replacements)								\$490,000
CHS Artificial Turf Field	\$100,000	\$100,000						
CHS Building Envelope Restoration					\$425,000			
CHS Daylighting Phase I					\$225,000			
CHS Football Field Bleacher Replacement		\$1,200,000						
CHS Football Field Lighting Replacement		\$150,000						
CHS Campus Security Lighting & Paving (Phase I)	\$330,000							
CHS Campus Security Lighting & Paving (Phase 2)		\$20,000	\$375,000					
CHS Campus Security Lighting & Paving (Phase 3)				\$495,000				
CHS Parking Lot Resurfacing		\$100,000						
CHS Roof Repairs	\$165,178							
CHS Softball Field Spectator Seating & ADA Access		\$99,490						
Clark Building Envelope Restoration								\$350,000
Clark Elevator Overhaul							\$128,000	
Clark Restroom Renovations							\$375,000	
Facility Condition Assessments	\$87,888							
Greenbrier Building Envelope Restoration			\$385,000					
Interior Painting -- Systemwide	\$49,956	\$86,675	\$68,850	\$120,792	\$76,833	\$79,973	\$77,223	\$76,584
J/V Building Envelope Restoration				\$175,000				
J/V Fire Protection - fire sprinkler system				\$370,000				
Johnson Building Envelope Restoration	\$41,244							
PAC Stage Roof - Smoke Door Replacements		\$125,000						
Venable Elevator Overhaul (includes interior cab upgrades)					\$105,000			
Venable Building Envelope Restoration						\$300,000		
Venable Restroom Renovations	\$148,792							
Walker Building Envelope Restoration							\$425,000	
Walker Electrical (11 panel replacements)								\$73,000
<b>Small Cap Program - Funding Allocation from Large Cap</b>	<b>\$115,000</b>	<b>\$115,000</b>	<b>\$110,000</b>	<b>\$110,000</b>	<b>\$110,000</b>	<b>\$110,000</b>	<b>\$110,000</b>	<b>\$110,000</b>
<b>Actual/Estimated Large Cap Expenditures</b>	<b>\$2,638,058</b>	<b>\$2,401,165</b>	<b>\$938,850</b>	<b>\$1,270,792</b>	<b>\$1,038,833</b>	<b>\$1,014,973</b>	<b>\$1,115,223</b>	<b>\$1,172,584</b>
<b>Year-End Balance</b>	<b>\$332,689</b>	<b>\$332,041</b>	<b>\$438,682</b>	<b>\$213,381</b>	<b>\$220,039</b>	<b>\$250,557</b>	<b>\$180,825</b>	<b>\$53,732</b>



**Charlottesville City Schools**  
**FY14 - FY18 Unfunded Project List**  
 October 26, 2012



Project Title	Priority 2	
CHS / MLK-PAC Fire Protection - fire sprinkler system	2	\$ 1,141,900
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 1,141,900</b>

-- cost estimate assumes 2013/2014 construction  
 \*CIP Line Item submission made for FY14 funding\*

Project Title	Priority 3	
Buford Breezeway Enclosure (B Bldg at B-105 & B-106)	3	\$ 175,000
CHS STEM Program - north half of Media Center	3	TBD
Science Lab Upgrades: 9 labs at CHS and 5 labs at Buford (includes courtyard enclosure)	3	TBD
Walker Breezeway Enclosure (Bldg A to Modular Classrooms)	3	\$ 175,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 350,000</b>

-- HOLD, pending CCS Fac Reconfig  
 -- scoping is underway....cost estimate to follow  
 -- scoping is underway....cost estimate to follow  
 -- HOLD, pending CCS Fac Reconfig

Project Title	Priority 4	
Buford Storefront Replacements - Bldgs A, B & C	4	\$ 127,000
Buford Interior Renovations (classroom VCT, restore interior doors, remove bulkheads, etc)	4	\$ 176,000
Buford & Walker Covered Walk Repairs	4	\$ 100,000
Burnley-Moran Auditorium Finishes	4	\$ 75,000
CHS Breezeway Enclosures (3 locations)	4	\$ 300,000
CHS Loading Dock Improvements	4	\$ 402,000
CHS Running Track ReSurfacing	4	\$ 100,000
CHS Stadium Field House (concession & locker rooms)	4	TBD
Daylighting:	--	--
*CHS - Phase II	4	\$ 385,000
*Buford	4	\$ 413,000
*Walker	4	\$ 507,000
*Jackson-Via	4	\$ 355,000
*Greenbrier	4	\$ 19,000
Greenbrier Interior Renovations	4	\$ 225,000
Johnson Auditorium Refurbishment	4	\$ 75,000
PAC Seating Refurbishment & Carpeting	4	\$ 275,000
Venable Auditorium Finishes	4	\$ 125,000
Venable Refurbish Monumental Entry Stair	4	TBD
Walker Upper Breezeway Enclosure at Elevator	4	\$ 200,000
Walker Restroom Renovations	4	\$ 250,000
Walker Interior Renovations (classroom & corridor VCT, restore interior doors, remove bulkheads, etc)	4	\$ 236,000
Walker Storefront Replacements - Bldgs A, B & C	4	\$ 127,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 4,472,000</b>

-- HOLD, pending CCS Fac Reconfig  
 -- HOLD, pending CCS Fac Reconfig  
 -- HOLD, pending CCS Fac Reconfig  
 -- renovation, versus demo/rebuild  
 -- Jim Henderson & Jay Taylor may submit as CIP line item  
 -- HOLD, pending CCS Fac Reconfig  
 -- HOLD, pending CCS Fac Reconfig  
 -- HOLD, pending CCS Fac Reconfig  
 -- HOLD, pending CCS Fac Reconfig

Project Title	Priority 5	
Walker Admin Office Relocation to Main Level	5	\$ 200,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 200,000</b>

-- HOLD, pending CCS Fac Reconfig

**Project Totals: \$ 6,163,900**

CCS Reconfiguration		
Buford: renovation of 7-8 middle school	TBD	
Buford: 6th grade wing expansion	TBD	
Walker: consolidated Central Offices & Pre-School Learning Center	TBD	
Alternative High School (CHS-lower level)	TBD	
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ -</b>

Updated: September 17, 2012

## Facilities Development Government - Lump Sum Projects

Project Title	Proposed FY '14	Proposed FY '15	Proposed FY '16	Proposed FY '17	Proposed FY '18
CATEC - Civil Rights compliance -- construction phase	115,000	-	-	-	-
CATEC - building envelope restoration	-	30,000	240,000	-	-
CATEC - cooling tower replacement	-	90,000	-	-	-
CATEC - chiller replacement	-	-	-	-	160,000
CATEC - h&v unit replacements (5) in shops	-	-	-	118,000	-
CATEC - electrical: replace 23 original circuit breaker panels	-	-	-	-	180,000
CATEC - interior painting	-	-	-	45,000	-
CATEC - parking lot milling & paving	-	-	-	-	150,000
Central Library - building envelope - design & construction	30,000	395,000	-	-	-
Central Library - interior finishes	-	-	150,000	-	-
Central Library - installation of 2nd elevator	-	-	-	150,000	-
Central Library - fire protection systems improvements	150,000	-	-	-	-
City Hall Annex - carpet replacement (all floors)	-	-	250,000	-	-
City Hall Annex - elevator overhaul	-	-	-	133,000	-
Gordon Avenue Library - interior finishes	-	50,000	-	-	-
Health Department - asphalt milling & paving and concrete curb/sidewalk repairs	-	-	180,000	-	-
Health Department - interior finishes	-	-	-	TBD	-
J&DR Court Building - roof replacement	-	55,000	-	-	-
Market Street Parking Garage - building envelope restoration	-	425,000	-	-	-
McIntire Building (aka Historical Center) - roof replacement	-	-	-	93,000	-
Preston/Morris Building - building envelope restoration (windows/doors)	50,000	-	-	-	-
Warehouse - EPDM roof overlay & gutters	452,000	-	-	-	-
Wheeler Building - building envelope restoration (windows/doors)	-	-	50,000	-	-
	Proposed FY '14	Proposed FY '15	Proposed FY '16	Proposed FY '17	Proposed FY '18
<b>Project Totals:</b>	797,000	1,045,000	870,000	539,000	490,000
<b>Lump Sum Funding:</b>	1,045,091	1,045,091	1,045,091	1,045,091	1,045,091
Albemarle County Reimbursement:	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Annual Fund Balance:</b>	<b>\$248,091</b>	<b>\$91</b>	<b>\$175,091</b>	<b>\$506,091</b>	<b>\$555,091</b>

-- scope to be developed fall 2012

On Hold & Unfunded Projects	
CATEC: Fire Protection-installation of fire suppression system	310,000
Fire: 250 Bypass Station - interior finishes & ACT removal	40,000
Fire: HQ Station - replace ACT floor tile (2nd floor)	92,000
Fire: HQ Station - select milling, paving & storm water improvements	70,000
Fire: HQ Station - fire protection systems improvements	45,000
Levy Opera House - elevator overhaul	73,000
Levy Opera House - replace standing seam metal roof	225,000
Levy Opera House -- HVAC component replacement	425,000
McGuffey Art Center - replace windows & doors and add a/c & ventilation	2,600,000
PW Admin Building - interior finishes (walls & ceilings)	45,000
PW Admin Building - exterior Improvements - windows & siding	78,000
PW Admin Building - PU's expansion	445,000
Warehouse - overhead doors, loading dock & site improvements	185,000
Warehouse - exterior Improvements - windows & siding	312,000
Wash Building (Public Works) - replace entire building	360,000

-- Pending completion of assessment

# Attachment VIII

## Capital Improvement Program Development Timeline and Code Requirements



## **FY 2014 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program Development** **Timeline**

The CIP process begins in August of each year when the City departments are asked to submit their CIP projects to the Budget Office. As departments are preparing their CIP requests, they are asked to provide justification for their projects based on a set of nine fixed criteria. This criteria not only helps the department think about the type of requests they are submitting, but serves as a key factor when the CIP Budget Development Committee begins to discuss the projects as a whole, since generally requests far outweigh available funding.

CIP submissions are received by the Budget Office in mid-September. In late September the CIP Technical Review Committee begins meeting to discuss and rank the requested projects, based upon the nine fixed criteria. The CIP Technical Review Committee consists of staff members from Neighborhood Development Services, Public Works, Budget, Parks and Recreation, Public Safety, Finance, a Planning Commission member, and one member from a non-CIP requesting department, which for the FY 14 process was Community Attention.

The ranked new and modified CIP submissions, existing project CIP submissions, and recommendations from the CIP Technical Review Committee are then forwarded to the CIP Budget Development Committee who then reviews all projects and their criteria scoring, and develops a CIP recommendation that reflects the fiscal realities and the overall priorities of the City and its needs. The CIP Budget Development Committee consists of the City Manager, Assistant City Manager, COO/CFO, Finance Director, the Director of Budget and Performance Management, the Budget and Management Analyst, and one member from the Planning Commission.

It is the final proposal from this Committee that then comes before the Planning Commission for review and feedback. For the current process, the Planning Commission will first discuss the FY 2014-2018 Proposed CIP at its November 27<sup>th</sup> work session, followed by a public hearing at the regular meeting on December 11<sup>th</sup>.

On March 4<sup>th</sup>, the FY 2014-2018 Proposed CIP is presented to City Council as part of the FY 2014 Proposed City Operating and Schools Budget. During the next month and a half the budget is reviewed by City Council at which time City Council may make changes to the CIP. The City Budget, along with the first year of the 5 year CIP, is adopted by Council no later than April 15<sup>th</sup>.

## **Code of Virginia**

§ 15.2-2239. Local planning commissions to prepare and submit annually capital improvement programs to governing body or official charged with preparation of budget

A local planning commission may, and at the direction of the governing body shall, prepare and revise annually a capital improvement program based on the comprehensive plan of the locality for a period not to exceed the ensuing five years. The commission shall submit the program annually to the governing body, or to the chief administrative officer or other official charged with preparation of the budget for the locality, at such time as it or he shall direct. The capital improvement program shall include the commission's recommendations, and estimates of cost of the facilities and life cycle costs, including any road improvement and any transportation improvement the locality chooses to include in its capital improvement plan and as provided for in the comprehensive plan, and the means of financing them, to be undertaken in the ensuing fiscal year and in a period not to exceed the next four years, as the basis of the capital budget for the locality. In the preparation of its capital budget recommendations, the commission shall consult with the chief administrative officer or other executive head of the government of the locality, the heads of departments and interested citizens and organizations and shall hold such public hearings as it deems necessary.

Charlottesville City Planning Commission  
Mini Retreat  
November 27, 2012

Draft Agenda

4:00-4:10	Gather, Greet, Call to Order
4:10-5:00	CIP Discussion
5:00-5:45	Review of feedback on topic of Land Use
5:45-7:00	Discussion of Land Use focused feedback
7:00-7:30	Dinner
7:30-8:00	Continue dinner, staff recap of previous discussion/set-up of next conversation
8:00-8:10	Break
8:10-8:30	Vision Statement conversation
8:30-9:30	Land Use Goal conversation
9:30-10:00	Review discussion, reach consensus on language and direction for staff's next steps

Items for PC packet (homework review)

City items (raw data and summary needed)

1. Summary memo
2. Draft LU chapter <http://www.charlottesville.org/Index.aspx?page=3323>
3. 2007 LU chapter <http://www.charlottesville.org/Index.aspx?page=1745>
4. Focus Group report
5. Charlottesville LU survey
6. Notes – June LU mapping work session, September 25 PC work session, October 23, PC Work session
7. Current Community meeting series comments and materials
8. 2006 design day analysis
9. Kurt's diagrams (as of packet date)
10. Map of project areas from JT power point.

One Community items

11. Current Community meeting series comments and materials
12. LU/Trans sessions from last year
13. Community Priority Questionnaire
14. Materials from city/county subcommittee



**CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE  
NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
MEMO**

**To:** City of Charlottesville Planning Commission  
**From:** Brian Haluska, AICP  
**CC:** Jim Tolbert, AICP; Missy Creasy, AICP  
**Date:** November 2, 2012  
**Re:** Land Use Work Session Briefing

---

**Introduction**

As part of the retreat on November 27, 2012 dedicated to the land use chapter of the Comprehensive Plan; staff is preparing a presentation of the public feedback we have received on this topic. The purpose of this memo is to summarize and introduce the various feedback staff will be presenting at the work session.

**Land Use Chapters**

Included in your packet is the draft Land Use Chapter for the 2013 Comprehensive Plan, as well as the corresponding chapter from the 2007 Comprehensive Plan. When comparing the goals from the current plan with the draft goals, it should be noted that several goals from the 2007 plan have been moved to other chapters in the 2013 draft.

- Draft Land Use Chapter - <http://www.charlottesville.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=23410>
- Land Use Chapter from the 2007 Comprehensive Plan - <http://www.charlottesville.org/modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8177>

**Land Use Survey**

As a part of the update of the Land Use chapter of the Comprehensive Plan, staff aimed to gather input from multiple sources, especially citizens and members of the public that do not often participate in the visioning and planning of the City. Staff particularly wanted to get more input on the idea of creating more neighborhood commercial nodes in the City, as well as what improvements citizens would like to see in their residential neighborhoods.

Following the completion of the survey effort, there are several overarching themes apparent in the responses staff received.

1. Strong support for the existing character of the City of Charlottesville, and a desire to see that character maintained.

2. Support for increased access to alternative modes of transportation, whether public transportation, or walking and bike routes.
3. Support for the preservation and increase in the amount of green and open space.
  - Land Use Survey Summary Report  
<http://www.charlottesville.org/Index.aspx?page=3325> (link at bottom of page)

### **Land Use Focus Groups**

In addition to the land use survey, City staff attempted to engage various groups of people in a series of conversations regarding aspects of the City people like, opportunities for improvement, as well as gathering input from citizens based on their unique experiences in and around the City.

Looking back on the nine focus groups the City hosted, several themes stand out:

1. The desire to have the City focus on pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.
  2. Strong support for open space and parks.
  3. Balanced economic development.
- Land Use Focus Groups Summary Report -  
<http://www.charlottesville.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=23724>

### **Community Outreach Meetings**

To gain input on the plan as a whole and the draft Land Use materials, staff scheduled a series of three outreach sessions. The purpose of these sessions was to gather public input on prioritizing the goals in the draft plan, as well as gather reactions to the draft land use plan and map.

The attendees at these meetings identified “protection of the environment” and “supporting mixed-use” as the two land use priorities they would consider the most important.

Among the specific comments received on the draft maps:

- Several respondents do not support increasing the amount of Neighborhood Commercial Land Use.
- It is difficult to evaluate the City’s Land Use without including the County’s corresponding map.
- The threshold for “Low-Density Residential” is too low at 12 units per acre.
- Several respondents expressed concern about the Business and Technology designation potentially excluding industrial uses that may have lower-income jobs that would serve existing City residents.
- The plans for new Business and Technology zones need to take into account the traffic impact and how automobiles access the properties.
- Summary Report from the Community Outreach Meetings (Fall 2012)

<http://www.charlottesville.org/Index.aspx?page=3326> (link at bottom of page)

### **Notes from Past Work Sessions**

Included in the packet are the notes from the Land Use mapping exercise the Commission participated in in June, as well as the notes from the PC Work Sessions in September and October. These are reference documents showing a flow of activities related to this chapter.

### **2006 Neighborhood Design Day**

Staff received an inquiry about how the data collected during Neighborhood Design Day in 2006 is being brought forward in the process of drafting the current Comprehensive Plan. In response, staff has reviewed the Neighborhood Plans from the 2007 Comprehensive Plan, and categorized the input contained therein. Staff has organized the items in the neighborhood plans and presented them in the attached document.

It was found that the following items should be included/refined further in the 2013 Comprehensive Plan:

1. Additional references should be made highlighting the importance and the promotion of opportunities for mixed use development in our community.
2. The addition of a goal to support planning efforts for the Rivanna River.

Both items have been discussed and are being integrated as appropriate.

- Summary of 2006 Neighborhood Design Day input  
<http://www.charlottesville.org/Index.aspx?page=3355>

### **Questions for Discussion**

As you review materials and organize your thoughts in preparation for the work session, consider these questions as they will mirror those asked during the retreat. You are encouraged to make notes in preparation for the event.

1. Did anything you saw/heard in the Land Use feedback surprise you?
2. Does the Land Use feedback support the City's current Land Use policies?
3. Are the elements listed in the Vision Statement all the elements that should be represented?
4. Does the language of the Vision Statement express the elements appropriately?

5. Do the listed issues cover all Land Use issues that should be included in the Comp Plan update?
6. Do the Land Use goals adequately address the issues?

### **Listing of All Supporting Documents**

- Draft Land Use Chapter (2013) (Oct, 5, 2012 draft)-  
<http://www.charlottesville.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=23410>
- Land Use Chapter from the 2007 Comprehensive Plan -  
<https://www.charlottesville.org/modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8177>
- Land Use Survey Summary Report <http://www.charlottesville.org/Index.aspx?page=3325>  
(link at bottom of page)
- Land Use Focus Groups Summary Report -  
<http://www.charlottesville.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=23724>
- Summary Report from the Community Outreach Meetings (Fall 2012)  
<http://www.charlottesville.org/Index.aspx?page=3326> (link at bottom of page)
- Summary of 2006 Neighborhood Design Day input  
<http://www.charlottesville.org/Index.aspx?page=3355>
- One Community Project – Land Use Materials  
Land Use & Transportation Workshop information:  
[http://www.1-community.org/?page\\_id=285](http://www.1-community.org/?page_id=285)  
Community Priorities Questionnaire Report:  
[http://1-community.org/wp-content/themes/Light-Station-child/pdfs/Priorities\\_report.pdf](http://1-community.org/wp-content/themes/Light-Station-child/pdfs/Priorities_report.pdf)
- Draft Land Use Chapter Vision Statement (November 2012 draft)
- Proposed Project Areas Map
- Notes from previous work sessions June 2012, September 2012, October 2012
- Conceptual Diagrams

## Land Use Vision Statement Drafted 11/2/12

### **Land Use**

The use of land is a reflection of human activities and values. A good land use plan incorporates general health, safety and welfare concerns, and aims to provide for compatible, harmonious and orderly development of the community and its interdependent parts. Charlottesville land use patterns will preserve neighborhood character and environmental quality, promote mixed use and transit oriented development, encourage infill development and increased density in appropriate areas while supporting the future social, cultural, recreational and economic needs of our City.

**City Council/Planning Commission Joint Work Session  
June 7, 2012  
Notes**

**Councilors Present:**

Mr. Huja  
Dede Smith  
Kathy Galvin  
David Norris  
Kristin Szakos

**Commissioners Present:**

Ms. Genevieve Keller  
Mr. Kurt Keesecker  
Ms. Lisa Green  
Mr. John Santoski  
Ms. Natasha Sienitsky

**Staff Present:**

Maurice Jones  
Missy Creasy  
Richard Harris  
Brian Haluska  
Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Huja and Ms. Keller called the meeting to order and turned the time to staff. Mr. Haluska explained the mapping exercise and those in attendance spent 40 minutes working on the map. The three groups then presented their work and outlined the following themes:

Group 2 (Kurt, Mr. Huja, Lisa and Dede)

- Organized around bike and travel links to employment
- UVA and Hospital are employment centers
- Some neighborhoods have centers but others do not
- Opportunity to link green spaces in the Fry Spring area

Group 3 (Kathy, Gennie, John)

- Pointed out destinations
- Areas of potential – Monticello road, City yard, East Market Street, Harris Road
- Link the parks and green space at schools
- They used multiple colors at some locations to depict multiple uses

Group 1 (Kristin, Natasha, David)

- They pointed out lots of “green” including what is present and potential for more.
- Bike/ped could be placed along the RR and river areas to link to current systems
- Envision Rivanna River area with entertainment, housing and boat access
- Possible employment expansion at Arlington/Millmont
- River Road – potential for higher density residential and higher utilization of property
- Pointed out areas for discussion – Cherry Ave, East Market

Mr. Haluska then noted the discussion questions and the group discussed.

Items noted include:

- Using “heat map” spots on the Land Use map might work
- Do not include parcels on the Land Use Map
- Include bike and transit somehow on the map
- Show links for greenspace
- The current zoning map has more mixed use areas than the land use map
- Circles of activity make more sense than long lines
- There was interest in placing the green spaces and transportation routes on a base map and looking at connectivity opportunities.
- There was a brief discussion about zoning allowances for convenience commercial in neighborhoods, where that could be located and the mix of community opinions on the topic. It was noted that most neighborhood had asked for this in the past. The vision of this type of commercial use would be very limited in size and impact
- Ms. Galvin noted that a model like the Crozet Masterplan could be looked at for our land use plan.
- It was noted that the plan should be visionary and there was discussion on ways to get input to allow the community to weight in.
- The Riverfront and city/county edges should be used as opportunities.

There was interest in the Land Use Map including aspirational vision as well as reflecting our current zoning map. Radical changes could create concern in the community.

### **Public Comment**

Colette Hall noted there should be discussion about how people gather in an area. Do they move there first and business comes later or the other way around. People chose to live in an area because of its character. Don't change that without consulting the public.

Mark Kavita stated that his experience with business noted that low overhead and volume of sales are important. These are difficult to reach in a small scale neighborhood operation. Will residents pay more for the convenience?

Victoria Dunham noted that when she thinks of neighborhood commercial, she does not think of the scale of “Beer Run” but a much smaller size. There should be lots of buffering between residential and commercial/industrial. Think about lighting, truck traffic and other impacts. She did not want to have additional density in her neighborhood.

Bill Emory read a statement which outlined that some Land Use issues need to have determinations. They have been in discussion for a long time and there needs to be a resolution.

There was acknowledgement of this concern.

Meeting adjourned @ 7:07 pm.

**Planning Commission Work Session  
September 25, 2012  
Notes**

**Commissioners Present:**

Mr. Kurt Keesecker  
Ms. Lisa Green  
Mr. Dan Rosensweig  
Mr. John Santoski  
Ms. Natasha Sienitsky

**Staff Present:**

Jim Tolbert  
Missy Creasy  
Richard Harris  
Brian Haluska  
Michael Smith  
Willy Thompson  
Ebony Walden

Mr. Rosensweig convened the meeting at 5:10 p.m. and turned the meeting over to Ms. Creasy. Ms. Creasy made announcements concerning upcoming community outreach events and other reminders related to the Comprehensive Plan. She turned the time to Mr. Haluska who provided an overview of the Land Use Map update process. He stressed that this map is general and used as a one of a number of components for review of development applications. He reviewed the components of the memo and opened the discussion.

Mr. Keesecker asked why parcels were shown on this plan? It was noted that information is need to assist individual owners as they contemplate development of their parcels. It was also noted that a companion “Heat Map” could be helpful for showing the intensity of potential development in the City. Mr. Keesecker note that this potential “conceptual diagram” could include the “C” shape path (Route 29 south to Emmet extending around to West Main Street into W Market Street) and other nodes of activity. These diagrams could be included in the executive summary.

Commissioners provided feedback on specific map elements with the following conclusions:

- Mixed Use areas should be a deeper color (would need to adjust business-tech color to make these complementary).
- Public/Semipublic should be a less bold color.

Ms. Kathy Galvin noted that consideration of the Torti Gallas study and links between transportation routes and land use should be made. She asked about public input for this process. Mr. Haluska noted what activities had occurred to date and Ms. Creasy outlined the upcoming community input events. Mr. Haluska pointed out that a number of our survey respondents in the community did not want to see Charlottesville move in a different direction.

Mr. Santoski asked if there was potential to expand the commercial area further west on Fontaine. It was noted this could be a consideration.

Discussion concerning the identification of centers/nodes keeping in mind walking sheds continued. Staff reminded the Commissioners that each area of the City currently has its own character and that should be taken into account. Ms. Galvin sketched potential “transects” into

the Woolen Mills area and Ms. Green pointed out the physical barrier of the railroad to the scenario sketched.

Ms. Green asked that easements be added to show additional green space on the map. It was noted that this information is present on the open space map in the environment chapter.

Mr. Keesecker outlined the process he goes through as he analyzes a project for his clients and how that process might be useful moving forward.

Ms. Green pointed out that schools are community focal points as well as commercial areas.

Mr. Haluska summarized by noting that it would be helpful to overlay mapping data to show where commonalities exist and where centers are located. This could lead to some new opportunities. The “concept diagrams” could be used as companions to the land use map.

Mr. Keesecker presented a diagram that aided him in understanding how the individual changes proposed fit into the bigger picture. This diagram included the “C” shape path noted above, centers and ½ mile walking circles.

Mr. Rosensweig asked Mr. Keesecker, Ms. Galvin and Mr. Haluska to further explore the “concept diagram” idea.

Mr. Keesecker noted that it could be helpful to the public to provide 3-5 bullet points for the community vision which could be supported with a visual.

Mr. Rosensweig moved discussion back to the memo and focused on the general changes outlined. Everyone was okay with the Low Density residential classification, there was interest in exploring another name for Business-Technology, and there was one concern raised about designating open space for PUD’s as green space on the maps and how that might affect future development. There was a brief discussion concerning the differences between Mixed Use and Business Technology classifications.

Comments on the General areas are summarized as follows:

- Agree with Low Density Residential Designation
- Mixed Use – Generally okay
- Open Space – There was concern from Mr. Rosensweig with adding PUD open space into this designation where the open space was small. There was question as to how this would affect the ability to develop in the future.
- Neighborhood Commercial Designation – Generally okay
- Business /Technology Zone – There was interest in exploring renaming this “Charlottesville Innovation Zone” or something similar. Do all the current industrial areas fall into this category?

The discussion then moved to comments on the specific parcels noted in the memo. The following comments were made in reference to those as well as areas of consideration added for future discussion:

- #5 – Expressed concern

- #7 – needs more clarity but some feel mixed use works there. There is a class at UVA working on a project in that area.
- #12 – Dan felt this should be high density residential.
- Parcel across from #11 – The trapezoid property – it was felt this should be more intense than low density.
- #20 – After discussion it was determined to leave it like it is shown
- City Yard – Should we look at this?
- #11 – agree with the high density proposal
- Delavan – Why is it noted as high density when there are no connections?
- Low Density around MJH – what direction should these parcels go?
- #17 – this is really two items – the west side backs up to parking lots and the east to Locust
- Fontaine area – Should the mixed use/business area expand west?
- 5<sup>th</sup> Street Extended – Should think about the possibilities.

**Public Comment** – No Comments occurred.

Meeting adjourned at 7:15 pm.

**Planning Commission Work session  
October 23, 2012  
Notes**

**Commissioners Present:**

Ms. Genevieve Keller (Chairperson)  
Mr. Kurt Keesecker  
Mr. Dan Rosensweig  
Mr. Michael Osteen

**Council member Present**

Kathy Galvin

**Staff Present:**

Missy Creasy  
Richard Harris  
Willy Thompson  
Brian Haluska  
Ebony Walden  
Mike Smith

Ms. Keller convened the meeting at 5:10 pm and turned it over to Ms. Creasy.

Ms. Creasy reminded the Planning Commission that they should have received an email from Summer at the PDC letting them know who they have been partnered with from the county planning commission. The first City community meeting on Oct 17, 2012 was a success. The turnout was not high, but the participation from the community discussion was wonderful. The next meeting will be at Venable Elementary on October 25<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Creasy also confirmed that the next Joint Planning Commission meeting will be December 4<sup>th</sup>. A meeting place has not been set at this time. She also suggested that the Commission set aside dates on the calendar to be used for comprehensive plan review. She also suggested that they could add an extra hour to existing work sessions.

The Commission feels that they need additional time to review the material. They feel this will help them regroup and have a better time frame in reviewing the material given to them. The Commission has struggled with editing the chapters. They feel they need a more outlined structure as well as additional consistency with the goals and strategies. There was a request for a table of contents to assist in the review. They also agreed that a three tiered approach to the chapters should occur containing a vision statement, goals and objectives. Maybe a diagram that shows relationship that the vision, goals and strategies could also be created.

Ms. Creasy wanted to know what areas the commission wanted to start with and put the effort towards those first.

Ms. Galvin stated that Roanoke had done a great job with a diagram which could be helpful in the review.

Ms. Creasy wanted to know what would be helpful to the commission. Staff requested that the commission outline elements for inclusion “above the yellow line” on the draft and staff would provide draft language.

Ms. Keller feels that the information is positive, but the format may need some work.

Mr. Rosensweig feels that transportation is a big issue. He wanted to make sure that we discuss the many different ways one can move from one place to another. He feels that they should go through the chapters and highlight “words of excellence” for staff to include in the next draft.

Mr. Keesecker likes the idea of the statements being really simple. He would like the strategies to be underneath the goals and highlight single ideas.

Mr. Osteen would like to see a general concept above the line which is inclusive of all in our community.

Ms. Creasy noted that the commission should take a few moments to read each statement and highlight words or phrases that they are interested in having included in the draft language.

### **Transportation**

The Commission feels that the wording is excellent, but some things are missing. The vision should be about the connection of people and places. Shared streets and getting people to places in the city and county could be added to the vision. They feel that a parking goal is not needed.

### **Urban Design**

There should be a focus on the current character of neighborhoods. It should be more about the character of the space and not what the space will be used for.

### **Environment**

The first sentence of the chapter is a good start. The Rivanna River should be mentioned.

### **Housing**

The Commission feels that the sentence relating to the zoning impact should be taken out. Some additional language should be added to highlight transit oriented impact. They feel that a park doesn't have to be right in front of houses, but there should be an easy way to access a park close

to the neighborhoods. They also feel that there should not be any zoning in the vision, it should only be in the strategy.

A strong housing vision is important.

### **Economic Sustainability**

There was interest in outlining the target industries more fully in the vision as well as discussion about the connected nature of the City and County economies.

### **Public Comment**

Bill Emory, 1604 E Market St, is supportive of the changes to the chapters. He stated that Charlottesville only has one River, the Rivanna, and that should be mentioned by name.

Mr. Keesecker noted that he will be drafting diagrams for review of design concepts for the comprehensive plan and will consult with any parties which will be helpful in his work.

Meeting adjourned at 7:20 pm

