

**CITY OF NEWARK
DELAWARE**

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

October 16, 2018

7:30 p.m.

Present at the 7:30 p.m. meeting were:

Chairman: Alan Silverman

Commissioners Present: Bob Cronin
Will Hurd
Stacy McNatt
Bob Stozek
Tom Wampler

Commissioners Absent: Frank McIntosh

Staff Present: Mary Ellen Gray, Planning and Development Director
Tom Coleman, Acting City Manager
David Del Grande, Finance Director

Mr. Alan Silverman called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:40 p.m.

1. REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF THE 2019-2023 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM.

Mr. Silverman: I would like to call to order the City of Newark, Delaware Planning Commission meeting for Tuesday, October 16, 2018 at 7:30 p.m. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to review the Capital Improvements Program for 2019-2023. Madam Director, do you have opening comments?

Ms. Mary Ellen Gray: No, I do not.

Mr. Silverman: Mr. Coleman, you may get started.

Mr. Tom Coleman: Thank you. And thank you for hosting us this evening. Welcome to the Commission, Commissioner Wampler. Nice to have you aboard. We're happy to be here tonight to present the highlights of our recommended 2019-2023 Capital Improvement Program [CIP]. Our departments have worked to identify the needs of the community and feel that the five-year Capital Program presented this evening meets those needs. The successful passage of the Capital Referendum earlier this year has greatly helped us keep our most critical infrastructure projects moving and on schedule. For those of you who have been through the process before, it is rare that our CIPs look similar year-over-year due to the need to re-shuffle projects from a lack of funding. That's not the case this year. Most of what you will see this evening is largely the same as what we presented in the 2019 year during last year's 2018-2022 CIP review, with a few minor changes. Since the referendum largely secured funding for a five-year period, to the extent possible, this CIP will serve as our guide for the next five years.

So, tonight we have quite a few staff members in attendance in case anyone has any questions about particular projects. We have Electric Director Bhadresh Patel, Acting Public Works Director Tim Filasky, Parks Director Joe Spadafino, Deputy Chief and Acting Deputy City Manager Mark Farrall, Police Chief Paul Tiernan, Deputy Police Chief Kevin Feeney, Captain Van

Campen, Acting IT Manager Daina Montgomery, and our Finance Assistant Trevor Miller, in addition to Dave and I.

So, this slide represents the charge of the Planning Commission with respect to the Capital Budget, with the pertinent sections bolded. Ultimately, the Planning Commission has the responsibility to review the recommended CIP and advise Council on expenditures for capital projects that refer to a matter covered by the Comp Plan or the official map of the City. And most of these are going to be related to the Comp Plan.

In developing the Capital Program, our departments begin by reviewing projects that were previously approved or are underway from earlier programs. We confirm completion levels and discuss modifications to projects that may become necessary as we progress further into them. Likewise, staff [inaudible] the out-year projects, identifying new needs and confirming the continued need and Council and community support for projects that are existing in the program. These efforts are completed with a focus on how each project supports the provision of services today or moves the City's vision forward for tomorrow. The Capital Program presented in the 2019-2023 CIP aligns with the vision elements noted on these slides. The City's belief is that a healthy, active, sustainable, and inclusive community resonates with all who are committed to Newark's continued success. The Capital Program is the backbone of the City's work as a local government. This year's CIP carries forward the plan that we put in place in the 2018-2022 CIP and it keeps us primarily focused on infrastructure, maintaining our utilities, and ensuring that all who reside and work in Newark are receiving the electric, water, stormwater, and sewer service that they require on a daily basis. Lastly, we must safeguard the financial strength of the City via prudent investments and decision-making.

The recent passing of our referendum this past June helps us with the overall financial plan to use our capital reserves conservatively, recover the cost for our projects through fair and equitable means, and make certain that the City has sufficient revenue and resources to meet our Capital Project demands. As a successful referendum is a key to the City's ability to meet our capital spending requirements, in past years we would primarily use our reserves and current revenue to fund long-term projects. All of our projects were completed, sorry, were competing for the same dollar, which resulted in a delay of many projects, especially the large ones, pushing them out into future years. A lack of resources resulted in a five-year Capital Plan that changed frequently beyond the first year, as it was uncertain how the projects would be funded if we were able to get to them. The delay of projects or equipment, in many cases, would not save us money in the long-term due to increased maintenance costs and inflation. Now, with an approved referendum behind us, the City has a secure funding mechanism for much-needed projects, which has enabled us to stick to our plan from last year and carry it into 2019. In addition, the State Revolving Loan program as part of our capital portfolio, we now have the ability to secure new state grants which we were previously not eligible for. That means additional funding resources, which enables us to effectively plan and accomplish the projects we set out to do in the timeframes that we intended.

So, moving into our 2018 accomplishments, the Electric Department was very busy this year. They installed a new 10 megavolt amp substation transformer at our South Chapel Substation that serves the South Wellfield Treatment Plant along with the surrounding areas. They replaced conductors on the line that connects Apple Road to Forest Lane, which was aging and often the source of outages, especially here at City Hall. They also completed the automatic switching system on our 12-kilovolt system, that will increase reliability and decrease the length of outages.

Parks and Rec was also very busy, completing several hard surface improvement projects, including both parking lots and courts. Preston's Playground, if you haven't had a chance to stop out, is nearly complete and they're continuing to secure grant funding to construct the permanent accessible bathroom facilities at the site. Staff is also continuing to work on the Emerson Bridge and the Pomeroy Trail Connector to Fairfield Crest, with the expectation that both projects will be bid out in 2019.

Since [inaudible] Capital Program is in Public Works, they always have a good list of accomplishments here, but I'm going to start with some that aren't necessarily capital, but they are relevant. Moving back to January, they successfully implemented the new stormwater utility, which secured a stable revenue source for our stormwater program and our regular stormwater infrastructure projects like pipe replacement. In June we had the successful passage of the Capital Referendum. And then Public Works has also been very busy on the GIS front, continuing to build out their asset databases with accurate information that forms the backbone of our asset management programs. This year, they've been able to successfully roll out real-time data collection in the field using tablets with our field staff and summer interns, which will greatly improve our efficiency. They also performed a comprehensive overhaul of our water and waste water standards and specifications, which will help us build more consistent projects moving forward. The 2018 Street Contract is currently underway. They're working on Center Street and Hullihen right now. The Curb Ramp program has been bid. We've reviewed the bids and it's ready to go to Council for authorization. This year we were able to purchase and begin to use salt brine for anti-icing as part of our snow efforts. We expect that brine will help reduce our salt usage and improve overall plowing efficiency, both of which have a financial and environmental benefit. The largest and most critical project in the 2018 Program is the Curtis Water Treatment Plant Upgrade project. This one, I think, was WOOO2, so it was one of those projects that just kept getting pushed and pushed and pushed, because we never had funding for it. It is currently underway and most of the interior demolition work is complete. If you've passed the site, you'll notice the sides of the building are off and they're covered with large tarps, and they should start installation of the wall panels shortly. But most importantly, we have completed the conversion from gaseous chlorine to liquid sodium hydrochloride for disinfection. That's effectively bleach. It's much safer both for our employees and the environment and the public should there be an accident at the plant. We anticipate this project will be complete early in 2019. Our SCADA projects are progressing along well. All remote tanks and treatment plants are now in our system. And on the sewer side, all of our pump stations and siphon stations have updated control and we're monitoring them remotely through the SCADA system. And earlier this year, we completed sewer main relining on around 2,000 feet of sewer mains.

IT has nearly completed the Parking Lot Surveillance project, which should wrap up by the end of the year. They also completed camera installations at the reservoir and Curtis Water Treatment Plant to help address security weaknesses there. In addition, we replaced the CityView software with Tyler Munis for property tax, business licensing, and permitting, which eliminated the use of one of our three major ERP systems, providing better integration with our accounting software. In addition, they completed security upgrades with the implementation of SecureWorks, which helps identify potential data breaches and threats to our system. And our Police computer systems were migrated onto the City network which provided an assortment of benefits that are listed up on the screen.

As I mentioned earlier, we are very busy on the GIS front this year. Public Works now has access to their databases via the mobile tablets for field personnel and management. This helps both for day-to-day data access but also for completing field surveys and inspections. We can now enter data directly into the database as opposed to making notes on paper and hoping they get to the right person to be updated officially in the database. That is a problem that had a tendency to break down in the past. Hopefully everybody has a chance to view the new real-time Parking Map which works in coordination with the lot countdown signage that was installed this year in our downtown municipal lots. We also presented recently to the Planning Commission our new Development Proposals Map, which I understand was well-received, and they're using that as the basis to build a new Capital Projects Map that's similar. It has all our Capital Projects in the GIS map, so our residents can learn more about the work that's planned as part of our five-year Capital Budget process.

I'm going to hand it over to Dave for the next few.

Mr. David Del Grande: Thank you, Tom. So, as you can see, we made some refinements to the CIP sheets themselves, so not only is it prettier and attractive than it was in the past, it also has more information that's more useful to the Planning Commission, to our Council, and to our Newark residents. So, the main issue was use of funding in prior years and how it rolls over into future CIPs. So, we hope to capture those questions with these refinements that we made.

So, on the top of this sheet, we've added a Funding Summary box in the top right corner. And the Funding Summary highlights the funds brought forward from 2018 to be utilized between 2019 and 2023. This provides a better picture of how much funding requested in the 2019-2023 budget is new, and also creates a bridge from the previous year's CIP to our ongoing projects. In this scenario, we are requesting \$1.355 million for 2019, but \$500,000 of it is going to be carryover from 2018. The difference of \$855,000 reflects how much new money is asked for in the requested CIP. And, also, we now indicate if a project is reoccurring with or without an end date in the Project Status box on the upper left side.

The bottom of the CIP displays the following information now. The Prior Authorized box is the first column and that represents the project funding authorized in prior years. Next to that you'll see Actual Funds Utilized as of June 30, and that displays the expended or encumbered funds through June of 2018. Following along, we highlight what we plan to spend or encumber over the second half of the year, and the estimated expenditures of July through December. And then in the middle of the worksheet, you'll see the Estimated Authorized Balance 12/31/18, which reflects the estimated balance at year-end that we anticipate carrying forward into 2019. Lastly, the five-year window highlighted in the green remains unchanged, however we are now reflecting how much of the funds unexpended or encumbered in 2018 are rolling into 2019. So, in this example, \$500,000 of the \$1.355 million requested for 2019 includes a \$500,000 balance carried forward from 2018.

The yellow circle reflects the fund the project belongs to and this was a request of the Planning Commission last year to include this enhancement on our future forms, so we have done that. The red circles across the bottom adds up the funds utilized as of June 30, with what we estimate to spend in 2018. And then we add that number to our five-year CIP Budget to reflect the total project cost. The total cost of the whole project is displayed in the summary level up on the middle left side there in the red box. So, the balance to be funded only reflects what is in the five-year plan, which includes unexpended funds from 2018. So, the key carryover from this is unexpended funds or unencumbered funds from the current fiscal year, how that folds over into the future CIPs. And we hope we captured those questions by adding this part to our CIP sheets themselves.

Summarizing the entire five-year CIP for 2019-2023, we are requesting just over \$59 million, of which \$4.4 million is carryover balances from 2018 projects that are still ongoing. The CIP request for 2019 is just under \$19.6 million, which includes just over \$4.9 million for the Rodney Project itself. It is important to note that some of the projects where we are budgeting debt in 2019 are shown that way due to the timing of when we would need to encumber the funding, but not necessarily when the work will be completed. As presented, the total five-year CIP is just over \$59 million, of which \$4.4 million is carried over.

The Planning Commission expressed concerns in the past regarding the ever-changing out-years of the CIP. So, we put together this slide to show the 2019 CIP that's in the current 2018-2022 CIP to the 2019 CIP that we have in the 2019-2023 CIP. So, we broke the differences down by fund just to give a better granular detail level of what actually changed from last year to this year. So, all in all, there is a \$3.5 million difference between the two for a few reasons. For Stormwater, we moved \$1.4 million in funding to 2020, as this amount reflects the purchase price of the Rodney parcel from the University of Delaware, as we do not anticipate purchasing this parcel until the end of the project, which would be around 2020. The Water fund increased \$3.176 million, Project #W1402, which is the air stripper for the South Well Field project. That would be largely completed in early 2020, but since construction needs to be completed over the winter months when demand is low, we must encumber the funding in 2019 so we can be

ready to go with the contractor to hit the ground running once the students leave for winter break, and the demand will drop off at that point. Because of this, we need to move the funding from the year the project will be completed in 2020 back to 2019. So, that's a large chunk of the \$3.176 million under Water. The Sewer fund increased by \$555,000 and that's largely due to the funding for sanitary sewer repairs approved in 2018 but not expended due to pending State Revolving Loan approval. The additional \$55,000 has been added for interest payments that will be required on the State Revolving Loan starting in 2019. The Maintenance fund includes a new project to replace the City Hall HVAC system. As you're aware, we have our winter months and summer months going on inside this building and not necessarily agreeing with what's going on outside. We have a \$1 million project in place. Of that, we have \$50,000 put aside for 2019 just for the engineering study for a possible replacement of our heating and air-conditioning, or lack of heating and air-conditioning, that we have here. That's the reason for our Maintenance fund change. Parking increased by \$387,000 and that's largely due to the expansion of Lot 1, which was approved by Council just recently for \$290,000 after the original 1822 CIP was approved back in December. Parking meter sensors, the lot countdown sign project, and replacement radios round out the difference when compared to the 2018 numbers. Lastly, the replacement cost of the Unicity bus has steadily climbed over the years. We've added an additional \$10,000 for anticipated costs increases, while we pursue additional funding from the state for bus replacement. We have three Unicity buses which were on a cycle to replace every so often and due to pollution control issues and just the cost of replacing a bus, we're not being fully reimbursed for the full cost of the bus itself.

As you see on this chart, our utilities drive the capital spending and it's not any different from past years. Eighty-one percent of the gross capital spending for 2019 is earmarked for water, sewer, stormwater, streets, and our electric projects. These projects aren't glamorous or pretty to most, but they're the backbone of the City and often go unnoticed until an issue arises. The infrastructure projects in our CIP keep most unforeseen surprises from occurring, making our utilities reliable and efficient for our customers.

This slide represents the revenue streams from each fund's capital program. The majority of the funding for stormwater, water, and sewer will be the State Revolving Loan, and of the combined \$12.3 million for water, sewer, and stormwater, 87% of the funding is coming from the SRL in 2019. To date, we are in the loan closing process for the Rodney project and the other projects are in varying levels of the approval process, and we are meeting with the state over the next week or so to hone down our timeframe for the remaining projects.

Continuing on as to what makes up our 2019 funding sources, \$3.9 million, or 20%, of the funding for the CIP comes from current resources in 2019. Current resources also pay all the City's operating and debt service. Another \$848,000 comes directly from our capital reserves for what is called pay-as-you-go capital spending and does not rely on debt or borrowing. The majority of the use of our reserves in 2019 is to offset the rising cost of our aging equipment and vehicles. Our use of the reserve fund for our CIP dropped down from 12.8% of the budget in 2018 to just 4.3% in 2019, which provides a much-needed boost to our reserve balances in the water and sewer funds. Vehicle and equipment replacement account for another \$1 million, or 5% for our planned funding source for our equipment needs. And that's followed up by our grants and donations totaling \$2.5 million, of which \$642,000 is for the street program and \$1.15 million is for the bicycle and pedestrian bridge, and another \$165,000 for the body-worn cameras and mobile cameras for our Police Department. Now I'll hand it back to Tom.

Mr. Coleman: Thanks, Dave. We had these sheets in our presentation last year and we felt they were somewhat helpful, so we included them again this year. This first slide is a list of what represents all the projects to be financed using the State Revolving Loan fund per the referendum. We did recently bring the Rodney project to Council and are beginning to work with the state to secure the remaining funding through the SRF. That project is underway with the environmental remediation contract that is coming out to bid. Yeah, it's out to bid right now.

This next slide represents the projects that are being financed using bond or loan financing. We plan to bring the 2018 projects to Council all on one evening to have a discussion on the path forward for these projects. We have one last project that we're waiting to come back from bidding, we had the bid opening this morning, and we'll be bringing all those to Council not at this coming Monday's meeting but at the first meeting in November. We anticipate requesting that Council use surplus reserves to cash-finance these projects initially to delay taking on the debt to put ourselves back until the next round of projects in 2019.

The projects listed in this table represent those that have been identified as Priority 1 projects by their respective department directors. And by definition, a Priority 1 project is one that's currently underway or has grant funding. These individual CIP sheets provide additional detail as far as the funding sources for each project, which I believe the Commission has been provided with those detail sheets. There are only two new Priority 1 projects on here, which are the Mobile Video Recording Refresh and Body Worn Camera projects. The Police have received two grants, one for Mobile Video and one for Body Worn Cameras. Because of this grant funding and should Council support the projects and they stay in the budget, they'll appear as C1902 and 1904 in the budget. The rating of projects has existed in previous iterations of the Capital Budget, so everyone should be familiar with them. Funding for all Priority 1 projects totals just over \$13.5 million in 2019 and \$32.2 million over the five-year period.

Now this is a new slide that we included based on feedback we received during the departmental budget hearings with Council. It summarizes all equipment sinking fund spending across each separate fund. As you can see, we have 15 separate sinking fund accounts where we track spending on equipment. We're proposing to replace equipment valued at \$1.7 million in 2019, up from the \$861,000 that was included in 2018's budget. We are just over \$7.25 million budgeted for equipment over the next five years. We discussed this with Council recently but it's worth reiterating here that each piece of equipment in the sinking fund is tracked separately with an amount of money deposited over the life of the asset equal to its purchase price. So, if you depreciate a vehicle that costs \$100,000 to buy and it will last seven years, you take 1/7 of that \$100,000 and you put that into the equipment sinking fund. What that means is that when the equipment comes up to be replaced seven years from now, there's not enough funding in the sinking fund to cover the replacement at that time because the equipment is likely more expensive than it was when you first bought it. To make up the difference, we use current resources of Capital reserves from the fund in which the vehicle exists. So, if it's a water vehicle, we use water reserves. If it's an electric vehicle, we use electric reserves. If it's a police car, we use general fund revenue. When we push a vehicle from the year it was originally set to be replaced, we do save money in the near term because we don't have a depreciation expense that year, but it does result in a larger differential between what we saved for replacement and the final replacement cost. In 2019, the sinking fund shortfall was \$643,566 after taking into account grants. So, it's a pretty big differential of \$640,000 on \$1.7 million. In order to make it into the current year for replacement, each piece of equipment is evaluated by our mechanics in the Public Works Department, with a report provided to the Public Works Director which he reviews with the various department directors. Vehicles that can be retained for another year because they're in good shape are pushed out into future years for consideration at a later time.

Priority 2 projects are the highest priority among projects that are new for 2019, have not been started, or do not have grant funding. Funding for all Priority 2 projects totals \$4.7 million in 2019 and \$11.5 million over a five-year period. Included in this list is a recently approved Lot 1 Expansion. Many of these projects would normally fall victim to being bumped out in previous years but they're able to stay in the budget this year due to the referendum. I'd like to draw your attention to W1402 in particular because this is a project that's now being shown to be fully funded in 2019, as opposed to having it shown in the 2018 budget. Dave touched on this one earlier. The reason for this is just timing and came as a result of getting further into the project planning process, so it has to be completed over the winter to avoid having to purchase

water from Suez because that's when we have our largest demand, so we have to encumber the money earlier in 2019 to complete it in 2020.

Priority 3 projects are medium-to-high priority where the department director has determined that the City would be taking a calculated risk in deferring the project. We have \$126,000 of Priority 3 projects in 2019 and \$1.8 million in Priority 3 projects over the next five years.

Priority 4 projects are considered needs, but they are projects where there is not a considerable risk from deferring the project. We have \$495,000 in Priority 4 projects in the 2019 budget and \$2.9 million over the next five years.

Lastly, Priority 5 projects are ones that can start in year 2 or later of the CIP. We have \$100,000 in Priority 5 projects in the 2019 budget and \$735,000 over the next five years.

So, that's all we had tonight as far as the presentation and we figured we would get to the discussion quickly so, at this time, I'll turn it back over to the Commission to ask any questions that they have.

Mr. Silverman: Thank you very much, Mr. Coleman. Starting to my right, do the Commissioners have any questions or comments on the Capital Budget or its format?

Mr. Will Hurd: I guess I have, and this came up partly from your presentation, the Unicity buses, I know that we're using basically school buses, do we find that we're actually using those at their capacity, or would we be better off purchasing smaller like 15-passenger shuttle vans or something that might be more accessible and easier to get into, smaller to get around? Has this been looked at?

Mr. Coleman: Yeah, so, that is a discussion that we've had in the past. I'd say it's more relevant now than ever, so historically the grants that we receive from the state were sufficient to cover the full cost of the purchase of the vehicle, so the only cost that we had as a City was the long-term maintenance of the vehicle, and the school buses are relatively inexpensive to maintain, easy to work on, everything is wide open. Now we're in a situation where the grants are no longer covering the full cost of the bus and I think it gets into a cost benefit analysis on our side to see at what point is it going to be cheaper to operate these buses, make them smaller and deal with the increased maintenance associated with them. But it's an open question . . .

Mr. Hurd: Okay.

Mr. Coleman: And definitely one that we're going to review.

Mr. Hurd: That was my main question.

Mr. Coleman: And I guess to build off that, one thing that we discussed with Council, I think it was at the last meeting, was having Council direct our lobbyist to see if he can secure additional funding for the Unicity bus program, because what are we, \$140,000 short this year?

Mr. Del Grande: We're between \$120,000 and \$140,000 short annually on the operational side of the Unicity bus program, not including the bus purchase itself.

Ms. Stacy McNatt: Is that why the \$130,000 for 2019 and then the \$130,000 in 2021 is listed on the Unicity bus. Is that for the purchase of a new bus each of those years?

Mr. Coleman: Yes, so we get grant funding equal to \$115,000-ish, or something like that.

Mr. Del Grande: About \$115,000 or \$120,000. In that range.

Mr. Coleman: So, we'll have to cover the difference between that grant funding amount and the actual purchase price.

Mr. Del Grande: So, there are three buses that run the Unicity loop so every seven years or so they're replaced.

Mr. Hurd: That was it for my comments, but I'm glad to see some of the parking upgrades and improvements we've been talking about coming to play. Thank you.

Ms. McNatt: I have a few. Thank you for the report and the way it's been modified. It's really easy to read and really easy to evaluate. And I'm a detail-oriented person, so it's really helpful. Thank you. One, and I'm going to talk about some specific items, Project W1702, which is the Source Water Protection for the White Clay Creek Watershed . . .

Mr. Coleman: Yes.

Ms. McNatt: It seems like in reading that specific, which over five years is \$105,000, it seems like it's very contingent on DNREC's acceptance of this idea that's being proposed and I'm not suggesting it's a bad idea, but what happens if DNREC doesn't formally accept or modifies this in some way? How does this affect this project specifically?

Mr. Coleman: So, that's a very good question. Initially we included it in the Capital Budget as a request, so for those of you who may not be familiar with that particular project, the thought of the project is we have requirements that we need to meet to satisfy our permit, our MPDS permit for the City, the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System permit, MS4, and in these requirements, you have to improve water quality, reduce sediment, reduce nutrients and things like that that get into the water. Traditionally, you meet those requirements by doing projects within our urbanized area, so within the City itself. Us being a City, it's pretty expensive to get land to do projects like so you can do stormwater retrofits like we did at the Hunt of Louviers a little while back. You can try to build things on parkland to try to [inaudible]. There are lots of ways you can do it, but all of them are more expensive than paying a [inaudible] or planting a riparian buffer in a farm field. So, we've been working with the University of Delaware and the William Penn Foundation and a few other groups. They're forming a group called the Brandywine Christina Healthy Water Fund and what it is it's a fund that leverages money from downstream beneficiaries to do work upstream to improve water quality. So, the models that they used were from Columbia or somewhere like that where there's a bottling plant at the bottom of a watershed and there were a bunch of farmers up in the mountainous areas that were cutting down trees and creating pollution in the watershed, so the bottling plant paid the farmers to use better practices upstream and then they received a direct financial benefit downstream by having to treat the water less and that sort of thing. So, the thought process behind this water fund is that us, the City of Wilmington, Suez Water that operate water intakes on the creek can put our Source Water Protection funding into this fund and use it to leverage other grant funding, so like matching for other grants, and then take our money, maybe \$20,000, and it turns into a \$1 million project, which is not out of the question. So, the added benefit we have as a city is we have this MS4 permit that also has requirements. So, not only will we get benefits from Source Water, but we can also potentially meet our MS4 requirements. There's still somewhat of an open question as to whether or not DNREC will allow us to take credit for something that we do in a different state because of concerns over bookkeeping. Are we taking credit for it and West Grove taking credit for it? So, how do you make sure only one group is taking credit for what you're doing up there versus what you're doing down there? So, we've been working with DNREC and the DEP on it. DEP seems to be on-board. DNREC has indicated that there did not appear to be anything that would disallow us from doing that. So, things are looking good on the DNREC side for meeting the MS4 requirements, but even if they don't accept, it's still a valid program for our drinking water side.

Ms. McNatt: So, you can still use those funds if that ideology or that idea doesn't come to full fruition? You can still use that money and allocate it for the, in that project, that W1702, somewhere else? It's not like . . .

Mr. Coleman: Yes. So, largely we'd be doing the same projects. So, we did a pilot and as part of the project to show DNREC and DEP how we would handle the bookkeeping, how we would calculate exactly the nutrient removal efficiencies, the loads that we're taking out, and then it will allow us to do a cost benefit analysis. So, based on that project, how many dollars per pound of nitrogen did it cost to get that removal and what benefit did we see on the water side, what benefit would be we have seen on the MS4 side, so we can compare it to doing local projects here. So, we feel pretty comfortable that on the water side that there will always be a need. Whether or not it stays at that level, it's hard to say.

Ms. McNatt: It could increase, potentially.

Mr. Coleman: Yeah, it could definitely increase.

Ms. McNatt: Okay.

Mr. Coleman: Sorry to keep going on this one but there's another pay-for-success model that they're looking into which would be where they pay, where you have an investment company come in, let's say J.P. Morgan, and they have a bunch of money and they say give me all your projects, I'm going to do them all at one time and I'm going to guarantee that I'll meet your nutrient removal targets by a certain date. So, the goal of the project is fishable, swimmable in the White Clay and Christina. So, they can say I'll get your streams fishable and swimmable within five years and if I do, you sign this contract that says you'll pay me back at 4% interest or 5% interest so we can make a return on that investment for the next 20 years or whatever the project term is. So, all the risk is borne by the investment company and you can meet your goals today instead of having to wait 20+ years to get it over time. Certainly, it could be more or it could be different. We really don't know, but we have had projects identified. We completed the one already. Public Works has met with them to identify a second project to keep the ball rolling and build some track record with it.

Ms. McNatt: Thank you. My next question is I was just curious about which existing pond, it's been mentioned twice in the different projects, that there was an existing pond that received an aeration system. Which . . .

Mr. Coleman: It went in yesterday, correct? Was it yesterday?

Ms. McNatt: Which pond?

Mr. Coleman: So, over by Fountainview on the east side of town. So, it's the White Chapel Pond, correct? Yeah, White Chapel Pond.

Ms. McNatt: Why did they need an aeration system?

Mr. Coleman: So, we wanted to test . . . Tim, do you want to . . .

Mr. Silverman: Please identify yourself.

Mr. Tim Filasky: Tim Filasky, Acting Director of Public Works and Water Resources. Again, obviously we like to do tests before we put these things out in full use and we were approached by a local company named PondHawk. It's actually Linne Industries but they have a product called PondHawk. It's all Newark-based and I believe most of the solar panels were produced here or stored here in Newark for quite some time, and we wanted to use them when we started talking about the Rodney project. We wanted to get this company, or this product, into that project. So, we said we have a few years before that happens, let's get a pilot study,

maybe work with us to get some water quality samples prior to the installation and then we can look at it after the installation. It's primarily a golf course type product because we don't need electricity. Sorry, Bhadresh, we don't need the electricity because of the solar panel. But, we were able to put this out maybe a year before we would ever deploy it at Rodney and get some good results, or get some good data on whether, you know, it actually has results. The key point we found at that point was the pH level was very high in that pond and I'm assuming that's just due to stagnant water and the receiving waters that go into that pond. So, our hope is that we're able to reduce the pH somewhat, as well as get rid of some of the issues with less oxygen in that pond. Again, it just went in and the sun was out today, and it was pumping. I'm literally thanking Kelley Dinsmore, our Stormwater Coordinator, for getting this project complete as we speak. And it will be in my weekly report this week with a picture of the pond. You can just see the bubbles. Stop out, it's been cleared, you can see down into the pond and see the bubbles coming up if you have some time. Thank you.

Ms. McNatt: Thank you. My last question is in, I guess this is Iron Hill, I'm not sure, 1902, there's funding appropriated in 2019 and 2020 for the Tyler Technologies Contract Module to support certain, I guess, processes that are going on. But it stops, it seems like the way it's described, it seems like it's an ongoing process or an ongoing funded situation, so I'm not sure why it's not continuously funded in 2021, 2022, and 2023. And I'm only asking because I guess it seems like it's a computer type program and it should be continuously funded, maybe.

Mr. Silverman: Please identify yourself.

Ms. Daina Montgomery: Acting IT Manager Daina Montgomery. It's an implementation cost so it's just the cost to purchase the software license as well as the implementation with the vendor. And then there's ongoing maintenance costs that would be in the operating budget.

Ms. McNatt: Thank you. I think that's it. Thank you.

Mr. Tom Wampler: I have a couple of questions about a couple of projects that I'm not familiar with, so this will be pretty simple. On page 6, the Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge, where is that?

Mr. Coleman: So, that is along Paper Mill Road. If you're heading north on Paper Mill Road, Timothy's is on your right and if you go over the bridge, the Paper Mill Road bridge over the White Clay Creek, it will be parallel to the Paper Mill Road bridge on the left side, kind of near the dam.

Mr. Wampler: So, on the west side is a pedestrian and bicycle bridge?

Mr. Coleman: Yes.

Mr. Wampler: Okay, that's news to me. That's good. And on the same page, the Pomeroy Trail Connector, is that to connect the Pomeroy Trail like across Cleveland Avenue to the trail that goes back into the park?

Mr. Coleman: So, that is Pomeroy on both side. So, if you go up through the Newark Shopping Center and you cross the intersection of Paper Mill and Cleveland . . .

Mr. Wampler: That's still Pomeroy?

Mr. Coleman: That's still Pomeroy, yes.

Mr. Wampler: Okay so what's the . . .

Mr. Coleman: So, the connector is if you take it all the way up into the White Clay Creek State Park . . .

Mr. Wampler: Right?

Mr. Coleman: And where you hit, I've only heard it every referred to as bubble gum rock, but where the road makes a real sharp jog . . .

Mr. Wampler: Yes.

Mr. Coleman: There's a trail that heads up to Fairfield Crest from there.

Mr. Silverman: Behind Christiana Towers.

Mr. Coleman: So, if you go in Fairfield Crest and down Fremont Road, there's an electrical substation and a wall right there, there's an easement that runs down the Creek Road which is also part of the, basically the terminus of the Pomeroy Trail, where Pomeroy Trail bumps you into Creek Road. So, that easement, we're going to turn that into the trail, an improved trail.

Mr. Wampler: Got it. Thank you. And on page 16, either I didn't understand this or I'd like to understand it better, under one of the them we're talking about the Air Stripper Replacement for the South Well Field. Am I reading it right that had that been done in 2016, it would have cost, 2018, I'm sorry, it would have cost \$1.7 million and if it's done next year it's \$3.09 million?

Mr. Coleman: Sort of except that we would have never been able to actually do it for \$1.7 million. So, that project is also somewhat misleading because, as part of the Air Stripper project, we're also going to be remediating the two tanks that are next to it. So, in the out-years, those two tanks fell out of the budget, correct, Tim? One of the two tanks fell out of the budget, so there's a decrease over here, an increase over here in that Air Stripper project. But the \$1.7 million number, that was a number that we did before we had engineers come in and actually do a full review of what we needed to do to actually be able to pull it off, basically. So, we used numbers from the first one that was put in back in 2002 and kind of worked our way forward, and that unit wouldn't do what we need to do . . .

Mr. Wampler: And do you have an approximate revised figure for what that would have been? If the \$1.7 million was too low and wasn't covering everything, what would that have jumped up to?

Mr. Coleman: Up to the \$3 million number.

Mr. Wampler: And then on page 25, and this is a small item but I'm curious what's included in it, under Abandon Old Wells, in 2019 it's \$5,000, in 2020 there's \$40,000. What's involved in abandoning an old well that would cost thousands of dollars? And what do we do if we're, I assume that if you abandon a well, you're no longer using it . . .

Mr. Coleman: Correct.

Mr. Wampler: So, you have to make up the deficit and if you're using that water and now you're not, where do you get the water from?

Mr. Coleman: So, we're not using these wells. The ones we're proposing to abandon, it's what's referred to as the North Well Field, which is actually in the [inaudible]. If you know where Lewis Park is, Water Works Lane . . .

Mr. Wampler: Yeah, I live around the corner from that.

Mr. Coleman: So, in that complex there are a number of wells around that complex that aren't in use but haven't been officially abandoned so you can cap them and they're not in use anymore but abandoning a well is a formal permitting process. You have to fill the well with [inaudible], there's permits that are included. Basically, we take each well, this is one of those

projects that we always kind of push off and push off and this year we wanted to leave enough money in to at least do one. So, each well we estimated we could do one for \$5,000 or less, so we left \$5,000 in this year to actually do one, and then we'll maybe move to another one the next year and another one the next year. But it's a, the only real need for this project is risk mitigation. So, you basically have a straw in your aquifer and if someone were to contaminate the aquifer, that's bad. So, we want to plug that straw and eliminate that pathway to the aquifer. So, these are wells we haven't used in years. They have contamination that would require . . .

Mr. Wampler: I was going to say it was my understanding they weren't being used because they were already contaminated.

Mr. Coleman: Yeah, they're already contaminated but we don't want them to get more contaminated.

Mr. Wampler: Okay, that's it. Thank you.

Mr. Silverman: Commissioner Cronin.

Mr. Bob Cronin: Just one question so far. On page 25, Roosevelt Park Pressure District, is there a history to that? I mean I think Roosevelt Park is outside the City limits, from my understanding of where the limits are, so I'm curious about that.

Mr. Coleman: Yes, so, that is a project, this is its second go-round in the Capital Budget, so some time ago, I know it's been looked at at least once, perhaps even twice before, and it was always cost-prohibitive to do. Essentially, the way the water system works, is you drive pressure . . . pressure is equal to an elevation. So, by standards, you have to maintain 20 pounds of pressure in your water system legally. That's the minimum you can provide. At that minimum pressure, showerheads on the second floor maybe work. You basically have no water [inaudible] 40-45 feet high. So, if you've got a 30-foot-tall building, you have very little pressure at the top. So, it's not great from a user experience. But also, the more critical thing is our fire hydrants on those roads you basically can't use because if you open the fire hydrant, it would drop [inaudible] 20 pounds, and then they would have to boil water. So, the houses up on that road have very limited, if any, fire protection through the water system. So, what this project would do and the reason it's back in is, as our in-house crews have become more capable and technology has changed, there are now pump systems that we think we can put in place that are much more cost effective. We performed an alternatives analysis that looked at a couple of different ways that we could achieve the goals of this project. We have a higher-pressure zone that's nearby, so we could run a new main from the higher-pressure zone over to this one and just flip it onto the higher-pressure zone, or we could put in pumps. I think one we decided on putting in pumps. Yeah, so it's essentially like a valve pump. The water main would go into the side of this well pump, the pump is underground, it boosts its, and then pumps it right out the other side. And we think it's something our guys could probably do to install it themselves. So, it drove the cost down a lot and made it a lot more reasonable to actually do now. So, when those houses were built, they were built with the understanding that the water pressure was low. I think it might even be in their deeds that they have to have booster pumps, I'm not 100% sure. But we felt it was appropriate to include to allow us to do water main flushing, better maintenance on the system, not have to do water [inaudible], and provide fire protection to the neighborhood up the hill.

Mr. Cronin: So, in this case we provided water to this community that's not part of the City of Newark?

Mr. Coleman: Correct, yes. We provide water all the way out to what used to be Persia Carpet and now it's Ferris Roofing. So, we go down Kirkwood Highway as far as Harmony Road, and then we down Red Mill Road to Ruthar Drive, and then up Ruthar Drive to Happy Lane. So, we go out that way pretty far.

Mr. Cronin: Thank you.

Mr. Stozek: Okay. I really don't have questions about specifics. I'm going back to page and I'm more always in the philosophical arena. If I look at page 1, I'm assuming that the . . .

Mr. Cronin: Page 1 of this . . .

Mr. Stozek: No, I'm looking at page 1 of the CIP, I guess. Sorry. So, I look at this and I'm assuming, it says the budget for this year is a little over \$13 million. Is that correct? The amended budget.

Mr. Coleman: 2018, yes.

Mr. Stozek: Pardon?

Mr. Coleman: Yes. The 2018, yes.

Mr. Stozek: Okay, the concern I have every year is, again, trying to level some of the spending. We're always front-end loaded in a project. So, if you go to the top of the page, the \$4.3 million that's prior authorization balance, where, principally, does that come from?

Mr. Coleman: So, that would be projects that were approved in 2018 or before that weren't yet completed. So, one of the things we ran into was having not done a referendum in a while and borrowing, we were maybe a little optimistic as to how soon we had to turn around the legal documents to get our loan funding authorized. So, we had like the sewer main project, for example, that was a half-million dollars that we anticipated being able to get done this fall because they were pretty easy projects to get out on the street, contracted and installed. But we haven't been able to get through the SRF loan process yet, so we haven't secured the funding and so . . .

Mr. Stozek: Basically, work that's been delayed.

Mr. Coleman: Yes. So, the \$4.5 million is things that we thought would be done and haven't gotten done yet.

Mr. Stozek: So, but if I look at the five-year plan, we're talking about \$60 million over five years. If I throw in some extra for unforeseen things that are going to come up and bump it up to, say, \$66 million dollars, that's an average of about \$13 million a year. Which is about what we're presumably spending this year. So, I guess my question is, where is, in that \$13 million this year and \$13 million average, where is the money for the \$19 million coming from?

Mr. Coleman: So, the big bump in 2019 and 2020, if you look at the Rodney project, I think we have \$4.7 million, \$4.77 million or just under \$5 million of that 2019 money is directly from Rodney, and then \$3 million is for a project that was supposed to go in 2020 and got pulled forward in 2019. So, of that \$19 million, you could take \$8 million of it out because it's a project that was either supposed to be in the next year and is really only showing up in 2019 administratively because that's when we have to encumber it but we're not actually going to spend it until the next year, and then the other project is a one-off that doesn't happen very often. So, that was one thing that we worked pretty hard to try and balance. So, if you look at 2021, 2022, and 2023, that's probably where it's close as I imagine we've had three years back-to-back-to-back with \$9.2, \$9.5, and \$8 million. So, we've tried to level the spending out year-over-year, but . . .

Mr. Del Grande: If I could add, so our budget for 2019 is \$19.6 million. Of that \$19.6, \$4.4 million is coming over from balances left over on our 2018 projects. So, the net of \$15.2 is about what we're looking at.

Mr. Stozek: Okay. And, again, I come from a different place. I've never worked for government and, you know, basically we get budgets and maybe we get a few percent added on each subsequent year. We haven't spent a lot more time being concerned about leveling our numbers out. So, and I don't need an answer today, but I guess the question would be if this \$13 million is indeed the leveled average over the next five years, if you had to cut \$2 million out of that \$15.1 million that you've got forecast for this year, do you have idea, either are there things that you think are going to slide, because things have slid in the past, or are there things that you can cut if the money is not available? Again, I don't need an answer today, but I think you need to put some thought towards that unless you know for sure you're going to get all this money.

Mr. Coleman: One other thing that a lot of, not a lot, but there are some projects like IT-related things in particular that have been hard to really forecast where you're going to be 3-4 years from now in IT because everything changes relatively quickly, and you have projects that pop up like the Body Worn Camera project . . .

Mr. Stozek: Sure

Mr. Coleman: That don't reflect in the current year, especially if they're grandfathered. No, I think it's a good question. We try to keep it leveled, but I think so long as we keep the out-years levels and have an expectation that we're probably going to have projects that come up, you know, we can plan for it.

Mr. Stozek: Again, I threw another \$6 million in there to get to the \$13 million. I guess the question is, of this \$15 of new money, what's the probability that a reasonable percentage of those projects are also going to slide? That you're not actually going to spend that money in 2019?

Mr. Coleman: And chances are if the projects are going slide . . . Dave, can you go back to the, let's see . . .

Mr. Del Grande: On the bottom left we have \$10.6 million related to the State Revolving Loan in 2019.

Mr. Coleman: Yeah, there you go. So, the State Revolving Loan funding, in particular, so if the project slides, we don't pay anything until you actually do the project. So, if any of those projects ends up moving to an out-year, it doesn't have a financial cost to us. We didn't put money aside for that and then not do a different project because we thought we were going to do this one and it didn't happen. So, of the \$15 million, \$10 million is in the SRF, there's some more that's in bonds, there's a good \$2 million in grants. So, what's our total current resources?

Mr. Del Grande: \$3.9 million is coming out of City money and is coming out of current revenue.

Mr. Coleman: So, \$3.9 million is coming out of current funding, and of that \$3.9, \$1.7 is vehicles.

Mr. Del Grande: That's aside from that.

Mr. Coleman: Okay.

Mr. Del Grande: So, \$3.9 million is current revenue coming out of tax, sewer, water fees that we charge. \$1 million is coming out of reserves, out of our vehicle replacement fund. \$1.8 million is grants. So, everything we have identified for vehicle and equipment replacement for our grants, our other financing resources are pretty locked down and established. And like Tom said, if the funding doesn't come through for whatever reason, the project doesn't go forward. So, all this is doing is creating a map of the spending plan for us to create our ability to finance

this. So, our 2018-2022 CIP is relatively similar, minus the changes that we talked about this evening. And we're always going to have a few million dollars carrying over to the next year just due to the timing of things beyond our control. So, I'm not so sure of what other items we could talk about in here . . .

Mr. Stozek: The tax increase was 4%, right?

Mr. Del Grande: Right.

Mr. Coleman: Correct.

Mr. Stozek: What's the dollar value of that?

Mr. Del Grande: Every 1% generates about \$33,000 the first year. I'm sorry, \$33,000 the first year and then \$66,000 in the second year.

Mr. Stozek: So, relative to this, it's pretty insignificant.

Mr. Del Grande: Yeah.

Mr. Coleman: Yeah. And then with the tax, I think our tax rate has been the same since 2016.

Mr. Del Grande: Correct.

Mr. Coleman: So, we've been flat for the last two years.

Mr. Stozek: And, again, it's not, I would just encourage you to continue to look at this leveling and part of the leveling is what are the priorities of your projects. I mean everybody has their favorites that they want to put in but what things are really necessary and what things can be delayed. We certainly have voids in the outer years where you could be pushing money out there and spending it later.

Mr. Del Grande: And most of our projects that tend to go, where we tend to spike with what we're requesting has a lot to do with our ability to secure grants. And if we're relying, in most cases, the state and federal money or, in some cases, the county, to provide a matching grant of some type. And, ultimately, we know if they're going to be this year or next year, but when we get into years 2-5 . . .

Mr. Stozek: Sure.

Mr. Del Grande: It's a guess. So, for those reason, we don't necessarily put some of those items that far out because we don't have any certainty on the funding. So, it becomes kind of tough on our side to plan in that regard.

Mr. Stozek: I think that's even more important about why your prioritization really needs to be dead-on, just where things really fall on a priority list. Not that they're just #3, but they're #3.1, #3.2, #3.3, so you can look at things that you can delay or move forward depending upon funding. That's all.

Mr. Del Grande: Okay.

Mr. Silverman: Okay. I have some general comments and one specific comment. I failed to write down the prefix alphabet number but it's probably W1503.

Mr. Coleman: Do you remember what the project was?

Mr. Silverman: It dealt with replacing the interconnection between Suez and the City of Newark with respect to the train station construction.

Mr. Coleman: Yes?

Mr. Silverman: Will the City be able to recapture its expenditure as part of the expense incurred with the train station or the STAR site?

Mr. Coleman: So, that is an interesting project. Essentially, our interconnection was, again, back at the same site as the abandoned wells on Water Works Lane, and if I took you to see the building, you wouldn't think it was even in operation anymore. It barely, I think we've used it once since the reservoir was completed back in 2006, and that was when we had a project at the water treatment plant. The building is in terrible shape. The facility is in terrible shape. If this opportunity didn't come along, we would have to rehab that building and pump station. We actually had a project; the original version of this project was just that. It was to rebuild that pump station in its current location. When the train station project came up, Suez has their large water main is on the south side of the train tracks and Amtrak is widening the tracks as well, so they would have had to have run a new main across the tracks from . . . when Amtrak is widening their tracks, they have to move their big main, and then they'd have to run a new main across Amtrak's tracks to our old interconnection site, so we were asked by both DelDOT and Suez if we'd be agreeable to relocating that, our interconnection with the south side, because it would have held the whole project up because of dealing with Amtrak. It's not going to cost us any more than it would have in the other location and we made, that's a project, I think, what year is it in, it's in an out-year, correct?

Mr. Silverman: I don't know.

Mr. Del Grande: 2020.

Mr. Coleman: It's in 2020.

Mr. Del Grande: And 2021. Actually 2021 is the . . .

Mr. Coleman: 2021. So, the way we . . . sorry.

Mr. Silverman: Identify yourself please.

Mr. Filasky: Tim Filasky, Acting Director of Public Works and Water Resources. They, actually, did pick up the tab for the work that they did now in order to . . . so we currently have the interconnection back up and running on the south side and they paid for the meter vault, the meter pit, and all the meters, as well as all the piping for the deadheads that come up out of the ground. So, all we need to do now to add the interconnection is to go in and drop a new portable pump in order to make the interconnection with Suez.

Mr. Silverman: Thank you. You've answered my question.

Mr. Coleman: Thank you, Tim.

Mr. Silverman: I do have a question that I'd like to direct to a Police official. With my experience with fire service, we have been told through federal regulations that we're going to have to abandon our 800-megahertz radio system within two years and go to, I believe, a 700-megahertz system. Will the City Police effort be under this same change in megahertz?

Mr. Kevin Feeney: One of our capital projects was the mobile in-car for this year, and that should be completed by the end of the year and we should be compatible. Because we had until 2023 but with the rebates, for cost-effectiveness, we wanted to get that done by 2018.

Mr. Silverman: Okay, but when this mass change, I believe, to 700-megahertz, is that reflected in the Capital program to bring all the radios in compliance?

Mr. Feeney: We will be in compliance, yes sir.

Mr. Silverman: Thank you. In preparation for making a recommendation to Council, I'm citing from Section 2-89 General Powers and Duties of the Planning Commission. It shall be the duty of the Planning Commission, after considering the advice of the Planning Director, to advise the City Council on expenditures for capital improvements where such improvements refer to a matter covered by the Comprehensive Plan. Comprehensive Plans are often used as a plan for growth but as we know in the City of Newark, we are relatively confined with respect to growing outside the City boundaries. So, Newark's Comprehensive Plan is one of maintaining our community and accommodating change. The proposed Capital program affirms this idea of accommodating change and maintaining our community. I'd like to congratulate the staff and the City Manager for bringing to the surface a number of items that have been out of side and out of mind for years. A substantial number of the listed projects deal with remediation and replacement, and that's 100-year-old water mains, it sounds rather odd but exercising valves. Those of us who don't exercise the valves underneath our sink know what happens when you go to shut off the water when you have to replace a washer. Unless you've exercised them, you end up with a big plumbing problem. Replacing or relining parts of the sewerage system, which is at the ends of its designed life. And this Capital program, as it's laid out, is well thought out and, in addition, clearly calls out in easy-to-understand, non-technical descriptions, along with GIS-aided illustrations over aerial photography, the locations and extent of the Capital Improvement Programs. It's on the public website and you tell me you've got to replace 2,800 linear feet of sewer line, but show me that on an aerial photograph and the neighborhoods it affects and the number of manholes that are involved and the fact that you're relining my sewer line and not tearing up my street, visually, that makes quite an impact and, I think, drives your program home. The Acting City Manager spoke about the GIS system as being the backbone of the asset management program of the City. This is something that the Planning Commission members and I, in particular, have been supporting for the last 4-5 years, and I think we're really seeing the value of it. It brings home the Capital projects. The descriptions and explanations that are in the program are well-written and easy for the average citizen or Commissioner to understand. It's not a lot of technical babble or accounting kind of language and I think it increases the transparency to the citizens and the Commission as to what's actually going on. That being said, the Chair will entertain a motion to recommend approval of the 2019-2023 Capital Improvements Program as presented and discussed with the Planning Commission on October 16, 2018. This is based on the findings of fact that the expenditures described in the 2019-2023 Capital programs comply with the goals of the general Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Hurd: I so move.

Mr. Silverman: Is there a second?

Ms. McNatt: I'll second.

Mr. Stozek: Second.

Mr. Silverman: All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. All those opposed, Nay. The motion carries.

Mr. Del Grande: Thank you very much.

MOTION BY HURD, SECONDED BY MCNATT THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION MAKE THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL:

THAT CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE 2019 - 2023 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM AS PRESENTED TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON OCTOBER 16, 2018.

VOTE: 6-0

AYE: CRONIN, HURD, MCNATT, SILVERMAN, STOZEK, WAMPLER
NAY: NONE
ABSENT: MCINTOSH

MOTION PASSED

Mr. Silverman: Since there is no other business to be considered on this agenda, the Chair entertains a motion to adjourn

Mr. Hurd: I move to adjourn.

Ms. McNatt: I'll second.

Mr. Silverman: All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. All those opposed, Nay. The motion carries. We stand adjourned.

MOTION BY HURD, SECONDED BY MCNATT THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING BE ADJOURNED.

VOTE: 6-0

AYE: CRONIN, HURD, MCNATT, SILVERMAN, STOZEK, WAMPLER
NAY: NONE
ABSENT: MCINTOSH

MOTION PASSED

There being no further business, the Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Frank McIntosh
Planning Commission Secretary

As transcribed by Michelle Vispi
Planning and Development Department Secretary

Attachments

Exhibit A: [Finance Department project detail report \(Capital Improvement Program 2019-2023\)](#)
Exhibit B: [Finance Department presentation \(Capital Improvement Program 2019-2023\)](#)